

MEDIEVAL RHETORIC: ITS STUDY AND PRACTICE  
IN NORTHERN EUROPE FROM 1050 TO 1250

by

John R.E. Bliese  
B.A., Kearney State College, 1966  
M.A., University of Kansas, 1969

Submitted to the Department of Speech and  
Drama and the Faculty of the Graduate School  
of the University of Kansas in partial ful-  
fillment of the requirements for the degree  
of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dissertation Committee:

Redacted Signature

---

Chairman

Redacted Signature

---

Redacted Signature

---

### Acknowledgments

I would like to thank, first of all, my adviser, Dr. Donn Parson, for reading the rough drafts, and for his infrequent snide letters reminding me that this project was yet unfinished. I would also like to thank Dr. Wil Linkugel and Dr. David Berg for serving on my committee, and for their assistance in this project. A special debt is owed to Dr. Lynn Nelson, who introduced me to the study of the middle ages, and who first suggested this general topic for investigation. Dr. Thomas Beisecker is also to be thanked, for becoming a medievalist on five minutes notice without inordinately loud protest. Finally, thanks must be given to Messrs. James B. Beam, T. Jeremiah Beam, and John Walker, for having made this project tolerable.

J.B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION . . . . . 1  
    Precis of Chapters . . . . . 15  
CHAPTER II. AVAILABILITY OF RHETORICAL TEXTBOOKS . 19  
    Aristotle . . . . . 19  
    Cicero . . . . . 24  
    Quintilian . . . . . 42  
    Minor Rhetoricians . . . . . 66  
    Libraries . . . . . 77  
CHAPTER III. RHETORIC IN THE SCHOOLS . . . . . 90  
    Grammar Schools . . . . . 93  
    Advanced Schools . . . . . 103  
    Universities . . . . . 113  
    Commentaries . . . . . 129  
    Ideal Curricula . . . . . 140  
    Geographical and Chronological Variations . . 147  
    Conclusion . . . . . 153  
CHAPTER IV. INTRODUCTION TO BATTLE ORATIONS . . . . 156  
CHAPTER V. THE SAME SPEECH IN SEVERAL CHRONICLES . 184  
CHAPTER VI. COMMONPLACES . . . . . 240  
CHAPTER VII. CLASSICAL MODELS . . . . . 308  
CHAPTER VIII. CONCLUSION . . . . . 333  
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 357

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In the educational system of the ancient world, both Greek and Roman, the study of rhetoric occupied a central position. To perform one's duties as a citizen of the city or state, one had to be able to speak effectively. The orator-statesman was, in many cities, the ideal. With the rise of Christianity, the status of rhetoric became problematic. Rhetoric was a pagan discipline, closely connected with the concept of pagan culture. Its teaching normally involved all sorts of pagan stories; it often led to the very opposite of Christian humbleness; and it expressed an ideal in the use of language that the Scriptures did not fit. Had St. Augustine not eventually taken the position that the study of rhetoric could be used by Christians without necessarily damaging their souls, the subject might have faded into the background, regardless of its ancient lineage. But St. Augustine did, indeed, lead the West into accepting the pagan study of rhetoric as legitimate and useful for Christians, and Western Europe received as part of its classical heritage the ideal of eloquence.

The middle ages, however, had not the same potential

for the use of eloquence that the ancient world had. There were not the city states where each citizen was expected to participate in government. There were not the law courts where an effective pleader might sway a jury of citizens. And the occasions for epideictic oratory were lacking as well. Yet rhetoric maintained a place in the educational tradition, as one of the seven liberal arts. It was studied throughout the middle ages, in all of Western Europe, from various points of view and with varying amounts of interest; but it was studied. Naturally, the teachers and students of the middle ages approached the concept and ideal of eloquence with a different motivation than the ancients had. The resulting various fortunes suffered or enjoyed by rhetoric during the medieval period have been insufficiently studied, for the most part. It is the purpose of this investigation to take one area of Western Europe, one period of the middle ages, and consider the fate of one aspect of rhetoric.

Since the middle ages had different interests and a different social structure than the ancient world, men could not use the study of eloquence in the same ways. Therefore, it is hardly surprising to find that although they continued to study rhetoric, medieval scholars adapted the subject to their own needs. In doing so, they developed four separate fields of study based on the ancient rhetor-

ical principles.<sup>1</sup> In the first place, one of the few areas where there was much potential for public speaking in the middle ages was in preaching. Consequently, one of the most important developments in medieval rhetoric was its application to the sermon. While early, in the dark ages, sermons were relatively infrequently given, the primary function of the priest being to perform the Mass, by the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and especially in the thirteenth with the rise of the friars, sermons became more important. Thus it is not surprising to find a large number of manuals for preachers teaching what was known as the *ars praedicandi*. Since this is an aspect of Church history, as well as of rhetoric, many of these manuals have been published and a relatively large amount of study has been devoted to the various *artes praedicandi* and their doctrines.

A second important development of medieval rhetoric came in the eleventh century, the *ars dictaminis*. As legal systems developed, and concomitantly central administrations of the various kingdoms, duchies, counties, and the Church became more highly developed, the demand increased for people who were able to keep the records and produce the necessary correspondence. While kings, dukes, bishops and the like had long had clerks who performed such functions,

---

<sup>1</sup>James Murphy, "Saint Augustine and Rabanus Maurus: The Genesis of Medieval Rhetoric," Western Speech, XXXI (1967), 95.

in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the demand for such people multiplied. Naturally, educators sought to fill this need by teaching the correct and proper methods of composing letters. They did so by adapting the ancient rhetorical principles to the form of the letter. Many manuals of the *ars dictaminis* survive. There are not only many treatises explaining how to write letters correctly, but also collections of examples of correct letters for every conceivable occasion. The latter, of course, rather rapidly eliminated the need for the former, although, especially in Italy, a more highly specialized branch of dictamen developed, the *ars notaria*, which could not be so easily displaced by collections of models. This aspect of medieval rhetoric has also received much attention, as it is important not only for the history of rhetoric but is also related to the development of institutionalized bureaucracies which had not previously existed. It also has been studied for the light the sample letters shed on life in the middle ages.

A third branch of rhetoric, the *ars poetriae*, was developed in the medieval period, especially in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries, that bridges two of the subjects of the trivium, rhetoric and grammar. This is the study of rhetoric purely as a matter of style, particularly poetic style. Based largely on the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, many treatises were produced listing figures and tropes, giving examples of each, explaining differences between

them, prescribing the places where each was appropriate, and the types of style which each fit. This aspect of medieval rhetoric, too, has received much attention, primarily from the point of view of the history of grammar and style.

All three of the above mentioned approaches to the study of rhetoric, as the medieval scholars adapted the ancient subject to their own individual needs, diverge from the ancient ideal of eloquence as desirable in itself, as well as necessary for performing one's duties as a citizen. Rhetoric purely as a liberal art is not included in any of the above three. Yet, as one of the seven liberal arts, such an approach to the study of eloquence did survive during the middle ages. While it did not have as an outlet, as a utilitarian foundation, the ancient concept of the citizen, rhetoric was still studied during the middle ages as a liberal art and not only isolated aspects of it as tools for some other end, whether it be preaching or letter writing or composition of poetry. Yet this fourth aspect of medieval rhetoric has received very little attention. While many works exist concerning *ars praedicandi*, *ars dictaminis* and *ars poetriae*, very few exist concerning the study of rhetoric as a liberal art. While there are modern collections of medieval preaching manuals, manuals and models for letter writing, and manuals for composing poetry, not a single one of the medieval treatises on rhetoric as an art



in itself has even been published. A few secondary works appeared early in this century that dealt with the liberal art of rhetoric, but for the most part they must be considered outdated. A few articles have been published recently on the study of rhetoric in the medieval schools, but they are for the most part incomplete, or concerned primarily with the late middle ages. This study, then, will be concerned with filling this gap.

Actually, this study began with a very different goal in mind. At the outset, the writer assumed that it would be a reasonably simple task to turn to a few secondary sources to discover some generalizations about rhetoric as taught during the two hundred years from the mid-eleventh to the mid-thirteenth centuries. It was the intention, then, to take an overview of the rhetorical principles that students would have learned in their studies, and apply them to specific exercises in rhetoric, in the form of the battle orations the chroniclers put in the mouths of their characters. However, it rapidly became obvious, on turning to the major secondary sources, that, at least for this period, their assertions varied so greatly that the whole question would have to be investigated.

The problem centers around the seemingly simple questions: What text books were read in the study of rhetoric? Where? And to what extent? Haskins explains the significance of these questions.

To the historian of the influence of classical antiquity upon the civilization of the Middle Ages the study of mediaeval textbooks yields information of the first importance. It was almost wholly as formulated in a few standard texts that the learning of the ancient world was transmitted to mediaeval times, and the authority of these manuals was so great that a list of those in use in any period affords an accurate index of the extent of its knowledge and the nature of its instruction.<sup>2</sup>

To illustrate the difficulty, a few quotations from secondary sources will suffice. Buttenwieser believes that Cicero's De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium provided the substance of the rhetorical art.<sup>3</sup> Paré, Brunet and Tremblay add to this Cicero's De Oratore and the commentary on De Inventione by Marius Victorinus, contending that they were also normally read in this subject.<sup>4</sup> Rashdall concludes, "Under the head of rhetoric the treatises of Cicero, such as the Topics (with the commentary of Boethius), the De Oratore and the pseudo-Ciceronian ad Heren-

---

<sup>2</sup>Charles Homer Haskins, "A List of Text-Books From the Close of the Twelfth Century," in Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924), p. 356.

<sup>3</sup>Hilda Buttenwieser, "The Distribution of the Manuscripts of the Latin Classical Authors in the Middle Ages," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1930), p. 37. Hereinafter cited as: Buttenwieser, "Distribution."

<sup>4</sup>G. Paré, A Brunet, and P. Tremblay, La Renaissance du XII<sup>e</sup> Siècle: Les Ecoles et l'Enseignement, Publications de l'Institut d'Etudes Medievales d'Ottawa, Tome III (Paris et Ottawa, 1933), p. 156.

nium were largely read."<sup>5</sup> Boskoff claims that De Oratore was not normally studied, but rather the Ciceronian De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium, along with the very brief summaries in the encyclopedias by Cassiodorus, Isidore and Martianus Capella. She adds that Quintilian was not normally studied.<sup>6</sup> Abelson generalizes that the encyclopedias alone were normally studied, but, in those few places where conditions were especially favorable, Cicero's De Inventione, De Oratore, Topica, and the Rhetorica ad Herennium were also studied. Furthermore, "in some instances the works of historians and classical and Christian prose writers, notably the Consolation of Philosophy of Boethius, were also read as a part of the study of rhetoric."<sup>7</sup> He continues, concluding that Cicero's and Quintilian's works were read after the "technical study" of rhetoric, as illustrations of excellent Latin style.<sup>8</sup> Dickey believes that

Cicero's De Inventione and . . . the Rhetorica ad Herennium /were/ the two basic texts of medieval rhetoric. Cicero's mature works, the

---

<sup>5</sup>Hastings Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, 3 vols., ed. by F.M. Powicke and A.B. Emden (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936), Vol. I, p. 35.

<sup>6</sup>Priscilla S. Boskoff, "Quintilian in the Late Middle Ages," Speculum, XXVII (1952), 77.

<sup>7</sup>Paul Abelson, The Seven Liberal Arts: A Study in Mediaeval Culture (New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1965; first published, 1906), p. 59.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

Orator and Brutus 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.<sup>9</sup>

Holmes presents, as the normal texts for the study of rhetoric at Paris in the twelfth century, "the Rhetorica ad Herennium, Cicero's De Oratore, and the works of Quintilian."<sup>10</sup> Later, he provides a different list, greatly expanded, of texts used in studying rhetoric. This time he includes Cicero, Quintilian, Ovid, Vergil, Juvenal, Fortunatus plus the histories of Gregory of Tours, Bede, Livy, Florus, and Josephus!<sup>11</sup> Finally, Murphy, while recognizing the widespread existence of Cicero's De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium attributed to him, concludes that "in the north Cicero survived largely in reputation and in physical presence—that is, in seldom-consulted books resting on library shelves and in grammatical teaching—while south of the Alps Cicero exercised a direct influence through constant use."<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Mary Dickey, "Some Commentaries on the De Inventione and Ad Herennium of the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries," Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies, VI (1968), 1.

<sup>10</sup>Urban Tigner Holmes, Jr., Daily Living in the Twelfth Century (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1953), p. 121.

<sup>11</sup>Urban Tigner Holmes, Jr., "Transitions in European Education," in Twelfth-Century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society, ed. by M. Clagett, G. Post and R. Reynolds (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961), p. 17.

<sup>12</sup>James Murphy, "Cicero's Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," Quarterly Journal of Speech, LIII (1967), p. 336.

Thus the secondary sources. While most of them agree that De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium formed the substance of the liberal art of rhetoric during this period, not all do so. There is widespread disagreement on the extent to which Cicero's other rhetorical works, especially De Oratore, were used in the schools. The same is true of the availability and use of Quintilian.

It becomes clear upon examining the modern histories that many of the disagreements stem from generalizations, based on the study of a particular period in the middle ages, that have been extended to cover the entire age. Thus, for example, Abelson's belief that the study of rhetoric was almost entirely confined to the study of the brief treatments of the subject in the encyclopedias may have been true for some period or periods prior to the one in question here, but certainly does not fit the middle ages in their entirety.

With such widespread disagreement, the whole question must be investigated, and in the course of the research, this investigation assumed a rather large place in the total project, necessarily at the expense of analysis of the battle orations. It will become fairly clear that it is not possible to isolate a few rhetorical principles accepted throughout northern Europe during this time period, and then apply them to the speeches. Once again, a detailed analysis of the available evidence will dispel the illusion of uni-

formity throughout medieval Europe.

The ancient rhetorical tradition which was studied by educated men, while being applicable in many ways to literature, both prose and poetry, was primarily directed toward the training of orators. However, during the middle ages occasions for oratory were rather limited. Preachers gave sermons, and adapted the ancient rhetorical principles to help them compose and deliver effective ones. By and large, however, this was done beyond the normal study of rhetoric as a liberal art; it was studied as a special skill. Dictamen, of course, was strictly limited to prose writing in its application, and became increasingly specialized as it developed into the ars notaria. For the orator there was little demand, outside perhaps some of the Italian cities toward the end of the period. However, as rhetoric was studied, it is only natural to expect that it would find an outlet in use. One possible outlet was in the composition of prose, of which history was especially popular. While prior to the twelfth century historical writing was largely limited to the composing of annals, where so few details were given that no speeches would be included, from the late eleventh century on historical writing flourished once again. The twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, on which this study will focus, is an age of many famous chronicles. In these works, often the authors take every opportunity to present their narrative by way of discourse. Many times

they will report entire speeches, some of great length. The speeches they include are given on the most diverse of occasions. We find many chroniclers not merely reporting on the famous speech Urban II made at the Council of Clermont, but actually presenting a speech and attributing it to the Pope. Consequently, we have several different versions of that speech. Some chroniclers were much concerned with the legal rights of their monasteries or churches, and report legal pleadings in great detail, sometimes in the form of long speeches in support of the several sides of a dispute. A few chroniclers present speeches of deliberation in a king's or duke's council, as they are attempting to reach some important decision. Sometimes the chroniclers present a sermon given on some notable occasion by an important preacher. Many chroniclers—indeed, nearly all—include in their works discourse of some type, even if only in the form of conversations among the characters involved in some event being reported. The discourse they include is often supposedly from a time long before the writer's own. Thus, the chroniclers took the opportunity to make direct use of their rhetorical training to the extent possible. It is the purpose of the second part of this study to focus on one type of rhetorical composition contained in many chronicles and analyze it. Specifically, one finds in the chronicles of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries many speeches purportedly given by military leaders or others immediately

prior to battles, to rouse the fighting spirits of the troops. It is these battle orations that will be used, in an attempt to characterize at least one way in which the historians utilized their rhetorical training.

Battle orations were chosen specifically because of several factors. First, the battle oration is generally an identifiable speech. While the classical historians inserted speeches of exhortation to the troops at many places, the medieval chroniclers generally did not, giving them for the most part only before battles. This is about as clear a class of speeches as will be found. Second, there are a good many of them included in the chronicles from all areas covered in this study, in works written by all types of historians, from monks to archdeacons and knights. Furthermore, these chronicles are readily available, especially in the collections. Most of the chronicles appear in the Rolls Series, the Monumenta Germaniae Historica, and the Patrologiae Latinae. Others are readily available in the publications of the various English historical societies, or in the publications of the Société de l'Histoire de France. Third, the battle orations are speeches the chronicler himself—with one possible exception, as we shall see—did not make but is reporting. This introduces a number of interesting problems that cluster around the question: How accurately can one assume the chronicler is presenting a speech that was really given? It is the purpose of the



second part of this study to describe some characteristics of battle orations, and to analyze some aspects of this class of rhetorical composition.

This study naturally must be limited in what it will cover. The study was to focus on the twelfth century renaissance. Therefore, taking the twelfth century as the center, about a half-century was added on either end, with the dates not being used rigidly. Therefore, the study takes in the period from about 1050 to about 1250. Geographically, it was decided to limit the study to the areas of England, France and Germany. Italy was omitted because the educational tradition there seems to have been different from that in northern Europe. Among other differences, the probability that a layman would be educated in Latin was much higher in Italy than in the other areas. It was desired to limit this to one historical and educational tradition. Including Italy would have both greatly expanded the materials that would have to be used, and added another complicating factor as well, in that those who supposedly gave the speeches might have also been educated in rhetoric. The Iberian peninsula was omitted simply because so little was found about it that no conclusions would have been possible. Finally, from a rhetorical point of view, it was decided to limit this study to a general consideration of the use of battle orations, an analysis of the commonplaces used in them, and a brief consideration of organization. Most im-

portantly, this omits style from detailed consideration here. This would have required an extensive study in itself as there are so many battle orations and the treatment of style in the textbooks is so detailed.

So far as could be ascertained, the secondary sources, modern historians and rhetoricians, have paid virtually no attention to these speeches. The few historians who comment on them, usually the editors of the chronicles, normally dismiss the speeches as fanciful, artificial, imaginary constructions by the chroniclers. Nevertheless, whether they are accurate reports or not, they are still real rhetorical phenomena, and could at the very least be studied as such, as products of the medieval arts course. No such study was found anywhere. In fact, if one excepts the sermons, virtually no medieval speeches have been studied as products of a rhetorical tradition.

#### Precis of Chapters

Chapter II will consider the relative availability of the various rhetorical texts during the period, and in the area, under investigation. Evidence from the existence of manuscripts, the medieval library catalogues, and quotations by medieval authors will be considered. In general, it will be shown that the rhetorical instruction was thoroughly Ciceronian, with De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium providing the substance of the art. Aristotle's

Rhetoric was unknown. Quintilian's work was largely ignored as a rhetorical treatise even where known. Cicero's more literary writings were either unknown or read as literature rather than used as textbooks. Finally, an attempt will be made to show what combinations of rhetorical works were available, based largely on the library catalogues and the libri manuales.

Chapter III will focus on the schools. It will consider the evidence for rhetorical instruction at the grammar schools, at the cathedral schools, and finally at the universities. The grammar schools attempted little in the way of rhetorical instruction. At least at some cathedral schools rhetorical instruction was extensive and thorough. Some commentaries that have come from the cathedral schools will also be considered. By the time the universities appear on the scene, however, rhetoric was being given a secondary place in the arts course. There is evidence that early in the thirteenth century it was still studied at Paris, but the evidence is scanty and inconclusive. Evidence about other universities is even scarcer. However, several ideal curricula will also be considered in this chapter which indicate some interest in rhetoric even at the end of our period.

Chapter IV will deal with the ways in which chroniclers introduce their battle scenes. It will also discuss the places and extent to which battle orations were written

by the chroniclers. This chapter will not, however, deal with specific battle orations, but with several ways of animating the troops that are not really classifiable as speeches. The historians often merely describe a speech that was supposedly given, and this practice will be characterized in this chapter also.

Chapter V will deal with several cases in which the same speech appears in different chronicles. Two different practices will be considered. In the first place, often chroniclers would simply borrow a speech from an earlier chronicle, and use it, usually in relating the same event, in their own work. Several examples of this practice will be presented, including some cases in which the borrower also altered the account, either embellishing it or reducing it. In other cases, however, the chroniclers wrote independent speeches supposedly given on the same occasion, sometimes by the same person. Several examples of this will also be presented. In this chapter many of the longer battle orations will appear in full, as the practice being described involved so many of them.

Chapter VI will focus on the topics the chroniclers used in their battle orations. Several lines of appeal appear in many of the speeches, others appear in only a few. The commonplaces will be identified, the relative frequency of their occurrence will be presented, along with examples of each appeal to show how it was developed.

Chapter VII will deal with the potential for the use of classical models of battle orations, and the evidence for their actual use. The chroniclers had available to them many of the classical historians. This chapter will consider the relative availability of those which contain battle speeches, and then will consider the evidence for borrowing of these speeches by the medieval writers. The chroniclers showed a great propensity to borrow speeches from each other, as demonstrated in the fifth chapter, but in general it does not appear that the classical speeches were often so used.

Chapter VIII will attempt to draw some conclusions from the evidence presented in previous chapters. It will consider the use of the various commonplaces as evidence for the motivations of men at arms in this period and area. It will consider the extent to which it seems the medieval writers used the precepts of invention and disposition they were taught in the schools. In general, the medieval historians did not adhere to the prescriptions of their classical rhetorical textbooks. This chapter will also consider the possibility that speeches not conforming to the general pattern might be closer to reports of speeches actually given. It appears that only one speech may be a simple translation of one actually given, and one other may be fairly close to a report.

## CHAPTER II

### AVAILABILITY OF RHETORICAL TEXTBOOKS

Studying a subject during the middle ages normally meant hearing a work read, with the teacher adding comments as he went along. To determine what rhetorical principles were taught during a given period, one must therefore first determine which works were used in the study of rhetoric. In this chapter, the availability of specific authors' works will be considered.

#### Aristotle

The evidence for the use of Aristotle's Rhetoric is the easiest to consider. Today, classical rhetoric almost automatically brings to mind Aristotle, but in the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries such was not the case. Indeed, the evidence indicates that Aristotle as a rhetorician was almost completely unknown in Christian Europe, and the little that was known was at best second hand information.

Whereas students in Western Europe were the direct heirs of the classical Latin works, Greek classics had to arrive by a rather circuitous route. Boethius, in the early

sixth century, had translated some of Aristotle's works, but not the Rhetoric. The latter had to reach Christian Europe, as did so many others, by way of the Arabs in Spain. However, it did so rather late in the age of translations and was soon after translated more satisfactorily directly from the Greek.

Aristotle's Rhetoric was available in Arabic from at least the beginning of the tenth century, and was taken to Spain as were other Greek writings.<sup>1</sup> There were also Arabic commentaries on the Rhetoric, such as that by Al-Farabi who glossed it in the ninth century,<sup>2</sup> and those of the twelfth century by Averroës, who composed both a short abstract and a more technical commentary.<sup>3</sup> Even though translators had been at work for some time in Spain, the Rhetoric did not receive attention until 1256 when Hermannus Allemanus, in Toledo, translated Al-Farabi's gloss.<sup>4</sup> Murphy dates this translation "about 1240"<sup>5</sup> but even if he is correct, the con-

---

<sup>1</sup>Marvin T. Herrick, "The Early History of Aristotle's Rhetoric in England," Philological Quarterly, V (1926), 243.

<sup>2</sup>James Murphy, "Aristotle's Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," Quarterly Journal of Speech, LII (1966), 110. Hereinafter cited as: Murphy, "Aristotle."

<sup>3</sup>John E. Sandys, A History of Classical Scholarship, Vol. I (2nd ed.; Cambridge: At the University Press, 1906), pp. 563f.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 569.

<sup>5</sup>Murphy, "Aristotle," p. 109. Boggess gives the date as 1256. William F. Boggess, "Hermannus Alemannus's Rhetorical Translations," Viator, II (1971), 249.

clusion is not substantially altered: knowledge of the Rhetoric was at best extremely limited during the period in question.

The actual text of the Rhetoric was finally translated into Latin in two versions. First was the "translatio vetus," possibly by Bartholomew of Messana, completed shortly before 1250. This work was not used in the schools and only three manuscripts of it survive.<sup>6</sup> It was a rather poor translation and a new one was in order. William of Moerbeke, the associate of St. Thomas Aquinas, filled this need about 1270 with what became known as the "translatio Guillelmi." His work, a direct translation from the Greek, apparently enjoyed some popularity.<sup>7</sup> Thus the first translation, largely unsuccessful, came at the very end of the period under consideration, and the second, although successful, was completed twenty years after the period ended. Even then, its dissemination seems something less than spectacular: Herrick believes the Oriel College Library list from 1375, containing the entry, "Sententie super libros Rhetoricorum Aristotelis secundo folio omnia Cobildik precio," is the first appearance of the Rhetoric in England.<sup>8</sup>

Seldom is Aristotle mentioned as a writer on rhet-

---

<sup>6</sup>Murphy, "Aristotle," p. 111.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Herrick, op. cit., p. 246.



oric. One of the few such notations comes close to the end of our period, in Italy. Buoncompagni, in his Rhetorica novissima of 1235, refers to Aristotle, first by way of Boethius:

Boethius also tries to prove from Aristotle that rhetoric was not handed down by the ancients. For, he says, if anyone teaches how to make different kinds of shoes, he does something useful yet does not hand down an art. What Aristotle has noted elsewhere concerning rhetorical orations is defective. For Aristotle, since he was preeminently an investigator of nature, said some things concerning rhetorical documents according to the motion of nature, but I think he knew<sup>9</sup> rhetoric from the outside, not from the inside.

The reference to Aristotle as a rhetorician is quite vague; the "elsewhere" is not specified, nor are the "things" Aristotle said. One could not take this as evidence for first hand knowledge of Aristotle's Rhetoric.

Among modern historians, the only one found to have attempted to place some knowledge of Aristotle's Rhetoric in this period is Sister Mary Bride, in her study of John of Salisbury. While she admits that "Webb's exhaustive research makes it appear certain that John did not read the Rhetoric," she nevertheless claims that "he comes so close to its spirit, even to echoing in one of his letters a striking simile from it—that between a false friend and spiced wine—that one is greatly tempted to think that he

---

<sup>9</sup>Lynn Thorndike, University Records and Life in the Middle Ages (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944), p. 44.

had at least come into contact with someone who had read it or some work in which it was quoted."<sup>10</sup> However, as she accepts Webb's evidence, the conclusion still seems sound, that the Rhetoric was not known or used during this period, even by John of Salisbury.

References to two other works must also be considered. Murphy, after referring to Herrick's date of 1375 as the first appearance of Aristotle's Rhetoric in England, adds: "it must be remembered that the pseudo-Aristotelian Rhetorica ad Alexandrum was often mistaken for Aristotle's work during the Middle Ages."<sup>11</sup> The writer has been unable to find any other references to this work, in university statutes, library catalogues, lists of works that should be studied for rhetoric, other writings from the period in question, or in modern secondary sources. Consequently, the Rhetorica ad Alexandrum will not be considered further.

Aristotle's Topics, however, were widely read in the study of dialectic. Cicero had written his version of the book, and Boethius had composed a commentary on Cicero's. Aristotle's work itself was translated by Jacob of Venice

---

<sup>10</sup>Sister Mary Bride, O.P., "John of Salisbury's Theory of Rhetoric," Studies in Medieval Culture, Vol. II (Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1966), pp. 60f.

<sup>11</sup>James J. Murphy, "The Earliest Teaching of Rhetoric at Oxford," Speech Monographs, XXVII (1960), 346. Hereinafter cited as: Murphy, "Oxford."

in the first half of the twelfth century.<sup>12</sup> For present purposes, only Aristotle's Book VIII need be considered, since John of Salisbury claims it useful for the study of rhetoric:

It is undoubtedly true, as Cicero and Quintilian acknowledge, that this work has not merely been helpful to rhetoricians, but has also, for both them and writers on the arts, even served as the initial starting point for the study of rhetoric, which subsequently expanded and acquired its own particular rules.<sup>13</sup>

However, Book VIII of the Topics deals with rules for conducting a dialectical dispute, undoubtedly useful in the middle ages, but not directly relevant to the type of rhetorical work to be considered here.

### Cicero

The evidence for the availability of Cicero's rhetorical works is clear and decisive. Secondary sources are nearly unanimous in at least one of their conclusions: Cicero was the primary rhetorician for the middle ages, and more specifically, his De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium attributed to him during this period, provided the

---

<sup>12</sup>Harry Caplan, "A Medieval Commentary on the Rhetorica ad Herennium," in Of Eloquence, edited by Anne King and Helen North (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970), p. 266.

<sup>13</sup>John of Salisbury, Metalogicon III. 10. The translation by Daniel McGarry (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955) has been used throughout.

substance of this liberal art.<sup>14</sup> For example, Murphy writes, "Cicero's rhetorical works enjoyed a continuous popularity from Saint Augustine to Erasmus, earning him the medieval title of 'master of eloquence.' So dominant was his influence that in most medieval manuscripts the writers simply use the latin term rhetorica ("the rhetoric") to indicate Cicero's De Inventione."<sup>15</sup> Sandys concludes that "we find Cicero revered throughout the Middle Ages as the great representative of the 'liberal art' of Rhetoric."<sup>16</sup> Rand adds, "St. Jerome gave these libros rhetoricos /De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium a good sendoff by declaring them vel perfectissimos, and throughout the Middle Ages they remained, until the rediscovery of Aristotle, the standard textbook on rhetoric."<sup>17</sup> To support these claims, we will consider first the extant manuscripts of Cicero's rhetorical works, then the library catalogues from the rele-

---

<sup>14</sup>James J. Murphy, "Cicero's Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," Quarterly Journal of Speech, LIII (1967), 335. Hereinafter cited as: Murphy, "Cicero." He explains that De Inventione was often referred to as rhetorica vetus, the Rhetorica ad Herennium as rhetorica nova. Even more common in the period in question are the appellations rhetorica prima and rhetorica secunda, respectively.

<sup>15</sup>Murphy, "Aristotle," p. 109. Italics here and throughout this chapter are in the original.

<sup>16</sup>Sandys, op. cit., p. 648.

<sup>17</sup>Edward K. Rand, Cicero in the Courtroom of St. Thomas Aquinas (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1946), p. 14.

vant period, a few of the numerous references in twelfth and thirteenth century works, and finally, translations of Cicero's rhetorical treatises into the vernacular.

One older but widely used secondary source, however, claims Cicero's works were little used for the study of rhetoric. It would perhaps be best to present his argument first, since it is based on incorrect information about the extant manuscripts. Abelson writes, "While in the technical study of rhetoric, Cicero and Quintilian were throughout the middle ages looked upon as models of style, their own works were rarely used as text books, possibly enough on account of their considerable size."<sup>18</sup> In a footnote he indicates his support for this conclusion:

The small number of manuscripts of the rhetorical works of Cicero and of Quintilian's Institutes which have come down to us at once create this presumption. Compare also M.T. Ciceronis opera ed. Orelli I., praefatio. According to the editor there are extant of his rhetorical works four Mss. of the de Inventione and three of the de Oratore, antedating the thirteenth century.<sup>19</sup>

Now we shall see that this conclusion is reasonable insofar as Quintilian is concerned. It is also a supportable claim for many of Cicero's rhetorical works. Of the De Oratore Battenwieser found only eight extant manuscripts.<sup>20</sup> Murphy indicates that this work appears "only infrequently" prior

---

<sup>18</sup>Abelson, op. cit., p. 54.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Battenwieser, "Distribution," p. 25.

to 1400, and usually only in a mutilated form.<sup>21</sup> Most of Cicero's other rhetorical treatises were at least equally rare. Battenwieser found only eight manuscripts of the Partitione Oratoriae, four of De Optimo Genere Oratorum, three of the Orator and only one of the Brutus.<sup>22</sup>

The manuscript evidence is corroborated by the catalogues of medieval libraries, another type of evidence from which to draw conclusions about the use of an author in a particular period. If a library catalogue from the relevant period lists a work, the potential for its use therefore existed. This does not, of course, mean that the work was in fact used, as Haskins warns,<sup>23</sup> nor does the existence of a manuscript. On the basis of Mollard's argument, however, the presumption that it was used may be made:

Evidemment une objection se présente à l'esprit: du fait qu'un ouvrage se trouve dans une bibliothèque, s'ensuit-il qu'il soit connu, autrement que de nom, des possesseurs de cette bibliothèque; et parce que l'Institution oratoire se trouvait dans les villes précitées, en peut-on conclure que la rhétorique de Quintilien était connue dans ces villes?—S'il s'agissait de grandes bibliothèques provinciales modernes, qui comptent des dizaines de milliers, parfois des centaines de milliers d'ouvrages, l'objection aurait toute sa force; mais en est-il de même

---

<sup>21</sup>Murphy, "Cicero," p. 341.

<sup>22</sup>Battenwieser, "Distribution," p. 25.

<sup>23</sup>Charles Homer Haskins, The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century (New York: The World Publishing Company, 1957; first published, 1927), p. 105. Hereinafter cited as: Haskins, Renaissance.

lorsqu'il s'agit de bibliothèques du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, que l'on peut regarder comme riches lorsque le nombre des volumes qu'elles contiennent dépasse 200? Il est difficile de croire que ces ouvrages n'étaient pas lus, qui par les uns, qui par les autres, et ne donnaient pas lieu à des échanges d'idées.<sup>24</sup>

Assuming, therefore, that the listing of a work is, if not conclusive, at least good evidence that the work was known at that place, yet the use of library catalogues has still other limitations. Not all libraries have left lists of their holdings during the relevant period. Indeed, some of the most important libraries have not done so. Tours and St. Albans, for example, either had no catalogues or they have been lost. Many book lists have simply vanished, others have survived only in fragmentary condition.<sup>25</sup> Even when there is a complete catalogue, the absence of a given work from the list does not necessarily mean that the library did not possess it. Catalogues usually listed only the number of manuscripts, rather than the items contained in them. Entire volumes were normally listed by the name of the first work leaving any others in the volume uncatalogued.<sup>26</sup> Cranage has suggested that the actual number of

---

<sup>24</sup>Auguste Mollard, "La Diffusion de l'Institution Oratoire au XII<sup>e</sup> Siècle," Le Moyen Age, Serie 3<sup>e</sup>, Tome V, p. 162. Hereinafter cited as: Mollard I.

<sup>25</sup>Dorothy Evelyn Grosser, "Studies in the Influence of the Rhetorica ad Herennium and Cicero's De Inventione" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1953), p. 171.

<sup>26</sup>James Stuart Beddie, "The Ancient Classics in the

works in a library should be estimated by multiplying the number found in the catalogue by about four.<sup>27</sup>

Keeping in mind the limitations inherent in this type of evidence, we may examine the catalogue citations of Cicero's rhetorical works. In Becker's collection, the following entries may be found:<sup>28</sup>

80. Coenobium S. Michaelis Bambergae=Michelsberg.

1112-23. 85. 86. de oratore II.

86. Beccum. 1142-64. 64. in alio . . . et Tullius de particione oratoria . . . 104. in alio Tullius de particionibus oratoriis et . . .

Manitius adds the following entries:<sup>29</sup>

---

Medieval Libraries," Speculum, V (1930), 4. Hereinafter cited as: Beddie, "Classics."

<sup>27</sup>D.H.S. Cranage, The Home of the Monk (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1926), p. 5. Knowles reaches roughly the same conclusion: "It is generally assumed that all these figures should be multiplied between four and five-fold." David Knowles, The Religious Orders in England, Vol. II (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1957), p. 350.

<sup>28</sup>Gustavus Becker, Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui (Bonn, 1885). The first number, preceding the entry, is the number of the catalogue as printed by Becker. Then follows the name of the library, the date of the catalogue, the number of the particular work in this catalogue, and the entry as it appears in the original.

<sup>29</sup>Max Manitius, Philologisches aus Alten Bibliothekskatalogen, Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, S. 3, Vol. 47:2 (Frankfurt am Main, 1892), pp. 15ff. First is the name of the library, followed by the date of the catalogue. In parentheses appears Manitius' source for this catalogue as abbreviated by him; then follows the entry.



S. Gildas. s. XI (Bibl. de l'ecole des chart. 47,  
101) N. 68 Librum Tulli Cesaris de oratore.

Bibl. incogn. s. XI (Delisle II, 445) N. 15 Cicero  
de partibus oratoriae.

Cluny 1158-61 (Delisle II 459 ff.) N. 477 . . .  
doctrina eiusdem de oratore.

Chartres 1170 (Migne 199 col. XII) Tullium . . . et  
de oratore.

Richard de Fournival ca. 1250 (Delisle II, 524 ff.)  
tab. II, 28 eiusdem de oratore libri III et  
quartus Brutus et quintus Orator.

Bamberg (Dom) s. XIII (Anz. f. Biblwesen 1877 S. 277)  
Tullius de oratore. Item Tullius de oratore.

These are the only catalogue citations discovered for  
Cicero's rhetorical works, exclusive of De Inventione and  
the Rhetorica ad Herennium. The small number of entries  
clearly supports Abelson's claim. Furthermore, the more  
humanistic rhetorical works, such as De Oratore, simply do  
not lend themselves well to use as text books.

However, Abelson's claim for De Inventione must, in  
the light of more recent evidence, be judged wrong. Ogilvy<sup>30</sup>  
lists four manuscripts of this work in England alone prior  
to 1066. For a more comprehensive overview, the research of

---

<sup>30</sup>J.D.A. Ogilvy, Books Known to the English, 597-  
1066 (Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America,  
1967), p. 113.

Buttenwieser on extant manuscripts clearly demonstrates that De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium enjoyed great popularity. Cicero was by far the most popular of the classical prose writers. There are nearly 600 extant medieval manuscripts of works by Cicero, almost one-fourth of them being copies of De Inventione, which stands at the top of the list as easily the most numerous.<sup>31</sup> There are 194 manuscripts of Cicero's rhetorical works, with 148 containing copies of De Inventione.<sup>32</sup> Of all of Cicero's works there are nearly 100 manuscripts before the eleventh century, almost another hundred in the eleventh, about 200 in the twelfth, and only a few less in the thirteenth, the decline chiefly in copies of the rhetorical works.<sup>33</sup> Of De Inventione, the twelfth century alone provides 59 manuscripts, the peak in copying this work, as well as the Rhetorica ad Herennium which occurs 45 times. Although the thirteenth century saw a reduction in copying these rhetorical treatises, De Inventione is still found in 31 manuscripts and is still the most popular single work.<sup>34</sup>

Throughout this discussion of Cicero, Buttenwieser makes reference to claims made by Haskins. For example, she

---

<sup>31</sup>Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 187.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., pp. 23f.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 23.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., pp. 32f.

quotes his belief that "the new rhetoric of the twelfth century had scant respect for any Roman models," which belief astonishes her in light of the number of manuscripts of Cicero's rhetorical works.<sup>35</sup> At any rate, Abelson's claim is clearly not supported by the evidence. From the number of manuscripts alone, one may conclude that De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium were very popular in the period under consideration here.

The latter treatise merits more detailed consideration. Its fate was closely tied to that of De Inventione. It appears in 107 manuscripts but only 19 times is it alone.<sup>36</sup> Manuscripts from the relevant period break down by date as follows:

Ninth century: Three manuscripts, two from France, one from Germany.

Ninth or Tenth century: One German, two French copies.

Tenth century: Three German, one British.

Eleventh century: Three from Germany, one from France, four from Italy, three from Britain.

Eleventh or Twelfth centuries: One German, two

---

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 32. In a footnote she writes: "Mr. Haskins says: 'we may well believe that Cicero was more admired than read.' In the twelfth century, to which Mr. Haskins is alluding, more than two hundred manuscripts of Cicero were copied, in the thirteenth almost as many." Ibid., p. 23.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 35.

French.

Twelfth century: Eleven each from Germany, France and Italy, twelve from England.

Twelfth or thirteenth century: Four from Germany, two each from Italy and England.

Thirteenth century: Eleven copies from France, six each from Germany and Italy, two from England.<sup>37</sup>

The Rhetorica ad Herennium, while known before the twelfth century, did not become popular until then. Many of the manuscripts prior to that time contain only a mutilated text. In the twelfth century, however, "there appeared a new edition of the Rhetorica ad Herennium in which it was joined together with De Inventione and became known as the rhetorica secunda."<sup>38</sup> The gaps were filled in, and its popularity then increased greatly.

The evidence supplied by library catalogues corroborates that of the manuscripts. "Centers everywhere in Germany and France possess many copies of Cicero's works. The school texts de Inventione . . . occur in great abundance."<sup>39</sup> However, the Rhetorica ad Herennium, although it exists in many manuscripts, does not often appear in medieval cata-

---

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>Grosser, op. cit., pp. 199f.

<sup>39</sup>Buddenwieser, "Distribution," p. 33.

logues. Battenwieser explains this by claiming that, since it was attributed to Cicero, it probably was simply absorbed in citations of Cicero's works.<sup>40</sup> Since it usually appears after De Inventione, many entries listing the latter probably included the pseudo-Ciceronian work as well.

Overall, Bolgar found citations of these two text books in catalogues, with De Oratore added for comparison, as follows:<sup>41</sup>

	Century					
	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV
<u>Ad Herennium</u>	1	-	6	13	4	5
<u>De Inventione</u>	6	2	9	32	35	35
<u>De Oratore</u>	3	-	1	3	3	2

Specifically, the two texts in question appear in catalogues from the relevant period as follows:<sup>42</sup>

Germany

Reichenau. 1020. rhetorica Ciceronis /i.e., De Inventione.<sup>7</sup>

Liege. XI cent. rettorica de inventione; retorica ad Erennium.

Toul, St. Evre. XI cent. rethorica Ciceronis.

Bamberg, Michelsberg. XI cent. M. Tullii Ciceronis rhetorica.

Bernardus (private library). XI cent. rethorica de

---

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>41</sup>Quoted in Murphy, "Cicero," pp. 335f.

<sup>42</sup>Grosser, op. cit., pp. 172-94.

inventione.

Unknown library. XI cent. rethoricam Ciceronis;  
ad Erennium iterum eiusdem.

Egmont. 1129. duos libros prime partis rethorice  
Tullii. /De Inventione./

Lippoldsberg. 1151. Rhetorice Ciceronis quarum hoc  
habetur initium: Sepe et multum.

Engelberg. 1142-78. liber Tullii de Rhetorica.  
Retorica Tulli ad Erennium. /This is a list  
of books for school instruction probably drawn  
up by the abbot, Frowin./

Arnstein. XII cent. Rethoricam Tullii.

Brogne. XII cent. Rethorica Tullii.

Bamberg, Michelsberg. 1112-23. Tullius de rethor-  
icis coloribus /probably a mutili manuscript  
of the Rhetorica ad Herennium/; rethorica  
Tullii.

Bamberg, Michelsberg. 1172-1201. Rhetoricae III;<sup>43</sup>  
ad Herennium I.

Neumünster. 1233. Rhetorica Tullii. M. Tullii  
Cyceronis ad Here.

Passau. 1254. Rhetorica Tullii duplex.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup>Grosser believes this means three copies of De Inventione, one of the Rhetorica ad Herennium. Ibid., p. 175.

<sup>44</sup>Grosser believes this means both De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium. Ibid., p. 176.

Bamberg, Cathedral. XIII cent. Tullius ad Herennium; liber rethoricorum.

Heilsbronn, Cistercian abbey. XIII cent. Rethorica Tullii.

Rolduc. XIII cent. De Inventione, two copies.

France

Beauvais. XI cent. Rethoricam de inventione.

St. Gildas. XI cent. alium rhetorica et est in capite "Sepe multum."

Puy. XI cent. Cicero de rhetoricis divisus duobus libris.

Unknown library. XI cent. Cicero de rhetorica.

Fleury. XI cent. rethorica Ciceronis ad Herennium.

Unknown library. XI cent. Liber Marci Tullii Ciceronis ad Herennium.

Cluny. 1158-61. utreque rhetorice Ciceronis majores et illas ad Herennium; rhetorica Ciceronis de eloquentia (De Inventione); Cicero de civilium quaestionum<sup>45</sup> et rhetorica ipsius ad Herennium; rhetorica Ciceronis ad Herennium et illa de eloquentia; utraque rethorices.

St. Amand. XII cent. Both works.

Anchin. XII cent. Marci Tullii Ciceronis liber duo de rethorica . . . et eiusdem libri sex ad

---

<sup>45</sup>This is probably De Inventione. Ibid., p. 183.

Herennium.

Arras. XII cent. liber rethoricorum Tullii Ciceronis.

Bec. XII cent. retorica (De Inventione, three entries); utraque rethorica II.

St. Bertin. XII cent. rethorica Tullii liber I (De Inventione).

Corbie. XII cent. Both works.

Marseilles. XII cent. rethorica Ciceronis (De Inventione, two entries).

Unknown library. XII cent. Rhetoricam utramque.

Corbie. 1200. prima rethorica Tullii (De Inventione, two entries); secunda rethorica; utraque rethorica (two entries).

Richard de Fournival, Biblionomia. 1250. Marci Tullii Ciceronis liber de iudiciis et figuris (Rhetorica ad Herennium?)<sup>46</sup> eiusdem liber priorum rethoricorum et item posteriorum ad Herennium.

Paris, St. Genevieve. XIII cent. Rhetorica Tullii II.

Unknown library. XIII cent. Tullius de retorica.

Great Britain

Canterbury, Christ Church. 1170. Rhetorica (De Inventione, six entries); rethorica morsel;

---

<sup>46</sup>Probably the Rhetorica ad Herennium. Ibid., p. 185.



rethorica imperfecta.

Durham, gift of Bishop Hugh de Puiset. 1195. Rethoricae duae.

Glastonbury. XII cent. rethoricam primam et secundam (two entries).

Bury St. Edmund's. XII cent. Prima et secunda rethorica tullii.

Rievaulx, Cistercian abbey. XIII cent. Retorica . . . Ciceronis.

Rochester. 1202. Rethorica.

Canterbury. XIII cent. Rhetorica (De Inventione, eight entries).

Bury St. Edmund's. XIII cent. Rethorica prima et secunda.

### Spain

S. Floridi. XII cent. Rhetoricam.

Bernard II of St. Iago. 1224. due retorice.

From the evidence of the library catalogues, Grosser concludes:

It is . . . obvious that the De Inventione far outstrips the Rhetorica ad Herennium in the number of catalogues in which it appears; in Germany and Great Britain, for example, it occurs in more than twice as many catalogues. Furthermore, it tends to appear more than once in a single catalogue, indicating a great demand for it. This last is true of the Rhetorica ad Herennium but to a lesser degree.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 195.

Manitius notes that the catalogue evidence indicates that rhetorical works in general were most numerous in France, yet of Cicero's rhetorical treatises, the manuscripts show a large superiority in Germany.<sup>48</sup>

Another type of evidence for the availability of an author's works during a given period comes from contemporary references to or quotations from that author's writings. Such references, however, can never be conclusive, for, as Haskins warns, "full account must be taken of the large body of quotations which came at second hand, through the Fathers, the Latin grammars and glossaries, and the various collections of extracts. Chief among such sources was the Latin grammar of Priscian,"<sup>49</sup> one of the most common textbooks. With these reservations, the evidence provided by the extant manuscripts and catalogue citations is, in general, supported by the writers of the period in question. One finds frequent references to Cicero as the exemplar of eloquence. Thus, to take just a couple of twelfth century examples, William of Malmesbury refers to Cicero as "the prince of Roman eloquence," and proceeds to quote from De Inventione.<sup>50</sup> Honorius of Autun says that "those who dwell

---

<sup>48</sup>Cited in Battenwieser, "Distribution," p. 24. Cf. J. de Ghellinck, L'essor de la Littérature Latine au XII<sup>e</sup> Siècle, Vol. II (Brussels et Paris, 1946), p. 79: "La célèbre Rhetorica ad Herennium, bien connue en France au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, moins en Allemagne et en Angleterre."

<sup>49</sup>Haskins, Renaissance, p. 113.

<sup>50</sup>William of Malmesbury, Chronicle of the Kings of

in the 'City of Rhetoric' are taught by Tully to speak with grace, and are trained by him in the virtues of prudence, fortitude, justice and temperance."<sup>51</sup>

Just before mid-century, the right hand doorway of the west front of the cathedral at Chartres was decorated with figures of the seven liberal arts, each represented by an appropriate ancient individual. Rhetoric, of course, is represented by Cicero.<sup>52</sup> Murphy writes, "such instances [of the virtual equation of Cicero with eloquence] could be multiplied indefinitely," for Cicero "was so assumptively, so overwhelmingly, so pervasively regarded as prime auctor."<sup>53</sup>

One comes upon references to and quotations from

---

England, trans. by J.A. Giles (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1847; New York: AMS Press, 1968), p. 131.

<sup>51</sup>Sandys, op. cit., pp. 648f.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 672. However this conclusion may be the result of circular reasoning. Katzenellenbogen indicates the process used: "Underneath each Art a philosopher is portrayed who had excelled in that particular discipline. The Liberal Arts are easily identifiable. The identity of the philosophers can only be suggested, as Emile Male has done, according to the authors whose writings or theories were primarily used in the study of the arts at that time. We see . . . Rhetoric accompanied by Cicero." Adolf Katzenellenbogen, "The Representation of the Seven Liberal Arts," in Twelfth-Century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society, ed. by Marshall Clagett, Gaines Post, and Robert Reynolds (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961), p. 40.

<sup>53</sup>Murphy, "Cicero," p. 335.

Cicero's De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium in many different contexts. Perhaps the best study in detail of such use is Rand's Aquinas Lectures on St. Thomas' use of De Inventione. He demonstrates St. Thomas' acute knowledge of this rhetorical textbook and his willingness to use it as authority in strictly theological works.<sup>54</sup> Grosser devotes a chapter of her study to the use of these two rhetorical works in non-rhetorical literature, and concludes:

Our excursion into non-rhetorical literature has . . . revealed in general, with few exceptions, the use of precepts, chiefly from De Inventione, which lent themselves readily to application to non-rhetorical material. Apart from the use of De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium, the writers we have here met had something else in common. Whether their interests were primarily rhetorical, philosophical, or historical, they had received the same sort of education, with a basis in rhetoric, and had become familiar with the popular rhetorical textbook, De Inventione.<sup>55</sup>

Yet another indication that Cicero's De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium enjoyed great popularity is found in the fact that they, and they alone of the classical rhetorics, were translated into the vernacular during the middle ages. These translations all fall outside the period in question, as the trend to vernacular translations of classical works gathered momentum only in the second half of the thirteenth century. Most of De Inventione was trans-

---

<sup>54</sup>Rand, op. cit.

<sup>55</sup>Grosser, op. cit., p. 282.

lated into French and Italian by Brunetto Latini during the 1260's. Bono Giambono then translated the French edition into Italian by 1266. Before the latter date there was a paraphrase of the Rhetorica ad Herennium in Italian by either Guidotto da Bologna or Bono Giambono. Jean d'Antioch de Harens, in 1282, made a compendium of both works in French. A Castilian version of the pseudo-Ciceronian treatise was produced in the fifteenth century and an English one in 1530.<sup>56</sup> One here has evidence both of the popularity of Ciceronian rhetoric in the middle ages, and the lack of vernacular treatment of this liberal art during the period in question.

The conclusion in the case of Cicero's rhetorical works is quite clear. His De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium attributed to him were widely available and widely known. The more humanistic works, such as Orator, Brutus, and De Oratore, were, in the first two cases, virtually unknown, in the last case, known but not widely read.

### Quintilian

Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria and the Declamations attributed to him were known during the middle ages, but the extent of their availability and use is not clear. Therefore, the evidence will have to be considered in detail. As the best way to determine that a work was present during

---

<sup>56</sup>Murphy, "Cicero," pp. 337f.

a given period is to have extant manuscripts from that period or earlier, the manuscripts of Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria will be discussed first. All those from the thirteenth century and earlier will be considered.

Buttenwieser gives a list of 21 manuscripts, eight of which are only florilegia, but many fall outside the relevant period, and the list is incomplete.<sup>57</sup> Sutherland lists only those manuscripts she considers "valuable in determining the descent of the florilegia."<sup>58</sup> The "most elaborate report"<sup>59</sup> of the manuscripts is found in Fierville's edition of Book I. He describes 70 in all (not 67, as Sutherland claims)<sup>60</sup> but many are of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Peterson, in reviewing Fierville's book, takes him to task for overlooking several British manuscripts.<sup>61</sup> In his own edition of Book X, Peterson adds twelve British manuscripts to the list.<sup>62</sup> Consequently, to establish as

---

<sup>57</sup>Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 138. A florilegium is a collection of quotations, usually relating to some central theme.

<sup>58</sup>Priscilla Warren Sutherland, "Quintilian in the Medieval Florilegia" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1950), p. 116. Sutherland was Priscilla Boskoff's maiden name.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid.

<sup>61</sup>W. Peterson, "Fierville's Quintilian," The Classical Review, V (1891), 32. Hereinafter cited as: Peterson, "Fierville's Quintilian."

<sup>62</sup>W. Peterson, M. Fabi Q. Intiliani Institutionis

complete a list as possible, these various sources have been combined to obtain the following list. The manuscripts are listed in chronological order, alphabetically within each century. When there is disagreement about dating a manuscript, the various authorities' conclusions are given. In no case, as will be noted, would any alternatives significantly alter the conclusion about the availability of Quintilian's Institutes during the period under consideration.

1. Beccensis. Written in the ninth or tenth century.
2. Bern 212. A ninth or tenth century product, containing only excerpts.
3. Ambrosianus II. Tenth century.
4. Bamberg M. IV. 14. This is in actuality the product of three different writers, and is sometimes listed as three separate manuscripts.<sup>63</sup> First are two parts both in tenth century hands. The third part dates from the eleventh century, and is listed below as number 10.
5. Bern 351. Tenth century, of French origin.
6. Ambrosianus I. Late tenth or early eleventh century, by Fierville's account.<sup>64</sup> Colson dates it

---

Oratoriae, Liber Decimus (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1891).

<sup>63</sup>For example, by Sutherland, op. cit., p. 117.

<sup>64</sup>Ch. Fierville, ed., M.F. Quintiliani de Institutione Oratoria Liber Primus (Paris: Librairie de Firmin-Didot et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1890), p. lxxxix.

simply as tenth century.<sup>65</sup>

7. British Museum Harl. 2664. Peterson dates this as late tenth or early eleventh century.<sup>66</sup> Colson lists it as an eleventh century product.<sup>67</sup> Buttenwieser gives the date as the ninth century.<sup>68</sup>
8. Gotha Mbr. 1. no. 100. Tenth or eleventh century, from Germany.
9. Paris 18527, sometimes known as the Codex Nostradamensis. Colson<sup>69</sup> and Buttenwieser<sup>70</sup> date it as tenth or eleventh century. Fierville limits the range to the tenth century.<sup>71</sup>
10. The eleventh century hand completing Bamberg M. IV. 14. See above, number 4.
11. Medicean Laur. Plut. XLVI. 7, also known as the Codex Florentinus. An eleventh century manu-

---

<sup>65</sup>F.H. Colson, M. Fabii Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber I (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1924), p. lxi.

<sup>66</sup>Peterson, "Fierville's Quintilian," pp. 32f. He claims for this manuscript the distinction of being the oldest complete copy of the Institutes in existence.

<sup>67</sup>Colson, op. cit., p. lxi.

<sup>68</sup>Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 138.

<sup>69</sup>Colson, op. cit., p. lxi.

<sup>70</sup>Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 138.

<sup>71</sup>Fierville, op. cit., p. lxx.



- script originally from Strasbourg.<sup>72</sup>
12. Montpellier Bibliothèque de l'Ecole de Medicine 336, also known as the Codex Pithoeanus. It dates from the eleventh or twelfth century.
  13. Zurich 288 (c. 74a), also known as the Codex Turicensis. The manuscript was originally from St. Gall. The dating is very confused: Buttenwieser gives it as eleventh or twelfth century;<sup>73</sup> Colson as eleventh century;<sup>74</sup> and Fierville, after quoting Spalding's conclusion that it is an eighth or ninth century manuscript, decides that it was written at least before the eleventh century.<sup>75</sup>
  14. Paris 7231. A twelfth century fragmentary manuscript.
  15. Paris 7696. Also a twelfth century fragmentary manuscript, originally from France.
  16. Paris 14146, also known as the Codex Pratensis. It dates from the twelfth century.
  17. St. John's College, Cambridge, D. 16, also known

---

<sup>72</sup>James Westfall Thompson, The Medieval Library (New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1957; first published, 1939), pp. 209f.

<sup>73</sup>Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 138.

<sup>74</sup>Colson, op. cit., p. lxi.

<sup>75</sup>Fierville, op. cit., p. xci.

as the Codex Ioannensis. Twelfth century.

Peterson gives the thirteenth century as its date,<sup>76</sup> but Colson is "assured on the best authority that the earlier date is right."<sup>77</sup>

18. University of Salamanca, Est. S. Cajon 3, n. 3. Twelfth or thirteenth century.
19. Codex Sancti Victoris. Fragments from the early thirteenth century.
20. Paris 7719, also known as the Codex Puteanus. Thirteenth century.
21. Vossianus 77. Thirteenth century.

In addition to these manuscripts, which are either complete texts or partial (mutili) ones, Battenwieser found a number of florilegia: two in France of the twelfth century, another French one from the twelfth or thirteenth, and two thirteenth century ones each in England and France.<sup>78</sup>

Those of the above manuscripts that have been dated thirteenth century naturally may or may not have been available during the first half of that century. But it is at least known that Quintilian's Institutes existed in Western Europe in the period in question.

Not all of the above manuscripts are complete; indeed, most are mutili, some are only fragments. The complete text

---

<sup>76</sup>Peterson, "Fierville's Quintilian," p. 35.

<sup>77</sup>Colson, op. cit., p. 184.

<sup>78</sup>Battenwieser, "Distribution," p. 138.

appears only in Ambrosianus I, Bambergensis (the combination of the first Bamberg manuscript and the later hand filling in the lacunas), Harleianus, Turicensis and Florentinus.<sup>79</sup> Colson divides the remaining, incomplete, manuscripts into two primary classes: mutili with the "great lacunas":

1. Prooem. I to a point not earlier than I.1,6.
2. V.14,12 to VIII.3,64.
3. VIII.6,17 to VIII.6,67.
4. IX.3,2 to X.1,107.
5. XI.1,71 to XI.2,33.
6. XII.10,43 to the end, although some omissions begin earlier than this.

In this class Colson places Bernensis 351, Bambergensis (the tenth century parts) and Nostradamensis. The second class has the same lacunas with the exception of X.1,46 to 107, which is added at the end of the manuscript. This class is represented by Pratensis, Puteanus, Vossianus and some later manuscripts. Finally, rather in a class by themselves, are the two manuscripts, Paris 7231 and 7696, which only contain X.1,46 to 107 with its immediate sequel, X.1,107 to the end of the chapter, bound up with other rhetorical matter.<sup>80</sup>

Sutherland claims that these two manuscripts have also added XII.10,10 to 16.<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup>Colson, op. cit., p. lxi.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid.

<sup>81</sup>Sutherland, op. cit., p. 124.

The classes into which these manuscripts fall were already established by the ninth century, from which date, at least, the complete text of Quintilian existed in Germany. France, however, had only texts of the mutili classes, primarily of the first one.<sup>82</sup> In the middle of the twelfth century a copy of the second mutili family, that with the one lacuna filled in, came to France. In 1164 this manuscript came to Bec from Rome as a bequest by Philippe de Harcourt, bishop of Bayeux. This particular copy has been lost, but Pratensis, the twelfth century excerpts of Etienne of Rouen, and Puteanus, the thirteenth century copy of Harcourt's manuscript, done independently of Etienne's work, still survive as its descendants.<sup>83</sup> No complete manuscripts are known to have circulated in France, at least into the thirteenth century. This conclusion, it will be seen, is also supported by the evidence available from writers of the period.

Turning next to the medieval library catalogues, one finds eight references to Quintilian in six lists from the collection printed by Becker:<sup>84</sup>

63. Bibliotheca incognita. saec. XI. 20. Quin-

---

<sup>82</sup>Priscilla S. Boskoff, "Quintilian in the Late Middle Ages," Speculum, XXVII (1952), 71. Boskoff is Priscilla Sutherland's married name.

<sup>83</sup>Sutherland, op. cit., pp. 148f.

<sup>84</sup>Becker, op. cit.

tillianum de rethorica.

80. Coenobium S. Michaelis Bambergae=Michelsberg.  
1112-23. 105. 106. Quintiliani II.
86. Beccum=Bec. 1142-64. 93. in alio Quintilianus  
de institutione. 94. in alio Quintilianus de  
causes.
115. Monasterium ad S. Petrum Salisburgi=St. Peter  
bei Salzburg. saec. XII. 228. Quintilianus  
de rethorica.
117. Ecclesiae Dunelmensis=Durham. saec. XII. 76.  
Quintilianus. 534. libellus de causes Quin-  
tiliani cum quibusdam sermonibus.
127. Beccum=Bec. saec. XII. 146. in alio Quin-  
tilianus de causes.

To this list Manitius adds the following:<sup>85</sup>

S. Amand s. XII (Delisle II 449 ff.) N. 200 Pris-  
cianus de XII primus versibus Eneidorum prae-  
misso Pauper apes Quintiliani.

Angers s. XII (Delisle II 485) N. 101 Quintilianus  
I vol.

Richard de Fournival c. 1250 (Delisle II 524 ff.)  
tab. II 25 M. Fabii Quintiliani liber institu-  
tionum oratoriarum.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup>Manitius, op. cit., pp. 64f.

<sup>86</sup>Fierville provides some evidence that Richard owned  
a copy and donated it to the library at Amiens. "Dans le

Pontigny s. XIII (Catal. gen. des mscr. des dep.  
(4<sup>o</sup>) I 714) Quintilianus de causis XVIII uno  
volumine.

Bamberg (Dom) s. XIII (Anz. f. Biblwiss. 1877 S. 277)  
Marci Fabii Quintiliani + + volumine incipit  
. . . Liber Marci Fabii Quintiliani institu-  
tionum oratoriarum.

Only two other references were discovered. De Ghellinck claims that Glastonbury possessed a copy of the Institutes in the twelfth century.<sup>87</sup> And Thomson presents evidence that Bury St. Edmunds Abbey possessed a copy about 1165.<sup>88</sup>

Thus, the references to Quintilian in libraries of the time are not numerous. Colson provides a comparison with some other classical writers, based on the number of citations in Becker's catalogues: "Judged thus in popular-

---

Discours sur l'état des lettres au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle, M. J.-V. Leclerc signale à Amiens un Quintilien (Institution oratoire) qui aurait été donné au chapitre de cette ville, vers 1250, par Richard de Fournival, chancelier de la cathédrale. Ce Ms. devait être incomplet . . . M. Garnier, conservateur de la bibliothèque d'Amiens, que j'ai consulté a ce sujet, m'a répondu: 'Il faut croire, si Richard de Fournival avait donné ce Ms. au chapitre, que celui-ci ne l'avait pas conservé bien sérieusement, car dans un Inventaire du trésor du chapitre, que j'ai publié autrefois, et qu'avait dressé en 1347 Hugues de Montreuil, il n'est point fait mention des Institutiones oratoirae.'" op. cit., pp. cxxixf.

<sup>87</sup> de Ghellinck, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 81.

<sup>88</sup> R.M. Thomson, "The Library of Bury St. Edmunds Abbey in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," Speculum, XLVII (1972), 645.

ity he comes far behind, not only the chief poets, but also Cicero, Seneca and Sallust, but he is found oftener than Caesar or Livy, or even Aulus Gellius."<sup>89</sup>

It will be noted that of the citations given, not all are for the Institutes. Some are for the Declamations, or, as they were also known, Causae, and others are indeterminate. Buttenwieser found nineteen manuscripts of the Declamations. A French manuscript of the tenth century contains the "briefer exercises," the "maiores" are found in another tenth century copy in Germany, and in a tenth or eleventh century French manuscript. The rest of the manuscripts are of the twelfth or thirteenth centuries, occurring in France, where they are the most numerous, and in Germany and England.<sup>90</sup> The Declamations were abridged by Adelard of Bath about 1130 and were in general studied throughout the middle ages.<sup>91</sup> Buttenwieser found a total of seven references in library catalogues: a French collection in the eleventh century, twelfth century libraries in France, Germany and England, and a thirteenth century one in Germany.<sup>92</sup> However, she does not give any specific citations.

The school of Chartres was the greatest center of

---

<sup>89</sup>Colson, op. cit., p. lvi.

<sup>90</sup>Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 139.

<sup>91</sup>Sandys, op. cit., p. 655.

<sup>92</sup>Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 139.

interest in Quintilian. The monastery of Bec, however, has been claimed as the original center of knowledge of Quintilian. Mollard claims that the educational ideas of Quintilian were known and used at Bec, specifically first by Lanfranc and by Yves, his disciple.<sup>93</sup> However, Sutherland believes that Mollard is reading too much into the evidence.

There is no evidence that Quintilian was known by Fulbert [of Chartres] or Lanfranc or St. Anselm. All three, however, were vitally interested in learning and especially in the auctores, and their pupils seem to have used the educational methods set forth by Quintilian. Although someone had to be the first to use Quintilian, it is too tenuous a hypothesis to agree with Mollard that it was Lanfranc who first knew Quintilian and spread his knowledge. Assuredly he was interested in training good copyists, in correcting defective texts, but it was not until the gift of Harcourt that we definitely know that Bec had a Quintilian.<sup>94</sup>

Nevertheless, Bec was closely connected with the cathedral school at Chartres, which was the "true center from which the knowledge of Quintilian was diffused."<sup>95</sup> Of the scholars of Chartres, Bernard, who died in 1126, was probably the first to use Quintilian to any great extent. Thierry of Chartres (died, 1155) indicates in his commentary on De Inventione interest in Quintilian. William of Conches (died, 1154), Richard l'Eveque (died, 1140) and Gilbert de la Porree (died, 1154) may also be included in this list

---

<sup>93</sup>Mollard I, p. 173.

<sup>94</sup>Sutherland, op. cit., p. 151.

<sup>95</sup>Ibid., p. 150.



of Chartres scholars acquainted with Quintilian. But our knowledge of Bernard indicates that he was the one most inspired by the pedagogical ideals of Quintilian. His teaching methods and philosophy are described by the most famous humanist in this period, John of Salisbury, although John did not become a student at Chartres until eight or so years after Bernard's death. He therefore, in his description, "depended on the traditions established by the master and presumably continued by his followers."<sup>96</sup>

Of the twelfth century writers, John of Salisbury shows by far the most interest in and knowledge of Quintilian.<sup>97</sup> In both the Metalogicon and Polycraticus John often quotes or paraphrases Quintilian. However, even though the Metalogicon deals with the arts of the trivium, the selections from Quintilian and references to him almost never deal with rhetoric, at least not with its precepts and rules. Rather, John's interest centered on Quintilian's pedagogical ideas. Hence, his use of the Institutio Oratoria was primarily limited to Books I, II and X.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup>Ibid., p. 153.

<sup>97</sup>Mollard I, p. 164.

<sup>98</sup>Cf. Auguste Mollard, "La Diffusion de l'Institution Oratoire au XII<sup>e</sup> Siècle," Le Moyen Age, Serie 3<sup>e</sup>, Tome VI, p. 1: "Salisbury comprend bien Quintilien. Ce qui l'intéresse, ce sont moins les préceptes et les artifices de l'art oratoire proprement dit que les questions les plus générales de la pédagogie: pres-que toutes ses citations, ou ses allusions, et, par suite, ses commentaires, se rapportent aux deux premiers livres de l'Institution Oratoire." This

Whether or not John had the entire text of Quintilian is a difficult question, one that need not be considered in detail here. Baldwin believes he used the entire text.<sup>99</sup> Atkins limits his claim somewhat: "his use of Quintilian's Institutio shows that he was acquainted with sections of that work which were wanting in almost all manuscripts before Poggio's discovery of the complete text in 1416."<sup>100</sup> However, the evidence for these two claims seems rather tenuous. Baldwin first compares several passages from the Institutio Oratoria with John's Metalogicon. He lists from Quintilian I.iii,3-5; I.viii,13-14; and I.viii,17-18, all quoted by John "verbatim for considerable stretches" and with only minor "transpositions or other variations."<sup>101</sup> He cites Quintilian's I.iv,5-6; II.iii,3; II.iv,5-7; X.i, 83 and 125-131 as passages which John follows.<sup>102</sup> Then, he concludes, "It is only fair to assume of so careful a scholar reading the first books and one of the last, and occupied with Quintilian's idea of educational sequence, that he read

---

is the second of two articles carrying the same title, cited hereinafter as: Mollard II.

<sup>99</sup>Charles Sears Baldwin, Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959; first published, 1928), pp. 170f.

<sup>100</sup>J.W.H. Atkins, English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1961; first published, 1934), pp. 80f.

<sup>101</sup>Baldwin, op. cit., p. 169.

<sup>102</sup>Ibid., p. 170.

the whole work."<sup>103</sup> However, if we compare Baldwin's examples with what would have been found in even the first mutili class manuscripts, it is obvious that John could have had simply one of these texts for all but the two passages from Book X. Of these, the first is included in MSS of the second mutili class, and the second is contained in both Paris 7231 and 7696. And even the examples Baldwin uses are open to question. Sutherland considers Baldwin's evidence and reasoning in depth and concludes: "When those examples [of supposed borrowing] are studied it is observed that actually the similarity lies in one or two words which do not necessarily come from Quintilian but may come from other sources or more probably, were invented by John himself as a man of letters."<sup>104</sup> Later she added that to assume that John had the entire text available to him "is contrary to our knowledge of the manuscript tradition in circulation in northern France."<sup>105</sup>

Although John of Salisbury shows great knowledge of Quintilian, "to find such a decided interest in our author, who was so little known throughout these centuries, is very unusual."<sup>106</sup> In the period from the mid-eleventh to the

---

<sup>103</sup>Ibid., pp. 170f.

<sup>104</sup>Sutherland, op. cit., p. 158.

<sup>105</sup>Boskoff, op. cit., p. 72.

<sup>106</sup>Ibid.

mid-thirteenth century, there are a number of authors, besides John, who indicate some knowledge of Quintilian.<sup>1</sup> However, the extent of their knowledge is almost always in doubt.

Wibald, abbot of Stavelot and Corvey, who died in 1158, demonstrates some knowledge of Quintilian. His letter to Mangold, canon and magister scholae at Paderborn, is summarized by Colson:

It is no small matter, he says, to know the power and character of different pupils, to stimulate the indolent, to hold back the impetuous, and to guide them with a strong rein. Then he goes on, "Lege Quintilianum de institutione oratoria, qui ab utero matris susceptum infantem limare incipit et formare in substantiam oratoris perfecti." The same letter contains a clear though unacknowledged adaptation from X.5,19 "si gloria dicendi tangeris, elige quem sequaris."<sup>107</sup>

In the second half of the twelfth century there is definite evidence of the use of Quintilian at the monastery of Bec. Philip Harcourt, bishop of Bayeux, bequeathed some books to the abbey in 1164, among which was a copy of the Institutio Oratoria. Later in the same century, the monk and poet Etienne de Rouen made an abstract of this copy of the Institutes, condensing it to about a third of its original length. His abstract is the manuscript now known as the Codex Pratensis.<sup>108</sup> Etienne added a long preface in

---

<sup>107</sup>Colson, op. cit., pp. lii. The letter is number 147 in Migne's edition, PL CLXXXIX, col. 1249-57.

<sup>108</sup>Sandys, op. cit., p. 656.

verse in which he demonstrates the necessity of the study of rhetoric, and shows "un vif enthousiasme" for Quintilian and his teaching.<sup>109</sup> This abstract was composed for his students at Bec, so one can assume that some knowledge of Quintilian was disseminated there.<sup>110</sup>

Towards the end of the twelfth century, mention of Quintilian appears in the Sacerdos ad altare, found among the works of John of Garland but attributed to Alexander Neckham by Haskins. This work will be considered in more detail later, but here it is important to note that Quintilian is listed as a rhetorician whose works are recommended. Neckham also lists Quintilian in his De Laudibus Divinae Sapientiae, but neither source gives us any idea of the extent of its author's knowledge of the Roman.<sup>111</sup>

Vincent of Beauvais, in the thirteenth century, demonstrates considerable knowledge of Quintilian. Colson provides a summary:

In the Speculum Historiale, one of the four divisions of his great work, there are collected (Book IX. 121) some sixty flosculi from him /Quintilian/. They are rather of a moral or philosophical character, than rhetorical. In another division, the Speculum Doctrinale, many of these recur in various connexions. And it

---

<sup>109</sup>Mollard I, pp. 170f.

<sup>110</sup>Leon Maitre, Les Ecoles Episcopales et Monastiques de l'Occident (Paris, 1866), p. 224. See also Sandys, op. cit., p. 620.

<sup>111</sup>Colson, op. cit., p. lv.

is noteworthy that in the chapters of this Speculum Doctrinale which deal with the Instructio and Eruditio Puerorum he is equally prominent. Still more is this the case in a Tractatus de Educatione Filiorum regalium, which forms part of his Opuscula.<sup>112</sup>

However, Sutherland noted that Vincent wrote at least his major work before he came into intimate contact with the royal court, so he had to rely on the resources of the library at Beauvais, not at Paris. Furthermore, his interests were in gathering maxims, as Colson also noted, and these are precisely the things prominently found in the florilegia. After detailed discussion of the evidence she concludes that Vincent did not have even a mutili class text, but used one of the florilegia.<sup>113</sup>

In 1250 Richard de Fournival, chancellor of Amiens, wrote his Biblionomia, apparently a list of works recommended for various fields of study. Among the rhetorical authorities he places Quintilian first. This, again, gives no real indication of the extent of his knowledge of Quintilian. Indeed, it is not even known whether this list is an actual library catalogue, or just a list of recommended books. Mollard claims it is a catalogue for an ideal library.<sup>114</sup> Some of the books Richard lists have been matched

---

<sup>112</sup>Ibid., p. lii.

<sup>113</sup>Sutherland, op. cit., pp. 161f. Boskoff, op. cit., p. 74.

<sup>114</sup>Mollard I, p. 174.

with existing manuscripts, so the present belief is that he probably either knew or had seen the Institutio Oratoria.<sup>115</sup>

Now we come to a number of authors who give some indication that they at least know that Quintilian existed, but the evidence for any considerable knowledge is quite limited. Caplan describes a commentary on the Rhetorica ad Herennium by one Alanus who seemed to have used a mutili family text of the Institutes. There is also a possible reference to the Declamations, and perhaps to some lost ones.<sup>116</sup>

Conrad of Hirschau wrote a dialogue in which he gives a list of 21 authors, each described with some fullness. Quintilian does not appear in this list, which includes only two prose writers, Cicero and Sallust. Quintilian only appears at the end of the work, named as one of the founders of Latin rhetoric. However, "the whole passage is merely transcribed from Isidore and couples with the names of Cicero and Quintilian that of the nebulous Titinius."<sup>117</sup> Consequently it is impossible to say how much knowledge Conrad had of Quintilian.

Alain de Lille, in his Anti-claudianus, puts Quin-

---

<sup>115</sup>Sutherland, op. cit., p. 161. Boskoff, op. cit., p. 74. See note 86 supra for the claim that Richard owned a copy of the Institutes.

<sup>116</sup>Caplan, op. cit., p. 262.

<sup>117</sup>Colson, op. cit., p. lv.

tilian in the forefront of rhetoricians (III.3). Another reference occurs in II.6, where, in a list of accomplished persons, he writes: "ut Fabius loquitur, ut Tullius ipse perorat."<sup>118</sup>

Giraldus Cambrensis quotes Quintilian twice, both times from Book X (91 and 114). However, he quotes many other authors much more fully, so probably did not consider Quintilian of great significance.<sup>119</sup>

Others in the twelfth century who cite Quintilian are Ulrich of Bamberg, whose quotes from Books VII-IX indicate that he must have had a complete manuscript, possibly the Bamberg one itself; Petrus Cantor; Laurence of Durham; and John of Alta Silva.<sup>120</sup> Thorndike translated two letters by Peter of Blois in which there are direct references to Quintilian.<sup>121</sup> However, Peter was a student of John of Salisbury and might have simply reproduced quotations from his master's work.<sup>122</sup> Finally there is the question of Abelard: Was he familiar with Quintilian? He studied rhetoric, and

---

<sup>118</sup>Ibid., p. liv. However, Cornog interprets this reference differently. "Probably Q. Fabius Sanga, to whom the Allobrogian ambassadors disclosed the Catalinian conspiracy. (Sall. Cat. 41; Cic. in Pis. 31)." William Hafner Cornog, trans., The Anticlaudian of Alain de Lille (Philadelphia, 1935), p. 73.

<sup>119</sup>Colson, op. cit., p. lii.

<sup>120</sup>Sutherland, op. cit., pp. 154ff.

<sup>121</sup>Thorndike, op. cit., pp. 15f.

<sup>122</sup>Sutherland, op. cit., pp. 154f.



was one of the most learned men of his time. But direct evidence of acquaintance with the Institutes or Declamations is lacking.<sup>123</sup>

Out of these vague references to Quintilian little can be positively concluded.

In the first place some of them apply mainly or entirely to the Declamations, and secondly one may ask, are we really sure that these people knew anything more about Quintilian than that he was praised by the writer whom they really did know—Jerome? This suspicion is confirmed by the fact that one of the couplets quoted from Neckham is obviously a paraphrase of Jerome, Ep. 36 . . . and that the "floridus Quintilianus" of Alvarus comes almost as certainly from the same source.<sup>124</sup>

In general, however, the evidence of medieval writers serves to confirm the evidence of the manuscripts. Copies of Quintilian's works were not widespread. The mutili classes circulated in France, while Germany had the complete text as did perhaps England.<sup>125</sup> Even the centers of greatest interest in Quintilian, Chartres and Bec, had only mutili-class texts.

Even in incomplete form, the Institutio Oratoria is relatively long—long enough to discourage frequent use or full study. The florilegia, however, were probably used much more frequently. Besides the florilegia, some writers

---

<sup>123</sup>Mollard I, p. 166.

<sup>124</sup>Colson, op. cit., p. lv.

<sup>125</sup>Sutherland, op. cit., p. 121.

produced handbooks, such as William of Conches' Moralis philosophia, containing excerpts from Latin writers chosen to illustrate various topics of an ethical nature. Abelson, too, concludes that Quintilian was "probably used only in excerpts. Only in this way can the existence of many such selections be explained. These generally consisted of passages taken seriatim from the Institutes. They are often found as appendices to texts on rhetoric."<sup>126</sup> Consequently, probably only an advanced student, such as John of Salisbury, would use the actual text of Quintilian.

Others would apologize as did John of Alta Silva: Ceterum rogo te, o lector, si quid incultum vel minus apte positum reppereris, dones veniam sciasque me non multum in Prisciani regulis desudasse necdum me in florigeros Quintiliani Tullique ortulos recubasse. Yet the very fact that he apologized suggests that he felt he actually should have gone to the sources he names.<sup>127</sup>

Thus, Mollard's contention, that "nous avons des témoignages suffisamment nombreux et précis pour établir que Quintilien a bénéficié, au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, d'un large mouvement de diffusion, et même d'une véritable vogue en Normandie et dans l'Ile-de-France,"<sup>128</sup> must be somewhat qualified. Quintilian was, indeed, widely known, but more in name than in substance, and mostly through excerpts in handbooks, florilegia, and perhaps grammar texts. Few writers seem to have

---

<sup>126</sup>Abelson, op. cit., p. 59.

<sup>127</sup>Sutherland, op. cit., pp. 179f.

<sup>128</sup>Mollard I, p. 161.

been sufficiently interested in him to study even the mutilated texts in depth. Colson, who had believed Quintilian's influence very widespread, in his edition of Book I of the Institutio Oratoria retracts his earlier statements, made in the Classical Review for November, 1921: "I was then too much impressed by the cases of Chartres and Bec and had not realised that elsewhere this influence was not so apparent."<sup>129</sup> Boskoff quite reasonably concludes: "In actuality, the transmission of Quintilian was in the hands of only a few enlightened scholars, such as Lupus in the ninth century and John of Salisbury in the twelfth century."<sup>130</sup>

Mollard, however, still believes Quintilian's influence was much more widespread. Therefore, he has to account for the paucity of direct references to his works. His argument is rather interesting. He first sets up clearly the problem to be solved:

Il reste, en effet, à résoudre une difficulté. Si l'Institution oratoire était si connue au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle,—et les témoignages a'Etienne de Rouen, de Pierre de Blois, de Jean de Salisbury ne permettent pas d'en douter,—comment se fait-il que ceux qui le connaissaient, sans excepter Guibert, ne nous aient pas plus fréquemment et plus clairement révélé qu'ils la connaissaient?<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>129</sup>Colson, op. cit., p. liii.

<sup>130</sup>Boskoff, op. cit., p. 72.

<sup>131</sup>Mollard I, p. 175.

In his next article, Mollard constructs an answer. He believes that scholars used Quintilian, but without giving him due credit, because Quintilian had spoken ill of Seneca, who was held in great respect during the middle ages. Following the well-established tradition of taking the pagans' gold and silver for the use of the faithful, Christians took Quintilian's ideas for their own, thinking him superior to Seneca in literary matters, but without acknowledging that use, thinking him inferior to Seneca in moral matters.<sup>132</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup>Mollard II, pp. 7-9. His argument is as follows: Quintilien a médié de Sénèque: voilà sa faute impardonnable, aux yeux de Salisbury et, sans doute, de plus d'un de ses contemporains. Cette raison qui peut nous surprendre nous apparaîtra dans toute sa force si nous nous reportons au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle et si nous songeons à la piété, à la vénération qui entouraient le nom de Sénèque au Moyen Age.

.....  
Pour concilier finalement ses deux admirations, il concède que Quintilien est supérieur à Sénèque en tant que littérateur, mais, pour la morale c'est le dernier qui l'emporte.

.....  
Ceux-ci sont contents d'utiliser l'Institution oratoire sans bruit; n'avaient-ils pas du reste, pour justifier leur silence, une antique tradition qui conseillait de prendre chez les auteurs païens ce que le christianisme y trouvait de profitable, comme le vainqueur s'empare des vases d'or et d'argent du vaincu, sans toutefois lui faire hommage de leur beauté?

.....  
Est-il téméraire de penser que ce sentiment de Salisbury était partagé par ceux de ses contemporains qui connaissaient Quintilien? Quoi de surprenant des lors qu'on évitât de le citer, et sans doute est-ce là qu'il faut chercher l'explication de cette sorte de conspiration du silence, au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, que nous avons signalée à son égard. Mais Salisbury était trop spontané, trop indépendant, trop bon humaniste aussi pour ne pas rendre justice à Quintilien, quelque grief qu'il eût contre lui.

An intriguing argument, no doubt, but it surely seems that Mollard is reading too much into his evidence. It may be that some did not acknowledge their acquaintance with Quintilian's Institutes because he spoke ill of Seneca. But in the presence of the evidence supplied by the extant manuscripts and library catalogues, and in the absence of positive support for Mollard's thesis—such as clear quotations or paraphrases from Quintilian that are unacknowledged—it seems more reasonable to conclude simply that Quintilian was not one of the more popular Latin authors in our period.

#### Minor Rhetoricians

The elder Seneca composed a series of Declamations which were available for rhetorical training during this period, especially in France. Of 26 manuscripts Buttenwieser found, ten of which contain only excerpts of varying lengths, fully half are of French origin. Five manuscripts date from the tenth century. The next ones come from the twelfth: two complete manuscripts from France and one of excerpts; two complete ones from Germany, one each from Italy and England. From the twelfth or thirteenth century are two French collections of excerpts. From the thirteenth century there are five complete French copies, two florilegia from Italy, two complete and two florilegia from England, and a single florilegium from Germany.<sup>133</sup> Libraries

---

<sup>133</sup>Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 86.

listing ownership of the declamations do not appear before the twelfth century. In that century, Cluny and Bec in France, Bamberg and Leitzkau in Germany possess copies. In the thirteenth century, it is listed at Corbie, Pontigny, Rochester, Canterbury, and by Richard of Fournival.<sup>134</sup> The declamations, however, would not have been used as textbooks, but as examples.

In the late Roman empire a number of minor treatises on rhetoric were produced, often glosses on Cicero's rhetorical theory, sometimes incorporating the rhetorical doctrines of Hermagoras and Hermogenes. Many of them stress forensic oratory, some are mere lists of figures. They enjoyed varying fortunes during the middle ages.

Abelson calls the Libri III Artis Rhetoricae by Chirius Fortunatianus<sup>135</sup> "the typical text book of technical rhetoric as studied in the middle ages."<sup>136</sup> The work dates from the latter half of the fourth century, and incorporates doctrines by the Romans Cicero and Quintilian, and the Greeks Hermagoras and Hermogenes. Unlike some late empire treatises, Fortunatianus' is a complete art of rhetoric, with sections on all five canons.<sup>137</sup> The work appears in

---

<sup>134</sup>Ibid., p. 87.

<sup>135</sup>Carolus Halm, Rhetores Latini Minores (Lipsiae, 1863), pp. 81-134.

<sup>136</sup>Abelson, op. cit., p. 55.

<sup>137</sup>Grosser, op. cit., p. 42.

several catalogues printed by Becker:

68. Tullum Leucorum=Toul. ante 1084. 245. reth-  
orica Ciceronis cum Fortunatiano et Alcuino  
Vol. I.
76. Ecclesia S. Maximini Treverensis=Trier. saec.  
XI vel XII. 140. Fortunacianus de rhetorica  
cum dialectica Augustini.
136. Corbeia=Corbie. circa a. 1200. 291. rhet-  
orica Fortunati.

Manitius adds no others.<sup>138</sup>

Late in the fourth century, C. Julius Victor produced his Ars Rhetorica,<sup>139</sup> the most elaborate technical treatise of the period. "Under twenty-seven main headings the author exhaustively treats all the essentials of the 'ars.' Logical subdivision and relative subordination are the marked characteristics of the work."<sup>140</sup> It was not, apparently, popular during the period in question. Becker's catalogues contain not a single mention of this work, and Manitius discovered none, either. Its influence in our period was mediated by Alcuin, as noted below.

From the same age as Julius Victor comes the Institutiones Oratoriae of Sulpitius Victor.<sup>141</sup> The extant frag-

---

<sup>138</sup>Manitius, op. cit., p. 91.

<sup>139</sup>Halm, op. cit., pp. 371-448.

<sup>140</sup>Abelson, op. cit., p. 56.

<sup>141</sup>Halm, op. cit., pp. 311-352.

ment "indicates an elaborate and well arranged commentary on the elements of rhetoric. The author being a practical jurist, his work naturally emphasizes the aspects of the art most closely connected with the work of the pleader."<sup>142</sup> As with his namesake, references from the relevant period were not found.

A treatise on rhetoric was attributed to St. Augustine,<sup>143</sup> for which Abelson claims widespread circulation: "It need hardly be said that the fame of the author made the book very popular."<sup>144</sup> The claim, however, does not seem supportable. While it is intuitively reasonable to conclude that a treatise attributed to Augustine would be very popular, no evidence has been found to support the claim. In fact, the treatise apparently was not widely attributed to Augustine: four of the five extant manuscripts do not identify any author. The eighth century Codex Bernensis 363, originally from Ireland, "bears the superscription: Item Aurelii Augustini de rhetorica."<sup>145</sup> The other four remaining copies are:<sup>146</sup>

---

<sup>142</sup>Abelson, op. cit., p. 56.

<sup>143</sup>Halm, op. cit., pp. 135-51. English translation by Otto Alvin Loeb Dieter and William Charles Kurth, "The De Rhetorica of Aurelius Augustine," Speech Monographs, XXXV (1968), 90-108.

<sup>144</sup>Abelson, op. cit., p. 56.

<sup>145</sup>Dieter and Kurth, op. cit., p. 90.

<sup>146</sup>Ibid.



Codex Darmstadtensis 166, of the seventh century.

Codex Parisianus 7530, of the eighth century.

Codex Frisingensis 206, now Monacensis Lat. 6406,  
from the twelfth century.

Codex Emmeramus Ratisbonensis, now Monacensis Lat.  
14649, a thirteenth century copy.

Neither catalogue citations nor references by writers of the period were found. Consequently, Abelson's claim of widespread use cannot stand.

The commentary on Cicero's De Inventione by Marius Victorinus<sup>147</sup> enjoyed some success. Ogilvy lists one manuscript in England in the eleventh century, and concludes that that century was the earliest it was used in England.<sup>148</sup> Buttenwieser discovered it in 21 "widely scattered" manuscripts, eight times accompanying the work it glossed.<sup>149</sup> The treatise is listed in several of Becker's catalogues:

57. Tegernsee. saec. XI. 9. rhetoricam cum Victorino et Grillio.
68. Tullum Leucorum=Toul. ante. 1084. 246. Victorinus sup. rethoricam Ciceronis vol. I.
79. Corbeia=Corbie. saec. XII. 308. Victorinus in rhetorica.

---

<sup>147</sup>Halm, op. cit., pp. 153-304.

<sup>148</sup>Ogilvy, op. cit., p. 256.

<sup>149</sup>Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 33.

80. Coenobium S. Michaelis Bambergae=Michelsberg.  
1112-23. 73. Victorinus in rhetoricam.
117. Ecclesia Dunelmensis=Durham. saec. XII. 177.  
178. Victorini duo super rhetoricen.

Manitius adds these citations:<sup>150</sup>

Bibl. incogn. s. XI (Delisle II 445 f.) N. 98

Commentariorum M.V. (=Marii Victorini) in  
rethorica quaterniones III.

S. Amand s. XII (Mangeart etc. p. 32 ff.) N. 12

Victorinus de rethorica.

Richard de Fournival c. 1250 (Delisle II 524 ff.)

tab. II 36 Victorini liber commentariorum in  
rhetoricos Tullii secundos ad Herennium.

Reichenau 1020 (Grimm, I. Schriften V 191) Victorini

nobile commentum (scil. in rhetorica Ciceronis).

Metz 1064 (Pitra Spicil. II. p. XXXV) Commentum

Marci Victorini super rhetorica Tullii C.

Heilsbronn s. XIII (Serapeum 26, 203) Victorinus

in Rhetoricam Tullii.

Manitius gives three other citations for Victorinus (an unidentified French library of the eleventh century, Cöln of the same century, Bamberg cathedral of the thirteenth century) where the specific work is not identified. As Victorinus also wrote a grammar, which appears in several of

---

<sup>150</sup>Manitius, op. cit., pp. 85f.

the catalogues, these three listings might be for it or the rhetorical treatise.

The commentary of Grillius,<sup>151</sup> from the fourth or fifth century, occurs, according to Buttenwieser, in four manuscripts.<sup>152</sup> Becker's catalogues list it only once:

57. Tegernsee. saec. XI. 9. rhetoricam cum  
Victorino et Grillio.

Manitius adds three other citations:<sup>153</sup>

Bibl. incogn. s. XII (Delisle II 511) N. 12 Com-  
mentum Grillii in rhetoricam.

Richard de Fournival c. 1250 (Delisle II 524 ff.)  
tab. II 32 item commentarium Grillii super  
rhetoricos Tullii secundos.

Bamberg (Dom) s. XIII (Anz. f. Biblwiss. 1877 S. 277)  
Commentum Grillii de rethoricis.

Universally available were the encyclopedic works of the early middle ages. The summaries of knowledge by Martianus Capella (De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii),<sup>154</sup> Cassiodorus (Institutiones divinarum et humanarum litterarum),<sup>155</sup> and finally, the Etymologies of Isidore of

---

<sup>151</sup>Halm, op. cit., pp. 596-606.

<sup>152</sup>Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 33.

<sup>153</sup>Manitius, op. cit., p. 109.

<sup>154</sup>Halm, op. cit., pp. 449-492.

<sup>155</sup>Ibid., pp. 493-504. English translation: Cassiodorus Senator, An Introduction to Divine and Human Read-

Seville<sup>156</sup> all contain sections on rhetoric, as on the other liberal arts. The relevant portion of Cassiodorus' Institutes is an abstract of Fortunatianus.<sup>157</sup> Isidore incorporated practically the whole of Cassiodorus' section without acknowledgment.<sup>158</sup> All three are very brief summaries of rhetorical doctrine, undistinguished as text books, but, since they formed parts of encyclopedias, universally popular. Catalogue citations for all three encyclopedias abound. Indeed, one or more almost seem to form the basis of the libraries' collections of secular works.

In the Carolingian period, Alcuin composed a dialogue on rhetoric in which he and Charlemagne are the participants, the Disputatio de Rhetorica et de Virtutibus Sapientissimi Regis Karli et Albini Magistri.<sup>159</sup> The work is based on De Inventione and on Julius Victor's Ars Rhetorica to such a great extent that Howell describes it as a "text-

---

ings, trans. by Leslie Webber Jones (New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1966).

<sup>156</sup>Halm, op. cit., pp. 505-522.

<sup>157</sup>Abelson, op. cit., p. 57.

<sup>158</sup>Ernest Brehaut, An Encyclopedist of the Dark Ages: Isidore of Seville, Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, Vol. XLVIII: 1 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1912), p. 106.

<sup>159</sup>Halm, op. cit., pp. 523-550. English translation by Wilbur Samuel Howell, The Rhetoric of Alcuin and Charlemagne (New York: Russell and Russell, 1965; first published, 1941).

ture of excerpts."<sup>160</sup> It survives in 26 manuscripts. Thirteen are from the ninth century, seven from the tenth, two from the thirteenth and the last one from the fifteenth.<sup>161</sup> Howell interprets these dates as indicative of the early popularity of the dialogue, and adds that most of the ninth and tenth century manuscripts are very well preserved, which might account for the small number of copies from later centuries.<sup>162</sup> The book lists printed by Becker mention this work three times:

- 68. Tullum Leucorum=Toul. ante 1084. 254.  
Alcuinus de rethorica et de dialectica vol. I.
- 114. Elnon=Saint-Amand. saec. XII. 67. disputatio  
Albini et Karoli de dialectica et rhetorica etc.
- 121. Bibliotheca Aquiscinctina=Anchin. saec. XII.  
31. quaestiones Karoli ad Albinum de dialectica et rhetorica.

However, there are also numerous references to Alcuin's works, and it seems reasonable to conclude that this particular dialogue has often been absorbed in such general entries and was owned by far more than three libraries.

Finally, the grammatical textbooks present a problem. The fields of rhetoric and grammar overlap to a great ex-

---

<sup>160</sup>Howell, op. cit., p. 22.

<sup>161</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>162</sup>Ibid.

tent. "It should be recognized that the medieval teacher of grammar customarily included all forms of writing and speaking under his jurisdiction," is the conclusion Murphy reaches.<sup>163</sup> Even if his statement is a bit too strong, at the very least Paetow is correct when he states that "frequently it is difficult to draw the line between grammatical and rhetorical instruction."<sup>164</sup> The overlap is especially clear in the subject of style, particularly when dealing with tropes and figures.

Each one of the four divisions of grammar /ars prosaicum or ars dictandi, ars rithmica, ars metricum, ars prosimetricum/ provided for a study of figurae or exornationes or colores—the tropes and figures used to adorn language. . . . The primer itself—Donatus—describes more tropes than even /Geoffrey of Vinsauf does, and the next most popular elementary text (the Graecismus of Evrard of Bethune) treats some hundred figurae, the Doctrinale of Alexander de Villedieu seventy-eight. These are basic textbooks, not artes poetriae. When Robert of Basevorn wishes to commend the figures to readers of his Forma praedicandi (c. 1322), he says that the list found in Rhetorica ad Herennium will be "adequate"—the same 65 figures Vinsauf uses—but implies that the interested reader can of course go further if he wishes to. The point is that any educated reader was expected to have learned for himself the lore of figurae, and a glance at any standard grammatical textbook of the

---

<sup>163</sup>James J. Murphy, "The Arts of Discourse, 1050-1400," Mediaeval Studies, XXIII (1961), 197. Hereinafter cited as: Murphy, "Arts."

<sup>164</sup>Louis John Paetow, The Arts Course at Medieval Universities with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Reprint Library, n.d.; first published, 1910), p. 67. Hereinafter cited as: Paetow, The Arts Course.

Middle Ages will show us where he could have learned them.<sup>165</sup>

Thus, in the area of style, when one attempts to place some limit or boundary to the study of rhetoric, more than a little arbitrariness will be involved. One can never be sure, no matter where the line is drawn, whether a given writer studied figures in rhetoric or in grammar class or in both. For present purposes, we may take the treatment of tropes and figures in the Rhetorica ad Herennium as the limit. While it provided the basis for many grammatical works, it yet clearly falls within the province of rhetoric.

The overlap between grammar and rhetoric must be considered in one other area, also. Priscian, in his grammar, published a "close translation" of the basic rhetorical exercises, or progymnasmata, attributed to Hermogenes of Tarsus. Some of these exercises are applicable to this study. They all involve composition of some sort, retelling stories, paraphrasing legends, amplifying themes, and so on. One in particular, allocutio, is applicable here. In this exercise, the student composed speeches appropriate to real or imagined characters in given situations, a practice that was claimed to be especially helpful for those who would be historians.<sup>166</sup>

---

<sup>165</sup>Murphy, "Arts," p. 198.

<sup>166</sup>Donald Lemen Clark, "Rhetoric and the Literature of the English Middle Ages," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLV (1959), 25-7.

Of the numerous manuscripts of Priscian which survive, not all include these elementary exercises, but many do, normally as the final treatise in his Opera.<sup>167</sup> While the claim has been made that about a thousand manuscripts of Priscian survive,<sup>168</sup> Battenwieser located only about three hundred seventy prior to the fourteenth century. Of these, more than a hundred contain the minor works.<sup>169</sup> Priscian was a very popular textbook for those above the stage of beginner.

#### Libraries

To this point, we have used the library catalogues to show the relative availability of various individual rhetorical works. They can also be used in another manner: to establish combinations of works available. We have seen the numbers of libraries listing various rhetorical works among their holdings. Now, we must take the library catalogues individually to see what combinations of rhetorical works each library lists. Becker's catalogues provide the following information:

45. Incognita bibliotheca. saec. X vel XI. 1.

Rethorica ciceronis. 45. rethorica ciceronis

---

<sup>167</sup>Ibid., p. 24. These exercises are printed in Halm, op. cit., pp. 551-560.

<sup>168</sup>Clark, op. cit., p. 24.

<sup>169</sup>Battenwieser, "Distribution," p. 53.



ad herennium.

54. Bernardus. saec. XI. 8. rethorica de inventionione.
56. Hamersleven. saec. XI. 7. liber rhetoricorum primus, qui sic incipit: Quam Graeci vocant rhetoricam etc. 8. 9. glossae super librum divisionum rhetoricarum Ciceronis Saepe et multum duos libros. 90. 91. Serviolum rhetoricae flores, dupliciter.
57. Tegernsee. saec. XI. 26. topica Tullii cum commentis Boetii et libr. differentiarum et divisionum et multa de rhetorica et de sillogismis in uno corpore. 9. rhetoricam cum Victorino et Grillio.
60. Monasterium S. Laurentii Leodiense=Lüttich. saec. XI. 17. retorica ad Erennium. 18. item retorica ad Erennium. 37. rettorica de inventionione.
63. Bibliotheca incognita. saec. XI. 18. rethoricam Ciceronis. 19. ad Erennium iterum eiusdem. 20. Quintilianum de rhetorica.
68. Tullum Leucorum=Toul. ante 1084. 245. rethorica Ciceronis cum Fortunatiano et Alcuino vol. I. 246. Victorinis sup. rethoricam Ciceronis vol. I. 254. Alcuinus de rethorica et de dialectica vol. I.

76. Trier. saec. XII. 140. Fortunacianus de rhetorica cum dialectica Augustini.
77. Monasterium S. Bertini=St. Bertin. saec. XII. 251. rethorice Tullii liber I.
79. Corbeia=Corbie. saec. XII. 100. Cicero in rethorica. 103. Cicero ad Herennium. 218. Liber in colluotione de rhetorica. 274. Rhetoricae artis liber. 308. Victorinus in rhetorica.
80. Coenobium S. Michaelis Bambergae=Michelsberg. 1112-23. 69.-71. rhetoricae III. 73. Victorinus in rhetoricam. 84. ad Herennium I. 85. 86. de oratore II. 105. 106. Quintiliani II.
86. Beccum. 1142-64. 64. in alio . . . et Tullius de particione oratoria. 93. in alio Quintilianus de institutione. 94. in alio Quintilianus de causis. 95. in alio rethorica. 96. in alio rethorica. 97. in alio rethorica. 104. in alio Tullius de particionibus oratoriis et Seneca de causis. 127. Seneca de causis. Quintilianus de causis. 146. Quintilianus de causis. 155. Seneca de causis.
88. Bibliotheca Lippoldesbergensis. 1151. 47. rethorice Ciceronis, quarum hoc habetur initium: Sepe et multum.

103. Engelberg. ante 1175. 6. liber epistolarum sub I volum. liber Tullii de rhetorica. 15. glosse super rhetoricam Tullii. regule de rhetorica. 33. retorica Tulli ad Erennium. 35. regule de retorica.
114. Elnno=Saint-Amand. saec. XII. 23. 24. duo vol. ubi sunt: . . . Boetii . . . de locorum rhetoricorum distinctione. 33. rhetorica de inventione. 34. rhetorica ad Herennium. 35. rhetorica consulti. 66. Isidorus de rhetorica et dialectica. 67. disputatio Albini et Karoli de dialectica et rhetorica etc.<sup>170</sup>
115. Salzburg. saec. XII. 228. Quintilianus de rhetorica.
117. Ecclesia Dunelmensis=Durham. saec. XII. 76. Quintilianus. 177. Victorini duo super rhetorice. 179.-81. rhetoricae III. 513. rhetorica. 534. libellus de causis Quintiliani.
121. Bibliotheca Aquiscinctina=Anchin. saec. XII. 31. quaestiones Karoli ad Albinum de dialectica et rhetorica. 34. Marci Tullii Ciceronis libri duo de rhetorica, in legibus Romanorum et eiusdem libri VI ad Herennium. 35. topica

---

<sup>170</sup>Delisle, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 451ff, adds a gloss and two more copies of Alcuin.

M. T. Ciceronis et commentum Boetii libri VI  
super ea, de dialectica et rethorica in uno  
vol.

122. Monasterium Murense=Muri. saec. XII. 141.  
rethorica.
125. Monasterium S. Vedasti Atrebatense=Arras.  
saec. XII. 15. liber rethoricorum Tullii  
Ciceronis.
126. Ecclesia Dunelmensis=Durham. 1195. 61. 62.  
retoricae duae.
127. Beccum=Bec. saec. XII. 146. Quintilianus  
de causis. 157. in alio . . . utraque rethorica II.
133. Monasterium S. Petri Resbacense. circa a.  
1200. 34. unus rethoricae.
136. Corbeia=Corbie. circa a. 1200. 279. Prima  
rethorica Tullii. 287. Tullius liber secunda  
rethorica. 288. utraque rethorica. 289.  
prima. 290. utraque rethorica. 291. rhetorica  
Fortunati. 292. rhetorica secunda. 334.  
Seneca de controversiis.

Delisle has printed several additional catalogues:<sup>171</sup>

Bibliotheque de la Cathedral du Puy. XI<sup>e</sup> siecle.

34. Post . . . cum quo Alcuinus de dialectica,

---

<sup>171</sup>Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 544ff.

rethorica, etc. 36. Cicero de rethoricis, divisus duobus libris.

Bibliothèque Indeterminee. XI<sup>e</sup> siècle. 14. Cicero de rethorica. 15. Cicero de partibus oratoriae. 16. Victorinus. In a footnote Delisle presents evidence that this is the rhetorical commentary.

Bibliothèque Indeterminee. XI<sup>e</sup> siècle. 79. Liber Marci Tullii Ciceronis ad Herennium. 98. Commentariorum M.V. in rethorica quaterniones III. Delisle adds the note, "Sans doute pour Marii Victorini."

Bibliothèque de Cluni. XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. 115. Volumen in quo continentur libri Seneca decem declamatorii. 489. Volumen in quo continentur . . . Ciceronis, doctrina ejusdem de oratore. 491. Volumen in quo continentur utreque rhetorice Ciceronis majores, et illas ad Herennium. 494. Volumen in quo continentur rhetorica Ciceronis de eloquentia. 495. Volumen in quo continentur Cicero . . . rhetorica ipsius ad Herennium. 497. Volumen in quo continentur rhetorica Ciceronis ad Herennium, et illa de eloquentia, topica ipsius, et precepta artis rhetorice a Juliano Severiano composita. 500. Volumen in quo continentur . . .

et explanatio Fabii Laurentii in rhetorica ad Herennium. 517. Volumen in quo continentur utreque rhetorices.

Bibliothèque de Saint-Aubin d'Angers. XII<sup>e</sup> siècle.

101. Quintilianus, I vol.

Bibliothèque Indeterminée. XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. 17. Liber de rethorica I.

Bibliothèque Indeterminée. Fin du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. 12.

Commentum Grillii in rethoricam. 13. Rhetoricam utramque.

Bibliothèque de l'Abbaye de Saint-Genevieve de Paris.

XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. 64. Rethorica Tullii II paria.

Bibliothèque de l'Abbaye de Saint-Pons de Tomieres.

1276. 290. De rhetorica sunt quinque volumina, et dicuntur libri rethoricam, et quodlibet eorum incipit: Sepe et multum. 291. Item est aliud volumen quod dicitur glose rethorice artis. 292. Item est aliud volumen quod dicitur liber Marci Tullii ad Herennium de rethorice. 293. Item est aliud volumen quod dicitur glose Maiciani. 294. Item est aliud volumen quod dicitur liber Tullii, et glose de rethorica.

A few additional catalogues are provided by Maitre:<sup>172</sup>

---

<sup>172</sup>Maitre, op. cit., pp. 278ff.

Bibliothèque de l'Abbaye de Saint-Gall. XI<sup>e</sup> siècle.

Ciceronis . . . de optimo genere dicendi.

Bibliothèque de Chartres. XI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Cicero, de

inventione rhetoricae; Cicero, ad Herennium;

Speculatio de rhetoricae cognitione.

Bibliothèque de Chartres. XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Ciceronis

de inventione; Ciceronis ad Herennium; Alia

Rhetorica; Comment. super omnia opera supra-

dicta. /In addition to these, Chartres was

given a copy of Cicero's De Oratore by John

of Salisbury.<sup>173</sup>

Bibliothèque de l'Abbaye Saint-Victor. XI<sup>e</sup> siècle.

Victorini comment. in rhetoricam Ciceronis.

Bibliothèque de l'Abbaye Saint-Victor. XII<sup>e</sup> siècle.

Tullii ciceronis veteris et novae rhetoricae

libri; Quintilianus, de causis.

Bibliothèque de Laon. XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Ciceronis de

inventione.

It is also known that, in the twelfth century, the monastery of Christchurch, Canterbury, possessed "Rethorica (8 copies); Glose super Reth.; Seneca de declamationibus."<sup>174</sup> Thomson

---

<sup>173</sup>James Stuart Beddie, "Libraries in the Twelfth Century," in Anniversary Essays in Mediaeval History by Students of Charles Homer Haskins, ed. by C.H. Taylor (Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, Inc., 1967; first published, 1929), p. 4.

<sup>174</sup>James Bass Mullinger, The University of Cambridge, Vol. I: From the Earliest Times to the Royal Injunctions

contrasts Christchurch with Bury St. Edmunds: "The multiple copies" of the standard text books for various subjects, including the copies of De Inventione "in the Canterbury list can only mean that its novices were instructed in the liberal arts; at Bury, on the other hand, such learning was for a privileged elite of appreciative monks with a background of education in the schools, not for the generality."<sup>175</sup> The library catalogues of Bury St. Edmunds show, for rhetoric, a copy of Quintilian's De Causis by 1150.<sup>176</sup> During the last half of the twelfth century, the abbey added many rhetorical works, as it built up its library:

There are also more classical works: . . . two copies of Cicero's De Inventione and the (pseudo-Ciceronian) Ad Herennium, two of Quintilian's Institutes (if these are not mistaken repetitions), and Oratius totus. A special interest in rhetoric at Bury is suggested not only by the possible double copies of the prima et secunda Rhetorica and the rare Quintilian, but by an important extant commentary on the De Inventione written there shortly after c. 1200. Moreover, the surviving late 12th century MS of pseudo-Quintilian, De Causis, is certainly not the same copy which figures in the earliest part of the catalogue. Finally, a letter of John of Salisbury . . . seems to indicate that Bury had a reputation for possessing good texts of rhetorical works. . . . This special interest may have begun with Abbot Anselm, of whom Osbert of Clare, writing c. 1138, said that rhetoricis coloribus tanquam Tullius exundat.<sup>177</sup>

---

of 1535 (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1873), pp. 102f.

<sup>175</sup>Thomson, op. cit., p. 640.

<sup>176</sup>Ibid., p. 633.

<sup>177</sup>Ibid., p. 639.



Finally, we find that even the Cistercian monastery at Rievaulx, c. 1200, possessed a copy of Cicero's Rhetorics, even though the monastery had no claustral school, so needed no text books, and made no attempt to collect books solely for the sake of collecting.<sup>178</sup>

A similar type of evidence comes from the collections known as libri manuales. These were "compendia for mature private study" as well as for public teaching.<sup>179</sup> They are rather like the florilegia, except that they contain excerpts centering on a more or less unified subject, usually one taught in the schools. Sanford has described the contents of several hundred libri manuales extant as of 1924. She lists the following as libri manuales for the study of rhetoric and dialectic (only the rhetorical works included are given here):<sup>180</sup>

91. 10th century. Lugdunensis Vossianus F 70 +

---

<sup>178</sup>David Knowles, The Religious Orders in England, Vol. II (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1957), p. 341.

<sup>179</sup>Eva Matthews Sanford, "The Use of Classical Latin Authors in the Libri Manuales," Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, LV (1924), 190.

<sup>180</sup>Ibid. The first number indicates the number of the book in Sanford's list. Then follows the date of the MS, its citation, and the list of rhetorical works included. No indication is given of the extent to which each work is excerpted, nor is any indication given of the provenance of the MSS. Therefore all with rhetorical material have been included here, though some might be from areas outside the range of this study.

- Bodleianus Canon. 279. Cicero, rhetorica.
106. 10th century. Parisinus 11127. communis speculatio de rhetoricae cognatione.
145. 11th century. Lugdunensis Vossianus Q 33. rhetorica; rhythmus de communione et differentia rhetoricae et dialecticae.
155. 11th century. Parisinus 7231. auctor ad Herennium; Cicero, partitiones oratoriae; Julius Severianus, rhetorica; Quintilian, excerpts from Book X.
156. 11th century. Parisinus 7696. Cicero, de inventione, partitiones oratoriae; auctor ad Herennium; Marius Victorinus, de rhetorica; Julius Severianus, rhetorica; Quintilian, excerpts from Books X and XII.<sup>181</sup>
163. 11th century. Sangallensis 830. Eutyches, locorum rhetoricorum distinctio.

---

<sup>181</sup>There seems to be some confusion about this MS. Sanford lists these works as included in it also: de attributis negotiis; Jerome, praefatio actuum apostolorum; Gerbert, epistule ad Constantinum; order for dotation of the library of Fleury; versus de artibus et disciplinis. However, Fierville, op. cit., p. lxxxiv, refers to a Codex Parisinus 7696 with the following contents: 1. De Inventione with glosses, 2. Marii Fabii Victoriani rethoris in rethoricis codicibus, 3. M. Tullii Ciceronis partitiones oratoriae incipiunt feliciter, 4. Precepta artis rethoricae summam collecta de multis ac sintomata a Julio Severiano, incipiunt feliciter, 5. Quintilian, 6. M.T. Ciceronis, rethorica ad Herennium. He indicates that these are the only works this MS includes.

169. 11th century. Vaticanus 8591. de rhetorica cognatione; Eutyches, de locorum rhetoricorum distinctione.
194. 12th century. Beccum (same as Becker 266, no. 157). Martianus Capella, commentum Remigii; utraque rhetorica.
206. 12th century. Carnotensis 497. Cicero, de inventione, de partitione oratoria; auctor ad Herennium; Julius Severianus, rhetorica.
266. 12th century. Vaticanus 1700. Cicero, rhetorica; auctor ad Herennium.
304. 13th century. Cantabrigiensis, Clare Kk 5,2. Quintilian, declamationes, institutiones.

The following manuscripts are also described by Sanford, but not listed as primarily for rhetorical and dialectical study although in some cases it is not clear why they were not so listed (again, only rhetorical works included are listed here):

11. 9th century. Bernensis 363. Fortunatianus, ars rhetorica; Augustine, de rhetorica; Clodianus, ars rhetorica.
13. 9th century. Bruxellensis 1372. Seneca, suasoriae.
189. 12th century. Bambergensis M V 6. Cicero, de inventione; auctor ad Herennium.
190. 12th century. Beccum (same as Becker 201, no.

- 64.) Tullius de partitione oratoria.
196. 12th century. Berolinensis 181 (Phill. 1732).  
Cicero, de oratore, Brutus.
199. 12th century. Bruxellensis 10615-10729: Ciris  
454-541. Seneca, excerpts from controversiae.
235. 12th century. Mon. S. Martialis Lemovicensis  
(same as Delisle, II, 495, no. 30). Magnus  
Seneca et controversiae Tullii.
247. 12th century. Oxoniensis, Magdalen 22. Seneca,  
de causis.
248. 12th century. Parisinus 1618. Quintilian,  
declamationes.
320. 13th century. Escorialensis Q I 14. flori-  
legium including Tullii de rhetoricis; Quintil-  
iani in materiis, in libro causarum; Seneca in  
declamationibus.
348. 13th century. Oxoniensis Bodleianus 633.  
proverbia from Quintilian.
349. 13th century. Oxoniensis Bodleianus 678.  
proverbia from Quintilian.
359. 13th century. Parisinus 7647. Same as 320.
376. 13th century. Vaticanus Reginensis 1575. pro-  
verbia from Quintilian.

The last five listed items, however, seem to be getting away from the concept of the libri manuales and closer to that of the florilegia.

## CHAPTER III

### RHETORIC IN THE SCHOOLS

The last chapter dealt with the relative availability of various rhetorical textbooks. This chapter will consider the evidence for the study of rhetoric at the different types of schools that existed during the period in question. That rhetoric was widely studied as a liberal art in this period cannot be doubted. We have seen that many famous writers in many fields used the basic rhetorical works. We also have direct testimony by some that as part of their higher education they studied, or as masters taught, the liberal art of rhetoric.

About the middle of the eleventh century, it appears that Magister Onulf of Speyer was teaching rhetoric at the Speyer cathedral school, using as his basis the Rhetorica ad Herennium.<sup>1</sup> Early in the twelfth century there are references in the metrical biography of Arcibhsiop Adelbert VI of Mainz (1137-41) indicating that his studies in Paris included rhetoric.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Luitpold Wallach, "Onulf of Speyer, A Humanist of the Eleventh Century," Medievalia et Humanistica, VI (1950), 49.

<sup>2</sup>Rashdall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 102.

Abelard tells in his autobiography of his days as a student at Paris. He describes how, as the student of William of Champeaux, he challenged the master with some success, then started teaching on his own. William attempted to remove him from Paris but failed. Peter then was taken ill and returned to his home. On recovering, he returned to Paris, and, strangely enough, once again became a student under William. "To him did I return, for I was eager to learn more of rhetoric from his lips; and in the course of our many arguments on various matters, I compelled him by most potent reasoning first to alter his former opinion on the subject of the universals, and finally to abandon it altogether."<sup>3</sup> His description makes one wonder how much time he spent studying rhetoric; one suspects most of the time was spent arguing about universals. Although Abelard only cites four of Cicero's works, one of them is De Inventione, so he must have studied rhetoric to some extent.<sup>4</sup>

Perhaps the best known testimony comes from a famous pupil of Abelard's, John of Salisbury. John describes his studies at some length in the Metalogicon, telling how he first studied rhetoric under Thierry of Chartres but did not learn much so had to study more about the subject later

---

<sup>3</sup>Peter Abelard, The Story of My Misfortunes, trans. by Henry Adams Bellows (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958), p. 5.

<sup>4</sup>Sandys, op. cit., p. 649. The other three are Topica, De Officiis, and Paradoxa.

under the grammarian Peter Helias.<sup>5</sup>

Later in the twelfth century, Giraldus Cambrensis describes his experiences in the schools of Paris. He went to Paris to find the best teachers available, making three successive journeys into France totalling several years of study there. His time was spent studying "in the liberal arts and procuring the most efficient teachers, he lectured in the Trivials, and obtained great reputation in the art of rhetoric."<sup>6</sup> He returned to England about 1172.

In Germany, late in the twelfth century, we find evidence that Otto, bishop of Freising, uncle of Frederick Barbarossa, had studied rhetoric. At least he shows familiarity with both De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium.<sup>7</sup>

As the thirteenth century progressed, a student would spend less and less of his time studying rhetoric. However, at the end of our period, we find St. Thomas Aquinas having detailed knowledge of the standard rhetorical textbooks, especially De Inventione.<sup>8</sup> In his Summa Theologica there

---

<sup>5</sup>John of Salisbury, op. cit., II, 10.

<sup>6</sup>J.S. Brewer, ed., Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. I (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1861; Kraus Reprint, 1966; Rolls Series), pp. xiv-xv.

<sup>7</sup>Otto of Freising, The Two Cities, trans. by Charles Mierow (New York: Columbia University Press, 1928), pp. 130-1 (I, vi).

<sup>8</sup>Rand, op. cit., p. 11.

are, according to Rand, at least seventy references to De Inventione, none of which contains a refutation of any of Cicero's views. For Thomas, Cicero's rhetorical treatise is a "weighty and respected source."<sup>9</sup>

With the fact established that rhetoric was studied during this period, we may consider the various types of schools available. These fall into three categories: simple grammar schools, more advanced schools, usually found at a cathedral, and universities.

#### Grammar Schools

Almost all the sources that deal with medieval rhetoric concern themselves primarily or exclusively with what would now be called "higher education." Institutionally, in the twelfth and earlier centuries, the lines between what we would call primary and secondary education, on the one hand, and higher education on the other, were not well established, and were becoming clearly drawn only toward the end of our period. Furthermore, as universities were established, the normal age for entering such an institution was about 14 to 16. Since university instruction was in Latin, before beginning the study of the liberal arts at the university level, the student must have received some sort of preparatory education in a grammar school. It is known that, toward the end of our period, instruction in grammar

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 44.



and rhetoric were increasingly crowded out of universities by the study of dialectic. It has also been noted that there is great difficulty in drawing a distinct line between instruction in grammar and in rhetoric. Thus, the question naturally arises, how much instruction in rhetoric was given at the grammar school level? The evidence here is extremely sparse and interpretation of it must proceed cautiously.

For the twelfth century, one of the few good descriptions of the schools is given by William FitzStephen in his biography of Thomas Becket, his former master. In the first part of this biography, William describes the city of London, including the following passage on its schools. The description actually seems to fit an advanced school, but must be considered first because of the interpretation Leach, in his study of medieval English schools, has given it.

In London the three principal churches have famous schools privileged and of ancient dignity, though sometimes through personal favour to some one noted as a philosopher more schools are allowed. On feast days the Masters celebrate assemblies at the churches, arrayed in festive garb. The scholars hold disputations, some argumentatively, others by way of question and answer. These roll out enthymemes, those use the forms of perfect syllogisms. Some dispute merely for show, as they do at collections; others for the truth which is the grace of perfection. The sophists and those in training in sophistry are pronounced happy because of the mass and volume of their words; others play upon words. Those learning rhetoric with rhetorical speeches speak to the point with a view to persuasion, being careful to observe the precepts of their art, and to leave out nothing that belongs to it.

The boys of the different schools hold contests in verse; or pose each other on the principles of grammar, or the rules of preterites and supines.<sup>10</sup>

Leach generalizes from this passage concerning the period from Lanfranc to Becket:

Rhetoric and logic, however, were not then university subjects, but school subjects, and were begun at a much earlier age than now. With grammar, rhetoric and logic formed the trivium, which was the domain of the grammar school, while the quadrivium and theology became the domain of the university. . . . Though . . . there were scholars of the university age and type at the London schools in 1118, they were probably in the minority. The stress laid on rhetoric suggests that the elder scholars were no older than the boys in the top forms of St. Paul's School now.<sup>11</sup>

As this is one of the very few extensive descriptions of schools from our period that was discovered, its interpretation is important. The first problem with this passage is the question of the date to which it refers. The description is the first part of a life of Thomas Becket, who was murdered in 1170. William FitzStephen's death has been assigned to the year 1191.<sup>12</sup> The paragraph immediately preceding the one quoted refers to the reign of Stephen,

---

<sup>10</sup>A.F. Leach, The Schools of Medieval England (New York: Macmillan, 1915), pp. 138-9. Hereinafter cited as: Leach, Schools.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., pp. 139-40.

<sup>12</sup>James Craigie Robertson, ed., Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, Vol. III (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1877; Kraus Reprint, 1965; Rolls Series), p. xvi. Robertson adds, however, "on what authority I know not."

and the actions of the town of London in the civil wars.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, the description was written long after 1118, the year to which Leach believes it refers. He gives no reason for assigning that date, but presumably took it as the year of Thomas' birth. Knowles seems more reasonable in his estimate that, as he believes the work was written around 1173, the description of London "probably represents the picture in the writer's memory of the city as it was twenty or thirty years earlier."<sup>14</sup>

Whatever the date at which FitzStephen's description fits the town of London, Leach's conclusion that rhetoric and logic were not university-level subjects, but mere "school" subjects is anachronistic. For even if the description fits a very late period in FitzStephen's life, it still antedates the first clearly established English university by at least fifteen to twenty years. And, even when universities were formed, none was organized in London. Technically, therefore, the description can support the last half of the conclusion that these were not university subjects, but only because there were at that time no univer-

---

<sup>13</sup>William FitzStephen, Vita Sancti Thomae, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi et Martyris, in Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, Vol. III, ed. by James Craigie Robertson (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1877; Kraus Reprint, 1965; Rolls Series), p. 4.

<sup>14</sup>David Knowles, Thomas Becket (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1971), p. 5.

sities.<sup>15</sup>

Leach adds, "At all events, besides the votaries of philosophy and logic, there were the younger pupils, those under fourteen, who only, in the strict language of the time, were called 'boys,' whose studies were purely grammatical."<sup>16</sup> Thus, he recognizes a distinction among these pupils. Clearly, the same schools served both groups in a city as important as London. The correct interpretation of this passage from FitzStephen's life of Thomas Becket would seem to be, then, that rhetoric was one of the subjects studied by those of an age who later would have been university students, students of the liberal arts, but apparently not a subject studied by mere 'boys,' at the grammar school level.

Leach has published a large number of documents concerning medieval English schools. These mention only grammar for the small boys or theology (presumably for older

---

<sup>15</sup>Leach clearly assumes that universities were formed in the twelfth century, but on what grounds is not apparent. He states that no universities existed at the end of the eleventh century, Schools, p. 106. He does not wish to discuss "the vexed question of when the studium of Oxford could first be termed a University," but notes that the term does not appear in the Oxford documents until 1245, Ibid., p. 129. He then proceeds to use the term, "university," as though such institutions existed in the twelfth century, see especially Ibid., pp. 129-30, and vaguer references throughout the chapter. Perhaps we must conclude that he is using the term in a non-technical sense.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 140. After the section of FitzStephen's description on rhetoric, he says, "So much for the elder scholars," Ibid., p. 139.

students) until one comes to the documents directly connected with the true universities. The only two exceptions are the excerpt from FitzStephen and one document dated 1248 mentioning logic taught apparently in a grammar school at Southwell.<sup>17</sup> Therefore it seems that London was a large enough city to have relatively advanced established schools prior to the rise of universities. Subjects other than grammar and theology were of course taught before universities came into existence, and at other places as well as at London, but the teaching of them was simply a matter for master and student, not to be institutionalized so not to appear in charters or other documents.

Leach offers a further description of the ordinary grammar school of the twelfth century in an article on Warwickshire.

As in other ancient churches of secular canons, whether cathedral or not, so also at Warwick there were two schools, one for grammar, the other for song, under their respective masters. The master of the grammar school gave instruction in the classics, dialectic or the art of argument, the beginnings of philosophy, and rhetoric or the art of persuasion, including composition. The master of the song school taught, besides singing and music, reading and perhaps writing.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>A.F. Leach, Educational Charters and Documents, 598 to 1909 (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1911), p. 158. Hereinafter cited as: Leach, Charters.

<sup>18</sup>A.F. Leach, "Schools," in The Victoria History of the Counties of England: Warwickshire, Vol. II (London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1965; first published, 1908), p. 300.

This would indicate that the grammar master did not teach the boys to read in the first place, but took them under his charge only after the song master had taught them at least the rudiments of reading. In applying this generalization to Warwick, Leach offers for support a statute for these two schools, which he dates either 1215 or 1315:

that undue encorachment of the scholars on one side and the other may cease for the future, we decree and direct to be inviolably observed that the present grammar master and his successors shall have the Donatists, and thenceforward have, keep, and teach scholars in grammar or the art of dialectic, if he shall be expert in that art, while the music master shall keep and teach those learning their first letters, the psalter, music and song.<sup>19</sup>

Thus, his evidence here actually is silent on the study of rhetoric, and indicates a school somewhat less ambitious than Leach believes ordinary. The present writer has been unable to locate evidence that would warrant such a generalization.

Of great interest for its information on the study of rhetoric is the reference by FitzStephen to those training in sophistry, the sophistae. This is a word that was not often discovered used in this sense. In her study of John of Salisbury, Ryan discusses at length this term as John uses it. John places sophistry as the third branch of ratio dissertiva, after demonstrative and probable reasoning. Sophistry has no regard for facts or truth.

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 301.

The sophists make use of logic, in any of its forms, for personal ends. Yet, sophistry has a place in the educational system.<sup>20</sup> The younger boys were to be trained in sophistry for several reasons. In the first place, the disputation, a verbal joust "in which two knights of reason confront each other, 'lapped in proof,' to demonstrate their skill,"<sup>21</sup> was of central significance in the educational process. The product of the educational system was to be one well trained to uphold the truth and to do battle with falsehood and error. Now, sophistry is "the mere appearance of wisdom," so anyone deceived by sophistry is a fool. "Therefore the young student should have a thorough training in the wiles of sophistry so that he will be able to detect and unmask it later when he finds it masquerading as true wisdom."<sup>22</sup> Thus, for a purely negative reason, the youth should receive training in sophistry.

John also believes training in sophistry has a positive value,

an opinion probably derived from Quintilian and Bernard of Chartres. Like Quintilian, John thinks that the education of children should be adapted

---

<sup>20</sup>Sister Mary Bride Ryan, O.P., John of Salisbury on the Arts of Language in the Trivium: An Abstract of a Dissertation (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1958), p. 19. The passages of John's Meta-logicon she is combining and interpreting occur at II.3, II.5, III.10, IV.22, IV.28, and IV.29.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 23.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 28.

to child-nature, and should be as agreeable as possible. Now, he says, there is nothing children like better than to appear wise, and to shine before their parents and classmates. However, their minds are not capable of assimilating real wisdom. The weighty questions of philosophy and science are not for their tender years to unravel. But sophistry offers just what they need, the dazzle of apparent knowledge without the labor and responsibility of defending truth. In the "declamatio" on a fictitious topic the budding orator can sway a mob, the aspiring lawyer convince the most obdurate judge, the would-be courtier praise the monarch—all without need of any weightier mental exertion than the pleasant employment of the imagination. Meanwhile, they are acquiring a large vocabulary, and facility in the selection and use of commonplaces; they become adept at parrying and thrusting; they gain practice in defining, dividing, and drawing inferences. They learn to defend their own arguments clearly and to be adroit in refuting those of their opponents. In other words, it is the kind of "mental gymnastics" for which the early works of Aristotle were intended.

But when the student reaches maturity, John says, this verbosity should be curbed, and the "impudence of sophistry suppressed." It is the duty of those entrusted with the office of teaching to see that this is done. There is nothing more disgusting, he thinks, than to see grown men trying to trip each other in these verbal jousts of childhood.<sup>23</sup>

Few other references to training in sophistry were found. Alanus, in his commentary on the Rhetorica ad Herennium, written in the twelfth century, divides the pedagogical duties, following Marius Victorinus' division, as follows: "The orator handles cases artistically; the rhetor teaches the art; the sophista provides practice in speaking

---

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., pp. 28-9.



for those who wish to pursue it."<sup>24</sup>

In 1252 the English nation at the University of Paris established standards for the granting of the bachelors degree. After listing the required courses, appears the following requirement: "Also he shall give satisfaction that he has diligently attended the disputations of masters in a recognized university for two years and for the same length of time has answered as required concerning sophisms in class."<sup>25</sup> In 1267, Oxford University established a similar set of rules according to which masters might admit determiners. "The bachelors who are to determine that year shall come before the said masters with the approved testimony of masters or bachelors and, if they are going to determine for themselves, shall swear on the Gospels that they have gone through," then follows a list of books none of which is a rhetorical treatise, except the Fourth Book of Boethius' Topics which they are not bound to hear at all. The next section concerns sophistry:

And it is to be understood that if they first answer publicly in the schools, they must have answered in sophistry for a whole year, no part of the year in which they have answered to the question being reckoned in the said whole year. To the question they ought to have answered at least once in the summer before the Lent in which they are going to determine. But if they have not answered in sophistry publicly they shall swear that they have heard all the books afore-

---

<sup>24</sup>Caplan, op. cit., p. 252.

<sup>25</sup>Thorndike, op. cit., p. 54.

said, with this addition, that they have twice heard the Posterior Analytics. In hearing them also they ought to make a longer stay than if they have publicly answered in sophistry.<sup>26</sup>

From these statutes it would appear that the study of sophistry, or rather its practice, was carried out extensively and at a rather later age than John of Salisbury would have approved a century earlier. However, later in the history of universities, we find the term "sophistical" used to describe a type of disputation, apparently a disputation in the faculty of arts corresponding to the quodlibets in the theological faculty.<sup>27</sup> Thus we seem to have here a term in the process of acquiring a technical meaning. Early in our period, it is used to refer to a general type of practice in speaking; by the end of the period, it is used to indicate a specific type of university disputation.

#### Advanced Schools

Prior to the twelfth century, the monastic schools had been by and large the main centers of learning in Western Europe. The grammar schools, connected with towns and cathedrals or large churches, offered basic instruction throughout our period, as before. But during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, those schools connected with several important cathedrals became the dominant centers of learning

---

<sup>26</sup>Leach, Charters, p. 193.

<sup>27</sup>Rashdall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 460.

and the monastic schools faded into relative obscurity. Indeed, it was out of such cathedral schools that several of the universities arose.

In an ordinary school, whether monastic, cathedral, or other, it seems, the grammar master would instruct the young boys in the elements of reading, adding some rhetoric and dialectic if he could, and, possibly, some small amount of the other four liberal arts. However, if the teacher was a true scholar, he would attract some students interested in much more than the elements of reading, the number and quality of students being a product of, among other things, the master's ability and fame. Since these students would come to him at his school, the schools were largely dependent upon the quality of instructors they could acquire. Thus, if a famous master died, and no one of equal competence was found to replace him, the students would disperse to masters' schools elsewhere. A few cathedrals were able, one way or another, to maintain consistently high quality scholars as their instructors. Some few places obtained such a reputation for learning, with so many excellent teachers and such a crowd of students at one time, that some form of institutionalization was obviously needed, resulting in the birth of universities. During the twelfth century, however, before the rise of universities, it was to these cathedral schools that the aspiring scholar would turn for more learning than he could get locally. The twelfth cen-

tury was a period of classical revival, centered in such cathedral schools as Chartres, Orleans, Paris and Rheims, "where the spirit of a real humanism showed itself in an enthusiastic study of ancient authors. There was a flourishing growth of these schools in northern France; the curriculum was based on the seven arts; and the study of rhetoric in particular nourished the humanism."<sup>28</sup>

These cathedral schools were for all intents and purposes simply expanded grammar schools. Since they were a major source of higher education, they must be examined to determine how much and what sort of rhetoric was taught to the older students. While it is clear that some cathedral schools flourished, specific evidence on their curricula is especially hard to find, as these schools were established and operated so informally.

By the early twelfth century the cathedral school at Rheims was already in decline, having passed its eleventh century peak of excellence. Williams, on the basis of his study of this school, claims, "we are bound to conclude that Rheims in the eleventh century was a principle, if not the principle, center of humanistic culture in Northern France."<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup>Caplan, op. cit., p. 249.

<sup>29</sup>John R. Williams, "The Cathedral School of Rheims in the Eleventh Century," Speculum, XXIX (1954), 676.

At Rheims as elsewhere in the eleventh century the basic curriculum was the seven liberal arts. Though Gerbert had distinguished himself as a teacher of trivium and quadrivium alike, his successors of the eleventh century were obviously giving these two areas of learning very unequal treatment. They spent a lot of time on the former, but, with the possible exception of music, paid little or no attention to the subjects of the latter. . . .

The eleventh century school was above all else a school of grammar and rhetoric.<sup>30</sup>

However, by the end of the century, the school was already in a decline, overshadowed by that at Laon.<sup>31</sup> During the twelfth century, although Rheims had occasionally some outstanding scholars, such as Alberic in the 1120's and 1130's in the subject of theology, in the arts Williams finds "no evidence of anything other than routine activity."<sup>32</sup>

Paris will occupy our attention more when we discuss the study of rhetoric at the universities. But during the twelfth century, Paris witnessed an increasingly large gathering of scholars connected with three schools: the cathedral school, the school at the Collegiate Church of Ste. Genevieve, and that connected with the Church of the Canons Regular of St. Victor.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 675.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 672.

<sup>32</sup>John R. Williams, "The Cathedral School of Reims in the Time of Master Alberic, 1118-1136," Traditio, XX (1964), 111.

<sup>33</sup>The last named school was founded by William of Champeaux when he retired from the world early in the twelfth century.

We have already seen testimony from John of Salisbury and Abelard, who studied rhetoric at Paris, and from Giraldus Cambrensis, who not only studied but also taught rhetoric in that city. Holmes expands on the case of the Welshman:

Master Mainerius, one of the best students of Peter Abelard, stood in his classroom and spoke a prophecy of Sibyl: 'The day will come, Woe be to them, when the Laws will obliterate the memory of Rhetoric.' Gerald the Welshman reports this twice and says that he heard Mainerius say it. Probably Gerald studied rhetoric with this master.<sup>34</sup>

There is also evidence that Anselm of Laon, a pupil of the more famous St. Anselm, became a master in the cathedral school at Paris and taught grammar, rhetoric, and theology.<sup>35</sup>

We have some idea of the activity at the schools:

In the De Vanitate Mundi Hugh /of St. Victor/ presents a picture of the activity within a school. It may be that he is depicting the activity at Mount Ste. Genevieve, above Paris; but then again he may have had his own studium in mind. The Teacher asks the Questioner to look around and say what he sees. He describes students who are exercising their tongues in the reading and pronunciation of letters. He sees still others who are practicing inflections for the sake of obtaining eloquence (for "talking and eloquence are not the same; to speak, and to speak well, are two things.") There are individuals engaged in dialectical dispute, endeavouring to trick one another slyly. Some are employed in . . . /here follows a list of the quadrivium plus physica./ We assume that

---

<sup>34</sup>Urban T. Holmes, Jr., "Transitions in European Education," p. 27.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

these exercises were not all taking place at the same time, in the same hall.<sup>36</sup>

Thus, some instruction in rhetoric clearly was given in the Parisian schools of the twelfth century.

The cathedral school at Chartres<sup>37</sup> is one of the best known to us, primarily because John of Salisbury studied there and recorded a great deal about the school, especially its most famous teacher, Bernard. From the time of Fulbert early in the eleventh century, the school at Chartres was known as a center of humanism. From the first efforts of Fulbert to build up a collection of the classics, and in particular to collect several rhetorical treatises,<sup>38</sup> through

---

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>37</sup>The description of the school of Chartres given here is the traditional one, following the study by A. Clerval, Les Ecoles de Chartres au Moyen-Age (Paris, 1895). R.W. Southern has questioned this interpretation, arguing that there is no evidence for the existence of such an outstanding school at this cathedral. The evidence, he claims, only proves that two outstanding masters taught there: Fulbert, and Bernard. Many famous masters were connected with the cathedral in various capacities, but no evidence suggests that they taught there. R.W. Southern, "Humanism and the School of Chartres," in Medieval Humanism (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), pp. 61-85. If Southern's conclusions are correct, then the evidence adduced for the teaching of rhetoric at Chartres, other than that for the two masters mentioned, actually applies to several other schools, especially those at Paris. Therefore, if Southern's claims are correct, rhetoric as a humanistic study was more widely popular than previously thought.

<sup>38</sup>Clerval, op. cit., p. 115. See also Thompson, op. cit., p. 235.

at least the first half of the twelfth century, Chartres was the center of humanistic learning in northern France. In the specific field of rhetoric, Curtius describes the attitude held at this cathedral school:

In the twelfth century there stands beside and above the *ars dictaminis* the antique ideal: rhetoric as the integrating factor of all education. The concept was common to Cicero, Quintilian, and Augustine. It survives in Martianus Capella's idea of arranging a marriage between Mercury and the maiden Philology. In the first half of the twelfth century it nourishes the Humanism of the School of Chartres. Its atmosphere pervades the writings of John of Salisbury.<sup>39</sup>

John's description of the type of education given at Chartres by Bernard and presumably carried on by his successors, is summarized by Laurie:

He accustomed his pupils to apply the rules of grammar to the texts they read, . . . he directed their attention to delicacies of language and beauty of expression, to the aptness of terms and metaphors, and the disposition of the argument. He criticized the varieties of style of different authors, and took advantage of allusions to give much collateral instruction. He also exercised his pupils daily in writing Latin prose and verse, and required them to learn fine passages by heart. This, it will be seen, was applied rhetoric as well as grammar, and indeed constitutes what we now understand by training in the humanities.<sup>40</sup>

The school at Orleans was nearly the equal of that

---

<sup>39</sup>Ernst Robert Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, trans. by Willard Trask (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953), pp. 76-7.

<sup>40</sup>S.S. Laurie, The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1902), pp. 60-1.



at Chartres. "Even when the school of Chartres, overshadowed by Paris, began to decline, the classical tradition lived on at Orleans till at least the middle of the thirteenth century."<sup>41</sup>

There was the school at Laon, mentioned above. Its fame, however, was rather in the areas of dialectic and theology. There was also a "school of rhetoric and poetry at Tours," about which virtually nothing is known.<sup>42</sup> Peter of Blois in all probability taught grammar and rhetoric in the latter school in the mid-twelfth century.<sup>43</sup>

In England, a rather different situation presents itself. We have already seen the type of study conducted at the London schools in the twelfth century. The other cathedral schools do not seem to have been as important. Furthermore, in England, when the universities appeared on the scene, they were not formed in towns with cathedrals.

Although the two towns of Oxford and Cambridge eventually emerged as the dominant centers of higher learning in England, there were, throughout our period, other towns that had important schools, sometimes overshadowing these two. Besides the schools in London, Poole adds Canterbury, York, Winchester, Lincoln and Exeter as towns where

---

<sup>41</sup>Sandys, op. cit., pp. 675-6.

<sup>42</sup>Haskins, Renaissance, p. 103.

<sup>43</sup>Southern, op. cit., p. 110.

a strong tradition of learning survived.<sup>44</sup> Even more important was Northampton where Geoffrey of Vinsauf taught rhetoric and poetics in the 1170's.<sup>45</sup> Richardson studied the evidence for the schools at Northampton, and concluded that they "enjoyed a high reputation in the reign of Henry II, and it seems likely that they had more to offer—presumably with the exception of theology—than the schools of any cathedral town."<sup>46</sup> However, by 1232 "there is no indication that they are serving more than local needs."<sup>47</sup>

Southern would add to the list of advanced schools those at Dunstable, Huntingdon, Gloucester, Bath and Warwick.<sup>48</sup> However, he concludes that, although they emerged as more than local grammar schools, none, not even Oxford or Cambridge or Northampton, "in the twelfth century ever rivalled the greatest of the French schools."<sup>49</sup>

The schools at Oxford and Cambridge are rather obscure, until one reaches the period when university docu-

---

<sup>44</sup>Austin Lane Poole, From Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 1087-1216 (2nd ed.; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1955), pp. 233-6.

<sup>45</sup>H.G. Richardson, "The Schools of Northampton in the Twelfth Century," English Historical Review, LVI (1941), 601.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. 602-3.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 604.

<sup>48</sup>Southern, op. cit., p. 163.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 164.

ments begin. While there is some evidence of a gathering of scholars at Oxford prior to the thirteenth century, the only specific reference to the teaching of rhetoric that was discovered was provided by Holmes from the works of Peter of Blois: "In another scathing letter Peter denounces Raoul of Beauvais, teacher at Oxford, who had criticized him for wasting his time with the King's Court. He denounces Raoul for continuing to teach grammar and rhetoric among the boys when his contemporaries have mounted to higher places."<sup>50</sup>

The twelfth century school at Cambridge is almost as obscure as that at Oxford. However, a few references provide useful information. In "Peter of Blois' continuation of Ingulph's Chronicle of Croyland," there is a reference to a school at Cambridge under the date 1109: "Then at the third hour, brother William read lectures on the Rhetoric of Tully, and the Institutions of Quintilian."<sup>51</sup> However, this document, despite its title, was not written by a contemporary, but is a forgery composed in the fourteenth century.<sup>52</sup> Perhaps it was an expansion on the information

---

<sup>50</sup>Holmes, "Transitions in European Education," p. 29.

<sup>51</sup>Peter of Blois, "Continuation of Ingulph's Chronicle of Croyland," in Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland, trans. by Henry T. Riley (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854), p. 238.

<sup>52</sup>Henry W.C. David, England Under the Normans and Angevins (13th ed.; London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1949), p. 548.

provided by Ordericus Vitalis, who mentions classes held in Cambridge by the monks of Croyland. "The monks rented a granary. Between dawn and the First Hour Odo taught grammar; at Prime, in the same hall, Terric held forth on rhetoric; at Tierce, William gave lessons in dialectic. On Sundays and on feast days Gilbert spoke on the Fathers and on elementary theology."<sup>53</sup> Further evidence on Cambridge, from a rather late source, indicates that Robert Grosseteste, sometime between about 1189 and 1200, went to Cambridge to study and taught rhetoric and logic there.<sup>54</sup>

Thus, without delving in any great detail into the various cathedral schools, we nevertheless can conclude that, at many, rhetoric was an important subject for study. However, the evidence almost never specifies the type of instruction or the works that were studied.

### Universities

It is only in the last quarter of our period that universities were developed as separate educational institutions. From about 1200 on there is an increasing amount of documentary material relating to universities. However,

---

<sup>53</sup>Quoted in Holmes, "Transitions in European Education," p. 22.

<sup>54</sup>J.P.C. Roach, "The University of Cambridge," in The Victoria History of the Counties of England: Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely, Vol. III (Oxford, 1959), p. 151. For details see Josiah Cox Russell, "Richard of Bardney's Account of Robert Grosseteste's Early and Middle Life," Medievalia et Humanistica, II (1943), 46ff.

prior to 1250, there is little evidence concerning the rhetorical training offered, and that, for the most part, is quite inconclusive. Furthermore, many secondary sources generalize from late medieval documents, and their conclusions therefore can be misleading for our period. Thus, the pertinent material must be carefully considered.

The University of Paris was the first to develop north of the Alps. From this university we have three statutes in or near the period in question. First there are the regulations imposed on the university by the papal legate, Robert de Courcon, in 1215. This statute, among other provisions, includes the first attempt to establish a course of studies, or a curriculum.<sup>55</sup> Actually, the section on curriculum is relatively short. It only specifies that masters shall give ordinary rather than only cursory lectures on those works of Aristotle included in the old logic as well as the new, that ordinary lectures shall be given on both Priscians, or at least on one, that lectures on feast days shall be limited, and that several books shall not be lectured upon, including Aristotle's treatises on metaphysics and natural philosophy. The section that is of concern here is the limitation on lecturing on feast days. The statute reads: "Non legant in festivis diebus nisi Philosophos et Rhetoricas et Quadruvalia et Barbarismum,

---

<sup>55</sup>Rashdall, op. cit., I, p. 440.

et Ethicam, si placet; et quartum Topicorum."<sup>56</sup> Munro translates this passage as follows: "On the feast-days nothing is to be read except philosophy, rhetoric, quad-rivialia, the Barbarisms, the Ethics, if one so chooses, and the fourth book of the Topics."<sup>57</sup> Now, this passage has been interpreted in a curious manner by the secondary sources. Rashdall takes it to mean that "rhetoric and philosophy are reserved by way of a treat for festivals," and that for rhetoric "the only books specified are the Barbarismus (i.e., the third book of the Ars maior) of Donatus and the Topics."<sup>58</sup> Paetow adopts a similar interpretation: "The earliest statute (1215) prescribing work at the University of Paris already indicates that rhetoric would occupy but an inferior place in the arts course. It was to be read on festival days and the only books mentioned are the fourth book of the Topics of Boethius and the Barbarismus."<sup>59</sup> Thurot also believes this statute "réserve pour les jours

---

<sup>56</sup>Paetow, The Arts Course, p. 68.

<sup>57</sup>Dana C. Munro, trans., "Statutes of Robert de Courcon for Paris, 1215," in Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History, Vol. II, No. 3 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1902), p. 13. Thorndike, op. cit., p. 28, translates the passage as follows: "They shall not lecture on feast days except on philosophers and rhetoric and the quadrivium and Barbarismus and ethics, if it pleases them, and the fourth book of the Topics."

<sup>58</sup>Rashdall, op. cit., I, pp. 440-1.

<sup>59</sup>Paetow, The Arts Course, p. 68.

de congé" the enumerated subjects and works, sanctioning a distinction between material for ordinary and that for extraordinary lessons.<sup>60</sup> Two items are of importance here: the status of rhetoric, and the textbooks to be used. The wording of the statute does not seem to support the above readings, on either count.

Paetow's claim that relegating it to being read on feast days indicates inferior status for the subject seems unwarranted. Indeed, Rashdall's interpretation, that rhetoric was to be a "treat" on festivals, would indicate an entirely different status. However, the statute says neither that rhetoric was to be read only on festival days, nor that it must be read on such days. We must consider here a distinction between two types of lectures, cursory or extraordinary and ordinary. The distinction between them was originally mainly one of time. Ordinary lectures were those delivered by masters during certain hours of the morning on regular (legible, or non-feast) days. Cursory lectures could be given at any time except that reserved for ordinary lectures. Furthermore, while ordinary lectures had to be given in the recognized schools of the faculty, cursory lectures might be delivered anywhere. However, a distinction arose in the manner of lecturing, the ordinary being

---

<sup>60</sup>Charles Thurot, De l'Organisation de l'Enseignement dans l'Universite de Paris, au Moyen-Age (Paris et Besancon, 1850), p. 78.

a more formal, elaborate and complete an analysis of the book being read, the cursory being more rapid and informal a treatment.<sup>61</sup> As Rashdall points out, "numerous festivals in term-time were observed by a total suspension of lectures, or by a suspension of ordinary lectures only."<sup>62</sup> Thus, the statute would seem to indicate that on festival days, lectures of a cursory nature could be given only on those enumerated subjects. However, Rashdall also points out that except for the faculty of canon law, the same book might be the subject of both ordinary and extraordinary lectures.<sup>63</sup> Indeed, shortly we will consider some later statutes that clearly indicate that some works were lectured upon both ways. Thus it is still entirely possible that rhetorical treatises were lectured upon ordinarily. However, no further evidence was discovered on this question as it relates to the 1215 statute, so it must remain an open question.

Yet another problem in interpreting the statute of

---

<sup>61</sup>Rashdall, op. cit., I, p. 434. He notes in a footnote on the same page that "the expression in the Paris statute of 1215 that certain books are to be read 'ordinarie et non ad cursum', can hardly refer only to the time of the lectures."

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., p. 489. Thorndike, op. cit., p. 175, printed an early fourteenth century calendar for the University of Paris which indicates 71 full holidays for all faculties and 8 more for the arts faculty. By that time, however, apparently some courses had been limited to festival days, but these days, 22 in all, were additional to the holidays.

<sup>63</sup>Rashdall, op. cit., I, p. 433.



1215 concerns the works prescribed. Rashdall, Thurot and Paetow, we have seen, believe the statute means that two of the three specific works mentioned are those to be read for rhetoric. Rather, the meaning seems to be that on a festival day, if one so chooses, he may lecture on philosophy, rhetoric, and quadrivalia—i.e., on any of those six subjects—and/or, specifically, on the books Barbarisms, Ethics, and the fourth book of the Topics. Munro's translation as well as Thorndike's would seem to support this reading. Furthermore, in subsequent statutes, as we shall see, the Barbarisms is clearly listed as a grammatical treatise, not a rhetorical one. Thus, the present writer takes the statute to be silent on the specific works to be read for rhetoric, and also silent on the status rhetoric was to enjoy on non-festival days.

A second Paris statute dates from 1252, but relates only to the English nation at that university. It establishes rules for determiners in that nation, i.e., the granting of the B.A. degree, and in its requirements rhetoric is conspicuously absent. Thorndike translates the statute, in relevant part, as follows:

Also before he is admitted to examination he shall give personal security . . . that he has attended lectures in arts for five years or four at least at Paris continuously or elsewhere in a university of arts. Further, that he has heard the books of Aristotle on the Old Logic, namely, the Praedicamenta and Periarmeniae at least twice in ordinary lectures and once cursorily, the Six Principles at least once in ordinary lectures

and once cursorily, the three first books of the Topics and the Divisions once in ordinary lectures or at least cursorily, the Topics of Aristotle and Elenchi twice in ordinary lectures and once at least cursorily or if not cursorily at least thrice in ordinary, the Prior Analytics once in ordinary lectures and once cursorily, or, if he is now attending, so that he has heard at least half before Lent and is to continue, the Posterior Analytics once in ordinary lectures completely. Also that he shall have heard Priscian minor (books 17-18) and the Barbarismus twice in ordinary lectures and at least once cursorily, Priscian Major (books 1-16) once cursorily. Also he shall have heard De anima once or be hearing it as aforesaid. Also he shall give satisfaction that he has diligently attended the disputations of masters in a recognized university for two years and for the same length of time has answered as required concerning sophisms in class. Also he shall promise that he will respond to question for a full year from the beginning of one Lent to the beginning of the next.<sup>64</sup>

This statute is much more detailed than the one of 1215, giving specific requirements for specific books. Two things in particular may be noted. First, the Barbarisms is listed with grammatical works and must have been lectured on both ordinarily and cursorily. Second, rhetorical works are quite absent. Even the fourth book of Boethius' Topics is specifically exempted, only the first three being required. However, there is here also the reference to training in sophistry.

A third Paris statute dates from 1255. In that year the masters enacted a law regulating the amount of time to be spent lecturing on each of several books. The lectures

---

<sup>64</sup>Thorndike, op. cit., pp. 53-4.

were to begin on the feast of St. Remy (October 1), and lectures could not be ended before the dates specified:

The Old Logic, namely the book of Porphyry, the Praedicamenta, Periarmeniae, Divisions and Topics of Boethius, except the fourth, on the feast of the Annunciation of the blessed Virgin or the last day for lectures preceding. Priscian minor and major, Topics and Elenchi, Prior and Posterior Analytics they must finish in the said or equal time. The Ethics through four books in twelve weeks, if they are read with another text; if per se, not with another, in half that time. Three short texts, namely Sex principia, Barbarismus, Priscian on accent, if read together and nothing else with them, in six weeks. The Physics of Aristotle, Metaphysics, and De animalibus on the feast of St. John the Baptist; De celo et mundo, first book of Meteorology with the fourth, on Ascension day; De anima, if read with the books on nature, on the feast of the Ascension, if with the logical texts, on the feast of the Annunciation of the blessed Virgin; De generatione on the feast of the Chair of St. Peter; De causis in seven weeks; De sensu et sensato in six weeks; De somno et vigilia in five weeks; De plantis in five weeks; De memoria et reminiscentia in two weeks; De differentia spiritus et animae in two weeks; De morte et vita in one week.<sup>65</sup>

These works were the only ones the masters, for whatever reason, thought ought to be regulated. Rhetoric is again conspicuously absent from the list. From the twelfth century evidence, we know that rhetoric was then a popular subject at Paris. But the university statutes seem to indicate that, by mid-thirteenth century, it had receded into the background, although Murphy takes Thomas Aquinas' extensive use of De Inventione as evidence of "some inter-

---

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., pp. 64-5.

est in rhetoric at the University of Paris."<sup>66</sup>

The evidence for the teaching of rhetoric at Oxford is even less conclusive than that at Paris. Gibson summarizes the early constitution of the school:

The organization of the Oxford studium generale prior to 1210 can be briefly stated. It consisted of a free society of scholars presided over by a magister scholarum. Its curriculum was based on that of Paris and embraced the faculties of Theology, Canon and Civil Law, and Arts. The faculty of Arts included the Seven Liberal Arts which were divided into two sections, the Trivium (grammar, rhetoric and logic) and the Quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music): later the three philosophies, Natural, Moral and Metaphysical, were also studied for the degree of M.A.<sup>67</sup>

However, to find statutory evidence for the University of Oxford one must go outside the period in question. While the numerous statutes far outside our period clearly cannot be used as evidence, perhaps the earliest statute regulating the curriculum, dated 1267, is close enough that one can reasonably draw some inferences from it. The regulation concerns admission of determiners, the granting of the B.A. degree which would allow the student to lecture cursorily

---

<sup>66</sup>Murphy, "Cicero," p. 336. However, Martin Grabmann, Thomas Aquinas, trans. by Virgil Michel, O.S.B. (New York: Russell and Russell, 1963), indicates that Thomas studied arts in Naples under Master Martin. Thus, his acquaintance with the rhetorical textbooks may only indicate an interest in the subject in southern Italy, not at Paris, except for Thomas himself.

<sup>67</sup>Strickland Gibson, "The University of Oxford," in The Victoria History of the Counties of England: Oxfordshire, Vol. III (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954), p. 2.

while finishing the rest of the M.A. program. The relevant portion of the statute, as translated by Leach, reads:

The bachelors who are to determine that year shall come before the said masters with the approved testimony of masters or bachelors and, if they are going to determine for themselves, shall swear on the Gospels that they have gone through all the books of the old logic in lectures at least twice, except Boethius, for which one hearing is enough, and the Fourth Book of Boethius' Topics, which they are not bound to hear at all; in the new logic, the book of Prior Analytics, Topics, Fallacies twice; but the book of the Posterior Analytics they shall swear that they have heard at least once.

In Grammar, Priscian's Constructions twice, Donatus' Barbarisms once.

Also in Natural Philosophy three books, viz. the Physics, the De Anima, the Generation and Corruption.

And it is to be understood that if they first answer publicly in the schools, they must have answered in sophistry for a whole year, no part of the year in which they have answered to the question being reckoned in the said whole year. To the question they ought to have answered at least once in the summer before the Lent in which they are going to determine. But if they have not answered in sophistry publicly they shall swear that they have heard all the books aforesaid, with this addition, that they have twice heard the Posterior Analytics. In hearing them also they ought to make a longer stay than if they have publicly answered in sophistry.<sup>68</sup>

Here again, Donatus' Barbarisms is clearly listed as a grammatical text, and the rhetorical fourth book of Boethius' Topics is clearly excluded. From this statute Murphy concludes, "The student who had progressed approximately half-way through his arts course was required to prove his knowledge of only two parts of the trivium, with rhetoric being

---

<sup>68</sup>Leach, Charters, p. 193.

entirely omitted."<sup>69</sup> Rashdall compares the developments at the universities of Paris and Oxford, concluding that "every development of the Parisian system reproduced itself in Oxford" with great rapidity.<sup>70</sup> The status of rhetoric seems to support this conclusion. Here, too, we have evidence from the twelfth century indicating that rhetoric was taught at Oxford, but by mid-thirteenth century the subject seems to have faded into the background. However, in the 1267 statute, as in FitzStephen's description of the London schools of a century or so earlier, one does find reference to training in sophistry. If the writer's interpretation, given earlier, of that word is correct, this would have been training in a specific type of rhetoric. And it was, by this statute, required, with the possibility of exemption.

The next Oxford documents that refer to rhetorical training date from 1431, far too distant from our period to attempt any inferences from them. However, after discussing the various statutes, Murphy concludes that "the formal teaching of rhetoric as a separate subject in English universities may have begun rather late in the medieval period."<sup>71</sup> He then refers to a statute addressed to grammar masters which contains no requirements that could be inter-

---

<sup>69</sup>Murphy, "Oxford," p. 345.

<sup>70</sup>Rashdall, op. cit., III, p. 140.

<sup>71</sup>Murphy, "Oxford," p. 345.

preted as training in rhetoric. He concludes that, if the grammar masters did not have to have any knowledge of rhetoric, presumably rhetoric was not taught in the grammar schools. Yet, this statute seems to date from the fourteenth century, and his specific evidence for grammar schools clearly refers to the fourteenth century.<sup>72</sup> We are thus left largely in the dark about the teaching of rhetoric at Oxford during our period. At least it does not seem to have been considered important enough to be included in the requirements.

For Cambridge University we have only evidence from late in the medieval period. While some secondary sources have generalized about the Cambridge curriculum from such evidence, Hackett, referring specifically to Mullinger and Leathes, concludes that these "summaries are derived from the very late edition of the statutes . . . and have little value."<sup>73</sup> The only text of Cambridge statutes in or close to our period, the Angelica text which probably dates from 1236-54 and can be no later than 1276,<sup>74</sup> "maintains an impenetrable silence as regards the curriculum."<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup>Ibid.

<sup>73</sup>M.B. Hackett, The Original Statutes of Cambridge University: The Text and Its History (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1970), p. 124.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 23.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., p. 124.

The University of Toulouse also was formed during the period in question, by the Treaty of Paris, 1229. Count Raymond VII agreed to pay for its maintenance. The relevant portion of the treaty, translated by Smith, reads as follows:

Likewise, four thousand marks shall be set aside by us /i.e., Raymond/ for four masters of theology, two decretists, six masters of the liberal arts, and two grammarians, teaching at Toulouse, which shall be divided in this manner: each of the masters of theology shall have fifty marks a year for ten years; each of the masters of decrees shall have thirty marks a year for ten years; similarly each master of arts shall have twenty marks annually for ten years; and each of the masters of the grammatical art shall likewise have ten marks annually for ten years.<sup>76</sup>

Beyond this information provided by the treaty, our knowledge of the early years of the University of Toulouse is largely dependent on the accounts of John of Garland, who taught grammar at Paris, and was persuaded to go to Toulouse to teach when the masters at the former city voted a suspension of lectures. Apparently, the area was in a rather chaotic state. Although John wrote a glowing account of the school attempting to attract other masters, he found the situation so bad, with so much local ill will toward the teachers, that he soon decided to leave, and only narrowly escaped with his life.<sup>77</sup> The evidence tells little specif-

---

<sup>76</sup>Cyril Eugene Smith, The University of Toulouse in the Middle Ages (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1958), p. 32.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., chapter III.



ically about the school. It is clear that some emphasis was to be placed on grammar, and there were to be masters of the liberal arts, but, as Paetow concludes, "not a trace can be found of instruction in old-fashioned rhetoric."<sup>78</sup>

One obvious question in interpreting these statutes arises: can one assume that, in the absence of a requirement, a subject was simply not studied? The secondary authorities are generally agreed that one cannot so conclude, as today one cannot look at the general education requirements of a university and assume that those are the only courses offered. Paetow, after discussing the Paris statute of 1215, states that "it is possible and even probable that in this [rhetoric], as well as in all subjects, books were read which are not mentioned in the statutes."<sup>79</sup> Daly, although not indicating to what period he is referring, claims that some books "apparently were mastered but were not mentioned in the documents."<sup>80</sup> Rashdall himself, after discussing the Paris statutes of 1255, adds: "Such are the books which were sufficiently in use at Paris to be included in a statute prescribing the length of time which the lecturer was required to spend over each book."<sup>81</sup> And in one

---

<sup>78</sup>Paetow, The Arts Course, p. 69.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid.

<sup>80</sup>Lowrie J. Daly, S.J., The Medieval University, 1200-1400 (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961), p. 85.

<sup>81</sup>Rashdall, op. cit., I, p. 443.

of the statutes cited above, the regulation itself indicates that not only might works be studied that are not specified, but some might even be substituted for those listed. The Oxford curriculum of 1267 adds:

And be it understood that if any of those who are going to determine have properly heard the books, which according to the aforesaid rule they are held to have heard twice, only once and not all twice, or have not heard properly all those which according to the aforesaid rule they ought to have heard once, as long as they have heard other books which are outside the rule, and those books are, in the real opinion upon oath of the masters elected to examine, adequate substitutes, they shall be admitted to the office of determiners, but otherwise shall be utterly refused.<sup>82</sup>

Unfortunately, this evidence leaves one in the realm of mere possibility. It is clearly possible that other works were read and other subjects studied than those specified in the statutes. For the very early history of the universities it is even certain, as the Paris regulation of 1215 is so very brief. Yet, the evidence gives us no clear indication of what other works were studied, or how extensively, leaving one with little more evidence for the study of rhetoric at universities than one has for the cathedral schools. On the whole, therefore, Paetow's general conclusion seems applicable to the subject of rhetoric:

Not a single one of the ancient Latin classics is prescribed in the statutes of the various universities of Europe of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The history of the universities, especially the internal history, can

---

<sup>82</sup>Leach, Charters, p. 195.

not be read solely from the statutes, and hence it would be rash to conclude from such evidence that during this time no university student or master even opened Virgil or Horace. Nevertheless, the silence of the statutes forcibly emphasizes the well established truth that the ancient authors were seriously neglected at the early medieval universities.<sup>83</sup>

Finally, a word should perhaps be said about the University of Bologna. Although this school falls outside the geographical area under consideration, there was a significant amount of student travel to attend universities. Many northerners would have studied at Bologna. However, as the Italian city was famous primarily for its school of law, presumably most who came to Bologna from the north would already have received their arts education. The liberal arts were, of course, taught at Bologna, including rhetoric. Rashdall generalizes about its arts course:

While the Italian universities never rivalled the scholastic fame of Paris, rhetoric, mathematics and astrology flourished more vigorously in the Italian universities than in the north. In the former subject the text-books at Bologna were the De Inventione of Cicero and the treatise ad Herennium then attributed to the same writer, or the compendium of it compiled by the Friar Guidotto of Bologna.<sup>84</sup>

The last mentioned work dates from the fifteenth century.

It is probable that in our period, rhetoric at Bologna would

---

<sup>83</sup>Louis John Paetow, "The Neglect of the Ancient Classics at the Early Medieval Universities," Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters, XVI, pt. 1 (1909), 311.

<sup>84</sup>Rashdall, op. cit., I, p. 248.

have been largely dominated by the teaching of dictamen, with whatever humanistic teaching there might have been based on the other two mentioned works.

The evidence directly relating to the schools has given us an idea of the extent to which rhetoric was studied during the period under consideration. But virtually none of the evidence gave indication of the books that were used in the subject. For conclusions here, we must turn to the evidence presented in the preceding chapter, plus two other types more directly connected with the schools: commentaries on rhetorical treatises, and lists of books that should, ideally, be read by the student.

### Commentaries

Many commentaries on rhetoric were written during the period from the mid-eleventh to the mid-thirteenth century. So far as is known, they were written on both De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium, but on no other rhetorical work. Now, as Murphy claims, "In the context of medieval society, the existence of commentaries can only mean the use of a book in the schools."<sup>85</sup> That is, commen-

---

<sup>85</sup>Murphy, "Cicero," p. 339. Caplan, op. cit., p. 250, describes Alanus' method of glossing, claiming that it is the ordinary method used in works of this kind: "lemmata from the original text are followed by his explanations, sometimes brief, sometimes full—an explication de texte, doubtless delivered in lecture form; and there are not many points that he omits to treat . . . He may give more than one explanation when he feels the need to do so, and in the treatment of Book IV, in which the figures of speech are

taries are actually lecture notes used by the masters. Thus, this evidence further substantiates the conclusion that these two Ciceronian texts were the substance of the liberal art of rhetoric. Unfortunately, it is rather difficult to draw specific conclusions from the commentaries, for they are not readily available. In 1967, Murphy noted that "to the best of my knowledge, not one single example of these commentaries has ever been printed in full,"<sup>86</sup> and the present writer has been unable to locate any before or since that date. To the best of his knowledge, only one is now being edited.<sup>87</sup>

We do know that many such glosses existed, during the middle ages from examining the library catalogues.

Medieval library catalogues are studded with terms which indicate the presence of rhetorical commentaries but authors are usually not named.

---

listed, described, and illustrated, he operates almost by a formula, supplying: the Greek name for the figure; a definition in his own words, which often reflects the infiltration—by this time far advanced—of dialectic into rhetoric; remarks on how the figure differs from kindred figures; and suggestions on the kind of issue or argument for which it is useful, and on the place in the discourse and type of style for which it is suitable."

<sup>86</sup>Murphy, "Cicero," p. 339. The one fragment that has been published, part of Thierry of Chartres' commentary on De Inventione, is in W.H.D. Suringar, Historia Critica Scholiastarum Latinorum (Leiden, 1834), pp. 216-53.

<sup>87</sup>Thomson, op. cit., p. 639, states that "an important extant commentary on the De Inventione written there /Bury St. Edmunds/ shortly after c. 1200" is being edited by "my colleague Dr. J.O. Ward."

The Benedictine library of Engelberg, for instance, records a list of books on hand about 1150, including an item Glosse super Rhetoricam Tullii. Is this the work of Victorinus or of Grillius, or of Manegold, or Thierry? Or it may be that of some writer unknown to the modern world.<sup>88</sup>

From the catalogues of our period, however, such citations are not all that numerous. Clear indications of a commentary, such as the example Murphy cites, were found in only two of Becker's catalogues:

56. Hamersleven. saec. XI. 8. 9. glossae super librum divisionum rhetoricarum Ciceronis Saepe et multum duos libros.
103. Engelberg. ante 1175. 15. glosse super rhetoricam Tullii. regule de rhetorica. (This is apparently the catalogue Murphy quoted above.)

From the catalogues printed by Delisle, only four citations were found in two catalogues:<sup>89</sup>

Bibliotheque de l'Abbaye de Saint-Amand. XII<sup>e</sup>  
siecle. 175. Glosulae super eandem /i.e.,  
De Inventione7.

Bibliotheque de l'Abbaye de Saint-Pons de Tomieres.  
1276. 291. Item est aliud volumen quod dicitur  
glose rhetorice artis . . . 293. Item est

---

<sup>88</sup>Murphy, "Cicero," p. 340.

<sup>89</sup>Delisle, op. cit., II, pp. 451f, 549.

aliud volumen quod dicitur glose Maiciani.

/This whole section of the catalogue concerns rhetoric, but no indication is given what work this commentary is on.<sup>7</sup> 294. Item est aliud volumen quod dicitur liber Tullii, et glose de rhetorica.<sup>90</sup>

We have already seen that commentaries were owned by Chartres, Christchurch, Canterbury, and Bury St. Edmunds Abbey. All citations of commentaries from the late Roman Empire have, of course, been omitted from this list, as they were considered in the preceding chapter. Beyond these few citations, however, there are many listings that are indeterminate; they may be one of Cicero's works, or the Rhetorica ad Herennium, or a gloss, or a florilegium. Furthermore, it seems reasonable to assume that many of the copies of the rhetorical textbooks contained marginal and/or inter-linear glosses. But the catalogue evidence alone does not indicate great numbers of glosses for our period.

A few of the commentaries have received the attention of historians. The first to receive such attention was that of Thierry of Chartres, now in the library at Brussels (No.

---

<sup>90</sup>Manitius in 1935 lists this, numbers 175 and 291 above, and the Hamersleven gloss, as Marius Victorinus' commentary, on what basis is not apparent. He did not so list them in 1892. Max Manitius, Handschriften Antiker Autoren in Mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen, Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, 67. Beiheft (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1935), pp. 176f.

10057). It was first discovered and described by Paul Thomas in 1884.<sup>91</sup> Dickey located four other manuscripts.<sup>92</sup> Murphy claims for this work the distinction of being "probably the first medieval commentary on the De Inventione,"<sup>93</sup> a claim we shall soon see is no longer supportable. The work does have special value, however, since it was the product of one of the more famous scholars at the greatest center of learning in northern France. Thierry was the younger brother of the famous Bernard of Chartres, whose teaching methods are described at length by John of Salisbury. After studying at Chartres, he went to Paris where he became famous as a master of the arts, teaching grammar, rhetoric and dialectic. In 1141 he returned to Chartres to become chancellor of the cathedral there, succeeding Gilbert de la Porree. He remained at Chartres until just before his death sometime around 1155.<sup>94</sup> He is best known for his massive summary of the liberal arts, the Heptateuchon, which we will consider later.

The value of the commentary has been disputed.

Clerval dismisses it: "ce n'est pas une oeuvre d'une grand

---

<sup>91</sup>Paul Thomas, "Un Commentaire de Moyen Age sur la Rhetorique de Ciceron," in Melanges Graux (Paris, 1884), pp. 41-5. Sandys, op. cit., p. 533, incorrectly identifies this as a commentary on the Rhetorica ad Herennium.

<sup>92</sup>Dickey, op. cit., pp. 7f.

<sup>93</sup>Murphy, "Cicero," p. 334.

<sup>94</sup>Sandys, op. cit., p. 533.



importance ni d'une grand valeur."<sup>95</sup> Yet Hunt refers to a Summa super rhetoricam by Thierry, which must be this commentary, as "the standard twelfth century Summa on rhetoric."<sup>96</sup> He illustrates this claim by a reference to Ralph of Longchamp's gloss on the Anticlaudianus of Alan of Lille: "It is noteworthy that nearly all Ralph's comments on the heads of rhetoric are drawn from the prologue of Thierry of Chartres."<sup>97</sup>

Question has also been raised of the originality of this commentary. Haring believes that Thierry did not even write it, but copied it directly from the De Divisione Philosophiae by the philosopher, translator, and archdeacon of Toledo, Dominicus Gundissalinus. Specifically, he believes "that Thierry copied the entire section on rhetoric . . . with the exception of the final paragraph in which Gundissalinus points out that rhetoric should be learned after poetics. Such a clarification makes good sense in its context. Its need would be much less obvious in Thierry's commentary on Cicero."<sup>98</sup> Haring contends that Thierry was,

---

<sup>95</sup>Clerval, op. cit., p. 233.

<sup>96</sup>Richard William Hunt, "The Introductions to the 'Artes' in the Twelfth Century," in Studia Mediaevalia in honorem admodum reverendi patris Raymundi Josephi Martin, O.P. (Bruges, 1948), p. 86.

<sup>97</sup>Ibid., pp. 103f.

<sup>98</sup>Nicholas M. Haring, S.A.C., "Thierry of Chartres and Dominicus Gundissalinus," Mediaeval Studies, XXVI (1964), 273.

throughout his life, an original thinker and writer of some importance, but that this once he turned plagiarist. He places Thierry's work in time somewhere between 1150 and 1155, that is, at the very end of his life. "At that age it was no doubt understandable that Thierry should lean on others more heavily than in his younger years. And he may not have known the name of the author of the *De Divisione philosophiae* from which he copied with such complete abandon."<sup>99</sup> On the other hand, Hunt dates Thierry's work "in all probability" earlier than Gundissalinus', and concludes therefore that it was the latter who "adopted" Thierry's introduction to the art of rhetoric.<sup>100</sup> Dickey, too, concludes that the commentary "is probably an early work," not one composed late in his life.<sup>101</sup> Southern also believes this work is the record of Thierry's lectures, hence would date from early in his career.<sup>102</sup> This controversy cannot be settled here. Suffice it to say that we have here two relatively important twelfth century works on rhetoric, one of which was probably used in the composition of the other.

That the commentary is on De Inventione rather than some other work seems important to Murphy. "Thierry had

---

<sup>99</sup>Ibid., p. 278.

<sup>100</sup>Hunt, op. cit., pp. 93, 109.

<sup>101</sup>Dickey, op. cit., p. 19.

<sup>102</sup>Southern, op. cit., p. 81.

at his disposal most of the major writings on rhetoric that had been produced up to his own times—Cicero, Quintilian, Grillius, Victorinus, Boethius—and was prepared to use them in explicating what he thought to be one of the most significant of them all: Cicero's De Inventione."<sup>103</sup> He does utilize the writings of a large number of authors. Thomas identifies those cited by Thierry in this commentary. The rhetorical works listed by Thomas are Cicero's De Oratore and, of course, De Inventione, Martianus Capella's section on rhetoric, Quintilian's Institutes, the Rhetorica ad Herennium, Grillius' commentary on De Inventione, and Victorinus' commentary on the same work.<sup>104</sup>

Dickey describes the relationships between five different commentaries, all from the eleventh or early twelfth centuries. Four are glosses on De Inventione, one on the Rhetorica ad Herennium. All are "most probably based on lectures actually given in the schools."<sup>105</sup> She identifies these works as:<sup>106</sup>

1. An eleventh century gloss<sup>107</sup> on De Inventione, probably from southern Germany, now in the

---

<sup>103</sup>Murphy, "Cicero," p. 340.

<sup>104</sup>Thomas, op. cit., p. 43.

<sup>105</sup>Dickey, op. cit., p. 1.

<sup>106</sup>Ibid., pp. 2-8.

<sup>107</sup>Therefore Thierry's is not the earliest. Note also the date for Manegold's commentary, listed next.

- Bodleian Library, MS. Laud Lat. 49. The manuscript also contains several other works, including De Inventione with this marginal and interlinear gloss, and Victorinus' commentary.
2. The commentary of Manegold of Lautenbach on De Inventione, now in the Cathedral Library at Cologne. It dates from the eleventh or twelfth century.
  3. The gloss In primis, a commentary on both De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium. Dickey found three manuscripts of it, York Minster, XVI.M.7 Saec. XII, originally from the Augustinian Abbey at Leicester; Durham Cathedral, C. IV. 29, vol. 216. Saec. XII; and Vatican Library Burghes lat. 57, vol. 56-95v. Saec. XII, formerly at the Papal Library at Avignon.
  4. The commentary by Thierry of Chartres, of which she found five manuscripts: British Museum MS. Arundel 348. Saec. XII, containing De Inventione, the Rhetorica ad Herennium, and this commentary; Royal Library, Brussels, 10057-62, the manuscript discovered by Paul Thomas, which also contains a second copy of the commentary but only in fragmentary form; Leyden University library, B.P.L. 189, vol. 42-7, of the thirteenth century (the fragment published by Suringar); a fourth

manuscript for which no date is given; and a fifteenth century copy.

5. Ars rethorice, a twelfth century commentary on De Inventione, originally written in Italy.

She then describes in great length the probable relationships between these various commentaries, but unfortunately the promised second half of the article, to deal with the evidence the commentaries provide on rhetoric as taught in the twelfth century, has not, to the best of the writer's knowledge, been published.

Caplan provides brief descriptions of several other commentaries. He refers to "an anonymous commentary of the early twelfth century represented by manuscripts at York, Durham, Cologne, Vienna, and Alba-Julia in Roumania," which "has been treated" by Dickey in "a valuable (as yet unpublished) study."<sup>108</sup> This is all the information Caplan provides, but it does not appear to be one of the commentaries Dickey analyzes in the article cited above. Caplan continues, on the basis of this same unpublished work, to summarize Dickey's claim that Manegold of Lautenbach about 1110 wrote a commentary on the Rhetorica ad Heremnum, and that Thierry of Chartres lectured on the ancient treatise. But, he adds, these works, if extant, have not been identified.<sup>109</sup> He further mentions that Hunt "has directed our

---

<sup>108</sup>Caplan, op. cit., p. 249.

<sup>109</sup>Ibid.

attention to a gloss by Lanfranc" on the Rhetorica ad Herennium, 2. XXVI. 42, which would indicate that he had lectured on this work also.<sup>110</sup>

After describing briefly these several glosses on De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium, Caplan describes in detail a commentary on the latter by Alanus, which he found in nine manuscripts.<sup>111</sup> He assigns the work to the second half of the twelfth century,<sup>112</sup> although the earliest manuscript is from the thirteenth or fourteenth.<sup>113</sup> A number of his observations about this commentary are worth presenting here.

A striking feature at the very outset is that Alanus used a number of manuscripts of the ancient treatise, and that these included representatives of the older group from the ninth and tenth centuries, the Mutili, but also of the Expleti, which came into existence in the twelfth century. He often says: Alii libri legunt or In quibusdam libris legitur. . . . He also had before him other commentaries, which he never specifies: Alii sic eam exponunt or Quidam volunt or Alii vero dicunt or Alii aliter legunt.<sup>114</sup>

Alanus knows of, but apparently did not have a copy of Cicero's De Oratore. He refers to it by way of Quintilian,

---

<sup>110</sup>Ibid.

<sup>111</sup>Ibid.

<sup>112</sup>Ibid., p. 267.

<sup>113</sup>Ibid., pp. 249f.

<sup>114</sup>Ibid., p. 251.

but at one point says of this book, "quo caremus."<sup>115</sup> Also of interest for present purposes is his use of the testimony of Peter Helias, the grammarian from Paris, active about 1140 to 1150, for one interpretation of a passage in the Rhetorica ad Herennium. Then Alanus cites Thierry of Chartres for a different interpretation of the same passage, "a striking juxtaposition in light of the fact that in the Metalogicon (2. 10. 868b) John of Salisbury says he learned more about rhetoric from Peter Helias than he had earlier learned from the meager treatment of the art by Thierry."<sup>116</sup> Perhaps one can assume from this reference that Peter also wrote a commentary on the rhetorical treatise, but Caplan does not offer speculation either way.

Undoubtedly there are many more commentaries on ancient rhetorical treatises. However, the above discussion exhausts the commentaries the writer was able to find treated by historians. Their evidence, however, clearly supports the conclusion that De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium were the basis for rhetoric as a liberal art and that rhetoric was taught by a good number of famous scholars.

#### Ideal Curricula

It is only natural for a teacher to provide recom-

---

<sup>115</sup>Ibid., p. 262.

<sup>116</sup>Ibid., p. 266.

mendations for further study. Thus, for example, Cassiodorus had recommended that the student of rhetoric read De Inventione, Marius Victorinus' commentary, Quintilian, and Fortunatianus.<sup>117</sup> During the period investigated here, several scholars composed works indicating what the student should ideally know in each of several subjects. Some of these are entire encyclopedias, summarizing the knowledge of a given art. Others are simple lists of books a student ought to read to be thoroughly versed in a subject. While such ideals do not necessarily indicate what was actually studied, they are valuable nevertheless, showing what several scholars thought an outstanding student would know.

The first to be considered is by Thierry of Chartres, his encyclopedia of the seven liberal arts which he entitled the Heptateuchon. It existed in two volumes at the library at Chartres.<sup>118</sup> It is a massive work, not the sort of encyclopedic product of the late Empire or early middle ages. It contains "the most important works in each branch, either entire or in important extracts, thus affording an idea of the range of studies pursued in the schools of Chartres in the time of Thierry, and of the books available

---

<sup>117</sup>Cassiodorus, op. cit., II. ii. 10.

<sup>118</sup>Beddie, "Libraries in the Twelfth Century," p. 4. The manuscripts were destroyed during World War II, but not before they had been microfilmed. Southern, op. cit., p. 48.



there."<sup>119</sup> Thierry devotes 190 leaves to grammatica, 88 to rhetorica, and 154 to dialectica, with 160 devoted to the quadrivium.<sup>120</sup> Murphy characterizes the rhetorical doctrine as "solidly Ciceronian."<sup>121</sup> Clerval summarizes in table form the works Thierry includes for each art. For rhetoric, the works are:

Ciceronis: De inventione rhetorica libri II.  
" Rhetorica ad Herennium libri IV.  
" De partitione oratoria dialogus.  
J. Severiani: Syntomata ac precepta artis  
rhetoricae.  
Capellae: De rhetorica libri V.<sup>122</sup>

Quintilian is conspicuous by his absence. Thierry knew more rhetorical works than these, for in his commentary on De Inventione he also uses De Oratore, Quintilian's Institutes, and the commentaries by Victorinus and Grillius. Still, if one absorbed the rhetorical doctrine of the works included in the Heptateuchon he would undoubtedly have done far more than the ordinary student of rhetoric.

Another curriculum, this time a list of books to be read for each subject, the "sacerdos ad altare," is found with the works of John of Garland in a manuscript in Gonville and Caius College.<sup>123</sup> Its authorship has been dis-

---

<sup>119</sup>Beddie, "Libraries in the Twelfth Century," p. 4.

<sup>120</sup>Baldwin, op. cit., p. 153.

<sup>121</sup>Murphy, "Cicero," p. 339.

<sup>122</sup>Clerval, op. cit., p. 222.

<sup>123</sup>Colson, op. cit., p. lv.

puted. Some attribute it to John, as did the one who compiled the extant manuscript. Most historians attribute it to Alexander Neckham, with the possibility that someone unknown wrote it.<sup>124</sup> Haskins studied the work and concluded that it was probably written by Neckham in the last quarter of the twelfth century as an "unofficial enumeration of the books in use in Paris."<sup>125</sup> Colson considers it "a very full and interesting list of recommended books."<sup>126</sup> Whether it is a recommended list, or one of books actually used, is a question that probably cannot be settled. Whichever it is, the relevant portion of the list reads as follows: "In rhetorica educandus legat primam Tullii rethoricam et librum ad Herennium et Tullium de oratore et causas Quintiliani et Quintilianum de oratoris institucione."<sup>127</sup> Paetow considers this "a rather remarkable program for rhetoric. Even the course at Chartres, when the schools there were at the height of their fame, did not offer so much solid rhetorical instruction."<sup>128</sup> He interprets the list, furthermore, as indicating "that about 1200 the study of the classics was still associated with the branches ordinarily taught at

---

<sup>124</sup>Ibid., pp. lv-lvi.

<sup>125</sup>Haskins, "A List of Text-Books," p. 357.

<sup>126</sup>Colson, op. cit., p. lvi.

<sup>127</sup>Haskins, "A List of Text-Books," p. 357.

<sup>128</sup>Paetow, The Arts Course, p. 68.

medieval universities."<sup>129</sup>

The Biblionomia, by Richard of Fournival, chancellor of Amiens, dates from about the middle of the thirteenth century.

His work purports to be, as explained in allegorical fashion in the introduction, a plan of education for the youth of Amiens and especially a plan for the formation of a library. He lists 162 books, with remarkably full descriptions, and a scheme of classification to aid the librarian in finding them readily.<sup>130</sup>

Whether the list is for an ideal library or an actual one is a controversy we have come upon before. The rhetorical section indicates the most ambitious program for study that was discovered. As printed by Delisle, it includes:<sup>131</sup>

25. Marci Fabii Quintiliani liber institutionum oratoriarum in uno volumine cujus signum est littera C.
26. Marci Tullii Ciceronis liber de legibus et jure civili, in uno volumine cujus signum est littera C.
27. Ejusdem liber priorum rhetoricorum, et item posteriorum ad Herennium, in uno volumine cujus signum est littera C.
28. Ejusdem de oratore libri tres, et quartus

---

<sup>129</sup>Paetow, "The Neglect of the Classics," p. 313.

<sup>130</sup>Beddie, "Libraries in the Twelfth Century," p. 13.

<sup>131</sup>Delisle, op. cit., II, pp. 525ff.

- Brutus, et quintus Orator, in uno volumine cujus signum est littera C.
29. Ejusdem liber epistolarum, in uno volumine cujus signum est littera D.
  30. Ejusdem accusatio in Cecilium Verrem, que sunt Invective Verrine vel Ceciliane, in uno volumine cujus signum est littera D.
  31. Ejusdem accusatio in Antonium Philippensem, que sunt Invective Philippice vel Antoniane. Item ejusdem accusatio in Catylinam, que sunt Invective Catylinarie Tulliane. In uno volumine cujus signum est littera D.
  32. Ejusdem oratio pro Marco Marcello et oratio pro Q. Ligario et oratio pro rege Dejotaro. Item invectio Salustii in eundem Tullium et responsio Tullii ad Salustium. Item ejusdem Tullii liber declamationum. Item commentarium Grillii super rhetoricos Tullii secundos. In uno volumine cujus signum est littera D.
  33. Lucii Annei Senecae Cordubensis liber rhetoricorum vel de causis, ad Nonatum Melam et Senecam filios, et ejusdem de sententiis diversorum oratorum, in uno volumine cujus signum est littera D.
  34. Salustii accusatio in dictum Catylinam, que sunt Invective Catylinarie Salustiane, in uno volum-

ine cujus signum est littera D.

35. Anitii Manlii Severini Boetii liber commentariorum in topics Ciceronis, in uno volumine cujus signum est littera D.

36. Victorini liber commentariorum in rhetoricos Tullii secundos ad Herennium, in uno volumine cujus signum est littera D.

Clearly, if there was little interest in humanistic rhetoric in the universities at mid-century, there was much still at this cathedral school.

Vincent of Beauvais (about 1190 to 1264) also composed a vast encyclopedia of knowledge, the Speculum Majus, of which one part, the Speculum Doctrinale, deals with various school subjects. Two books are devoted to the trivium.

Grammatica, including metric, follows Isidore. The following book devotes ninety-eight chapters to logic (logica), ten to rhetoric, twenty-three to poetic. The proportion is significant; and poetica, taken from under the aegis of grammatica, appears as a separate, co-ordinate section. For rhetoric Vincent, still following Isidore, repeats the classical definition and division. The following chapters (101-108) deal briefly with the elements of a speech, the ideals of oratory, the types of cases, status, syllogisms, loci rhetorici, style.<sup>132</sup>

His material is not original, but is compiled from various sources.

---

<sup>132</sup>Baldwin, op. cit., pp. 174f.

In the chapters allotted to rhetoric, Vincent identifies his discussion as a tissue of excerpts from the Etymologiae of Isidore, De Differentiis Topicis of Boethius, the Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian, and De Oratore, the Rhetorica Secunda and the Rhetorica Prima of Cicero. Indeed, there is scarcely a word in Vincent's entire discussion that is not part of a direct quotation from one of these authorities. Boethius and Isidore supply two-thirds of his material, or 236 lines of text; next to them in importance is the Rhetorica Prima of Cicero, which supplies 68 lines of text; and least quoted of all are the Institutio Oratoria, De Oratore, and the Rhetorica Secunda, the contributions from which amount in sum to 43 lines of text divided almost equally among the three works.<sup>133</sup>

#### Geographical and Chronological Variations

Within the geographical and chronological limits of this study, there were great variations in the study of rhetoric, as in the study of most subjects. The geographic differences are easier to characterize. Buttenwieser concluded that, contrary to the traditional belief, there was no real difference between France and Germany in the study of literary matters, including rhetoric.<sup>134</sup> In southern France, however, education differed considerably from that of northern France, Germany and England. In southern France even masters of grammar were rarely found.<sup>135</sup> The education

---

<sup>133</sup>Wilbur Samuel Howell, Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956), p. 77.

<sup>134</sup>Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 191.

<sup>135</sup>Smith, op. cit., p. 44.

given was largely practical and lay—concentrating at the highest level on training notaries, lawyers and physicians—with little ecclesiastical interest in learning.<sup>136</sup> Thompson, in his study of medieval libraries, notes the "poverty both of books and of learning, when compared with the north" of France.<sup>137</sup> Smith concludes:

There is no indication, however, of any active intellectual life in the religious establishments of the whole southern section of France. A few twelfth-century catalogues of local monastic houses show a paucity of books that implies a decided lack of interest in literature in general. . . . There are two fragmentary catalogues for Moissac published /by Delisle/, II, 440-441; a catalogue for Saint-Aphrodise de Beziers of 1162, *ibid.*, 504-505; and for the priory of Saint Martin de la Canourge in Gevaudan for the same century, *ibid.*, 505-506. Neither of the latter shows forty titles all told.<sup>138</sup>

These general characterizations of the materials available can be used as the basis for an inference that therefore rhetoric was less studied in those areas with fewer scholastic resources. Beddie claims that differences in size of collections "did not extend to the character of the collection or the choice of works included, which, if we disregard the natural inclusion of a certain amount of local material, remained much the same everywhere." He extends this comparison also to various types of owners, concluding that "a

---

<sup>136</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 40ff.

<sup>137</sup>Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

<sup>138</sup>Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 5f.

cathedral library did not differ noticeably from a monastery library," with the exception of the Cistercian houses which did not begin to form regular libraries with classical works included until the thirteenth century.<sup>139</sup>

Chronological differences for the study of rhetoric are more difficult to characterize. Many claims have been made about the changing nature of interest in the subject during the period in question. It is often asserted that, while the twelfth century began with great interest in the classics, including rhetorical works, with the recovery of Aristotle's logical treatises, interest in humanistic studies gradually died out, so that by the thirteenth century dialectic thoroughly dominated higher education. Haskins, for example, writes:

The stimulus given to dialectic by the masters of the early part of the century, reënforced later by the recovery and absorption of the New Logic of Aristotle, made the twelfth century preëminently an age of logic. The earlier trivium had preserved a balance between logic on the one hand and grammar and rhetoric on the other, but this was now destroyed by the addition of a large body of new material to be mastered in dialectic, so that less time and still less inclination were left for the leisurely study of grammar and literature, as they had been pursued in the school of Chartres. By 1159, John of Salisbury . . . is protesting.<sup>140</sup>

Sutherland summarizes the claim:

The thirteenth century, however, saw the em-

---

<sup>139</sup>Beddie, "Libraries in the Twelfth Century," pp.21f.

<sup>140</sup>Haskins, Renaissance, pp. 355f.



phasis no longer placed on the auctores but on artes at the newly developed universities. Rashdall compared John of Salisbury's account . . . with the earliest university statute at the beginning of the thirteenth century. This comparison revealed the rapid decline in literary culture. Grammar was represented only by Priscian and Donatus, rhetoric was barely acknowledged, and the classics were entirely neglected. The whole attention is focused on logic and Aristotle.

. . . . .  
The decline in the study of rhetoric is further demonstrated by the number of chapters which Vincent of Beauvais devotes to it in the Doct. II-III: ten chapters to rhetoric compared with one hundred and ninety-three to grammar, ninety-eight to logic, and twenty-three to poetica.<sup>141</sup>

The rate of decline in the study of rhetoric, and the classics in general, is difficult to determine from the secondary sources. Paetow's conclusion seems to give rhetoric more of a place during the twelfth century than Haskins' does.

Paetow writes:

It is not surprising therefore to find that very little of the old formal medieval rhetoric was taught at the universities. At the end of the twelfth century, it was more popular at Paris than it was to be later when the university was fully developed. Gerald of Barri says that as a student at Paris (c. 1170) he distinguished himself especially in rhetoric. Seven years later, he lectured there on canon law and ascribed his success partly to the fact that he employed rhetorical finish in his delivery.<sup>142</sup>

It is also known, as Haskins points out, that to a certain extent the study of rhetoric was taken over by the teachers of dictamen. Indeed, he goes so far as to claim that dic-

---

<sup>141</sup>Sutherland, op. cit., p. 180.

<sup>142</sup>Paetow, The Arts Course, pp. 67f.

tamen virtually drove out the study of rhetoric as a humanistic discipline.<sup>143</sup>

It has also been claimed that the study of rhetoric, as of grammar, was continued but became increasingly influenced by the methods of dialectic. Thus Holmes, writing of the last half of the twelfth century, says that "grammar and rhetoric were receiving a strong dialectic tinge in the schools of Paris. This fact was much decried by contemporaries, but the tendency grew constantly stronger."<sup>144</sup>

Bolgar describes this process in more detail:

But even if the study of rhetoric was traditional, scholastic rhetoric was a new departure. First of all, the subject was more intensively studied than had been habitual earlier. The very fact that men like Matthew of Vendome chose this moment to re-write the old text-books should tell us something. The grammar books had after all been rewritten and commented time and time again during the Dark Ages and the pre-Scholastic period. Why had works like the ad Herennium been, comparatively speaking, neglected? Presumably because the general interest in them had been less. And why were they now republished with such zeal in the second half of the twelfth century? Presumably because there was a revival of interest in systematic rhetoric.

Secondly, the dry formal aspects of rhetoric which admittedly had their place in the classical treatises, were given an extraordinary emphasis. The modern reader finds it wellnigh impossible to form any reasoned judgment about the merits of the various Poetriae, Arts of Verse and expositions de Coloribus, of which the Scholastic Age was so proud.<sup>145</sup>

---

<sup>143</sup>Haskins, Renaissance, p. 139.

<sup>144</sup>Holmes, Daily Living, p. 117.

<sup>145</sup>R.R. Bolgar, The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1958), p. 211.

Once again, here, we see rhetoric closely related to the study of grammar, and more specifically of poetics. At any rate, these various historians conclude, in general, that from the start to the end of our period, rhetoric steadily declined from a humanistic study of methods of eloquence to either virtual non-existence or to the scholastic treatment of figures of speech. Such a view of this period has been the traditional one.

Some doubt, however, must be cast on such a view. Rand, in his overview of the classics in the thirteenth century, has done so.<sup>146</sup> Battenwieser, in her study of extant manuscripts, does the same.

While multiplication of the manuscripts is rapid in the twelfth century, in almost every instance in the case of authors who are extant in many codices, the exemplars are far more numerous in the thirteenth century. Particularly noteworthy is the large increase in the copying of Seneca, the Philosopher, Lucan, Ovid, Statius, Juvenal, Persius, and to a smaller degree, Horace, while many others show a slight gain. In the case of Vergil and Sallust, the diminution is trifling. With Cicero the falling off is in the manuscripts of the rhetorical works (which are, to be sure, still plentiful); the other popular treatises increase in number. Moreover, commentaries of all kinds on the classical works are strikingly more plentiful in this century. The survey leaves no doubt that the interest in the classical authors was heightened in every country and that the thirteenth century with its avid copying of manuscripts but paved the way for the still riper activity of century to follow.<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>146</sup>Edward Kennard Rand, "The Classics in the Thirteenth Century," Speculum, IV (1929), 249-69.

<sup>147</sup>Battenwieser, "Distribution," pp. 191f.

Hunt, however, explains this by claiming that the classical authors "were probably read almost as much [in the thirteenth century] as before; but they came to be read rather for the information they contained than as models to imitate."<sup>148</sup>

This is clearly an area that merits more study. Here we can only conclude that, if the thirteenth century was indeed the age of scholasticism, yet interest in the classics in general seems to have been at an all-time high and in rhetoric, at least the approximate equivalent of the twelfth century. Else why the large number of manuscripts? However, apparently the study of the rhetorical treatises had changed significantly. There was an increasing interest in poetry, and rhetoric was often studied for those aspects applicable to poetics.<sup>149</sup>

### Conclusion

In this and the preceding chapter, various types of evidence have been examined in an attempt to determine how much, and what type of rhetorical training a student would have received in the schools from the mid-eleventh to the mid-thirteenth centuries. On the basis of this evidence,

---

<sup>148</sup>R.W. Hunt, "English Learning in the Late Twelfth Century," in Essays in Medieval History, ed. by R.W. Southern (London and New York, 1968), p. 113.

<sup>149</sup>Thus, for example, Howell, Logic and Rhetoric, p. 75, writes, "Early in the thirteenth century, the procedures of Ciceronian rhetoric reappeared in English learning. This development, however, occurred under the auspices of poetical as opposed to rhetorical theory."

several conclusions seem reasonable. Rhetoric was studied by students who were somewhat more advanced than the mere boys learning to read. Rhetoric was studied in the more advanced schools throughout the twelfth century, and was a highly regarded discipline in its humanistic form, not merely as *ars dictaminis*. When universities were in the process of formation very early in the thirteenth century, rhetoric was still taught in them. By the middle of that century, however, probably little if any humanistic rhetoric was taught to university students. If one was interested in rhetoric, he had to attend a few schools such as the cathedral school at Orleans which still offered it. However, the popularity of rhetoric was in eclipse, without much doubt, except as it related to poetic style.

The textbooks used were almost invariably Cicero's De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium, along with some ancient and/or contemporary commentaries on them. By the twelfth century, the study of rhetoric, as of the other arts, had advanced considerably beyond the meager amounts offered in the encyclopedias of the late empire, and students would turn to the classical works themselves. However, the more humanistic of Cicero's works were little used in this subject, and Quintilian's Institutes were popular at only a few schools. Greek works were virtually unknown.

This analysis of the rhetoric studied was necessitated by the widely divergent claims secondary sources

have made. The above evidence and conclusions should be kept in mind when evaluating such claims. While this presentation of available evidence is not exhaustive, the research gives the writer reason to believe it is relatively thorough and definitely representative.

## CHAPTER IV

### INTRODUCTION TO BATTLE ORATIONS

Virtually all chronicles include accounts of battles. However, not all chroniclers or historians include battle orations in their works. Indeed, of the chronicles reviewed for this study, only about one-fourth have such speeches, or at least descriptions of them. The great majority do not. However, some of the chronicles in the twelfth century especially were still rather close to the form of simple annals. These but seldom contain discourse of any type. Of the lengthier, more detailed, chronicles and histories, almost all contain speeches attributed to the characters in the history; about half contain battle orations. In general, the longer and more detailed the chronicle, the greater the likelihood that it will contain battle orations.

Naturally, battle orations are more numerous in those chronicles dealing with secular political events. Histories of local churches or monasteries, deeds of bishops, archbishops, abbots and saints seldom contain battle orations. Such histories, since military events are usually only tangential to their focus, normally give few if any details of

battles, being content to state simply that a battle was fought and this side won, if they mention the event at all.

All types of historians wrote battle orations into their works: monks, including even saintly ones, bishops, archdeacons, canons, knights, priests. Literary training did not seem to make much difference in their propensity to include battle orations. Thus, while Henry of Huntingdon and Geoffrey of Monmouth wrote elaborate speeches for their battle scenes, William of Malmesbury did not, and Matthew Paris did so only rarely, and these few are mostly borrowed. Even relatively uneducated, but literate, knights—such as the author of the Gesta Francorum—and priests—such as the author of the De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi—wrote such speeches.

The chroniclers introduce their descriptions of battles in many ways. The normal method is simply to state that a battle was fought between these two sides, and this one won. For more detail, sometimes the chronicler will state that the two dukes drew up their battle lines and the fight began. Often details of the battle itself will then be given, and a list of the important persons killed in it. But, normally, even with chroniclers who did write battle speeches, little or no information is given as to pre-battle preparations. When an account of such activities is given, it often takes the form of claiming that a speech was given, sometimes of presenting the speech itself. But



sometimes the pre-battle preparations involve other things. While no attempt was made to collect all other sorts of activities, and no attempt will be made to analyze those not involving speeches of exhortation, a brief notation ought to be made of other possibilities the chroniclers either reported or conceived themselves. These other possibilities cover a very wide range.

The knight Raymond d'Aguilers, in his Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem, reports a speech given by Christ Himself to the Crusaders in Antioch, through the medium of a priest, Stephen. The Crusaders had taken Antioch from the infidel, but the Turks still held the citadel. A large Turkish army was besieging Antioch from the outside, so the Christians were beset both from outside and from inside the city. Christ appeared to Stephen in a vision, and commanded him:

Haec dices episcopo: Populus iste male agendo me elongavit a se, et ideo dicas eis: Haec dicit Dominus, Convertimini ad me et ego revertar ad vos. Et cum pugnam inierint, dicant: Congregati sunt inimici nostri; et gloriantur in virtute sua, contere fortitudinem illorum, Domine, et disperge illos quia non est alius qui pugnet pro nobis, nisi tu Deus noster. Et haec quoque dices ad eos: Si feceritis, quae ego praecipio vobis, usque ad quinque dies, vestri miserebor.<sup>1</sup>

Tell the Bishop that these people by their evil deeds have alienated me, and because of this he should command, "Turn from sin and I shall return to you." Later when they go to fight they shall

---

<sup>1</sup>Raymond d'Aguilers, Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem, PL CLV, col. 613. Italics omitted.

say, "Our enemies are gathered together and boast of their might; crush their might, Oh Lord! and rout them so that they shall know you, our God, alone battles with us." And add these instructions, "My compassion shall be with you, if you will follow my commands for five days."<sup>2</sup>

The Christians were penitent for the requisite five days, and then ventured on battle, their one last hope. William of Tyre reports on the activities immediately preceding the engagement.

Sacerdotēs vero sacris induti vestibus turmas circumeuntes et conventus, cruces deferebant in manibus, et sanctorum patrocinia, peccaminum promittentes indulgentiam, et plenam delictorum remissionem his qui fortiter in acie desudarent, et paternarum traditionum et Christianae fidei vellent esse defensores. Episcopi nihilominus, principes, et exercitus primicerios tam seorsum quam in publico exhortantes, quanta eis divinitus dabatur exhortationis gratia instabant, benedicentes populum, et Domino commendantes: inter quos praecipuus Christi cultor dominus Podiensis episcopus, exhortationibus jugiter insistens, jejuniis, et orationibus et large eleemosynarum liberalitate seipsum Domino dabat in holocaustum.<sup>3</sup>

The priests, clad in their sacerdotal robes and bearing in their hands the cross and the images of the saints, went about among the ranks and wherever the people gathered. They promised indulgences for sin and full pardon for all offenses to those who should fight bravely in battle as defenders of the Christian faith bequeathed them by their fathers. The bishops also exhorted the princes and leaders of the army,

---

<sup>2</sup>Raymond d'Aguilers, Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Iherusalem, trans. by John Hill and Laurita Hill (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1968), p. 56.

<sup>3</sup>William of Tyre, Historia Rerum in Partibus Transmarinisi Gestarum, PL CCI, col. 369 (VI, xvi). The numerals in parentheses indicate the book and chapter or section.

both individually and publicly, and urged them on with all the power of eloquence that was granted them from on high. They blessed the people, likewise, and commended them to God. Foremost among these prelates was that servant of Christ, the lord bishop of Puy. He, ever constant in exhortation, fasting, and prayer, as well as most generous in bestowing alms, was continually offering himself as a sacrifice to the Lord.<sup>4</sup>

The battle was fought before Antioch on June 27-28, 1098. The Christians' five days of penitence and the exhortations of the clergy must have worked, because the Christians emerged victorious, and the citadel then surrendered, leaving them in sole possession of Antioch.

Geoffrey of Monmouth and, following him, Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris, report that Oswald, attacked by Penda in 635 at Hefenfeld, made a like appeal to piety and the aid of God:

At Oswaldus, cum a praedicto Peanda, in loco qui Hevenfeld, id est, celestis campus, quadam nocte obsideretur: erexit ibidem crucem domini, et commilitonibus suis indixit, ut suprema voce in haec verba clamarent: Flectamus genua omnes, et Deum omnipotentem vivum et verum in commune deprecemur, ut nos ab exercitu superbo Britannici regis, et ejusdem nefandi ducis Peandae defendat: scit enim ipse, quia iusta pro salute gentis nostrae bella suscepimus.<sup>5</sup>

But Oswald, as he was besieged one night by Penda, in the Place called Heavenfield, that is, the

---

<sup>4</sup>William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea, trans. by Emily A. Babcock and A.C. Krey (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943), Vol. I, p. 286.

<sup>5</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, Historia Britonum, ed. by J.A. Giles (Caxton Society Vol. I, 1844; New York: Burt Franklin Reprint, 1967), pp. 220f (XII, x).

Heavenly Field, set up there our Lord's cross, and commanded his men to speak with a very loud voice these words: "Let us all kneel down, and pray the Almighty, living and true God, to defend us from the proud army of the king of Britain, and his wicked leader Penda. For he knows how justly we wage this war for the safety of our people."<sup>6</sup>

Here we find something very close to a battle oration, but not quite, as the speaker is not trying to raise their spirits by his words, but rather is asking them to invoke divine aid themselves.

A different tactic, purely mercenary, was used successfully by King Richard, as described by Richard, canon of Holy Trinity, London:

Perpendens itaque rex processus rerum difficiles, et adversarios bellicosissimos, et quod in negotium articulis opus est virtute, commodius ratus est juvenum animos propensius propositis praemiis allicere, quam angariis praeceptorum urgere; quem enim non trahat odor lucri? Praeconem igitur statuit clamare, ut quisquis unam petram a muro juxta praedictam turrim extraheret, duos a Rege aureos perciperet. Post promisit tres aureos, demum quatuor, ut pro singulis, quot quisque extraheret a muro, lapidibus, quatuor pro mercede reciperet aureos. Tunc videres juvenes prosilire, et magnae virtutis satellites in murum irruere, et lapidibus extrahendis.

---

<sup>6</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, British History, in Six Old English Chronicles, trans. by J.A. Giles (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1848; New York: AMS Press, 1968), p. 285.

<sup>7</sup>Richard, canon of Holy Trinity, London, Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi, in Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I., Vol. I, ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, Vol. 38:1 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1864; Kraus Reprint, 1964), pp. 225f (III, xiii).

The king thought it best to incite the minds of his younger soldiers by rewards, rather than to urge them by severe orders; for whom will not the love of gain draw on? He therefore ordered the herald to proclaim a reward of two aurei, afterwards three, and then four, to whoever should overthrow a petrarria from the walls; and for each stone displaced from the wall, he promised a reward of four aurei. Then you might see the young men bound forward.<sup>8</sup>

On another occasion, the same chronicler reports that the emperor revived the courage of his troops not by exhorting them but by giving thanks to God.

Imperator, cum plerosque suorum ob insolitam hostium multitudinem trepidantes attenderet, magnanimi principis fiduciam exserit; et erectis ad coelum manibus, in conspectu omnium grates agit Domino, quod inevitabilis pugnae jam instat necessitas, quam fuga hostium huc usque suspenderat. Hac voce, ingens ardor cunctis incutitur, qui faciem Caesaris contemplantes laetissimam, a sene juvenes, a fragili fortes, ab uno universi, virtutis suscipiunt incentivum.<sup>9</sup>

The emperor, seeing some of his men alarmed at the unusual multitude of the enemy, displayed the confidence of a noble chieftain, and raising his hands to heaven, gave thanks to God in the sight of all, that the inevitable necessity was at length arrived for that combat which had so long been deferred by the flight of the enemy. At these words, all were inspired with fresh ardour, as they looked on the emperor's placid countenance; and one old man, weak though he was, supplied an incentive of valour to many who were young and strong.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Geoffrey of Vinsauf, Itinerary of Richard I., in Chronicles of the Crusades (London: George Bell and Sons, 1903), p. 210. Richard's chronicle was often attributed, as here, to Geoffrey of Vinsauf.

<sup>9</sup>Richard of Holy Trinity, op. cit., p. 52 (I, xxiii).

<sup>10</sup>Geoffrey of Vinsauf, op. cit., p. 98.

Another chronicler, the anonymous knight who composed the Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum, reports that at the battle of Dorylaeum the soldiers attempted to encourage each other by passing a secret message along their line, one that illustrates the curious mixture of piety and hope for worldly gain that motivated the Crusaders. "Estote omnimodo unanimes in fide Christi et Sanctae Crucis uictoria, quia hodie omnes diuites si Deo placet effecti eritis." ("Stand fast all together, trusting in Christ and in the victory of the Holy Cross. Today, please God, you will all gain much booty.")<sup>11</sup>

Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris claim that, prior to the battle of Hastings, William's men spent the whole night confessing their sins. When dawn came, they took communion and then formed their battle lines. William then entered battle, kindling the courage of his men by singing the song of Roland and invoking the aid of God.<sup>12</sup>

None of these examples are attempts to encourage the troops by a speech of exhortation; they are all attempts to do so by other means. Whether or not they actually happened is another question. Many may simply be taken as illustrations of what the chronicler thought would be a good way to

---

<sup>11</sup>Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum, trans. by Rosalind Hill (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1962), pp. 19f (III, ix).

<sup>12</sup>Roger of Wendover, Flowers of History, trans. by J.A. Giles (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1849), Vol. I, p. 332.

encourage the soldiers, or stories told to characterize the leader and his army. For example, Wendover's claim that William's army spent the whole night confessing their sins characterizes the army and its cause as pious. But would a commander really allow his men to get no sleep before a major battle?

Sometimes the chronicler includes in his account of a battle some exclamation spoken by someone either in the battle itself or just prior to it. A common type of exclamation, usually spoken by the whole army, is the battle cry. Apparently it was normal for an army to have its own battle cry. Thus, the Crusaders used the famous yell, "Deus vult!" Many others are also reported. For example, the army of Count Raymond had its own battle cry, "Tolosa!"<sup>13</sup> And Henry of Huntingdon writes that, at the Battle of the Standard, the battle cry of the Scots was "Alban! Alban!"<sup>14</sup>

Most exclamations reported, however, are not simply battle cries. For example, during the Battle of Hastings, at one point the Normans began to retreat, thinking their duke dead. To rally them, according to the account of Ordericus Vitalis, William rode up to the fleeing troops and

---

<sup>13</sup>Raymond d'Aguilers, (English), p. 21. After a chronicle has been cited once in full, subsequent citations will appear in this form, indicating English or Latin editions, where translations were available.

<sup>14</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, The Chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon, trans. by Thomas Forester (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853; New York: AMS Press, 1968), p. 269.

stopped them, loudly threatening them and striking with his lance. He then took off his helmet, exposing his naked head, and shouted, "Me conspicite; vivo et vincam, opitulante Deo."<sup>15</sup> ("See, I am here; I am still living, and, by God's help, shall yet have the victory.")<sup>16</sup>

Sometimes the exclamation given by the chronicler is in the form of an urgent report. In the Gesta Francorum, we find that at one point during the siege of Antioch, the scouts the Crusaders had sent out returned, exclaiming, "Ecce, Ecce ueniunt! Igitur estote omnes parati, quia iam prope nos sunt." ("Look, look, they are coming! Be ready, all of you, for they are almost upon us!")<sup>17</sup> This is followed by Bohemond's command: "Seniores et invictissimi milites, ordinate adinuicem bellum." ("Gentlemen and unconquered knights, draw up your line of battle.")<sup>18</sup>

Another time the same chronicle describes how Bohemond sent a message to the others, including the count of St. Gilles, Duke Godfrey, Hugh the Great, and the bishop of Puy, telling them to hurry to the battlefield, "dicens: 'Et

---

<sup>15</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, Historiae Ecclesiasticae, ed. by Augustus le Prevost (Paris, 1840), Vol. II, p. 148 (III, xiv).

<sup>16</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy, trans. by Thomas Forester (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853), Vol. I, p. 484.

<sup>17</sup>Gesta Francorum, p. 36 (VI, xvii).

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.



si hodie luctari uolunt, uiriliter ueniant." ("Saying, 'If any of you wants to fight today, let him come and play the man.')"<sup>19</sup>

Often the exclamation is one of prayer. For example, King Richard, leading only fifteen men into battle against the Turks, aroused his few men with the prayer, "Adjuua nos, Deus et Sanctum Sepulcrum," which he repeated three times.<sup>20</sup> ("Aid us, O God! and the Holy Sepulchre!")<sup>21</sup>

Sometimes the exclamation given is in the form of a command alone. Raymond d'Aguilers writes that, during the siege of Antioch, Isoard of Ganges, a Provençal knight, after kneeling and invoking the aid of God, "socios hortatus est, dicens: Eia, milites Christi!"<sup>22</sup> ("Stirred his comrades to action by shouting, 'Charge! Soldiers of Christ!')"<sup>23</sup> Or, again, William the Breton relates that a battle was preceded by the command, "Arma, arma, viri!"<sup>24</sup> ("To arms, to arms, men!")

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 19 (III, ix).

<sup>20</sup>Richard of Holy Trinity, op. cit., p. 274 (IV, xix).

<sup>21</sup>Geoffrey of Vinsauf, op. cit., p. 242.

<sup>22</sup>Raymond d'Aguilers, (Latin), col. 605. Italics here and throughout the chapter are in the original.

<sup>23</sup>Raymond d'Aguilers, (English), p. 43.

<sup>24</sup>William the Breton, Gesta Philippi Augusti, in Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton, tome premier, ed. by H. Francois Delaborde (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1882), p. 271.

Sometimes the chronicler reports that the leader made some very short statement, hardly classifiable as a real speech, more on the order of a simple exclamation, to rouse his men to battle. For example, William of Newburgh describes a battle between King William of Scotland and the English in 1174. William, beginning the engagement, shouted, "Modo apparebit quis miles esse noverit."<sup>25</sup> ("Now it will appear who knows how to be a soldier.")<sup>26</sup> Perhaps William later had second thoughts about this claim, for he was taken prisoner.

Richard, canon of Holy Trinity, writes several such exclamatory statements. Describing King Richard and his men in a sea battle with some Turkish pirates, the chronicler says that the English were afraid as they saw the pirates coming near: "Domine Deus, vae nobis! capti sumus jam trucidandi." ("O Lord God, we shall be taken and slaughtered.") To which Ivo de Vipont replied, "Quid, modicae fidei, timetis, quos sine mora mortuos videbitis?"<sup>27</sup> ("Why do ye of little faith fear those whom you shall soon

---

<sup>25</sup>William of Newburgh, Historia Rerum Anglicarum, in Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I., Vols. I and II, ed. by Richard Howlett, Rolls Series, Vol. 82:1 and 2 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1884; Kraus Reprint, 1964), Vol. I, p. 185.

<sup>26</sup>William of Newburgh, The History of William of Newburgh, in The Church Historians of England, Vol. IV, pt. II, trans. by Joseph Stevenson (London, 1856), p. 492.

<sup>27</sup>Richard of Holy Trinity, op. cit., p. 104 (I, liii).

see dead?")<sup>28</sup>

Describing the events of the next year, Richard relates that the king was coming to the aid of part of his army which was being beaten by the Turks. Some of the men with him, thinking their numbers far too small to accomplish the task, advised Richard that they should let the trapped army perish, rather than expose the king and his remaining forces to certain defeat as well. King Richard's immediate response was, according to the historian, one of indignation at these words: "Quando dilectos socios rogatos praemisi ad bellum, sub sponsione subsecuturi auxilii, si non, ut praedixi, quantum valuero, sic mihi credulis non fuero praesidio, sed me absente et vacante, mortem, quod absit, incurrant, nunquam regis nomen ulterius usurpavero."<sup>29</sup> ("What! if I neglect to aid my men whom I sent forward with a promise to follow them, I shall never again deserve to be called a king.")<sup>30</sup>

Of a slightly different type, but still more in the category of an exclamation than a speech, is Richard's account of a battle in 1191. The Turks attacked, and were winning, when one of the Hospitallers, Garnier de Napes, exclaimed in a loud voice: "Sancte Georgi, miles egregie,

---

<sup>28</sup>Geoffrey of Vinsauf, op. cit., p. 130. The chapter number is here given as liv.

<sup>29</sup>Richard of Holy Trinity, op. cit., p. 294 (IV, xxx).

<sup>30</sup>Geoffrey of Vinsauf, op. cit., p. 251.

numquid nos sic confundendos relinquis? Nunc perit Christianitas, quia contra hanc gentem nefandam non repugnat."<sup>31</sup> ("O excellent St. George! will you leave us to be thus put to confusion? The whole of Christendom is now on the point of perishing, because it fears to return a blow against this impious race.")<sup>32</sup> While this exclamation was not at the beginning of a battle, and indeed, Richard reports it not as an attempt to rouse the spirits of the men but rather as an exclamation of despair, it did prompt the master of the Hospitallers to go to the king for aid.

Matthew Paris, in his Historia Anglorum or Historia Minor, inserts two exclamations in describing a battle in 1097. Discovering that the enemy was advancing toward them, the Crusaders prepared for battle, reassured themselves and roused one another, saying, "Nobiscum Deus est, quis contra nos; simus inseparabiles, et erimus insuperabiles!"<sup>33</sup> ("God is with us, who is against us; let us be inseparable, and we will be unconquerable.") It should be noted that the play on the words, "inseparabiles" and "insuperabiles," is entirely lost in this translation. During this battle,

---

<sup>31</sup>Richard of Holy Trinity, op. cit., p. 267 (IV, xix).

<sup>32</sup>Geoffrey of Vinsauf, op. cit., pp. 237f.

<sup>33</sup>Matthew Paris, Historia Anglorum, sive, ut vulgo dicitur, Historia Minor, 3 vols., ed. by Sir Frederic Madden, Rolls Series, Vol. 44 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1866-69; Kraus Reprint, 1964), Vol. I, p. 85. Cited hereinafter as: Matthew Paris, Historia Minor.

according to Matthew, Duke Robert of Normandy, who had come up with reinforcements, demonstrated his valor, and attacked exclaiming, "Regales, regales, Deus adjuva; contriti sunt inimici tui, Deus!"<sup>34</sup> ("Princes, princes, God help us; your enemies are worn down, God!")

These are by no means all the exclamations the chroniclers put in the mouths of their characters before and during battles. No attempt was made to collect all of them. However, these few will serve to illustrate the use the historians made of such remarks.

Often the chroniclers do not attribute any specific speech to their characters, but rather describe a speech that was supposedly given. The boundary between describing a speech, and presenting the oration itself is not a clear one. A detailed description and a speech in the classical mode of indirect discourse are difficult if not impossible to distinguish many times. However, most descriptions offer few details and are clearly only descriptions. Many instances of this practice were discovered, for it was quite widespread. Some examples to illustrate it will suffice here.

As William of Tyre was especially fond of this approach, several examples will be taken first from his work. Sometimes William is content merely to state that a speech

---

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., pp. 85f.

was made prior to a battle, without giving any details whatsoever. Describing the final taking of Nicea in 1097, William reports that "sicque singuli principes suos animantes exercitus, et armatos ad congressum dirigentes."<sup>35</sup> ("Each leader urged on his own men and led them fully armed to the combat.")<sup>36</sup> Again, in another battle, William describes how the leaders drew up the battle formation. "Utroque patriarcha sermonibus exhortatoriis, addere militibus nituntur animos."<sup>37</sup> (Two patriarchs circulated among the soldiers and "strove with words of exhortation to inspire them with courage.")<sup>38</sup> Another time, Prince Roger of Antioch, having reorganized his lines, went around checking them "et verbis competentibus animat instauratas."<sup>39</sup> ("at the same time cheering the men with encouraging words.")<sup>40</sup> On yet another occasion we find the speech of encouragement given by the archbishop of Caesarea, Ebremar, who preached a sermon "monente et exhortante"<sup>41</sup> (of "admonition and encourage-

---

<sup>35</sup>William of Tyre, (Latin), col. 281 (III, viii).

<sup>36</sup>William of Tyre, (English), Vol. I, p. 161.

<sup>37</sup>William of Tyre, (Latin), col. 483 (X, xxx).

<sup>38</sup>William of Tyre, (English), Vol. I, pp. 458f.

<sup>39</sup>William of Tyre, (Latin), col. 529 (XII, ix).

<sup>40</sup>William of Tyre, (English), Vol. I, p. 529.

<sup>41</sup>William of Tyre, (Latin), col. 531 (XII, xii).

ment.")<sup>42</sup>

Often, however, more details are given. Thus, William describes a speech by the bishop of Puy during a battle in 1097.

Dominus vero Podiensis episcopus, cum aliis ejusdem officii comministris populos admonent, hortantur principes ne manus remittant: sed certi de victoria divinitus conferenda, interemptorum sanguinem ulciscantur, et de fidelium strage fidei hostes et nominis Christiani non patiantur diutius gloriari. In his et hujusmodi populum incitabant ad congressum viri Dei et vires quantas poterant eorum animis infundebant.<sup>43</sup>

The bishop of Puy, with some of his coworkers in the same ministry, admonished the people and encouraged the commanders not to relax their efforts. They bade them avenge the blood of their slaughtered brethren, in full assurance that victory would be granted from on high. Let them not suffer the enemies of the faith and name of Christ to glory longer over the massacre of the faithful. With these and like words of exhortation, the men of God urged on the people to combat and, as far as lay within their power, inspired them with courage.<sup>44</sup>

Apparently it worked, for the Christians won.

Again during a battle, William describes two speeches the latter of which illustrates the problem presented by indirect discourse. The Patrologiae Latinae edition, printing it in italics, treats it as the speech itself, the translator as a description.

Factum est ergo quod, convenientibus contra

---

<sup>42</sup>William of Tyre, (English), Vol. I, p. 533.

<sup>43</sup>William of Tyre, (Latin), col. 288 (III, xv).

<sup>44</sup>William of Tyre, (English), Vol. I, p. 172.

se mutuo legionibus, rex cum suis in hostes irruens instat animosius; verbo simul et exemplo suorum exhortans acies, vires ingeminat. Dominus quoque patriarcha, vivificae crucis lignum praeliaturis ingerens et precurrens agmina, monet et hortatur ut ejus meminerint, qui pro nobis peccatoribus in eodem ligno salutem operari voluit; praecipit etiam, in remissionem peccatorum ut contra hostes nominis et fidei Christianae decertent viriliter, ab eodem mercedem expectantes, qui suis solet centuplum retribuere. Sic ergo nostri facti animosiores, hostibus vehementius instant; et implorato de coelis auxilio, perempta ex eis infinita multitudo, reliquos in fugam convertunt.<sup>45</sup>

The king and his men fell upon the legions united against them and pressed them hard in the most spirited fashion. At the same time, by word and example, Baldwin encouraged his men and thus redoubled their strength. The patriarch with the Life-giving Cross in his hand also passed along the lines. He too cheered the fighters who were about to go into battle and admonished them to remember Him who for the salvation of sinners was willing to die on that Cross. He exhorted them to fight valiantly against the enemy of the name and faith of Christ. Thus they might hope to obtain the remission of their sins and win the hundredfold reward which the Lord ever grants to His servants. Animated and encouraged by these words, the Christians implored aid from on high and threw themselves with increased fury upon the foe. They succeeded in killing a vast number and forced the rest to flee.<sup>46</sup>

On another occasion, William has the exhortation given not by the leaders, secular or clerical, but by the veteran troops: "qui rei militaris exercitatione pristina erant prudentiores, alios hortantur, rudes instruunt, sermonibus exhortatoriis inflammant animos, promittunt vic-

---

<sup>45</sup>William of Tyre, (Latin), col. 487 (XI, iii).

<sup>46</sup>William of Tyre, (English), Vol. I, pp. 465f.



toriam, victoriae fructum, laudem immortalem."<sup>47</sup> ("Veterans with the wisdom obtained from experience in former conflicts, exhorted the rest; they instructed the recruits and roused their courage by promising victory and immortal glory, the fruit of success.")<sup>48</sup>

William also describes two battle orations, one on each side—one of the few such instances found.

Rex tamen more solito hostibus instans atrocius, strenuorum quemque vocat ex nomine, et verbis simul et exemplo commonens, ad stragem invitat et victoriam pollicetur. Illi vero stricto gladio hostibus incumbentes, regem quoad possunt, strenue nimis imitari nituntur; et fidei zelum habentes, divinam simul et suas ulcisci nituntur injurias. At vero Doldequinus suos nihilominus dictis animat, et ad pugnam promissis incendit, asserens eos justum bellum gerere pro uxoribus et liberis; et pro libertate, quod majus est, proque solo patrio cum praedonibus decertare. His et similibus insistent non inferiore spiritu, viribus non imparibus.<sup>49</sup>

In accordance with his usual custom, the king pressed the enemy hard. Calling his valiant men by name, he cheered them to the onslaught by word and example and promised them assurance of victory. In return, they strove valiantly as best they might to imitate their leader. Endued with the fervor of faith, they fell upon the enemy with drawn swords and endeavored to avenge at one and the same time not only their own wrongs but also those that had been committed against the Lord.

Tughtigin, on his part, inspired his men with no less ardor by his words and roused their fighting spirit by his promises. He reminded them that they were fighting a just war for the

---

<sup>47</sup>William of Tyre, (Latin), col. 772 (XIX, xxiv).

<sup>48</sup>William of Tyre, (English), Vol. II, p. 331. The chapter number is here given as xxv.

<sup>49</sup>William of Tyre, (Latin), col. 566f (XIII, xviii).

sake of their wives and children; nay, more, they were striving for liberty, an even nobler task, and for the defense of their fatherland against robbers. Cheered by these words, they pressed on with courage not less and with strength not unequal to ours.<sup>50</sup>

William also describes other battle orations given by the leaders of the Turks. Thus in 1098 we find Karbuqa encouraging his troops:

Reliquas autem a dextris locans et a sinistris, sub singulis principibus, sub obtentu gratiae suae, districte praecipit, quatenus pristinae virtutis memores, strenue et viriliter decertare contendant, frivolum reputantes quidquid tam imbellis populus, vulgus famelicum, plebs inermis et inconsulta, niteretur moliri.<sup>51</sup>

He gave strict instructions that if they wished to win his favor they should ever remember their reputation for valor and strive to fight bravely and vigorously. Let them regard as of no importance all the efforts of an unwarlike people, a mere mob of famished creatures, unarmed and undisciplined.<sup>52</sup>

However, on this occasion, at least, the Christians won.

Ordericus Vitalis offers an interesting description of a different type of battle oration. He describes the Crusaders taking Jerusalem in 1099. They were besieging the town, and made several attempts to storm it. They were encouraged, he writes, by the bishops and priests:

Pontifices et presbyteri populares allocuti sunt, et de morte Christi, et de loco passionis ejus, quem digito coram demonstrabant, sermonem optimum

---

<sup>50</sup>William of Tyre, (English), Vol. II, pp. 28f.

<sup>51</sup>William of Tyre, (Latin), col. 372 (VI, xx).

<sup>52</sup>William of Tyre, (English), Vol. I, p. 291.

fecerunt, et de coelesti Jerusalem, cujus figuram terrestris portendit, sancte et eloquenter affati sunt. Omnes ergo laici, armis accincti, unanimiter urbem impetebant, et quarta quintaque feria nocte et die civitati insistebant.<sup>53</sup>

The bishops and priests addressed the multitude in moving discourses, pointing with their fingers, while they spoke of the death of Christ, to the very spot on which he suffered; and while describing with holy eloquence the heavenly Jerusalem, taking for its type the terrestrial one before which they were assembled. In consequence, all the laity flew to arms, and made a general attack on the city during Wednesday and Thursday.<sup>54</sup>

Ordericus also uses descriptions of more normal battle orations. Describing the battle of Noyon, in August of 1119, he writes: "Ludovicus rex, ut vidit quod diu peroptaverat, quadringentos milites ascivit, quos in promptu tunc habere poterat, eosque pro servanda aequitate et regni libertate in bello fortiter agere imperat, ne illorum ignavia Francorum gloria depereat."<sup>55</sup> ("Lewis having come in sight of what he had long desired, called up four hundred knights, who were ready close to hand, and exhorted them to do battle valiantly in defence of justice and the liberty of the kingdom, and not to suffer the glory of the French arms to be tarnished by their cowardice.")<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (Latin), Vol. III, p. 604 (IX, xv).

<sup>54</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (English), Vol. III, p. 175.

<sup>55</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (Latin), Vol. IV, pp. 357f (XII, xviii).

<sup>56</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (English), Vol. III, p. 482.

Roger of Wendover describes a speech given by a papal legate in 1217:

Tandem in hebdomada Pentecostes, feria sexta, post divinorum celebrationem sacramentorum, surgens legatus saepe dictus ostendit coram omnibus quam iniqua erat Lodowice ac baronum, qui ei adhaeserant, causa, pro qua fuerant excommunicati et ab unitate ecclesiae segregati; et, ut denique exercitum illum animaret ad pugnam, albis indutus vestibis cum clero universo Lodowicum nominatim excommunicavit cum complicibus et fautoribus suis, et praecipue illos, qui apud Lincolniam contra regem Angliae obsidionem agebant, cum tota civitate, continens scilicet et contentum. Eis autem, qui negotium hoc in propriis personis expediendum susceperunt, de concessa sibi potestate ab omnipotente Deo et sede apostolica plenam suorum veniam peccatorum, de quibus veraciter confessi fuerunt, indulisit et in retributione justorum salutis aeternae praemia repromisit. Deinde, collata omnibus absolute et Dei benedictione, ad arma convolarunt universi, equosque cum festinatione ascendentes castra moverunt ovantes.<sup>57</sup>

At length, on the sixth day of Whitsun week, after the performance of the holy sacrament, the legate rose and set forth to all of them how unjust was the cause of Louis, and the barons who had joined him, for which they had been excommunicated and alienated from the community of the church; and in order to animate the army to battle, he put on his white robes, and, in company with the whole clergy there, excommunicated Louis by name, together with all his accomplices and abettors, and especially all those who were carrying on the siege of Lincoln against the king of England, together with the whole provinces, inclusive and included. And to those who had undertaken to assist in this war personally, he, by the power granted to him from the omnipotent God and the apostolic see, granted full pardon for their sins, of which they had made true confession, and as a reward to the just he promised the reward of eternal salvation. Then,

---

<sup>57</sup>Roger of Wendover, The Flowers of History, 3 vols., ed. by Henry G. Hewlett, Rolls Series, Vol. 84 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1886-89; Kraus Reprint, 1965), Vol. II, p. 213.

after all had received absolution and the blessing of God, they flew to arms, mounted their horses at once and struck their camp rejoicing.<sup>58</sup>

Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris, again, describing the battle of Assendon, offer a description of King Edmund exhorting his troops. "At rex Eadmundus apud Esseldunam hostibus audaciter occurrens, tripliciter insidiis acies instruxit, turmas circuivit, monet ut, memores pristinae virtutis et victoriae, sese regnumque suum ab avaritia barbarorum defendant; nam cum illis leviter certamen affirmat inire posse, quos antea saepe vicerunt."<sup>59</sup> (The king "went round them exhorting them to be mindful of their former exploits and to defend themselves and their country from the greedy barbarians, and assuring them of an easy victory over those whom they had beaten so many times before.")<sup>60</sup>

Roger of Hoveden, too, describes this pre-battle scene.

Quos rex Anglorum Eadmundus Ferreum latus, cum exercitu quem de tota Anglia contraxerat insecutus, in monte qui Assendun, id est, mons Asini, nuncupatur, abeuntes est consecutus. Ibi festine triplicibus subsidiis aciem instruit. Dein singulas turmas circuiens monet atque obtestatur, uti memores pristinae virtutis atque victoriae sese regnumque suum a Danorum avaritia defendant;

---

<sup>58</sup>Roger of Wendover, (English), Vol. II, pp. 392f.

<sup>59</sup>Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, 7 vols., ed. by Henry Richards Luard, *Rolls Series*, Vol. 57 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1872-83; Kraus Reprint, 1964), Vol. I, p. 497.

<sup>60</sup>Roger of Wendover, (English), Vol. I, p. 289.

cum his certamen fore, quos antea vicerunt.<sup>61</sup>

There, with all expedition, he drew up his troops in three divisions, and then going round each troop, exhorted and entreated them, bearing in mind their ancient valour and victories, to defend him and his kingdom from the avarice of the Danes, and reminded them that they were about to engage with those whom they had conquered already.<sup>62</sup>

Presumably these two accounts come from a common source:

Florence of Worcester. Florence's account reads: "Ibi festine triplicibus subsidiis acie instruit, dein singulas turmas circumiens, monet atque obtestatur uti memores pristinae virtutis atque victoriae sese regnumque suum a Danorum auaritia defendant, cum eis certamen fore quos antea vicerunt."<sup>63</sup> This was adopted almost verbatim, with no changes in meaning, by Roger of Hoveden. Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris have made a few slight alterations.

Geoffrey of Monmouth wrote one of the most famous of all medieval histories. Although it is largely fanciful, it had wide appeal in his day, and was often taken for a legitimate history, though criticized by some such as William of Newburgh. It was often used by later historians.

---

<sup>61</sup>Roger of Hoveden, Chronica, 4 vols, ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, Vol. 51 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1868-71; Kraus Reprint, 1964), Vol. I, p. 84.

<sup>62</sup>Roger of Hoveden, The Annals of Roger de Hoveden, 2 vols., trans. by Henry T. Riley (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853; New York: AMS Press, 1968), Vol. I, p. 101.

<sup>63</sup>Florence of Worcester, Chronicon ex Chronicis, ab initio mundi usque ad annum Domini 1118 deductum (London, 1592), p. 387.

Geoffrey's history was apparently largely a literary effort rather than an attempt to write sober history. In it, he placed many speeches in the mouths of the characters, several of which will be dealt with later. Here we will focus our attention on a few of the descriptions of speeches in this work.

Geoffrey describes a battle between Hengist and Aurelius.

At Hengistus cum adventum ipsius comperisset, revocata audacia commilitones suos elegit, atque unumquemque inanimans, hortabatur eos unanimiter et viriliter eis resistere: nec congressum Aurelii exhorrere. Dicebat autem ipsum paucos ex Armoricanis Britonibus habere, cum numerus eorum ultra decem milia non procederet. Insulanos vero Britenes pro nihilo reputabat, cum toties eos in praeliis devicisset. Proinde promittebat suis victoriam, et ob ampliorem numerum securitatem. Aderant enim circiter ducenta milia armatorum.<sup>64</sup>

But Hengist, upon his approach, took courage again, and chose out the bravest of his men, whom he exhorted to make a gallant defence, and not be daunted at Aurelius, who, he told them, had but few Armorican Britons with him, since their number did not exceed ten thousand. And as for the native Britons, he made no account of them, since they had been so often defeated by him. He therefore promised them the victory, and that they should come off safely, considering the superiority of their number, which amounted to two hundred thousand men in arms.<sup>65</sup>

Both Hengist and Aurelius drew up their battle lines. "Sed Aurelius hortabatur socios totam spem suam in filium Dei

---

<sup>64</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (Latin), p. 134 (VIII, iv).

<sup>65</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (English), pp. 209f.

ponere: hostes suos deinde audacter invadere, et pro patria unanimiter pugnare. At Hengistus e contrario turmas suas componebat: componendo praeliari docebat: docendo singulas perambulabat, ut omnibus unam audaciam pugnandi ingereret."<sup>66</sup>

("Then Aurelius exhorted his companions to place all their hope in the Son of God, and to make a brave assault with one consent upon the enemy, in defence of their country." Hengist, meanwhile, was giving his troops "directions how to behave themselves in the battle; and he walked himself through their several ranks, the more to spirit them up.")<sup>67</sup>

Again, Geoffrey describes a speech made by Hirelgas after avenging personally the death of his uncle, to rouse his countrymen to battle.

Deinde maximo clamore concivium suorum turmas inanizando, hortabatur in hostes irruere, crebrisque irruptionibus infestare, dum eis virtus recenter fervebat, dum illis formidolosis pectus tremebat, dum cominus imminentes, sapientius quam ceteri per catervas dispositi essent, atque crudelius damnum ingerere saepius valuissent.<sup>68</sup>

Then calling with a loud voice to his countrymen, he animated their troops, and vehemently pressed them to exert themselves to the utmost, now that their spirits were raised, and the enemy disheartened; and especially as they had the advantage of them in being placed in better order,<sup>69</sup> and so might the more grievously annoy them.

---

<sup>66</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (Latin), p. 135 (VIII, v).

<sup>67</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (English), pp. 210f.

<sup>68</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (Latin), p. 195 (X, ix).

<sup>69</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (English), p. 264.



In the battle, they were at first beaten. Retreating, they came to the Armorican Britons under the command of Hoel and Walgan. "Quae itaque velut flamma ingescens, impetum fecit in hostes, et revocatis illis qui retrocesserant, illos quo paulo ante sequebantur, diffugere coegit."<sup>70</sup> ("But these, being inflamed at the retreat of their friends, encouraged them to stand their ground and caused them with the help of their own forces to put their pursuers to flight.")<sup>71</sup>

Finally, Geoffrey describes the battle between Arthur and Modred. Modred first placed his troops.

His itaque distributis quemlibet eorum inanimabat, promittens ceterorum possessiones eis, si ad triumphandum perstarent. Arturus quoque suum exercitum in adversa parte statuit . . . et uniuersis praesidiis commissis, hortatur ut perjuros et latrones interimant, qui monitu proditoris sui de externis regionibus in insulam advecti, suos eis honores demere affectabant. Dicit etiam diversos diversorum regnorum Barbaros imbelles atque belli usus ignaros esse, et nullatenus ipsis virtuosis viris et pluribus debellationibus usis resistere posse, si audacter invadere et viriliter decertare affectarent.<sup>72</sup>

After he had made this disposition of his forces, he endeavoured to animate them, and promised them the estates of their enemies if they came off with victory. Arthur, on the other side, also marshalled his army, . . . exhorted them to make a total rout of those robbers and perjured villains, who, being brought over into the island from foreign countries at the instance of the arch-traitor, were attempting to

---

<sup>70</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (Latin), p. 195 (X, ix).

<sup>71</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (English), p. 264.

<sup>72</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (Latin), pp. 202f (XI. i).

rob them of all their honours. He likewise told them that a mixed army composed of barbarous people of so many different countries, and who were all raw soldiers and inexperienced in war, would never be able to stand against such brave veteran troops as they were, provided they did their duty.<sup>73</sup>

Beyond the descriptions of speeches, we have a twelfth century picture of one. The Bayeux Tapestry contains a picture of William speaking to his troops just before the Battle of Hastings. The picture bears the caption: "Hic Willelm dux alloquitur suis militibus ut pararent se viriliter et sapienter ad prelium contra Anglorum exercitum." ("Here Duke William exhorts his soldiers that they prepare themselves manfully and wisely for the battle against the English army.")<sup>74</sup>

There are many, many other descriptions of battle orations in the chronicles. These few may serve to illustrate the chroniclers' use of this technique.

---

<sup>73</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (English), p. 270.

<sup>74</sup>Frank M. Stenton, ed., The Bayeux Tapestry (revised ed.; London: Phaidon Press, 1965), p. 192.

## CHAPTER V

### THE SAME SPEECH IN SEVERAL CHRONICLES

Many chroniclers wrote accounts of the same battles. Sometimes several chroniclers describe speeches on the same occasion; quite often, when this occurs, a speech reported in one chronicle is also included in the same or similar words in other chronicles. Usually, it is possible to determine that one of the writers was used by the others who adopted and sometimes revised the speech for their own works. Many short speeches are thus found in several chronicles, but few long ones, and the latter almost exclusively originated in the history of Henry of Huntingdon.

Typical examples are two speeches reported in very similar language by Roger of Hoveden and Benedict of Peterborough. Both speeches were supposedly given by King Richard in the year 1191. The first was given by him as he exhorted his troops to take the island of Cyprus. According to Benedict, Richard spoke to his army as follows: "Armate vos et sequimini me; et vindicemus injurias quas perfidus iste et Deo et nobis fecit, opprimens innocentes quos nobis reddere recusat, 'sed et arma tenenti omnis dat qui justa negat,' certamque in Domino habeo fiduciam quod Ipse

nobis hodie dabit victoriam de isto imperatore et gente ejus."<sup>1</sup> ("Arm yourselves and follow me, and we may avenge the injuries which this perfidious one has done both to God and to us, oppressing the innocent whom he refuses to give back to us /the emperor of Cyprus had refused Richard's request to return some shipwrecked pilgrims/, 'but to him who wields arms, he yields up everything who denies him what is his right,' and I have full confidence in God that He will this day grant us the victory over this emperor and his people.") The quotation included in the speech, Stubbs notes, is from Lucan, Pharsalia i. 349.<sup>2</sup>

Roger of Hoveden gives a somewhat longer account. The underlining indicates wording like Benedict's, as identified by Stubbs.

Sequimini me, et vindicemus injurias quas perfidus illi imperator Deo et nobis fecit, qui peregrinos nostros contra Dei justitiam et aequitatem in vinculis tenet. Et nolite timere eos, quia inermes sunt, fugae potius quam bello parati; nos vero bene sumus armati, et

Arma tenenti

Omnia dat, qui justa negat.

Et oportet ut viriliter pugnemus ad liberandum populum Dei a perditione; scientes quod aut oportet nos vincere aut mori. Sed certam habeo in Domino fiduciam, quod Ipse dabit nobis hodie

---

<sup>1</sup>Benedict of Peterborough, The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II. and Richard I., 2 vols., ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, Vol. 49 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1867; Kraus Reprint, 1965), Vol. II, p. 163.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

victoriam de isto perfido imperatore, et de gente sua.<sup>3</sup>

Follow me, that we may avenge the injuries which this perfidious emperor has done to God and to ourselves, who thus, against the justice and equity of God, keeps our pilgrims in chains; and fear them not, for they are without arms, and better prepared for flight than for battle; whereas we are well armed, and to him who wields arms, he yields up everything who denies him what is his right. We are also bound to fight manfully against him, in order to deliver the people of God from perdition, knowing that we must either conquer or die. But I have full confidence in God, that He will this day grant us the victory over this perfidious emperor and his people.<sup>4</sup>

The second speech is much shorter. It was supposedly given by Richard prior to a sea battle on June 7, 1191. The King, according to Benedict, "dixit omnibus qui secum erant, 'Ite et persequimini eos et comprehendite; sed si abierint, amorem meum in perpetuum perdetis; et si eos comprehenderitis, dabo vobis quicquid petieritis, et insuper catalla eorum vestra sunt!'"<sup>5</sup> ("Go and pursue them and take them; but if they get away, you will forfeit my regard forever, and if you capture them, I will give you whatever you ask, and moreover their chattels are yours.") As Roger gives the speech, Richard said: "Persequimini eos, et comprehendite: si enim abierint, amorem meum perdetis in perpetuum; et si eos comprehenderitis, omnia catalla eorum

---

<sup>3</sup>Roger of Hoveden, (Latin), Vol. III, pp. 106f.

<sup>4</sup>Roger of Hoveden, (English), Vol. II, p. 201.

<sup>5</sup>Benedict of Peterborough, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 169.

vestra sint."<sup>6</sup> ("Give chase to them, and overtake them; and if they get away, you will forfeit my regard for ever; but if you capture them, all their property shall belong to you.")<sup>7</sup>

We have here, according to Stubbs, who edited both works for the Rolls Series, a case of borrowing by Roger. Stubbs concludes that the section of Roger's chronicle which includes these two speeches by King Richard was taken basically from Benedict of Peterborough, but revised and rewritten by Roger.<sup>8</sup> In these two speeches, he has made a number of changes. In the first speech, he has nearly doubled the length. He retained the quotation from Lucan, omitted a number of Benedict's words, and added several clauses of his own, which expand on the situation somewhat and reassure the soldiers of the outcome. In the second case, Roger has adopted the speech, only omitting a couple of words ("ite" and "sed") and the promise of whatever the troops may ask. Thus Roger considerably embellished the first speech, but actually diminished the second.

Another set of speeches comes from the betrayal of Antioch to the Crusaders. The Christians had laid siege to

---

<sup>6</sup>Roger of Hoveden, (Latin), Vol. III, p. 112.

<sup>7</sup>Roger of Hoveden, (English), Vol. II, p. 206. Riley, in translating this passage, has reversed the order of the two clauses.

<sup>8</sup>Roger of Hoveden, (Latin), Vol. I, p. li.

Antioch for some time without success. Bohemond meanwhile had made contact with a citizen of the city who agreed to give him access to the wall at one point. The plan being devised, on the appointed night Bohemond's men prepared to enter Antioch by a ladder the traitor would lower for them. Bohemond spoke to his troops just before they climbed up to the top of the wall. According to the anonymous Gesta Francorum, he said, "Ite securo animo et felici concordia, et ascendite per scalam in Antiocham, quam statim habebimus si Deo placet in nostra custodia." ("Go on, strong in heart and lucky in your comrades, and scale the ladder into Antioch, for by God's will we shall have it in our power in a trice.")<sup>9</sup> Guibert of Nogent elaborates considerably on this speech: "Procedite, et ab ea quam dudum passi estis inquietudine respirate, praeerectam vobis scalam conscendite, et ne diu nos morer, diu exoptatam vobis Antiocham capite, quia quae pridem Turcis subjacuit, vestrae in proximo, si Deus annuerit, cedet custodiae."<sup>10</sup> ("Go forward, and breathe freely from that which you have born restlessly so long, climb up the ladder set up before you, and lest I delay you longer, take Antioch, so long desired by you, because long ago the Turks subjected it, next, if God will assent, it will fall to your custody.")

---

<sup>9</sup>Gesta Francorum, p. 46 (VIII).

<sup>10</sup>Guibert of Nogent, Gesta Dei Per Francos, PL CLVI, col. 751 (V, i).

Apparently the soldiers climbed up the ladder and began fighting on top of the wall, but Bohemond stayed on the ground. Several chroniclers describe a speech made to get Bohemond to climb the ladder himself. The Gesta Francorum claims that a soldier went back down the ladder and ran up to Bohemond, asking, "Quid hic stas uir prudens? Quamobrem huc uenisti? Ecce nos iam tres turres habemus!" ("Why are you standing here, sir, if you have any sense? What did you come to get? Look! We have taken three towers already.")<sup>11</sup> As Ordericus Vitalis has it, one Langobardus went down the ladder and spoke to Bohemond: "Quid agis? an dormis? Mitte velociter quos missurus es, quia indemnes jam obtinuimus tres turres. Alioquin et nos, et civitatem, et amicum tuum, qui totam spem et animam suam in sinum tuum expandit, amisisti."<sup>12</sup> ("What are you doing? Are you asleep? Send up instantly all you intend, for we are already in possession of these towers without any loss; otherwise you will lose us, as well as the city, and ruin your friend, who has trusted you with his hopes and even his life.")<sup>13</sup> Ordericus has taken the speech almost exactly from the history of Baldricus Dolensis. The only changes he makes are to reverse the order of the words "velociter

---

<sup>11</sup>Gesta Francorum, p. 46 (VIII).

<sup>12</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (Latin), Vol. III, p. 539 (IX, ix).

<sup>13</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (English), Vol. III, p. 123.



quos," the words "indemnes jam," and to write "quia" instead of "quoniam," none of which changes the sense at all.<sup>14</sup>

The Gesta Francorum formed the basis of most accounts of this crusade by historians who had not themselves been present. Baldricus embellished the speech when he included it in his history, and Ordericus then adopted it.

Perhaps the most reported speech of all was supposedly given during the Battle of Dorylaeum. As the battle progressed, the Christians were getting the worst of it, and began to flee. Duke Robert of Normandy rallied them with a very short speech which is reported in at least seven chronicles, but not in the Gesta Francorum. The basic speech appears first, apparently, in the history of Henry of Huntingdon: "Quo, milites, quo fugitis? Equi eorum velociores nostris sunt; fuga non est praesidio: hic potius moriendum est; mecum sentite, me sequimini."<sup>15</sup> ("Where, soldiers, where are you fleeing? The Turkish horses are swifter than ours; flight will not save you, it is better to die here: if you think as I do, follow me.")<sup>16</sup> This speech then appears in Robert of Torigni's Accessiones ad Sigebertum with only a couple of changes: "Quo milites, quo fugitis? Equi

---

<sup>14</sup>Baldricus Dolensis Archiepiscopus, Historia Hierosolymitana, PL CLXVI, col. 1105.

<sup>15</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, Historia Anglorum, ed. by Thomas Arnold, Rolls Series, Vol. 74 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1879; Kraus Reprint, 1965), p. 221.

<sup>16</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (English), p. 229.

eorum nostris sunt velociores. Fuga nobis non est praesidio. Melius est bene mori quam male evadere. Mecum sentite. Me sequimini."<sup>17</sup> Then follows the sentence, "O vir magnae et admirandae probitatis!" which the editor, Howlett, treats as not part of the quotation. Thus, Robert has changed the word order a few times, and replaced the phrase "hic potius moriendum est" with "melius est bene mori quam male evadere." Ralph de Diceto then gives the speech, following Robert, changing word order only in the second sentence ("Equi eorum sunt nostris velociores"), omitting the command, "mecum sentite," and changing the last verb to "sequimini."<sup>18</sup> Following Diceto, according to Luard, the St. Alban's compilation attributed to Matthew of Westminster includes this speech, also. Matthew follows Diceto exactly, but includes in the quotation a final phrase adapted from Robert's account: "O viri magnae et admirandae probitatis."<sup>19</sup> This phrase does not appear in Diceto or

---

<sup>17</sup>Robert of Torigni, The Chronicle of Robert of Torigni, in Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I., Vol. IV, ed. by Richard Howlett, Rolls Series, Vol. 82:4 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1882; Kraus Reprint, 1964), p. 54.

<sup>18</sup>Ralph de Diceto, Abbreviationes Chronicorum, in The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto, Dean of London, Vol. I., ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, Vol. 68:1 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1876; Kraus Reprint, 1965), p. 222.

<sup>19</sup>Matthew of Westminster, Flores Historiarum, 2 vols., ed. by Henry Richards Luard, Rolls Series, Vol. 95 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1890; Kraus Reprint, 1965), Vol. II, p. 29.

or Henry. The other two famous St. Alban's historians, Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris, also include the speech. In Matthew Paris' Chronica Majora, taken from Roger of Wendover, the speech appears as follows: "Quo fugitis, milites? quo fugitis? Equi Turcorum nostris velociores sunt, unde fuga praesidio non est. Melius est enim bene mori, quam turpiter vivere; mecum sentite, me sequimini."<sup>20</sup> In Matthew's abridged Historia Anglorum or Historia Minor, the speech is nearly the same. The words "velociores sunt" are reversed, and in the last sentence "enim" is omitted.<sup>21</sup>

That so many included the same speech, with so little variation, seems a bit unusual. The speech, apparently, is entirely legendary, originating with Henry of Huntingdon. This makes it somewhat more understandable, as several chroniclers borrowed passages from Henry with little alteration. All the chroniclers who include this particular speech are Anglo-Normans, however, and yet they did not attempt to embellish the version they used to any significant extent. At any rate, it does appear that the tradition of this speech was firmly established early in its career, and continued to be used even after our period had ended.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), Vol. II, p. 64.

<sup>21</sup>Matthew Paris, Historia Minor, Vol. I, p. 85.

<sup>22</sup>Charles Wendell David, Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920), p. 194.

That the speech is legendary is established by David in his study of Robert's life. While Robert did indeed play a significant role in the battle of Dorylaeum, he was not, as the tradition claims, the sole savior of the Crusaders.<sup>23</sup> Yet Henry's is not the only version of Robert's words and deeds that attempts to enhance his image. Robert the Monk, too, pictures Robert as the savior of the day at Dorylaeum. According to his account, the Norman duke "quickly turned his charger and checked the rout by waving aloft his golden banner and calling out the inspiring battle cry, Deus vult! Deus vult!"<sup>24</sup> Ralph of Caen independently writes of Robert's exploits on this occasion, adding a speech. According to his account, Robert turned to his fleeing comrades and shouted:

Eho! Boamunde, quorsum fuga? Longe Apulia, longe Hydruntum, longe spes omnis finium Latinorum: hic standum, hic nos gloriosa manet aut poena victos, aut corona victores; gloriosa, inquam, sors utraque, sed etiam eo beatior altera, quo celerius efficit beatos. Ergo agite, o juvenes, moriamur, et in media arma ruamus.<sup>25</sup>

O Bohemond! why do you fly? Apulia and Otranto and the confines of the Latin world are far away. Let us stand fast. Either the victor's crown or a glorious death awaits us: glory will there be in either fate, but it will be the greater glory which makes us sooner martyrs. Therefore, strike,

---

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 193.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid.

<sup>25</sup>Radulfus Cadomensis, Gesta Tancredi in Expeditione Jerosolymitana, PL CLV, col. 509.

O youths, and let us fall upon them and die if  
need be!<sup>26</sup>

David then documents further examples of the legends that grew up around Robert, but the details do not concern us here.

Here we have a clear instance of the use of rhetoric to enhance the reputation of a famous warrior. In building up his image, the chroniclers, to be sure, attribute imaginary deeds to Robert. But they also build him up purely rhetorically, by attributing eloquence to him, as well.

Many other short speeches appear in similar versions in several chronicles. These examples are representative of the practice.

One of the most popular chroniclers to borrow speeches from was Henry of Huntingdon. Of the several speeches Henry includes, those given before the Battle of the Standard and the Battle of Lincoln, during the English civil wars in the reign of King Stephen, were quite popular.

The Battle of the Standard was fought in 1138, between David, King of the Scots, and the northern English barons. David had pledged his support to Matilda, so Stephen attacked in Scotland. The English king then had to go south, and David, in his absence, led a huge army, which included many barbaric Gallwegians, into the north of England. The northern barons were roused by Thurstan, archbishop of

---

<sup>26</sup>David, op. cit., pp. 193f.

York, to withstand David. They set up the royal standard and, since Thurstan was prevented by illness from being present, Ralph, bishop of the Orkneys, exhorted the followers of Stephen with words to this effect ("hujusmodi usus est incentivo"):

1 Proceres Angliae clarissimi Normannigenae, meminisse  
enim vestri vos nomines et generis praeliaturus decet  
perpendite qui et contra quos, et ubi, bellum geratis.  
Vobis enim nemo impune restitit. Audax Francia vos  
5 experta delituit: ferox Anglia vobis capta succubuit,  
dives Apulia vos sortita reffloruit, Jerusalem famosa,  
et insignis Antiochia, se vobis utraque supposuit.  
Nunc autem Scotia vobis rite subjecta repellere conatur;  
inermem praeferens temeritatem, rixae quam pugnae  
10 aptior; in quibus quidem nulla vel rei militaris  
scientia, vel praeliandi peritia, vel moderandi  
gratia. Nullus igitur verendi locus, sed potius  
verecundiae, quod hi quos semper in patria sua  
petivimus et vicimus, in patria nostra ritu trans-  
15 verso ebrii dementesque convolarunt. Quod tamen  
vobis ego praesul et archipraesulis vestri loco situs,  
divine providentia factum denuntio, ut hi qui in hac  
patria templa Dei violarunt, altaria cruentaverunt,  
presbyteros occiderunt, nec pueris nec pugnantibus  
20 pepercerunt, in eadem condignas sui facinoris luant  
poenas. Quod justissimum suae dispositionis arbitrium

per manus vestras hodie perficiet Deus. Attollite  
igitur animos, viri elegantes, et adversus hostem  
nequissimum, freti virtute patria, immo Dei praesentia,  
25 exsurgite. Neque vos temeritas eorum moveat, cum illos  
tot nostrae virtutis insignia non deterreant. Illi  
nesciunt armari se in bello, vos in pace armis exer-  
cemini, ut in bello casus belli dubios non sentiatis.  
Tegitur nobis galea caput, lorica pectus, ocreis  
30 crura, totumque clipeo corpus; ubi feriat hostis non  
reperit, quem ferro septum circumspicit. Procedentes  
igitur adversus inermes et nudos quid dubitamus? an  
numerum? sed non tam numerus multorum quam virtus  
paucorum bellum conficit. Multitudo enim disciplinae  
35 insolens ipsa sibi est impedimento in prosperis ad  
victoriam, in adversis ad fugam. Praeterea majores  
nostri multos pauci saepe vicerunt. Quid ergo con-  
feret vobis gloria parentalis, exercitatio sollennis,  
disciplina militaris, nisi multos pauciores vincatis?  
40 Sed jam finem dicendi suadet hostis inordinate pro-  
ruens, et, quod animo valde meo placet, disperse con-  
fluens. Vos igitur, archipraesulis vestri loco, qui  
hodie commissa in Domini domum, in Domini sacerdotes,  
in Domini gregem pusillum vindicaturi estis, si quis  
45 vestrum praelians occubuerit, absolvimus ab omni poena  
peccati, in nomine Patris, cujus creaturas foede et  
horribiliter destruxerunt, et Filii, cujus altaria

maculaverunt, et Spiritus Sancti, a quo sublimatos  
insane ceciderunt.<sup>27</sup>

Thomas Forester translates this speech as follows:

Brave nobles of England, Normans by birth; for it is well that on the eve of battle you should call to mind who you are, and from whom you are sprung: /Forester here omits a clause, which reads, "and against whom, and where, you wage war"/ no one ever withstood you with success. Gallant France fell beneath your arms; fertile England you subdued; rich Apulia flourished again under your auspices; Jerusalem, renowned in story, and the noble Antioch, both submitted to you. Now, however, Scotland which was your own rightly, has taken you at disadvantage, her rashness more fitting a skirmish than a battle. Her people have neither military skill, nor order in fighting, nor self command. There is, therefore, no reason for fear, whatever there may be for indignation, at finding those whom we have hitherto sought and conquered in their own country, madly reversing the order, making an irruption into ours. But that which I, a bishop, and by divine permission, standing here as the representative of our archbishop, tell you, is this: that those who in this land have violated the temples of the Lord, polluted his altars, slain his priests, and spared neither children nor women with child, shall on this same soil receive condign punishment for their crimes. This most just fulfilment of his will God shall this day accomplish by our hands. Rouse yourselves, then, gallant soldiers, and bear down on an accursed enemy with the courage of your race, and in the presence of God. Let not their impetuosity shake you, since the many tokens of our valour do not deter them. They do not cover themselves with armour in war; you are in the constant practice of arms in times of peace, that you may be at no loss in the chances of the day of battle. Your head is covered with the helmet, your breast with a coat of mail, your legs with greaves, and your whole body with the shield. Where can the enemy strike you when he finds you sheathed in steel? What have we to fear in attacking the naked bodies

---

<sup>27</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (Latin), pp. 262f.



of men who know not the use of armour? Is it their numbers? It is not so much the multitude of a host, as the valour of a few, which is decisive. Numbers, without discipline, are an hindrance to success in the attack, and to retreat in defeat. Your ancestors were often victorious when they were but a few against many. What, then, does the renown of your fathers, your practice of arms, your military discipline avail, unless they make you, few though you are in numbers, invincible against the enemy's hosts? But I close my discourse, as I perceive them rushing on, and I am delighted to see that they are advancing in disorder. Now, then, if any of you who this day are called to avenge the atrocities committed in the houses of God, against the priests of the Lord, and his little flock, should fall in the battle, I, in the name of your archbishop, absolve them from all spot of sin, in the name of the Father, whose creatures the foe hath foully and horribly slain, and of the Son, whose altars they have defiled, and of the Holy Ghost, from whose grace they have desperately fallen.<sup>28</sup>

While we have one independent account of the speech given on this occasion, that by Aelred of Rievaulx, Henry's version was adopted by several chroniclers: Matthew Paris, in both the Historia Minor and the Chronica Majora, Roger of Hoveden, and Roger of Wendover. In addition, Benedict of Peterborough took the speech and adapted parts of it to a different occasion.

In borrowing this speech for their own works, the several chroniclers made at least minor changes. To indicate what changes were made, the following numbers refer to the line numbers assigned above.

Roger of Hoveden made a number of changes, few of

---

<sup>28</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (English), pp. 267-9.

which change the meaning at all. They are as follows:<sup>29</sup>

- Line 2: omit enim.
- Line 4: reverse impune and nemo.
- Line 4: resistit instead of restitit.
- Line 5: ferax instead of ferox.
- Line 14: in patriam nostram instead of in patria nostra.
- Line 17: ii instead of hi.
- Line 18: violaverunt instead of violarunt.
- Line 19: praegnantibus instead of pugnantibus.
- Line 27: bellis instead of armis.
- Line 29: Tegite instead of Tegitur.
- Line 29: add ergo after Tegite.
- Line 29: vobis instead of nobis.
- Line 31: invenit instead of reperit.
- Line 32: ac instead of et.
- Line 34: efficit instead of conficit.
- Line 34: reverse efficit and bellum.
- Line 35: impedimento instead of inpedimento.
- Line 37: vestri instead of nostri.
- Lines 37-8: confert instead of conferet.
- Line 38: parentelae instead of parentalis.
- Line 38: solemnus instead of solennis.
- Line 42: nos instead of vos.
- Line 44: add et at the beginning of the line.
- Line 45: add eum after absolvimus.

Few if any of these changes are significant. Some change the person from first to second, or vice versa. Some are mere alterations in word order. Some merely substitute synonyms. Some are variant readings in the manuscripts of Henry's work. Some seem to be attempts to make more sense (as, for example, the use of praegnantibus—which reading, incidentally, Forester adopts in his translation of Henry, although the Rolls Series edition does read pugnantibus). All combined, however, it is quite clear that Roger adopts Henry's speech, following it very closely.

---

<sup>29</sup>Roger of Hoveden, (Latin), Vol. I, pp. 193f.

Roger of Wendover, in his Flowers of History, and Matthew Paris, who takes most of his Chronica Majora directly from Roger, also adopt this speech but with more alteration:<sup>30</sup>

- Lines 1-3: omit meminisse . . . qui et.
- Lines 3-4: omit et ubi . . . restitit.
- Lines 4-5: omit vos experta delituit; insert contremiscit.
- Line 5: add a before vobis.
- Line 5: some MSS have succumbit instead of succubuit.
- Line 7: move utraque to before se vobis.
- Line 8: omit autem.
- Lines 9-10: move aptior to the first of the clause.
- Lines 10-2: omit in quibus . . . gratia.
- Line 12: insert sit before verendi.
- Line 13: illi instead of hi.
- Line 14: add nunc before in.
- Line 14: in patriam nostram for in patria nostra.
- Line 15: dementes et ebrii for ebrii dementesque.
- Line 16: move vobis back after praesul.
- Line 16: omit et archipraesulis vestri loco situs.
- Line 17: move factum to before providentia.
- Line 18: polluerunt instead of cruentaverunt.
- Line 19: praegnantibus for pugnantibus.
- Lines 21-2: omit Quod . . . Deus.
- Lines 23-4: hostes nequissimos patria virtute instead of et adversus . . . patria.
- Lines 24-8: praescientia, conflagite, qui se nesciunt in bello armari, nec casus belli dubios suspicetis instead of praesentia . . . sentiatis.
- Line 29: vobis instead of nobis.
- Line 29: move galea caput to after lorica pectus.
- Line 30: et clipeo totum instead of totumque clipeo.
- Line 31: septem armis undique cernit instead of ferro septem circumspicit.
- Lines 31-2: Quid igitur inermes dubitatis et inertes? instead of Procedentes . . . dubitamus?
- Lines 33-9: omit sed non . . . vincatis?
- Line 40: loquendi instead of dicendi.
- Lines 40-1: conferunt hostes inordinate proruentes instead of suadet hostis inordinate proruens.

---

<sup>30</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), Vol. II, p. 168.

- Lines 41-2: dispersi confluentes, quod animo meo  
satis placet instead of et quod animo . . .  
confluens.
- Lines 42-5: Si quis denique vestrum pro Deo pugnans  
et patria occubuerit instead of Vos igitur  
. . . occubuerit.
- Line 45: add eum before ab.
- Line 47: peremerunt instead of destruxerunt.
- Line 48: polluerunt instead of maculaverunt.
- Lines 48-9: omit a quo . . . ceciderunt; add in its  
place, cujus gratiam, immania a perpetrantes  
et enormia, contempserunt.

Again, many of the changes Roger and Matthew made do not alter the meaning significantly: changing word order, using synonyms, sometimes even changing the person involved. Yet they have also made other revisions which do significantly affect the speech. Many passages have simply been omitted. The instances where whole passages have been replaced, however, do not change the general sense of the speech.

When Matthew Paris wrote his shorter Historia Minor he not only shortened the speech considerably, but also made much more extensive alterations. Yet the source is still unmistakable. The speech is as follows:

Proceres Angliae clarissimi, et Normannigenae,  
contra quos audax Francia contremiscit, quos  
Troja, flos Asiae, huc transmisit, erigite  
capita et pensate, quod populorum quisquiliae  
vos ad proelia provocaverunt; qui in hac patria  
templa Dei violarunt, presbiteros occiderunt,  
qui nec pueris nec pregnantibus pepercerunt.  
Suos procul dubio peccatum illaqueabit. Utquid  
inertes et inermes vos strenui et armati tim-  
eretis? Sed jam finem loquendi conferunt  
hostes inordinate prorumpentes et proruentes,  
atque dissute, quod satis animo meo dinoscitur  
complacere. Siquis autem vestrum pro Deo  
pugnans et patria succubuerit, et morte pia

occubuerit, absolvimus eum ab omni poena peccati.<sup>31</sup>

Most renowned nobles of England, Normans by birth, at whom gallant France trembles, whom Troy, the flower of Asia, sent here, arouse yourselves and consider that the trash of the peoples provoked you to battle, who in this land violated the temples of God, killed the priests, who spared neither children nor women with child. Beyond doubt their sin will trap them. Why do you, strong and armed, fear the incompetent and unarmed? But now the enemy bring an end of talking, attacking and rushing forth disorderly and in confusion, which is pleasing enough to my mind. If, however, any of you, fighting for God and country, should fall and die a pious death, we absolve him from all punishment for sin.

In much the same category is a speech in the chronicle of Benedict of Peterborough. It, too, is based on Henry's speech, but with extensive revisions. However, Benedict uses the model for an entirely different occasion, necessitating more extensive alterations. Benedict presents the following speech, supposedly given by the earl of Arundel to the army at Breteuil in 1173:

Proceres Normannigenae clarissimi, meminissi vos vestri nominis et generis praeliaturus decet. Perpendite ergo qui et contra quos, et ubi bellum gerere debeatis. Nemo vobis impune restitit, ferax enim Anglia, et dives Apulia, et Jerusalem famosa, et insignis Antiochia, vires vestras expertae, vobis succubuerunt. Nunc autem rex Franciae et sui, quos semper in patria sua petivimus et vicimus, in patriam nostram ritu transverso ebrii et dementes, proh pudor! convolaverunt. Attollite igitur animos, viri elegantes, et adversus nequissimum hostem freti praesentia, immo virtute Dei, exsurgite; tegeat vobis galea caput, lorica pectus, ocreae crura, totumque corpus clypeus; et ubi feriat hostis nudum non inveniat.

---

<sup>31</sup>Matthew Paris, *Historia Minor*, Vol. I, p. 259.

Et procedentes adversus nequissimos hostes quid dubitamus? An numerum? Sed non tam numerus multorum, quam virtus paucorum bellum efficit. Quid igitur confert vobis gloria parentelae, exercitatio sollemnis, disciplina militaris, nisi plures vincatis, cum sitis pauciores illis?

Praeterea considerate in cordibus vestris, quam injuste et contra praeceptum Dei rex Franciae temeritatem et errorem filiorum invictissimi regis Angliae domini nostri, contra eum et voluntatem ipsius fovet. Ponite ergo in Domino Deo spem vestram, et pugnate viriliter, quia Christus Filius Dei vivi, Qui factus est obediens Patri usque ad mortem, in mentibus filiorum regis domini nostri hodie filialem obedientiam inspirabit, vel ostendens Se Deum nolentem iniquitatem, hodie puniet scelus perfidorum Francigenarum, qui in tantum illos seduxerunt quod, ordine humanitatis oblito, et naturae lege soluta, insurrexerunt filii in parentem, in genitorem geniti.

Praeterea unum est, fortissimi proceres, quod vobis firmiter ingerere volo; quod nulla potest esse fugientibus reversio. Nam ita circumdati sumus undique hostibus nostris, et ideo quia nulla spes fugae est, hoc solum superest, ut vincamus vel occumbamus. Sed Deus Omnipotens, Cui judicat populos in aequitate, respiciat nos hodie oculis misericordiae Suae, et Qui per servum Suum David superbiam Goliae confregit, Ipse<sup>32</sup> conterat hodie superbiam inimicorum nostrorum.

Most renowned nobles of Norman birth, it is well that going to battle you remember who you and your ancestors are. Weigh carefully therefore how and against whom and where you are bound to wage war. No one resisted you with impunity, for fertile England, and rich Apulia, and famous Jerusalem, and noble Antioch, experiencing your strength, succumbed to you. Now however, the king of France and his men, whom we always have sought and conquered in their own land, madly reversing the order, are making an attack into our country, for shame! Rouse yourselves, then, gallant men, and rise up against the most evil enemy, relying on the presence, rather the power, of God. A helmet covers your head, a coat of mail the breast, greaves the legs, and a shield the whole body;

---

<sup>32</sup>Benedict of Peterborough, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 52f.

so where the enemy may strike he will not find it bare. And what do we doubt, proceeding against the most evil enemies? Is it their numbers? It is not so much the number of a multitude as the valor of a few that is decisive in war. What, then, does the renown of your fathers, your practice of arms, your military discipline avail, unless you conquer many when you are fewer than they?

Furthermore, consider in your hearts to what extent, unjustly and against the precept of God, the king of France supports the rashness and error of the sons of the most invincible king of England, our lord, against him and his will. Therefore put your hope in the Lord God, and fight bravely since Christ, Son of the living God, Who was made obedient to the Father even unto death, today will either inspire filial obedience in the minds of the sons of the king our lord, or, showing that God Himself does not wish evil, he will today punish the wickedness of the treacherous French who lead them away in so much that, having forgotten the order of humanity and broken the law of nature, the sons rose up against the parent, the begotten against the father.

Moreover, there is one thing, most brave nobles, that I want to stress firmly; that it is not possible to turn back as fugitives. For we are surrounded on all sides by our enemies, and therefore, since there is no hope of flight, this alone remains, that we conquer or we fall. But the Omnipotent God, Who judges the peoples in equity, may behold us today with the eyes of His mercy, and He Who crushed the haughtiness of Goliath through His servant David, Himself may consume the haughtiness of our enemies today.

The first half of this speech was clearly taken from Henry's account of the Battle of the Standard. However, to fit the occasion for which he was using it, Benedict took only part of Henry's speech, and added to it material adapted from a letter from the king of Sicily.<sup>33</sup> This was the only

---

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., Vol. I, p. 53.

instance of this nature discovered. Often, chroniclers would borrow and alter an earlier account of a speech, but Benedict has combined two entirely different sources to write this speech. Furthermore, the normal practice apparently was to take an earlier account of a speech and use it in describing the same event. But Benedict has taken the speech for an entirely different occasion.

Independently of Henry, Aelred of Rievaulx wrote a speech in his short tract describing the Battle of the Standard. Aelred must have been in a rather difficult position regarding this battle, for on one side was David, king of the Scots, in whose household Aelred had grown up, and on the other was Walter Espec, the founder of Rievaulx, and the northern barons who were Aelred's friends and neighbors. Afterwards, Aelred was one of those present when Walter handed over his castle at Wark to David. Thus, Aelred was not only in the general area, but knew the principal characters involved, and took part himself in some of the secondary activities. Aelred's speech is attributed to Walter Espec:

Non inutile est, inquit, viri fortissimi, si senem juvenes audiatis; me dico, qui multorum temporum vicissitudine, mutatione regum, et diversis bellorum eventibus didici et praeterita revolvere, et aestimare praesentia, et secundum praeterita de praesentibus, secundum praesentia de futuris capere conjecturam. Et certe si omnes, qui me audiunt, saperent et intelligerent, et ea quae nobis hodie ventura sunt praeviderent, silerem libentius et sompno meo requiescerem, vel luderem aleis, aut confligerem scaccis, vel si ea aetati meae minus congruerent,



legendis historiis operam darem, vel more meo veterum gesta narranti aurem attentius commodarem. Nunc autem video plerosque de proelio certos, incertos de victoria, fluctuare animo, timere vehementer ne paucitatem nostram immensae copiae Scottorum absorbeant; cum non ex multitudine victoria pendeat, vel viribus adquiratur, sed justis votis causaque honesta ab Omnipotente impetretur. Ego sane considerans qua ratione, qua causa, qua necessitate, qui adversus quos hodie dimicemus, sto intrepidus, tam securus de victoria quam de proelio certus. Cur enim de victoria desperemus, cum victoria generi nostro quasi in feudum data sit ab Altissimo? Nonne proavi nostri maximam Galliae portionem cum paucis invasere militibus, et ab ea cum gente etiam ipsum Galliae nomen eraserunt. Quotiens ab eis Francorum est fusus exercitus; quotiens a Cenomanensibus, Andegavensibus, Aquitanensibus, pauci de multis, victoriam reportarunt? Certe patres nostri et nos hanc insulam, quam quondam victoriosissimus Julius, non sine multa suorum strage, post multos annos vix tandem optinuit, in brevi edomuimus, in brevi nostris subdidimus legibus, nostris obsequiis mancipavimus. Vidimus, vidimus oculis nostris, regem Franciae cum universo suo exercitu nobis terga vertentem, optimos quosque regni ejus proceres a nobis captos, alios redimi, alios mancipari vinculis, alios carcere condempnari. Quis Apuliam, Siciliam, Calabriam, nisi vester Normannus edomuit? Nonne uterque Imperator eadem die, eadem fere hora, terga vertit Normannis, cum alter adversus patrem, alter adversus filium dimicaret? Quis igitur non rideat, potius quam timeat, quod adversus tales vilis Scottus seminudus natibus pugnaturus occurrit? Isti sunt, isti sunt utique qui non resistendum nobis quondam sed cedendum putarunt, cum Angliae victor Willelmus Laodoniam, Calatriam, Scotiam usque ad Abernith penetraret, ubi bellicosus ille Malcolmus deditioe factus est noster; et nunc victores suos, dominos suos bello provocant; lanceis nostris, gladiis et telis nostris nudum obiciunt coriam; pelle vitulina pro scuto utentes; irrationabili mortis contemptu, magis quam viribus animati. Quid ergo hastarum illarum, quas eminus intuemur, nimia longitudo nos terret? Sed lignum fragile est, ferrum obtunsum, dum ferit perit, dum impingitur frangitur, vix ad unum ictum sufficiens. Excipe illus saltem baculo, et inermis Scottus astat. An multitudinem expavescimus?

Sed quanto vincendorum major numerus, tanto vincens gloria major. Taceo quid de ipso numero sentiam, ne futurae gloriae nostrae aliquid detrudere videar. An pro causa diffidimus? Sed non injustum bellum pro rege nostro suscipimus, qui regnum non, ut hostes calumpniantur, invasit indebitum, sed suscepit oblatum; quem populus petiit, quem clerus elegit, quem unxit pontifex, quem in regnum Apostolica confirmavit auctoritas. Sed, ut interim de rege taceamus, nullus certe justum negabit, quod pro patria arma suscipimus; quod pro uxoribus nostris, pro liberis nostris, pro ecclesiis nostris dimicamus, imminens periculum propulsantes. Urget enim necessitas. Recolite quid in Transtianis partibus egerint, nec mitiora sperate si vicerint Scotti. Taceo caedes, rapinas, incendia, quae humano quodammodo more exercentur ab hostibus: talia dicam, qualia nec fabulae ferunt, nec narrant historiae a crudelissimis acta tyrannis. Dicam, inquam, si non praenimio horrore sermo defecerit, aut auditor aufugerit. Nulli aetati, nulli ordini, nulli omnino sexui pepercerunt; nobiles, tam pueri quam puellae, ducti sunt in captivitatem; pudica matrimonia incredibili libidine vexata sunt; parvuli jactati in aera, et aculeis lancearum excepti, delectabile spectaculum Galwensibus praebuerunt; praegnans mulier per medium secabatur, tener foetus, extractus ab utero, impia manu ad saxum allidebatur. Lassati innocentium caede, illotis cultellis, quibus miserorum effuderant viscera, carnes quas vorarent incidebant; humanumque sanguinem miscentes aqua, crudeli poculo sitim sedabant, dicentes se felicissimos quos in illud tempus fortuna servaverat, quo Gallorum sanguinem bibere potuissent. Casu inventi sunt in eadem domo plures parvuli. Stabat Galwensis, et unum post unum utroque pede arripiens, caput allidebat ad postem. Quos cum in unum coegisset acervum, ridens versus socium, "Ecce," inquit, "quot Gallos hodie solus occidi." Horreo dicere quomodo ingressi sunt templum Dei, quomodo polluerunt sanctuarium ejus, quomodo salutis Christianae sacramenta pedibus conculcaverunt. Quid agitis, o viri fortissimi? Non adversus homines dimicatis sed adversus bestias, quibus nihil humanitatis, nihil inest pietatis; quos coelum horret, quod abominatur terra, quos execrantur maris, quos ipsa mundi lumina detestantur; quos non ob aliud terra non absorbit, non fulminavit coelum, non maris submerserunt, nisi ut vestris victoriis

servarentur, vestris manibus interirent. Consecrate manus vestras in sanguine peccatorum: felices quorum hodie manus ad suas ulciscendas injurias Christus elegit. Festinate, et nefandum hoc genus hominum terris obruite, inferis sepel-  
ite, ne, si diutius vixerint, sol lumen abscondat, coelum neget pluvias, fruges quadam ariditate marcescant. Cogitate regem absentem, quantumque vestrae accedet gloriae, cum reportaveritis de rege sine rege triumphum. Vestra erit curia, vestrum erit regnum, vestris consiliis omnia tractabuntur, per quos hodie regi regnum, regno pax, paci gloria perquiretur: fatebitur rex se hodie manibus vestris iterum coronatum. Secure igitur congregiamur, cum nobis sit causa justior, manus fortior; quos urget necessitas, quos gloria provocat, quibus divinum auxilium praesto est, cum quibus tota coelestis curia dimicabit. Aderit Michael cum angelis suam ulturus injuriam, cujus ecclesiam humano sanguine foedaverunt, cujus altare superposito capite humano polluerunt. Petrus cum Apostolis pugnabit pro nobis, quorum basilicas nunc in stabulum, nunc in prostibulum converterunt. Sancti martyres nostra praecedent agmina, quorum incenderunt memorias, quorum atria caedibus impleverunt. Virgines sanctae licet pugnae dubitent interesse, pro nobis tam oratione pugnabunt. Amplius dico, ipse Christus apprehendet arma et scutum, et exurget in adjutorium nobis. Ipsi enim veniunt ad nos in superbia; nos cum humilitate procedimus. Illi carnes raptas quas voraverunt eructant; nos post sacra jejunia Christi carne et sanguine saginamur. Illos histriones, saltatores et saltatrices, nos crux Christi et reliquiae Sanctorum antecedunt. Sed quid moror? Certe aut vincendum nobis est, aut moriendum. Quis enim victoriae Scottorum se velit esse superstitem, ut videat uxorem suam Scottorum subjacere libidini, parvulos suos lanceis perforari?<sup>34</sup>

It would be useful, bravest men, he said, for you young men to listen to an old man; to me, I say, who by the vicissitude of many years, by change

---

<sup>34</sup>Aelred of Rievaulx, Relatio de Standardo, in Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I., Vol. III, ed. by Richard Howlett, Rolls Series, Vol. 82:3 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1886; Kraus Reprint, 1964), pp. 185-9.

of kings, and by diverse events of wars, have learned to reexamine the past, to think about the present, and to interpret the present as it follows from the past, the future following the present. And certainly if all who hear me would understand and comprehend, and those who are going to come to us today would foresee, I would gladly keep silence and lie quietly in my sleep, or I might play the gambler, or battle with chess men, or, if these correspond less to my age, I might concern myself with historical stories, or by my custom I might supply the ear, carefully narrating deeds from the ancient authors. Now, however, I see the greatest part certain of battle, uncertain of victory; the spirit wavers, greatly fears lest the immense multitudes of Scots absorb our few; but victory does not depend on a multitude, or require strength, but may be obtained from the Omnipotent by just vows and an honest cause. I, truly considering by what reason, by what cause, by what necessity, against whom we fight today, I stand calm, as secure of victory as certain of battle. For why should we despair of victory, when victory has been given to our people as if in fief by the Highest? Did not our ancestors invade the greatest part of Gaul with few knights, and erase along with the people the name of Gaul itself from it. How many times was the army of Franks beaten down by them; how many times from the Cenomani, the Andegavi, the Aquitainians, did the few bring back victory over the many? Certainly our fathers and we, in a short time, subdued this island, which formerly the most victorious Julius, not without great losses of his men, after many years barely got ahold of; in a short time we put it under our laws, we have transferred it to our allegiance. We saw, we saw with our own eyes, the king of France with all his army turning their backs to us, the best and noble of his realm taken by us, some to be sold back, some to be sold with chains, some to be condemned to prison. Who conquered Apulia, Sicily, Calabria, but you? Did not both Emperors on the same day, almost at the same hour, flee from the Normans, when the one fought against the father, the other against the son? Who therefore does not laugh rather than fear because he is going to fight against such vile Scots with half-naked asses? These, these are the ones who once thought they ought not resist us but ought yield, when William conqueror of England penetrated

Laodonia, Calatria, and Scotia up to Abernith, where that bellicose Malcolm surrendered to us; and now they provoke their victors, their lords, to war; they offer their naked hide to our lances, swords and spears; using calf skin for a shield; with an irrational contempt of death more than with strength of spirit. Why, therefore, does the excessive length of their spears, which we see from a distance, scare us? But it is fragile wood; hitting iron, when it strikes it, it is destroyed; when it is pressed on, it is broken, scarcely sufficing for one blow. Only remove that stick and the Scot will stand unarmed. Or are you afraid of the multitude? But the greater the number of the conquered, so much greater the glory to the conquerors. I keep silence about what I think of the number itself, lest I seem to detract some from our future glory. Or for what cause do we despair? But we do not undertake an unjust war for our king, who did not invade a kingdom not due to him, as the enemy falsely accuse, but one that had been presented to him; the people sought him, the clergy elected him, the priest annointed him, the Apostolic authority confirmed him in the kingdom. But, even though we keep silent about the king, certainly none will deny the justice of our cause insofar as we take up arms for our country; because we fight for our wives, for our children, for our churches, driving back imminent danger. For necessity urges us. Recall what they did in the Transtinan areas, nor hope for gentler treatment if the Scot should conquer us. I pass over the slaughter, rapine, burning, which are practiced by the enemy in a way as human custom: I should say, neither fables report nor histories tell of so great, of such acts by the cruellest tyrants. I would say, I tell you, if language did not fail before so much horror, or the listener would not flee from it. They spared no ages, no ranks, certainly no sex; nobles, boys, girls are led into captivity; chaste marriages are attacked with incredible lust; little ones thrown into the air and caught by the barbs of lances; a pregnant woman was cut open, the small foetus, extracted from the uterus, was dashed against a rock by the impious hand. Exhausted by the murder of innocents, with dirty small knives, by which they poured out the bowels of the wretched, they cut up flesh which they then devoured; and mixing human blood with water, they quenched their thirst with a cruel drinking

cup, saying that they were most happy whom fortune had preserved that time, who were able to drink the blood of Gauls. By chance, more little ones were found in the same house. A Galwegian stood, and seizing each one in turn by the foot, he dashed its head on the door post. When he had gathered them together in one heap, he said, laughing toward his comrade, "Behold how many Gauls I alone killed today." I dread to say in what manner they entered the temple of God, in what manner they defiled his sanctuary, in what manner they trampled under their feet the Christian sacrament of salvation. What do you do, o bravest men? You do not fight against men but against beasts, in whom there is nothing of humanity, nothing of piety; at whom heaven shudders, whom the earth detests, whom the seas curse, whom the lights of the world themselves detest; whom on account of nothing else has the land not swallowed, heaven not struck down, the seas not drowned, than that they might be saved for our victory, that they might perish by our hands. Consecrate your hands in the blood of sinners: happy the hands of those Christ chooses today for avenging his injuries. Hurry and bury with dirt this unspeakable sort of men, bury them dead, lest, if they live longer, the sun hide its light, the heaven refuse rain, the grain drying out begin to droop. Consider that the king is absent, and to what extent it will be added to your glory when you will have won a triumph for the king without the king. Yours will be the court, yours will be the realm, all will be managed with your counsels, through whom today the kingdom for the king, peace for the kingdom, and glory for the peace, is sought: the king will say he is crowned again by your hands today. Therefore let us fight securely, since ours is the juster cause, the stronger power; whom necessity urges, whom glory stimulates, to whom divine aid is at hand, with whom the whole court of heaven will fight. Michael will be present with angels going to avenge his injury, whose church they have defiled with human blood, whose altar they polluted by placing a human head on it. Peter with the Apostles will fight for us, whose churches they converted sometimes into a stable, sometimes into a brothel. The holy martyrs will precede our armies, whose shrines they have burned, whose halls they filled with corpses. The virgins may doubt whether to take part in a holy battle is

permitted them, however they will fight by prayer for us. Moreover, I say, Christ Himself will take up arms and shield, and rise up in aid of us. For those come to us in arrogance; we proceed with humility. They vomit up the seized flesh which they devoured; we after a sacred fast are nourished by the body and blood of Christ. Actors, dancers and dancing girls precede them, the cross of Christ and relics of Saints precede us. But why do I delay? Certainly either conquering or dying is for us. For who would wish to be a survivor of a victory of the Scots, that he might see his wife thrown to the lusts of the Scots, his little ones pierced by lances?

Aelred's account of Walter's speech is in some respects unique among battle orations. Of most note is the simple fact that, of all the battle orations discovered in research for this study, this one alone contains such bloody, detailed descriptions of the barbarities of the enemy. Often the speaker calls the foe enemies of God and Christ, polluters of churches, threats to their own families, and the like. But only here are detailed descriptions given of the most savage actions of their enemies. Sometimes, gory details are related by the chronicler, but only Aelred includes them in a battle oration. For example, Henry of Huntingdon mentions the savagery of the men from Galloway, giving some of the same examples, yet in his battle oration only one sentence is devoted to this aspect of the enemy and the invasion.

Furthermore, Aelred's battle oration contains more real hatred of the enemy than any other that was discovered. The normal battle oration seems more formalized. It asks

the knights to fight the enemy, to kill them for being bad people, or to die for glory and/or Christ. But Aelred's speech goes far beyond the normal limits: the enemy here are totally despicable, alive only that they may be wiped off the face of the earth by these Normans. And if they do not succeed, so horrible is this enemy that not only they and their families will be exposed to the savagery of these beasts, but the very earth itself will suffer. The amount of gory detail, and the hatred included in this speech, set it apart from the other battle orations.

Powicke explains Aelred's account and the attitude toward the enemy that it portrays by claiming that what the northern barons resented was not so much the incursion of the Scots, who were much like themselves in culture, as the presence in the Scottish army "of barbarians, of Picts and Galloway men, side by side with the feudal host of Scotland."<sup>35</sup> If this is indeed the case, one must wonder why in the speech the reference is so often to the Scots and so seldom to Galwegians, and never to Picts.

Henry of Huntingdon wrote three speeches in his description of the Battle of Lincoln in 1141 that were adopted by at least two other chroniclers. Here, again, is an example of the relatively rare practice of giving battle

---

<sup>35</sup>Walter Daniel, The Life of Ailred of Rievaulx, trans. by F.M. Powicke (New York: Oxford University Press, 1951), p. xlii.



orations for both sides. Unlike the speech before the Battle of the Standard, no case was discovered of any of these speeches being adapted for a different occasion by another chronicler.

In this battle, on one side was the Earl of Chester and Earl Robert of Gloucester, with their retainers and many other nobles exiled by King Stephen. On the other side was Stephen and those loyal to him. In Henry's account the two speeches against Stephen are given first, a short one by the Earl of Chester and a longer, more typical battle oration by Earl Robert. The Earl of Chester spoke first:

1 Gratias tibi multas, dux invictissime, vobisque,  
proceres et commilitones mei, cum summa devotione  
persolvo, qui usque ad vitae periculum amoris ef-  
fectum mihi magnanimiter exhibuistis. Cum igitur  
5 sim vobis causa periculi, dignum est ut periculo  
me prius ingeram, et infidissimi regis, qui datis  
induciis pacem fregit, aciem prius illidam. Ego  
quidem tam de regis injustitia quam de mea con-  
fidens virtute, jam jam regalem cuneum diffindam,  
10 gladio mihi viam per hostes medios parabo. Vestrae  
virtutis est sequi praeuntem, et imitari percuti-  
entem. Jam videor animo mihi praesago regias acies  
transvolare, proceres pedibus conculcare, regem

ipsum gladio transverberare.<sup>36</sup>

Receive my hearty thanks, most puissant earl, and you, my noble fellow-soldiers, for that you are prepared to risk your lives in testimony of your devotion to me. But since it is through me that you are called to encounter this peril, it is fitting that I should myself bear the brunt of it, and be foremost in the attack on this faithless king, who has broken the peace to which he is pledged. While I, therefore, animated by my own valour, and the remembrance of the king's perfidy, throw myself on the king's troops, and hew a road through the centre of his army, it will be your part, brave soldiers, to follow up my success. I have a strong presage that we shall put the king's troops to the rout, trample under foot his nobles, and strike himself with the sword.<sup>37</sup>

The speech is then followed by an address by the Earl of Gloucester:

1 Non indignum est quod ictus primi dignitatem poscis,  
tam ex nobilitate quam virtute qua praecellis. Si  
tamen de nobilitate contendas, ego filius regis  
nobilissimi et nepos summi regis non antecellor;  
5 si de virtute, hic multi sunt electissimi, quibus  
nemo viventium probitate potest praeferri. Sed  
longe alia me movet ratio. Rex enim, contra sacra-  
menta quae sorori meae fecit, regnum crudeliter  
usurpavit, et omnia conturbans multis millibus causa  
10 necis extitit, et exemplo sui nihil juris habentibus  
terras distribuit, jure possidentibus diripuit. Ab

---

<sup>36</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (Latin), p. 268.

<sup>37</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (English), p. 274.

ipsis ergo nequiter dehaeredatis, summo iudice Deo  
cooperante et vindictam subministrante, prius ag-  
grediendus est. Respiciet, qui iudicat populos in  
15 aequitate, de excelso coelorum habitaculo, et in-  
justum juste appetentes in hac tanta necessitate ne-  
quaquam relinquet. Unum vero est, proceres for-  
tissimi militesque universi, quod vobis animo  
firmiter ingerere volo, quod per paludes, quas vix  
20 pertransistis, nulla potest esse fugientibus reversio.  
Hic igitur vel vincendum vel occumbendum; spes fugae  
nulla; hoc solum superest, ut in urbem gladiis viam  
paretis. Si quid autem veri conjecturat animus  
mihi, hoc quod fugere nusquam potestis, illud est  
25 quod hodie Deo vobis adjuvante victoriam praestabit.  
Necesse est enim ut ad probitatem confugiat, cui  
non potest aliud esse diffugium. Cives autem Lin-  
colnienses, qui stant urbi suae proximi, in impetus  
gravedine animis liquescentibus ad domos suas trans-  
30 fugere victoriosi videbitis. Veruntamen contra quos  
bellum geratis attendite. Alanus Britonum dux con-  
tra vos, immo contra Deum, procedit armatus; vir  
nefandus, et omnium genere scelerum pollutus, malitia  
paris nescius, cui nunquam nocendi defuit affectus,  
35 cui se non esse crudelitate incomparabilem solum et  
supremum videtur opprobrium. Procedit quoque con-  
tra vos comes Mellensis, doli callidus, fallendi

artifex, cui innata est in corde nequitia, in ore  
fallacia, in opere pigritia, corde gloriosus, ore  
40 magnificus, opere pusillanimis, ad congregiendum  
ultimus, ad digrediendum primus, tardus ad pugnam,  
velox ad fugam. Procedit contra vos Hugo consul,  
cui parum visum est se contra imperatricem perjurum  
fuisse, nisi et secundo se patentissime perjuraret,  
45 affirmans regem Henricum Stephano regnum concessisse,  
et filiam suam abdicasse, qui nimirum fallaciam vir-  
tutem credit, et elegantiae perjurium ducit. Pro-  
cedit consul de Albemarle, vir in crimine singularis  
constantiae, ad agendum volubilis, ad relinquendum  
50 immobilis, quam sponsa sua causa spurcitiae intoler-  
abilis fugitiva reliquit. Procedit consul ille, qui  
consuli praedicto sponsam abripuit, adulter patentis-  
simus et excellenter impurus, Baccho devotus, Marti  
ignotus, vino redolens, bellis insolens. Procedit  
55 Simon comes Hamtoniensis, cujus actus sola locutio,  
cujus datum sola promissio, qui cum dicit, fecit,  
cum promittit, dedit. Procedunt caeteri consules et  
proceres regi suo consimiles, latrociniis assueti,  
rapinis delibuti, homicidiis saginati, omnes tandem  
60 perjuria contaminati. Vos igitur, viri fortissimi,  
quos magnus rex Henricus erexit, iste dejecit,—ille  
instruxit, iste destruxit,—erigite animos, et de  
virtutibus vestris, immo de Dei justitia confisi,

vindictam vobis a Deo oblatam de facinorosis prae-  
65 sumite, et gloriam immarcessibilem vobis et posteris  
vestris praefigite. Et jam, si vobis idem animus  
est, ad hoc Dei iudicium perpetrandum progressionem  
vovete, fugam abjurate, erectis in coelum unanimiter  
dextris.<sup>38</sup>

It is fitting that you should have the honor of striking the first blow, both on account of your high rank and your exceeding valour. If, indeed, it were a question of rank only, no one has higher pretensions than myself, the son and nephew of mighty kings; and for valour, there are many here who stand among the most renowned, to whom no man living can be preferred. But I am actuated by considerations of a very different kind. The king has inhumanly usurped the crown, faithless to the fealty which he swore to my sister, and by the disorder he has occasioned has caused the slaughter of many thousands; and by the example he has set of an illegal distribution of lands, has destroyed the rights of property. The first onset ought, therefore, to be made by those he has disinherited, with whom the God of justice will cooperate, and make them the ministers of his just punishment. He who judgeth the people with equity will look down from his habitation in the heavens above, and will not desert those who are seeking for justice in this their hour of need. There is one thing, however, brave nobles and soldiers all, which I wish to impress on your minds. There is no possibility of retreat over the marshes which you have just crossed with difficulty. Here, therefore, you must either conquer or die; for there is no hope of safety in flight. The only course that remains is, to open a way to the city with your swords. If my mind conjectures truly, as flee you cannot, by God's help you will this day triumph. Those must rely wholly on their valour who have no other refuge. You, victorious, will see the citizens of Lincoln, who stand in array nearest their walls, give way before the impetuosity of your attack and, with faint hearts,

---

<sup>38</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (Latin), pp. 268-71.

seek the shelter of their houses. Listen, while I tell you with whom you have to do. There is Alan, earl of Brittany, in arms against us, nay against God himself; a man so execrable, so polluted with every sort of wickedness, that his equal in crime cannot be found; who never lost an opportunity of doing evil, and who would think it his deepest disgrace, if any one else could be put in comparison with him for cruelty. Then, we have opposed to us the Earl of Mellent, crafty, perfidious; whose heart is naturally imbued with dishonesty, his tongue with fraud, his bearing with cowardice. Vain-glorious in temper and boastful in words, he is pusillanimous in deeds; slow in advance, quick in retreat, the last in fight, the first in flight. Next, we have against us Earl Hugh, who not only makes light of his breach of fealty against the empress, but has perjured himself most patently a second time; affirming that King Henry conferred the crown on Stephen and that the king's daughter abdicated in his favour; and this man considers fraud to be a virtue, and perjury to be admired. Then we have the Earl of Albemarle, a man singularly consistent in his wicked courses, prompt to embark in them, incapable of relinquishing them; from whom his wife was compelled to become a fugitive, on account of his intolerable filthiness. The earl also marches against us who carried off the countess just named; a most flagrant adulterer, and a most eminent bawd, a slave to Bacchus, but no friend to Mars; redolent of wine, indolent in war. With him comes Simon, earl of Northampton, who never acts, but talks, who never gives, but promises, who thinks that when he has said a thing he has done it, when he has promised he has performed. /Here Forester includes in brackets a sentence from one of the MSS, not included in the Rolls Series edition of the text./ So of the rest of Stephen's nobles: they are like their king; practised in robbery, rapacious for plunder, steeped in blood, and all alike tainted with perjury. You, brave nobles, whom the late King Henry exalted, this Stephen has humbled; whom the one raised, the other ruined. Rouse yourselves, and relying on your valour, nay rather on God's justice, take the vengeance which He offers you on these iniquitous men, and gain for yourselves and your posterity immortal renown. If you are of one mind in executing the divine judgment, swear to advance,

execrate retreat, and, in token of it, unanimously raise your hands to heaven.<sup>39</sup>

On the other side, Stephen arranged his troops and, since he himself did not have a clear voice, had Baldwin FitzGilbert exhort the army.

1 Omnes qui aciebus dispositis conflicturi sunt, tria  
praevidisse oportet, primum justitiam causae, deinde  
militum copiam, postremo adstantium probitatem. Jus-  
titiam causae, ne periculum animae incurratur; copiam  
5 militum, ne hostium numerositate comprimatur; probi-  
tatem adstantium, ne numero confisa debilibus tamen  
innixa subruatur. In his omnibus negotium, quo  
tenemur, expeditum conspiciamus. Causae namque  
nostrae justitia est, quod regi ea quae coram Deo  
10 vovimus servantes, contra suos in eum perjuros in  
periculo mortis adstamus. Numerus vero nobis in  
equitibus non inferior, in peditibus confertior.  
Probitatem vero tot consulum, tot procerum, militum  
quoque bellis assuetorum semper, quis vocibus ex-  
15 aequet? Virtus autem ipsius regis infinita vobis  
loco perstabit millium. Cum igitur sit in medio  
vestrum dominus vester, unctus. Domini, cui fidem  
devovistis, votum Deo persolvite, tanto donativum  
majus a Deo accepturi, quanto fidelius et constan-  
20 tius pro rege vestro, fidi contra infidos, legitimi

---

<sup>39</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (English), pp. 274-6.

contra perjuros pugnaveritis. Securi quinetiam et  
summa repleti confidentia, contra quos bellum geratis  
perpendite. Roberti ducis vires notae sunt. Ipse  
quidem de more multum minatur, parum operatur; ore  
25 leoninus, corde leporinus, clarus eloquentia, ob-  
scurus inertia. Consul autem Cestrensis, vir audac-  
iae irrationabilis, promptus ad conspirandum, in-  
constans ad perficiendum, ad bellum impetuosus,  
periculi improvidus, altiora se machinans, impossi-  
30 bilibus anhelans, assiduorum paucos adducens, con-  
venarum dispersam multitudinem congregans, nihil  
habet quod timeri debeat. Semper enim, quicquid  
viriliter incepit, effeminate reliquit. In omnibus  
quippe gestis suis infortunate rem agens, vel in  
35 congressibus victus aufugit, vel si raro victor ex-  
titit, majora victis detrimenta sustinuit. Walenses  
autem quos secum adduxit solos, vobis despectui sint,  
qui inermem bello praeferunt temeritatem, et arte et  
usu belli carentes, quasi pecora decurrunt in venabula.  
40 Alii vero, tam proceres quam milites, transfugae et  
gyrovagi, utinam numero plures adducerentur, qui quan-  
to numero plures, tanto effectu deteriores. Vos  
igitur consules, et viri consulares, meminisse nam-  
que vos decet vestrae virtutis et nobilitatis, hodie  
45 probitates vestras numerosas in cacumen florentis-  
simum extollite, et patrum imitatores filiis vestris



splendorem sempiternum relinquite. Assiduitas itaque  
victoriarum incentivum sit vobis conflagrandi; assidu-  
itas infortuniorum incentivum fiet illis fugiendi.

50 Jam siquidem, nec fallor, eos advenisse poenitet;  
jam de fuga meditantur, si locorum asperitas admittat.  
Cum ergo nec illis conflagrare nec confugere sit  
possibile, quid aliud egerunt, nisi quod vobis, Dei  
nutu, et se et impedimenta sua obtulerunt? Equos  
55 itaque eorum et arma, et ipsorum corpora, ditioni  
vestrae subjecta conspiciatis. Extendite igitur animos  
vestros, et dexteras inexpugnabiles, viri bellicosi,  
ad diripiendum cum summo tripudio quod ipse vobis  
obtulit Deus.<sup>40</sup>

All ye who are now about to engage in battle must consider three things: first, the justice of your cause; secondly, the number of your force; and thirdly, its bravery: the justice of the cause, that you may not peril your soul; the number of your force, that it may not be overwhelmed by the enemy; its valour, lest, trusting to numbers, cowardice should occasion defeat. The justice of your cause consists in this, that we maintain, at the peril of our lives, our allegiance to the king, before God, against those of his subjects who are perjured to him. In numbers, we are not inferior in cavalry, stronger in infantry. As to the valour of so many barons, so many earls, and of our soldiers long trained to war, what words can to it justice? Our most valiant king will alone stand in place of a host. Your sovereign, the anointed of the Lord, will be in the midst of you; to him, then, to whom you have sworn fealty, keep your oaths in the sight of God, persuaded that He will grant you his aid according as you faithfully and steadfastly fight for your king, as true men

---

<sup>40</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (Latin), pp. 272f.

against the perjured, as loyal men against traitors. Fearing nothing, then, and filled with the utmost confidence, learn against whom you have to fight. The power of Earl Robert is well known; but it is his custom to threaten much and do little; with the mouth of a lion and the heart of a hare, he is loud in talk, but dull in action. The Earl of Chester is a man of reckless audacity, ready for a plot, not to be depended on in carrying it out, rash in battle, careless of danger; with designs beyond his powers, aiming at impossibilities; having few steady followers, but collecting a confused multitude; there is nothing to be feared from him. None of his undertakings prosper; he is either defeated in battle, or, if by chance he obtains a victory, his losses are greater than those of the conquered. You may despise the Welsh he has brought with him, as ill armed and recklessly rash; and being unskilled and unpractised in the art of war, they are ready to fall like wild beasts into the toils. For the other nobles and knights, they are traitors and turncoats,<sup>41</sup> the more there are the less are they to be feared. Ye, then, earls, and men having pretensions to that rank, ought to be mindful of your valour and renown. Raise your military virtues this day to the highest pitch, and, following the examples of your fathers, leave to your children undying glory. Let the determination to conquer be your incentive to fight, while the certainty of defeat is theirs to fly. Already, if I am not mistaken, they repent of their coming, and their thought is of retreat, if the difficulties of their position permit it. Since, then, they can neither fight nor fly, what remains but that, by God's will, they surrender themselves and their baggage to you? Lift up then your hearts, and stretch out your hands, soldiers, exultingly, to take the prey which God Himself offers to you.<sup>42</sup>

These three speeches were then adopted by two chroniclers, Roger of Hoveden and John of Marmoutier. In both

---

<sup>41</sup>Forester includes a phrase here that appears in one MS but not in the Rolls Series edition.

<sup>42</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (English), pp. 277f.

cases, the writers made relatively few changes. In Roger's chronicle, the following alterations were made. Again, locations are indicated using the line numbers assigned above.

The speech by the Earl of Chester is adopted by Roger verbatim. The speech by the Earl of Gloucester is altered slightly:

- Line 4: change the word order to read nepos regis summi.
- Line 9: militibus instead of millibus.
- Line 12: omit ergo.
- Line 24: add et before hoc.
- Line 27: reverse esse and aliud.
- Line 33: reverse scelerum and genere.
- Line 34: parem instead of paris.
- Line 38: reverse nequitia and in corde.
- Line 39: reverse gloriosus and corde.
- Line 40: magnanimus instead of magnificus (although some MSS of Henry read magnanimus.)
- Lines 39-40: reverse magnanimus and ore.
- Line 40: reverse pusillanimus and opere.
- Line 44: omit se.
- Line 49: audiendum instead of agendum.
- Line 50: quem instead of quam.
- Line 56: datus instead of datum.
- Line 57: omit consules et.
- Line 58: omit suo.
- Line 60: perjurio instead of perjuria.
- Line 65: omit vobis et.
- Line 66: at instead of et.

A few changes are also made in Baldwin's speech:

- Lines 3 and 6: astantium instead of adstantium.
- Line 7: reverse omnibus and his.
- Line 8: videmus instead of conspicimus.
- Line 11: astamus instead of adstamus.
- Line 14: reverse semper and assuetorum.
- Lines 14-5: exequetur instead of exaequet.
- Line 20: fideles instead of fidi.
- Line 20: infideles instead of infidos.
- Lines 30-1: advenarum instead of convenarum.
- Line 32: quo instead of quod.

Line 37: soli instead of solos.  
Line 37: reverse despective and vobis.  
Lines 43-4: omit namque vos.  
Lines 48-9: omit assiduitas . . . fugiendi.  
Line 52: igitur instead of ergo.  
Line 53: fecerunt instead of egerunt.  
Line 54: obtulerint instead of obtulerunt.  
Line 56: ergo instead of igitur.  
Line 59: attulit instead of obtulit.<sup>43</sup>

John of Marmoutier, in using these three speeches for his own chronicle, made somewhat more extensive revisions. In the Earl of Chester's speech he only made three:

Line 1: omit tibi.  
Line 1: add igitur before multas.  
Lines 3-4: affectum instead of effectum.

In Earl Robert's speech, more changes were made:

Line 2: praecellentia instead of virtute qua praecellis.  
Line 3: omit regis.  
Lines 7-8: post sacramentum quod instead of contra sacramenta quae.  
Line 19: omit vix.  
Line 24: add est before quod.  
Line 29: languescentibus instead of liquescentibus.  
Line 31: attenditis instead of attendite.  
Line 34: parum instead of paris.  
Line 35: comparabilem instead of incomparabilem (but some MSS of Henry's chronicle also read comparabilem.)  
Line 37: Galerannus comes Mellenti instead of comes Mellensis.  
Lines 42-57: omit 4 sentences.  
Line 58: omit regi suo consimiles.  
Line 59: signati instead of saginati.  
Line 60: perjuro instead of perjuria.  
Lines 62-3: omit de virtutibus vestris, immo.

There are also several changes made in Baldwin's speech:

Lines 3 and 6: astantium instead of adstantium.  
Line 6: confidat instead of confisa.  
Line 7: reverse omnibus and his

---

<sup>43</sup>Roger of Hoveden, (Latin), pp. 199-203.

Line 11: astamus instead of adstamus.  
Line 13: tum instead of tot.  
Line 14: bello instead of bellis.  
Line 14: reverse semper and assuetorum.  
Line 16: praestat militum instead of perstabit  
millium.  
Line 17: noster instead of vester.  
Line 21: impugnaveritis instead of pugnaveritis.  
Line 24: morte instead of more (some MSS of Henry's  
chronicle also read morte.)  
Line 37: adducit instead of adduxit.  
Line 37: scilicet instead of solos.  
Line 37: sunt instead of sint.  
Line 44: omit vos.  
Lines 47-8: omit Assiduitas . . . conflagendi.  
Line 49: fugiendum instead of fugiendi.<sup>44</sup>

Once again, the changes made in Henry's original speeches do not seriously alter the product. The most serious variation by either of these copiers is the omission by John of four sentences from Robert's speech, which considerably shortens the discussion of their various enemies. The other alterations are largely changes of tense or person, or the substitution of synonyms.

Clearly, Henry of Huntingdon was a fairly popular rhetorician. In this regard, the remarks by Arnold in his edition of Henry's Historia Anglorum are especially important. According to Arnold, the speeches are included purely to enhance Henry's literary reputation. In fact, the speeches before the Battle of Lincoln were only added to the fourth edition of the work, about 1148. At this time,

---

<sup>44</sup>Johannes, Monachus Majoris Monasterii, Historia Gaufredi Ducis Normannorum et Comitum Andegavorum, in Chroniques d'Anjou, ed. by Paul Marchegay and Andre Salmon (Paris: Jules Renouard, 1856; New York: Johnson Reprint Company, 1965), pp. 302-7.

Henry "increased the number of historical books from seven to eight, making the last book commence at the death of Henry I., and eking out its otherwise slender dimensions by putting long speeches, after the manner of Livy, in the mouths of leading generals on either side before the battle of Lincoln."<sup>45</sup> Arnold then concludes, "it must be evident that Henry, when he incorporated this mass of new matter in his Historia Anglorum, was acting rather in the interest of his own literary reputation than in that of historical science."<sup>46</sup> The speeches must have succeeded in their purpose, then, for they were, as we have clearly seen, adopted by several subsequent chroniclers. Indeed, on the basis of the evidence discovered in this research project, it appears that Henry's speeches were used by subsequent chroniclers far more than those of anyone else.

Finally, we must examine the several chroniclers' speeches from their accounts of the Battle of Hastings. These speeches are of several types, and were supposedly given on several different occasions before and during the battle. The first speech, reported in only one chronicle, was given by William before crossing the channel. He and his men were waiting for the fleet to arrive which would take them to England where they would fight Harold. While

---

<sup>45</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (Latin), p. xiv.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. xiv-xv.

waiting, the men were growing apprehensive, so, according to William of Poitiers, the duke spoke to them to reassure them. While this is therefore not a speech given just before a battle, it does follow the form of a normal battle oration. The speech is as follows:

Erexit autem diffidentes dux hac elocutione:  
"Innotuit nobis, ait, Heraldii sapientia: terrorem nobis ingerit, sed spem auget. Sua quidem inutiliter expendet, aurum dissipans, non consolidans honorem. Non eo animi viget robore, quo vel minimum quid meorum polliceri audeat. At arbitrio meo pariter quae mea sunt, quaeque dicuntur illius, promittentur atque dabuntur. Hostem haud dubie superabit, qui non minus quae hostis possidet quam propriis largiri valet. Navigio, quo sufficiente citius gaudebimus, non praepediemur. Sint illi experti, quae nos cum felicitate majore experiamur: Virtute melius quam numero militum bella geruntur. Praeterea, ne rapinam amittat, ille pugnabit; nos quae dono accepimus, beneficiis comparavimus, requirimus. Quae partis nostrae prima fiducia periculum omne depellens, laetissimum triumphum nobis, summum decus, praeclarissimum nomen dabit.<sup>47</sup>

But the duke restored their courage with these words: "We know Harold's cunning very well. He seeks to alarm us but instead our confidence grows. He spends his money uselessly, squandering his gold and silver without increasing his power. He has not the strength of spirit to promise the least of the things which belong to me, whereas I can better promise both about what is mine and also what he now possesses. Without doubt victory will go to the man who can bestow not only what is his own but also what is held by his enemy. Nor will lack of ships hinder us, for very soon we shall rejoice in the sight of a fleet. That they have experience I do not doubt, but we shall gain it with greater felic-

---

<sup>47</sup>William of Poitiers, Histoire de Guillaume le Conquerant, ed. by Raymonde Foreville, Les Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Age, 23<sup>e</sup> tome (Paris: Societe d'Edition "Les Belles Lettres", 1952), pp. 156-8.

ity. And wars are won not by numbers but by courage. Besides he will fight to retain what he has wrongfully seized whereas we shall fight to regain what we have received as a gift, and what we have lawfully acquired. Strong in this knowledge we shall overcome all dangers and win a happy victory, great honour and high renown."<sup>48</sup>

After the fleet arrived and favorable winds arose for crossing the channel, the Normans landed on English soil, preparing to do battle with Harold. As they disembarked, William slipped and fell, an incident which his troops, he feared, might take as an ill omen for the coming battle. However, a quick witted knight turned the incident to his advantage by remarking, "Dux, Angliam tenes, rex futurus."<sup>49</sup> ("Duke, you hold onto England, you will be its king.")

Later, while preparing for battle, William put his tunic on backwards, another potentially ill omen. William himself turned this incident to his own advantage by remarking, "vertetur fortitudo ducatus mei in regnum."<sup>50</sup> ("The might of my duchy shall be changed into that of a kingdom.")<sup>51</sup> Or so Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris report the incident. The Brevis Relatio de Origine Wil-

---

<sup>48</sup>William of Poitiers, History of William the Conqueror, in English Historical Documents, Vol. II, ed. by David C. Douglas and George W. Greenaway (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1953), p. 220.

<sup>49</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), Vol. I, p. 539.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., Vol. I, p. 541.

<sup>51</sup>Roger of Wendover, (English), Vol. I, p. 332.



Willelmi Conquestoris reports the same incident, but a different speech by William. According to this account, William ended the incident, not by turning an ill omen into a favorable one, but by discounting omens altogether: "Si ego in sortem crederem, hodie amplius in bellum non introirem. Sed ego nunquam sortibus credidi, nec sortilegos amavi. In omni enim negotio quicquid agere debui, creatori meo me semper commendavi."<sup>52</sup> ("If I believed in prophecy, I would not enter any further into war today. But I never gave credence to prophecies, nor have I loved fortune tellers. For in all business whatever I had to do, I have always commended myself to my creator.")

Just before the battle commenced, William exhorted his troops. At least four different accounts of his remarks exist. The shortest speech is attributed to William by the author of the Brevis Relatio. William said, simply, "Credo in omnipotentis Dei misericordia, cujus judicia etsi sint occulta, sunt tamen vera, qui hodie justitiam faciet mihi de Heraldo qui perjurus existens hodie contra me audet ad pugnam venire."<sup>53</sup> ("I believe in the mercy of the almighty God, whose judgments, even if they are hidden, are nevertheless true, who today will give me justice over

---

<sup>52</sup>Brevis Relatio de Origine Willelmi Conquestoris, in Scriptores Rerum Gestarum Willelmi Conquestoris, Regis Angliae, ed. by J.A. Giles (Caxton Society, Vol. III, 1845; New York: Burt Franklin Reprint, 1967), p. 7.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid.

Harold who, becoming perjured, today dares to come to a battle against me.")

The Battle Abbey chronicle combines William's remarks on the ill omen with his speech of exhortation. The first part seems much like the corresponding speech in the Brevis Relatio.

Scio, karissimi, quod si sortibus crederem, bellum hodie nullatenus introirem. Sed ego me in omni negotio Creatori meo fiducialiter committens, nec sortibus credidi, nec umquam sortilegos amavi. Unde et nunc de ejus auxilio securus, ad vestras qui me gratia hoc initis certamen corroborandas manus ac mentes, votum facio, me in hos certaminis loco pro salute cunctorum, et hic nominatim occumbentium, ad honorem Dei et sanctorum ejus quo servi Dei adjuventur, congruum cum digna libertate fundaturum monasterium, quod ita ut mihi conquirere potero lib/er . . o/blatum universis propitiabile fiat asilum.<sup>54</sup>

I know, my dearest friends, that if I had any confidence in omens, I ought on no account to go to battle today; but, committing myself trustfully to my Creator in every matter, I have given no heed to omens; neither have I ever loved sorcerers. Wherefore, now, secure of His aid, and in order to strengthen the hands and courage of you, who for my sake are about to engage in this conflict, I make a Vow, that upon this place of battle I will found a suitable free Monastery, for the salvation of you all, and especially of those who fall; and this I will do in honour of God and his saints, to the end that the servants of God may be succoured; and even as I shall be enabled to acquire for myself a propitious asylum, so it may be freely offered to all my followers.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup>Chronicon Monasterii de Bello (London: Impensis Societatis, 1846), pp. 3f.

<sup>55</sup>The Chronicle of Battel Abbey, From 1066 to 1176, trans. by Mark Antony Lower (London: John Russell Smith, 1851), p. 4. Italics omitted. Lower notes: "I am not quite satisfied with this rendering, as the latter portion of the sentence is imperfect in the original."

This chronicle also includes a description of the speech William supposedly gave, as well as the above speech. The description is quite similar, including the vow to establish the monastery. No other account of William's speech includes this promise to build Battle Abbey, but William must have decided to do so sometime, whether or not he announced it to his troops before the battle.

Two other chronicles present different accounts of the speech William gave, but both begin by stating that it is not the actual speech itself which follows. William of Poitiers writes:

Exhortationem, qua pro tempore breviter militum virtuti plurimum alacritatis addidit, egregiam fuisse non dubitamus; etsi nobis non ex tota dignitate sua relatam. Commonuit Normannos, quod in multis atque magnis periculis victoris tamen se duce semper extiterint. Commonuit omnes patriae suae, nobilium gestorum, magnique nominis. Nunc probandum esse manu, qua virtute polleant, quem gerant animum. Jam non id agi, quis regnans vivat, sed quis periculum imminens cum vita evadat. Si more virorum pugnent, victoriam, decus, divitias habituros. Alioquin aut otius trucidari, aut captos ludibrio fore hostibus crudelissimis. Ad hoc ignominia sempiterna infamatum iri. Ad eufugium nullam viam patere, cum hic arma et inimica ignotaque regio obsistant, illinc pontus et arma. Non decere viros multitudine terreri. Saepenumero Anglos hostili ferro dejectos cecidisse, plerumque superatos in hostis venisse deditionem, nunquam gloria militiae laudatos. Imperitos bellandi strenua virtute paucorum facile posse conteri. Praesertim cum justae causae praesidium caeleste non desit. Audeant modo, nequam cedant, triumpho citius gavisuros fore.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup>William of Poitiers, (Latin), pp. 182-4. Italics omitted.

Although no one has reported to us in detail the short harangue with which on this occasion he increased the courage of his troops, we doubt not that it was excellent. He reminded the Normans that with him for their leader they had always proved victorious in many perilous battles. He reminded them also of their fatherland, of its noble history, and of its great renown. "Now is the time," he said, "for you to show your strength, and the courage that is yours." "You fight," he added, "not merely for victory but also for survival. If you bear yourselves valiantly you will obtain victory, honour and riches. If not, you will be ruthlessly butchered, or else led ignominiously captive into the hands of pitiless enemies. Further, you will incur abiding disgrace. There is no road for retreat. In front, your advance is blocked by an army and a hostile countryside; behind you, there is the sea where an enemy fleet bars your flight. Men, worthy of the name, do not allow themselves to be dismayed by the number of their foes. The English have again and again fallen to the sword of an enemy; often, being vanquished, they have submitted to a foreign yoke; nor have they ever been famed as soldiers. The vigorous courage of a few men armed in a just cause and specially protected by heaven must prevail against a host of men unskilled in combat. Only be bold so that nothing shall make you yield, and victory will gladden your hearts.<sup>57</sup>

The other account is in the chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon. Henry has considerably embellished his account, when it is compared with the one by William of Poitiers. Henry writes that William spoke to this effect ("orationem hujusmodi habuit"):

Vos alloquor, Normanni, gentium fortissimi, non quasi vestrae probitatis incertus, non quasi de victoria non securus: quae nunquam casu aliquo vel impedimento a vobis evadere potuit. Quod si semel non vincere potuissetis, exhortandi forsitan essetis, ut probitas vestra praeradiaret. Quod

---

<sup>57</sup>William of Poitiers, (English), p. 225.

autem nativum vobis est et quasi necessarium, qua indiget exhortatione? O mortalium validissimi, quid potuit rex Francorum bellis proficere cum omni gente quae sunt a Lotaringa usque ad Hispaniam contra Hasting antecessorem nostrum? Qui quantum voluit Francia sibi adquisivit, quantum voluit regi permisit; dum placuit, tenuit; dum satiatus est, ad majora anhelans, reliquit. Nonne Rou pater meus, dux primus et author nostrae gentis, cum patribus nostris regem Francorum Parisius in medio regni sui bello vicit? nec Francorum rex potuit sperare salutem, nisi et filiam suam et terram, quae ex vobis Normannia vocatur, supplex obtulisset? Nonne patres vestri regem Francorum in Rotomago ceperunt et tenuerunt, donec Ricardo puero, duci vestro, Normanniam reddidit, eo pacto, quod in omni colloquutione regis Francia et ducis Normanniae gladio dux accingeretur, regem vero nec gladium nec etiam cultellum ferre liceret? Hanc aeternam sanctionem patres vestri regi magno cogentes statuerunt. Nonne idem dux patres vestros usque ad Mirmandam juxta Alpes adduxit: et urbis decem, generum scilicet suum, sponsae suae proelians parere coegit? Et ne parum sit vobis homines vicisse, vicit et ipse diabolus, corporaliter colluctans et prosternens, ligansque manus ejus post terga, confusumque victor angelorum reliquit. Sed quid prisca narro? Nonne vobis congregientibus in eo tempore apud Mortemer, Franci praecipites praeposuerunt fugam bellis, calcaria telis? Vos autem, Radulfo summo duce Francorum interfecto, fama spoliisque potiti naturale bonum solita necessitate tenuistis. Eja! procedat aliquis Anglorum, quos centies antecessores nostri et Daci et Norwagenses bellis vicerunt: demonstratque gentem Rou ex ejus tempore usque nunc semel militiae naufragia perpessum esse, et ego victus abscedo. Nonne igitur pudori nobis est gentem vinci solitam, gentem arte belli cassam, gentem nec etiam sagittas habentem, contra vos, O fortissimi, quasi bello ordinatam procedere? Nonne vobis pudet regem Haraldum contra me in praesentia vestri, perjurum, faciem suam vobis ostendere ausum fuisse? Mihi tamen stupori est, quod eos, qui parentes vestros cum Alfredo cognato meo prodicione nefanda escapitaverunt, oculis vestris vidistis, et eorum capita nefanda adhuc humeris eorum supersunt. Erigite vexilla, viri; nec sit irae promeritae modus vel modestia. Ab oriente

ad occidentem videatur fulmen gloriae vestrae;  
audiatur tonitruum impetus vestri, vindicesque  
generosissimi sanguinis.<sup>58</sup>

What I have to say to you, ye Normans, the bravest of nations, does not spring from any doubt of your valour or uncertainty of victory, which never by any chance or obstacle escaped your efforts. If, indeed, once only you had failed of conquering, it might be necessary to inflame your courage by exhortation. But how little does the inherent spirit of your race require to be roused! Most valiant of men, what availed the power of the Frank king, with all his people, from Lorraine to Spain, against Hastings, my predecessor? What he wanted of the territory of France he appropriated to himself; what he chose, only, was left to the king; what he had, he held during his pleasure; when he was satisfied, he relinquished it, and looked for something better. Did not Rollo, my ancestor, the founder of our nation, with your progenitors, conquer at Paris the king of the Franks in the heart of his dominions; nor could he obtain any respite until he humbly offered possession of the country which from you is called Normandy, with the hand of his daughter? Did not your fathers take prisoner the king of the French, and detain him at Rouen till he restored Normandy to your Duke Richard, then a boy; with this stipulation, that in every conference between the King of France and the Duke of Normandy, the duke should have his sword by his side, while the king should not be allowed so much as a dagger? This concession your fathers compelled the great king to submit to, as binding for ever. Did not the same duke lead your fathers to Mirmande, at the foot of the Alps, and enforce submission from the lord of the town, his son-in-law, to his own wife, the duke's daughter? Nor was it enough to conquer mortals; for he overcame the devil himself, with whom he wrestled, and cast down and bound him, leaving him a shameful spectacle to angels. But why do I go back to former times? When you, in our own time, engaged the French at Mortemer, did not the French prefer flight to battle, and use their spurs instead of their swords; while—Ralph, the French commander being slain—you reaped the fruits of victory, the honour and the spoil, as natural results of

---

<sup>58</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (Latin), pp. 200-2.

your wonted success? Ah! let any one of the English whom our predecessors, both Danes and Norwegians, have defeated in a hundred battles, come forth and show that the race of Rollo ever suffered a defeat from his time until now, and I will submit and retreat. Is it not shameful, then, that a people accustomed to be conquered, a people ignorant of the art of war, a people not even in possession of arrows, should make a show of being arrayed in order of battle against you, most valiant? Is it not a shame that this King Harold, perjured as he was in your presence, should dare to show his face to you? It is a wonder to me that you have been allowed to see those who by a horrible crime beheaded your relations and Alfred my kinsman, and that their own accursed heads are still on their shoulders. Raise, then, your standards, my brave men, and set no bounds to your merited rage. Let the lightning of your glory flash, and the thunders of your onset be heard from east to west, and be the avengers of the noble blood which has been spilled.<sup>59</sup>

Later, during the battle, it is recorded that the Normans were at one point retreating, thinking their duke had been killed. To stop their flight and rouse them to return to the battle, William removed his helmet, exposing his head, so the troops could see for themselves that he was indeed yet alive. William of Poitiers reports that the duke yelled to his troops:

Me, inquit, circumspicite. Vivo et vincam, opitulante Deo. Quae vobis dementia fugam suadet? Quae via patebit ad effugiendum? Quos ut pecora mactare potestis, depellunt vos et occidunt. Victoriam deseritis, ac perpetuum honorem; in exitium curritis ac perpetuum opprobrium. Abeundo, mortem nullus vestrum evadet.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (English), pp. 210f.

<sup>60</sup>William of Poitiers, (Latin), p. 190.

Look at me well. I am still alive and by the grace of God I shall yet prove victor. What is this madness which makes you fly, and what way is open for your retreat? You are allowing yourselves to be pursued and killed by men whom you could slaughter like cattle. You are throwing away victory and lasting glory, rushing into ruin and incurring abiding disgrace. And all for naught since by flight none of you can escape destruction.<sup>61</sup>

We have already seen Ordericus Vitalis' account of this incident. Ordericus presents a short exclamation by William possibly taken from William of Poitiers' first sentence.

Of these several speeches, the version by Henry of Huntingdon is rhetorically the best developed. It appears that he has taken William of Poitiers' account and embellished it. Thus, whereas William merely says that the duke recalled to his men the past exploits and successes of themselves and their ancestors, Henry, in an elaborate series of rhetorical questions, delineates several of those successes. Where William emphasizes the duke focusing on the lack of escape routes, Henry seems to play down that rather negative approach, although he does retain it in other speeches.

Which version is probably closest to the actual speech? Here it is very difficult to say. Both Henry and William precede their accounts with words that clearly indicate they are not attempting to report the words the duke actually spoke. However, William of Poitiers was chaplain to Duke William, and although not present at the Battle of

---

<sup>61</sup>William of Poitiers, (English), p. 226.



Hastings, was an intimate of the duke and his associates. Henry was writing three-quarters of a century later. We also know that Henry often gave considerable room to his imagination. Furthermore, William was himself a Norman knight, before he became a priest. Therefore, it seems reasonable to suggest that he would have a more realistic grasp of what appeals would animate Norman fighting men at that time than would Henry.

The Battle Abbey chronicle's accounts of William's speech seem designed more to present the origin of the monastery than to present a speech of exhortation. And the short speech given in the Brevis Relatio is hardly an exhortation either.

The matter of the omens is also rather interesting. Henry does not mention them, but the other accounts do. It seems reasonable to conclude that they did indeed happen rather as reported. Perhaps Henry thought them not worthy of the valor of Normans, detracting from the Norman army rather than enhancing it, so in his embellished account omitted any mention of the incidents.

Medieval chroniclers showed a great propensity to borrow from one another, which practice included the borrowing of speeches. The most popular source was clearly Henry of Huntingdon, especially for the long speeches. Florence of Worcester was also a common source for several chroniclers, but that source only provides descriptions and

a few short speeches. With only a few exceptions, when a chronicler borrowed a speech he used it in relating the same event. On some occasions, several chroniclers provide different versions of the same speech. It might be possible to study those versions, and their authors, in detail and draw some conclusions about what the speaker really did say, but such a procedure is outside the scope of this study.

## CHAPTER VI

### COMMONPLACES

One of the most important aspects of rhetoric is invention. During the period under investigation here, the study of rhetoric as a liberal art must have been heavily weighted toward invention. Not only was dialectic, its close kin, of ever increasing importance in the educational scheme, but even the textbooks used would have contributed to such a bias. While De Inventione does include discussions of organization (conceived as a part of invention), with that exception the other canons of rhetoric are omitted. The Rhetorica ad Herennium, while treating all five classical canons, includes a more extensive discussion of invention than of any other aspect of rhetoric. Even though the topics delineated in these two works are for the most part of a forensic nature, the attitude that invention was quite important must have pervaded the rhetorical studies. Therefore, we now turn our attention to the lines of arguments used by the chroniclers in writing their battle orations.

A study of the lines of argument, or topics, used by the speakers as they exhorted their armies to fight might be of some value. From a knowledge of the arguments em-

ployed, one could draw some conclusions about what motivated people to fight in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Although it is entirely possible that most of the speeches are not authentic, that is, were written by the chronicler himself rather than by the duke or count or bishop who supposedly gave the speech, nevertheless, a study of their arguments would at the very least indicate what the chronicler thought would motivate the knights. Furthermore, since some of the chroniclers were themselves knights (as, for example, William of Poitiers was a knight before becoming a priest, and Raymond d'Aguilers and the author of the Gesta Francorum were also knights), and some of the clerics who wrote chronicles were very close to the knights who did the fighting (as, for example, Fulcher of Chartres or the author of the De Expugnacione Lyxbonensi), even if the speeches are not accurate historical reports, nevertheless an analysis of the argumentation used should provide useful information on the motivations of the medieval man of arms. What things would be important to him? What must he be warned against in advance? What values would he die to protect or gain? Some answers to questions like these may emerge.

The procedure used in analyzing the speeches for lines of argument was not determined a priori. Were more of the topics in De Inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium applicable to this type of speaking, it would have

been possible to search for arguments falling into those pre-existing categories. However, battle orations are not forensic speeches, and few of the topics overlap categories. Therefore, the procedure used was, in reading the battle orations, simply to note general appeals that recurred. Then these were used as categories and the specific arguments from the speeches were classified accordingly. Only the speeches themselves, and not the descriptions, were used, as the latter normally do not indicate in what way an argument was developed. If they had been used, however, they would not have altered the proportions among the appeals.

Some of the topics appear frequently; some occur but seldom. However, the numbers in each category only give an indication of the frequency with which an appeal occurs, not the extent to which it is developed. Often an appeal must be classified in two or three categories as different arguments are clearly implied or mentioned in a small section of a speech. Other appeals are extensively developed along one line of argument only.

In general, classifiable appeals occur most often in the longer speeches, less often, proportionately, in the shorter ones. The latter are quite often situation bound, and therefore unique.

To begin with an overview, out of over 100 speeches, of which slightly over half were fairly lengthy, several

appeals emerge as predominant. The most frequently occurring argument takes the form of a comparison, developed or implied, between the merits of the two sides in the war. It normally appears as the claim, "Our cause is just, the enemies' is unjust." This is sometimes presented in a closely related form: "Our actions and motives are pious, the enemies' are impious." Nearly one-fifth of the speeches surveyed included arguments of this type.

The second most common argument is one from history. It takes the form, "We and/or our ancestors have always been victorious/valorous/brave/etc." It is often followed by a narrative of past successes. At times, it, too, emerges in the form of a comparison: "We have always beaten this same enemy in the past," or, "This enemy has been often conquered, we and our ancestors never have."

Occurring as frequently as the previous argument in the longer speeches, but slightly less often in the shorter exhortations, is the appeal in which the speaker claims that his side has some sort of military advantage over the foe. This can be modified slightly by claiming that, if such-and-such is done, they will then have a military advantage. This tends to merge with the next most frequent argument, in which the speaker claims that they will obtain heavenly aid in the coming battle. Presumably if Christ and the saints are going to fight on your side, you then would have a substantial military advantage over the enemy.

Next in order is a series of arguments that cluster around the claim that, although the enemy outnumbered us, this will not affect the outcome. Many variations on this theme appear in the speeches. Apparently, either medieval armies often encountered enemies far more numerous than they or the chroniclers frequently sought to enhance an army's reputation by showing their fortitude in the face of great odds, and their ability to take on and conquer armies more numerous than they.

Another frequent argument is one from the piety of the cause. The speaker claims that they are fighting for Christ, and consequently it really does not matter whether they die in the battle or survive as conquerors, for in either case they will be blessed. Sometimes this argument is extended to claim that, actually, those who die for Christ in the battle will be better off than those who survive as the victors.

Almost as frequent is an appeal quite different from the last one: the claim that the knights should exert their utmost in order to obtain pure vengeance. Sometimes this is combined with the claim that God will aid us in the battle, since God is out to avenge Himself on the enemy as well, and we are therefore acting as His agents.

Also a frequent argument, but one of more limited applicability, is the claim that the soldiers must fight with the utmost bravery because there is no possibility of

escape. While this argument is more limited to specific situations than are previous ones, it nevertheless occurs in a comparatively large number of battle orations. Indeed, it is most remarkable how often the chronicler presents the commander telling his men that they should not consider flight, for it is impossible in their present situation.

Another class of arguments takes this form: "You have left everything behind in order to find this battle; well, here it is," or, "This is what you came here for, so now do it well." This appeal naturally occurs primarily in accounts of the Crusades.

Yet another argument that occurs fairly frequently concerns defense. The speaker states that the army must defend themselves and/or their families and/or their country. This line of appeal is, as the preceding one, clearly bound to limited types of situations.

At this point there is a distinct break in the frequencies with which the appeals occur. While even the most used argument was found in only about 20% of the battle orations, we have now reached a point at which about 10% include the appeal. After this, the frequency drops all the way down to 3 or 4%. In this range there are a large number of arguments. For example, one line appeals to the soldiers to fight for booty, for purely material gain. Another isolates glory as the gain to be won by fighting bravely. Two other closely related arguments claim that



you must die sometime; so, some add, it is best to die with glory now. Finally, there are many appeals that are completely situation bound. They occur once or twice and no more.

In compiling this list of arguments, an attempt was made to select only fairly complete lines of appeal, where the argument was either developed in full or at least mentioned. Therefore, no indication is given here of the number of times a term occurred in the battle orations. For example, the argument that one should win glory by fighting bravely was an appeal used very seldom. But many battle orations use the term, glory, in passing or in the course of another appeal. No attempt was made to determine the frequency of occurrence of individual terms, even though, in some cases such as this one, the use of a single term may imply the whole argument. Only where the appeal was spelled out, if not developed in detail, was it counted in this analysis. It might be possible, perhaps with the use of a computer, to analyze frequency of terms, but such a procedure is outside the scope of this project.

We may now turn to the topics themselves. In presenting them, since several of the lengthier speeches have already been presented in full, and may be consulted above, the specific examples to be used to illustrate the various arguments will be taken from other speeches. Examples from the speeches already presented will be merely mentioned.

The most frequent argument concerns the value of the cause for which the army is about to fight. This takes several forms. Normally the speaker claims that "Our cause is just," or "We are acting in a pious manner," while the enemy's cause is unjust or they are acting in an impious manner. The comparison is not always explicitly drawn, but any argument that claims that we are about to fight for justice surely implies that the enemy is the representative of injustice in the coming struggle. Therefore, since the possible variations all cluster around the same general concept—the relative values of the causes the two armies represent—they were grouped together for this analysis.

A clear example of this argument is found in a speech in Aelred of Rievaulx's Genealogia Regum Anglorum. Saint Cuthbert had appeared to King Alfred in a dream; Alfred then addressed his army. About half-way through the speech the argument appears:

Cogitate, qui adversum quos, qua ratione, qua insuper necessitate pugnamus. Christiani contra paganos, pii contra impios, contra superbos, contriti corde et humiles spiritu dimicamus. Et qua ratione. Ecclesias certe destruxerunt, altaria suffoderunt, non aetati, non ordini, non denique sexui pepercerunt. Praeterea non aliena petimus, sed nostra repetimus. Nostra nobis eripuerunt, nostra possident, nostra luxuriose consumunt, nostra in idolorum suorum sacrificiis expendunt.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Aelred of Rievaulx, Genealogia Regum Anglorum, PL CXCIV, col. 721. Hereinafter cited as: Aelred, Genealogia.

Think, who against whom, by what reason, and moreover by what necessity we fight. Christians against pagans, pious against impious, against the haughty, we fight with contrite heart and humble spirit. And for what reason. Certainly they have destroyed churches, torn down altars, they have spared neither age nor rank nor even sex. Furthermore, we do not seek gain from them, but we demand our own be returned. They have taken our possessions from us, they keep them, they consume them luxuriously, they expend them in sacrifices for their idols.

Aelred also uses such an appeal extensively in his Relatio de Standardo. He details the horrible things the Scots have done to people, to churches, and concludes that the northern barons are fighting a just war when compared with their enemies.

Giraldus Cambrensis presents a speech by Dermitius in which the two sides are compared on several counts, referring to the evil designs of the enemy. The comparison becomes direct toward the end of the oration.

Pro nobis itaque contra superbiam humilitas, contra injuriam jus et aequitas, contra agrogantiam et intemperantiam modus et modestia dimicabunt. . . . Injuriam armis irrogatam armorum propulsare remedio leges et jura permittunt. Favorabilis est causa pro patria simul patrimonioque pugnare. Illi de lucro captando, nos de damno vitando certamus.<sup>2</sup>

We, on our side, have humility against pride, right and equity against injustice, moderation against arrogance . . . Law and right allows us to repel force and injury by force. It is a favourable cause to contend at once for our country and our

---

<sup>2</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, Expugnatio Hibernica, in Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. V, ed. by James F. Dimock, Rolls Series, Vol. 21:5 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1867; Kraus Reprint, 1964), p. 241 (I, viii).

inheritance. They fight for gain, we to avoid loss.<sup>3</sup>

Henry of Huntingdon uses this appeal in several of the speeches already presented. At the Battle of Hastings, William refers to Harold as perjured, and tells his men that they should feel a merited rage at the English. At the Battle of the Standard, the army is told how the enemy has violated the churches, slain priests, women and children, and now seeks to do further crimes of the same sort. And at the Battle of Lincoln, both sides are concerned to point out that the enemy is perjured, and the anti-Stephen forces are reminded of the chaos Stephen has caused in the realm.

Matthew Paris relates a speech by the emperor to his army before doing battle against the Milanese in 1237. In this case, the comparison is again implied, but from the opposite direction; the enemy is characterized as "veritatis et ecclesiae sanctae inimici, quos proprii sceleris pondus labefactabit"<sup>4</sup> ("enemies as they are to the truth and to the holy Church, and borne down by the weight of their sins.")<sup>5</sup> It is only thereby implied that the emperor's

---

<sup>3</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, The History of the Conquest of Ireland, in The Historical Works of Giraldus Cambrensis, trans. by Thomas Forester (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1863; New York: AMS Press, 1968), pp. 199f.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), Vol. III, p. 408.

<sup>5</sup>Matthew Paris, English History, 3 vols., trans. by

army are defenders of truth and the Church.

In 1250 the king of France animated his troops, according to Matthew Paris, by telling them that if the enemy wins, "in confusionem totius Christianitatis delebunt de sub caelo, et sic gravius ecclesia universalis confundetur"<sup>6</sup> ("to the confusion of all Christianity; and by such a proceeding the universal Church will be more utterly ruined")<sup>7</sup> among other nasty consequences. Furthermore, the enemy are "cruorem amicorum nostrorum fusum de manibus" ("stained with the blood of our brethren"), and they have thereby done great injury to Christ<sup>8</sup> ("tantam Christi injuriam").<sup>9</sup>

Ordericus Vitalis also includes a similar argument. Before a battle at Joppa, in 1102, Ordericus states that the king addressed the troops, telling them that the enemy was "gentem . . . execrabilem Dominoque Deo, cunctisque fidelibus ejus adibilem" ("an accursed race which is hateful to God and all Christian men"), and also "inimicos omnium

---

J.A. Giles (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1852-4), Vol. I, p. 65. Hereinafter cited as: Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (English).

<sup>6</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), Vol. V, pp. 154f.

<sup>7</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (English), Vol. II, p. 373.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), Vol. V, p. 155.

bonorum" ("enemies of all godness"). He then instructed the army, "Injurias vestras et damna medullitus recensete, manusque vestras haud segnes sentiant alienigenae."<sup>10</sup> ("Reflect in your inmost souls on the wrongs and losses you have sustained, and let the aliens feel the weight of your arms in full vigour.")<sup>11</sup> The last part of the appeal clearly borders on asking for vengeance as well.

Rahewin depicts Frederick Barbarossa using such an appeal before the battle at Milan:

Mediolanum est . . . quod hos omnes labores sua irreverentia et temeritate capitibus vestris induxit. Iustam vobis belli causam fecerunt, qui legitimo imperio rebelles inveniuntur. Suscipietis itaque bella ipsa non cupiditate vel crudelitate, sed pacis studio, ut malorum audacia coherceatur et boni disciplinae suae debitum fructum inveniant. . . . Ministri ergo iusticiae suffragium vestrum iuste postulamus,<sup>12</sup> . . . Non inferimus, sed depellimus iniuriam.

It is Milan . . . that has brought all these hardships down upon your heads by her impiety and defiance. It has given us just cause for war, since it stands revealed as rebellious against lawful authority. You will thus engage in warfare, not from greed or cruelty, but eager for peace, that the insolence of the wicked may be restrained, and that the good may be fittingly rewarded. . . . It is therefore in the service of justice that we justly claim your support . . . We are not inflicting injury, but are

---

<sup>10</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (Latin), Vol. IV, pp. 135f (X, xxi).

<sup>11</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (English), Vol. III, p. 303.

<sup>12</sup>Rahewin, Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris, MGH SS Rerum Germanicarum in Usus Scholarum, Vol. 46 (Hannoverae et Lipsiae, 1912), p. 203 (III, xxix).

removing it.<sup>13</sup>

Simeon of Durham, in his Historia de Sancto Cuthberto, puts such an argument in the mouth of the saint himself. The saint claimed that it was the enemy "qui pacem Dei et meam non timuerunt violare"<sup>14</sup> ("who did not fear to violate the peace of God and mine.")

In William of Poitiers' account, Duke William, speaking before crossing the channel, reminds his troops that Harold was fighting to keep what he had gained unjustly, the Normans on the other hand were going to fight to get what is theirs by right. In the speech before the Battle of Hastings, William mentions that their cause is a just one. However, in the latter case the argument is not presented in full.

William the Breton, describing the Battle of Bouvines claims that Philip Augustus used this type of appeal extensively. Philip spoke as follows:

Rex Otho et exercitus suus a domino papa excommunicati sunt, qui sunt inimici et destructores rerum sancte ecclesie, et pecunia qua eis stipendia ministrantur, de lacrymis pauperum et de rapina ecclesiarum Dei et clericorum acquisita est. Nos autem Christiani sumus et communione et pace sancte ecclesie fruimur, et, quamvis

---

<sup>13</sup>Rahewin, The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa, trans. by Charles Christopher Mierow and Richard Emery (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1953), pp. 205f.

<sup>14</sup>Simeon of Durham, Historia de Sancto Cuthberto, in Opera Omnia, Vol. I, ed. by Thomas Arnold, Rolls Series, Vol. 75:1 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1882; Kraus Reprint, 1965), p. 214.

peccatores simus, tamen ecclesie Dei consentimus,<sup>15</sup>  
et cleri pro posse nostro defendimus libertates.

King Otto and his army are excommunicate by the Lord Pope, because they are enemies and destroyers of things of the holy church, and the money which is supplied for their pay is won from the tears of the poor and the robbing of the churches of God and the clerks. But we are Christians, and we enjoy the communion and the peace of the holy church, and, even though we are sinners, yet we submit to the Church of God and we defend the<sup>16</sup> liberties of the clergy with all our strength.

Here the entire argument is drawn out very clearly.

As a final example, we may take a speech written by Guibert of Nogent. The speaker tells the army that the enemy comes to fight Christ, not just themselves ("non vos pugnasse, sed Christum").<sup>17</sup>

Almost as common as the preceding argument or appeal is the claim and we and/or our ancestors have always been victorious in battle. This appeal can be presented very briefly, merely mentioning the claim, or it can be drawn out in great length, enumerating past successes. The two possibilities included in the statement can also be combined. The claim can be made that not only have our ancestors always been victorious or, by close analogy, that our race has always been known for its valor, but that we ourselves also have. The tradition of victory and valor

---

<sup>15</sup>William the Breton, op. cit., p. 273.

<sup>16</sup>William Holden Hutton, Philip Augustus (London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1896), p. 103.

<sup>17</sup>Guibert of Nogent, op. cit., col. 741 (IV, v).



must have been of considerable importance, judging by the number of times the chroniclers use the appeal.

Aelred of Rievaulx uses this argument in his Relatio de Standardo, but in a slightly different manner than any other chronicler. The speaker asks, "Cur enim de victoria desperemus, cum victoria generi nostro quasi in feudum data sit ab Altissimo?"<sup>18</sup> ("Why should we despair of victory, when victory has been given to our people as if in fief by the Highest?") Then follows a typical enumeration, partly in the form of a long rhetorical question, of the past successes of their ancestors, with some of their own victories interspersed. But the concept of possessing victory, holding it from God, was found only in this speech.

In Geoffrey of Monmouth's British History is an exhortation by King Arthur in which he argues from past success, ending with a classical argument from more to less:

Domestici mei, qui Britanniam terdenorum regnorum fecistis dominam, vestrae congratulor probitati, quam nullatenus deficere, immo magis vigere considero: licet quinque annis inexercitati, oblectamentis ocii potius, quam usui militiae dediti fuistis hactenus: nequaquam tamen ab innata bonitate degeneravistis: sed in ipsa perseverantes, Romanos propulistis in fugam: qui instimulante superbia suorum, libertatem vobis demere affectaverunt: qui ampliori numero incedentes, ingerere praelia coeperunt: qui congressui vestro resistere non valentes, sese turpiter intra civitatem istam receperunt, ex qua ad praesens egressuris, et per istam vallem, Augustodunum petituris, obviam poteritis adesse: et nihil tale praemeditatos, veluti pecudes occupare. Sane Orientalium gentium segnitiam in

---

<sup>18</sup>Aelred of Rievaulx, Relatio de Standardo, p. 185.

vobis esse existimabant: dum patriam vestram facere tributariam, et vosmetipsos subjugare affectarent. Numquid noverunt quae bella Dacis atque Norwegensibus, Gallorumque ducibus intulistis? quos meae subdidistis potestati, et ab eorum pudendo dominio liberavistis: Qui igitur in graviori decertatione valuimus: in haec leviori sine dubio praevalerimus, si pari affectu semiviros illos elaboraverimus opprimere.<sup>19</sup>

My brave countrymen, who have made Britain the mistress of thirty kingdoms, I congratulate you upon your late noble exploit, which to me is a proof that your valour is so far from being impaired, that it is rather increased. Though you have been five years without exercise, wherein the softening pleasures of an easy life had a greater share of your time than the use of arms; yet all this has not made you degenerate from your natural bravery, which you have shown in forcing the Romans to flee. The pride of their leaders has animated them to attempt the invasion of your liberties. They have tried you in battle, with numbers superior to yours, and have not been able to stand before you; but have basely withdrawn themselves into that city, from which they are now ready to march out, and to pass through this valley in their way to Augustodunum; so that you may have an opportunity of falling upon them unawares like a flock of sheep. Certainly they expected to find in you the cowardice of the Eastern nations, when they thought to make your country tributary, and you their slaves. What, have they never heard of your wars, with the Dacians, Norwegians, and princes of the Gauls, whom you reduced under my power, and freed from their shameful yoke? We, then, that have had success in a greater war, need not doubt of it in a less, if we do but endeavour with the same spirit to vanquish these poltroons.<sup>20</sup>

On this occasion, again, there is a speech presented on the other side by Lucius Tiberius. In it, the Roman also ap-

---

<sup>19</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (Latin), p. 191 (X, vii).

<sup>20</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (English), pp. 260f.

peals to his men to remember their ancestors' valor and victories, explaining in detail precisely why they should do so.

Patres venerandi, quorum imperio et orientalia et occidentalia regna subjici debuerant, majorum vestrorum memores estote: qui ut adversarios Reipublicae superarent, non abhorrescebant effundere sanguinem suum, sed exemplum probitatis et militiae posteris suis relinquentes, ita decertabant, ac si in praelio Deus non providisset eos morituros. Triumphabant ergo saepius, et triumphando mortem evadebant, quia nulli alia erant proventura, quam quae ex providentia Dei condescendebant. Augebatur itaque Respublica: augebatur eorundem probitas: et quod honestatis, quod honoris, quod largitatis in generosis esse solebat, in eis diutius vicens, ipsos et ipsorum posteros in dominium totius orbis promovebat. Id igitur in vobis excitare desiderans, hortor vos ut pristinam bonitatem revocetis, atque in eadem perstantes, inimicos nostros in valle qua nobis insidiantur, petentes, quod nostrum est ab illis exigere contendatis.<sup>21</sup>

Venerable fathers, to whose empire both the Eastern and Western kingdoms owe obedience, remember the virtues of your ancestors, who were not afraid to shed their blood, when the vanquishing of the enemies of the commonwealth required it; but to leave an example of their courage and military virtues to their posterity, behaved themselves in all battles with that contempt of death, as if God had given them some security against it. By this conduct they often triumphed and by triumphing escaped death. Such was the reward of their virtue from Divine Providence, which overrules all events. The increase of the commonwealth, and of their own valour was owing to this; and all those virtues that usually adorn the great, as integrity, honour, and munificence, flourishing a long time in them, raised them and their posterity to the empire of the whole world. Let their noble examples animate you: rouse up the spirit of the ancient Romans, and be not afraid to march out against our enemies

---

<sup>21</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (Latin), p. 192 (X, viii).

that are lying in ambush before us in the valley, but boldly with your swords demand of them your just rights.<sup>22</sup>

Henry of Huntingdon often used this type of appeal.

In his speech attributed to Julius Caesar, it is given prominence.

Consortes fortissimi, quorum virtuti nec asperitas maris, nec labor terrarum refragari potuit; quorum vires nec audacia Gallorum, nec fortitudo Germanorum perferre sustinuit; non me exhortari vos arbitremini, ut vestram verbis augeam probitatem: quae enim summa et perfectissima est, et tot in periculis toties probata crescere nequit, decrescere nescit: illa, inquam, virtus, quae semper in asperrimis clarius refulsit, et ubi alii desperarent, spe certa progrediens, et secunda hilaritate confligens. Quid nota vobis, imo cunctis gentibus memorem, quoties victi victores nostros vicerimus, et ira compulsi fortioribus fortiores devenerimus.<sup>23</sup>

Invincible fellow soldiers, who have braved the perils of the sea and the toils of marches and battles by land, and have been daunted neither by the fierce onset of the Gauls, nor the resolute courage of the German nations, think not that I suppose any words of mine can add to that disciplined courage which is already perfect, and which, tried in so many fields, can neither be added to nor diminished: that valour, I say, which has always shone brightest when danger was greatest, and, while others have despaired, has led you exultingly onward to certain victory. I need not recall to your minds what is fixed in your own memories, and in those of all nations, how often, seemingly conquered, we have conquered our conquerors; and, not disheartened by our disasters, have become braver than the brave by whom we have been repulsed.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (English), pp. 261f.

<sup>23</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (Latin), p. 17.

<sup>24</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (English), p. 13.

In his account of William's speech before the Battle of Hastings, Henry makes much of the fact that the Normans have never once been conquered in battle. In fact, the entire speech is mostly an enumeration of the past successes of the Normans' ancestors followed by an enumeration of the successes of those now going to fight Harold. And in the speech before the Battle of the Standard, Henry uses in the first place the argument from past successes, although not enumerating so many nor in such detail as in William's speech.

Matthew Paris, too, uses such an appeal, placing it in a speech by the Saracen leader in 1250. "O Orientales nobilissimi, qui jam fere medietatem exercitus Gallicani triumphaliter et magnifice devicistis, et spoliis, armis, et equis occisorum congaudetis, audacter huic adventanti plebeculae, fame et dolore tabidae . . ." <sup>25</sup> ("Most noble chiefs of the East, you who have now nobly and triumphantly defeated almost the half of the French army, and who now are rejoicing in the spoils, arms, and horses of the slain, boldly meet this approaching rabble, worn away by hunger and grief . . .") <sup>26</sup> Here the appeal changes to a claim of military superiority. But it began with a reference to the

---

<sup>25</sup> Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), Vol. V, p. 156.

<sup>26</sup> Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (English), Vol. II, pp. 374f.

immediately past success of the infidel army.

A similar appeal to remember a most recent success appears in a speech in Ralph of Coggeshall's Chronica Anglicanum. The speaker says,

Eia, strenui milites Christi! numquid non dixi vobis illos nobiscum non audere congregi, nisi prius a nobis ad congregiendum fuerint lacessiti? Jam enim totam probitatis suae audaciam in hac prima invasione erga nos ostenderunt; jam quidquid potuerunt terroris et formidinis, nobis incusserunt. Aestimabant quippe nos ex sua numerositate deterrere, et eorum primae irruptioni non audere resistere. Aestimabant nos ex sola formidine sui impetus muliebriter a statione nostra secedere, et per planitiem huc illusque discurrendo diffugere.<sup>27</sup>

Hey, strong soldiers of Christ! Did I not tell you they would not dare fight with us unless they were first provoked to fighting by us? For just now they showed us all the daring of their courage in this first invasion; now everything they could of terror and fear, they threw at us. They naturally thought we would be deterred by their numbers and not dare to resist their first strike. They thought we would withdraw like women from our station from one threat of their strike, and flee out, dashing about the plain here and there.

The speaker then asks them to act in the same manner and equally well resist the next attack.

In the De Expugnatione Terrae Sanctae Libellus, attributed to Ralph of Coggeshall, the Master of the Templars, in a battle oration to his troops, mixes into his appeal references to the successes of these soldiers them-

---

<sup>27</sup>Ralph of Coggeshall, Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon Anglicanum, ed. by Joseph Stevenson, Rolls Series, Vol. 66 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1875; Kraus Reprint, 1965), p. 48.

selves ("de ipsis semper victoriam habuistis") and to the successes of their ancestors ("Scitote vero patres vestros . . . victores ubique fuisse").<sup>28</sup>

William of Poitiers' account of Duke William's address prior to the Battle of Hastings begins by relating how the duke reminded the Normans that they had always been victorious in many battles with him as their leader, and of the great renown of their ancestors. But the appeal is not prominent, save for its position, as it is outside the detailed part of the speech as William presents it.

As a final example, Guibert of Nogent begins a battle oration with this appeal. "Fidei hactenus contra perfidiam bella gessistis, et inter omnia discrimina felices exitus habuistis."<sup>29</sup> ("So far you have waged a war of faith against treachery, and you have had happy outcomes from all decisive battles.")

A third common argument is the simple claim that the army should enter the fight sure of victory for they are stronger, or more numerous, or better armed, or occupy a better position than the adversary; that is, they enjoy some sort of military advantage. This appeal occurred nearly

---

<sup>28</sup> Ralph of Coggeshall, Libellus de Expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum, in Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon Anglicanum, ed. by Joseph Stevenson, Rolls Series, Vol. 66 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1875; Kraus Reprint, 1965), p. 212.

<sup>29</sup> Guibert of Nogent, op. cit., col. 740f (IV, v).

as often as the first two.

Aelred of Rievaulx, in the Relatio de Standardo, refers to the Scots as inadequately armed, both defensively and offensively. Defensively, they are not armored, exposing their flesh to the English swords. Offensively, they have only a fragile spear. He does not include, as does Henry of Huntingdon, the reverse side of this appeal, claiming that the English are very well protected and armed. Further, his second part of this argument is by refutation. Apparently the Scots' spears were quite long and had the English worried. The speaker undertakes to refute and therefore remove this fear.

The author of the De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi also includes this appeal. The priest in his sermon presents a rather weak argument that the enemy is not as strong as they. "Non resistent adversum vos, quia nimirum quos fidei ignorantie error dehonestat, hos proculdubio ex difficultate actionis cruciatus affligat." ("The enemy will not stand against you because those whom the error of ignorance of the faith degrades, torment will surely strike with a difficulty of action.")<sup>30</sup> Later in the speech he claims that the enemy "fures enim et latrones inermes et timidi sunt, quos etiam tot ineptiis stipatos inordinata

---

<sup>30</sup>De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi, ed. and trans. by Charles Wendell David (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), pp. 154f.



ipsorum et confusa multitudo prepediet" ("are thieves and robbers, helpless and afraid, who, crowded as they are by a clutter of trash, will be hampered by their confused and disordered multitude.")<sup>31</sup>

In the Expugnatio Hibernica Giraldus Cambrensis uses this commonplace in three consecutive speeches. The first is by Roderic, in which he argues that his army should attack now, while the invaders are yet few in numbers, but probably will increase later if not stopped now.

Francorum igitur exemplo pro patria pugnantes, acriter in hostes irruamus. Et dum numero tam pauci huc exteri sunt adducti, eos impetu unanimi conteramus. Ignis enim, dum adhuc in scintillis est, facillime opprimitur: cum vero flammis jam stridentibus, suppetente materia, in rogam simul et robur excreverit, difficiliter extinguitur. Principiis enimvero semper obvianandum, et moribus venientibus occurrendum. Sero namque

'medicina paratur  
Cum mala per longas invaluerit moras.'<sup>32</sup>

Let us then, following the example of the Franks, and fighting bravely for our country, rush against our enemies; and as these foreigners have come over few in numbers, let us crush them by a general attack. Fire, while it only sparkles, may be speedily quenched; but, when it has burst into a flame, being fed with fresh materials, its power increases with their bulk, and it cannot be easily extinguished. It is always best to meet difficulties half-way, and check the first approaches of disease; for,

Too late is medicine, after long delay,  
To stop the lingering course of slow decay.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>Ibid.

<sup>32</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (Latin), p. 240 (I, vii).

<sup>33</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (English), p. 198.

This particular speech also involves two relatively unusual devices. Most obvious is the quotation, taken from Ovid. Quoting classical poetry was quite unusual in battle orations. It was discovered in only five speeches: this one, and one other by Giraldus, one by Otto of Freising, and the speech Roger of Hoveden took from Benedict of Peterborough. The other unusual device is the use of an analogy that compares the situation the army faces with something other than just another military situation.

The second speech was given by Dermitius. He is first forced to argue that, although the enemy outnumbered them, few can beat a multitude, for which argument see below. However, at the end of the speech, he claims that their position is an advantageous one. "Praeterea locum habemus arctum, tam arte quam natura munitissimum: in quo et ipsa sibi multitudo fiet onerosa, et ad victoriam sufficere poterit paucitas unanimes et animosa."<sup>34</sup> ("Moreover, we occupy ground which is strongly fortified both by nature and art, where excessive numbers would be inconvenient, and a small force, full of courage and acting in concert, may suffice to secure success.")<sup>35</sup>

The third of Giraldus' speeches does not develop this line as an argument, but presents it as a rhetorical

---

<sup>34</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (Latin), p. 241 (I, viii).

<sup>35</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (English), p. 200.

question. "Cum itaque . . . tam animosi simus quam armis instructi, populum inermem, turbamque plebeiam, nobis resistere non posse quis diffidet?"<sup>36</sup> ("Since, then, . . . we are not only brave, but well armed, can it be supposed that an unarmed multitude and mere rabble are able to resist us?")<sup>37</sup>

Henry of Huntingdon also uses arguments of this general type. William the Conqueror, in Henry's account, referred to the English as ignorant of the art of war, accustomed to be conquered, not even in possession of arrows. However, the full argument is not developed, only presented in a rhetorical question. However, at the Battle of the Standard, Henry writes, the speaker used this appeal in great detail, comparing the armor of the Normans and the lack of it by the Scots, the constant practice of arms by the Normans and the inexperience of the Scots. At the Battle of Lincoln, Baldwin compares the sizes of the two forces, concluding that their own is stronger in infantry than the enemy, equal in cavalry.

Matthew Paris adopted the same arguments in the abridged speech at the Battle of the Standard in his Historia Minor. In the Chronica Majora he also includes the argument in the speech by the Saracen leader in 1250. We

---

<sup>36</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (Latin), p. 242 (I, ix).

<sup>37</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (English), p. 200.

have already seen how the argument begins with a reference to past success. It concludes as one from military advantage, claiming that the remaining French are "fame et dolore tabidae, citius occuratis conterendae"<sup>38</sup> ("worn away by hunger and grief, and easily to be crushed").<sup>39</sup>

When Roger of Hoveden embellished the speech by King Richard before the battle at Cyprus, which he had found in the chronicle of Benedict of Peterborough, he added a comparison of the two sides. The enemy, according to Roger, "inermes sunt, fugae potius quam bello parati; nos vero bene sumus armati"<sup>40</sup> ("are without arms and better prepared for flight than for battle; whereas we are well armed.")<sup>41</sup>

William of Poitiers makes use of such arguments also. In the speech before crossing the channel, William portrays the duke trying to convince his men that they will not face a militarily disadvantageous situation, reassuring them that, while Harold is spending lots of money, he is not increasing his power at all, that the Normans will have plenty of ships for their purposes, and that Harold is just trying to scare them by his cunning ways. But in the speech be-

---

<sup>38</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), V, p. 156.

<sup>39</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (English), II, p. 375.

<sup>40</sup>Roger of Hoveden, (Latin), Vol. III, p. 106.

<sup>41</sup>Roger of Hoveden, (English), Vol. II, p. 201.

fore the battle, the duke merely hinted at this appeal. He referred to the English as in the habit of losing, as never famous soldiers, and at the end of the speech as unskilled. But the argument is merely implied, not developed.

William of Tyre adapts the topic, focusing on a slightly different advantage. One army of Crusaders had just been beaten. The speaker is trying to persuade another army to take revenge on the infidel, as they now would enjoy a certain advantage.

'Videtur ergo mihi quod hostes de praesenti aliquantulum elati victoria, imprudentius se habebunt; et de sua virtute praesumentes, per nos ad urbem redire, praedam et manubias inferre non verebuntur.' Solet enim prosperitas eos, quibus praesens arridet, reddere incautiores; sicuti versa vice miseris et afflictis rebus, solet solertia major accedere.<sup>42</sup>

It seems to me that the infidels, somewhat elated over this victory, will not exercise their usual caution. Confident of their strength, they will not hesitate to pass through our ranks as they return to the city with booty and plunder. For just as an unfortunate and desperate situation induces greater caution, so prosperity generally renders rather careless those upon whom she is smiling for the moment.<sup>43</sup>

While the claim that they have some natural military advantage approaches the problem from a purely material point of view, the same general argument was often used

---

<sup>42</sup>William of Tyre, (Latin), col. 330 (V, v).

<sup>43</sup>William of Tyre, (English), Vol. I, p. 231. For some reason, the PL edition treats the last sentence as outside the direct quotation, but the translator includes it as part of the speech.

from a supernatural point of view. Often the speaker claims that, for one reason or another, his army will obtain heavenly aid in this combat, undoubtedly a considerable advantage.

There is in Aelred's account of the speech before the Battle of the Standard a detailed and extensive claim of this type. Walter Espec says that Michael and the angels, Peter and the Apostles, the holy martyrs, and indeed Christ Himself will be fighting with them against their barbarous enemies. This is the longest and most detailed use of this appeal that was discovered.

Alberic of Aix, or Albert of Aachen, presents this argument, basing it on a historic claim. The speaker states that they have been receiving divine aid in the past: "solo Deo protegente, evasimus superatis hostibus" ("sheltered by God alone we have evaded the superior enemy.") He then adds that they should hope for such aid in the coming battle: "et ideo quid consulam, nescio, nisi ut in nomine Domini Jesu, et in virtute S. crucis universi stemus adversus incredulos pugnantes. Potens enim est Deus etiam de istorum manibus nos liberare, sicut heri de manu plurimorum et fortiorum liberavit."<sup>44</sup> ("What I should counsel I do not know, unless that we might all stand in the name of the Lord Jesus, and in the strength of the holy cross, fighting

---

<sup>44</sup>Albert of Aix, Historia Hierosolymitanae Expeditionis, PL CLXVI, col. 604 (VII, lxviii).

against the unbelievers. For God is powerful enough to free us from their hands also, as yesterday he freed us from the grasp of many and more powerful.") Rather than claim that divine aid will automatically be given, the speaker often, as he does here, asks the army to hope for it, and in that hope, act decisively in God's cause.

The sermon in the De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi includes such an argument of an extended nature. The appeal here, however, is more implicit than explicit. The entire sermon asks the army to repent, confess their sins, humble themselves before God, and ask the Lord for aid in this enterprise. "Exhibite ergo vos iterum ad hoc negotium, quales huc advenistis, et secure promitto vobis hostium vestrorum potentias frangere. Non enim ego sed Dominus, qui digne petentibus semper annuit et favet, confitentibusque numquam veniam negare consuevit."

Therefore, show yourselves once more in this undertaking such men as you were when you arrived here, and I confidently promise you that you will shatter the power of your enemies. For it is not I but the Lord, who always grants and shows favor to those who make a worthy request, and who is accustomed never to deny forgiveness to those who make confession.<sup>45</sup>

Then the speaker claims that they have been thus far unsuccessful in penetrating the city because God has been strengthening their patience. He promises that he will go with them in the siege, bearing the wood of the cross. The

---

<sup>45</sup>De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi, pp. 154f.

last paragraph of the speech, back in the mode of a sermon, is a prayer for divine aid. Thus, it seems that this priest thought such a line of appeal a good one.

Before the Battle of Lincoln, according to Henry of Huntingdon, Baldwin used this argument in addressing the troops of King Stephen. Since they were pledged by oath to fight for the anointed king, and were fighting against perjured men, God, he promises, will therefore grant them His aid in battle. The argument is presented briefly, but the causal connections are clearly drawn.

On one occasion during the Crusades, Ordericus relates, the infidel were besieging an army of Christians. Another army of Christians was coming to their rescue. An exhortation was given to the latter, promising them that the Lord is with them, and concluding that they should, remembering Biblical examples of God's aid, trust in the power of God and fight.<sup>46</sup> "Dominus vobiscum est," he states and finally, "Haec et alia multa his similia in divinis operibus considerate, et in Dei virtute confidentes certamen inite."<sup>47</sup>

Simeon of Durham presents a vision in which Saint Cuthbert appeared to King Alfred, which the king related to a select number of his troops the next day to animate them

---

<sup>46</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (English), Vol. III, p. 189.

<sup>47</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (Latin), Vol. V, pp. 96f (XIII, xxxiii).



for battle. In the vision, Cuthbert promised that "per donum Dei et auxilium sancti Cuthberti . . . hostes vin- cerent, et terram haereditario jure obtinerent."<sup>48</sup> ("Through the gift of God and the aid of St. Cuthbert they would conquer their enemies and obtain the land they inherited by right.") Simeon also presents such an appeal in his Capitula de Miraculis et Translationibus Sancti Cuthberti.

Again it is Alfred speaking to his troops, but this time he is asking that they act in a certain way in order to obtain the promised aid. "Unde rogo monitis sancti Cuthberti, defensoris nostri, attente obediamus . . . vitiorum voragines fugiamus, atque virtutum exercitia diligamus, sic profecto, et promissum caelestis gratiae auxilium, et suae defensionis experiemur ubique patrocinium."<sup>49</sup> ("From whence I ask, let us be attentively obedient to the warning of St. Cuthbert, our defender . . . let us flee the abysses of sins, and let us love the practice of virtue, thus certainly, we will experience everywhere both the promised aid of heavenly grace and the protection of its defense.")

William the Breton portrays Philip Augustus using this topic before the Battle of Bouvines. Philip claims

---

<sup>48</sup>Simeon of Durham, Historia de S. Cuthberto, p. 206.

<sup>49</sup>Simeon of Durham, Capitula de Miraculis et Translationibus Sancti Cuthberti, in Opera Omnia, Vol. I, ed. by Thomas Arnold, Rolls Series, Vol. 75:1 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1882; Kraus Reprint, 1965), p. 233. Hereinafter cited as: Simeon of Durham, Capitula.

they are going to battle as defenders of the Church. "Unde presumere fiducialiter debemus de Dei misericordia qui nobis licet peccatoribus, dabit de suis et de nostris hostibus triumphare."<sup>50</sup> ("We ought faithfully to trust that by the mercy of God which is granted to sinners, He will provide a triumph over His and our enemies.")

Robert the Monk, as a final example, depicts a speech to an army of Crusaders. "Orientales divitias adduxit vobis Dominus vester in faciem vestram, imo in manibus vertiis. Confortamini, et estote viri cordati, quoniam jam mittet Dominus legiones, sanctorum suorum, qui ulciscuntur vos de inimicis vestris."<sup>51</sup> ("Your Lord brought Oriental riches before you, even into your hands. You should be comforted and be prudent men, because now the Lord will send legions of his saints, who will avenge you of your enemies.") The speaker then warns the army not to fear the advent of these heavenly legions, although they will look strange and make lots of noise. He concludes, "et Dominus Deus noster omnipotens sit vobiscum"<sup>52</sup> ("and may our omnipotent Lord God be with you.")

Another common argument is for the speaker to tell his troops that they can conquer the enemy even though they

---

<sup>50</sup>William the Breton, op. cit., p. 273.

<sup>51</sup>Robert the Monk, Historia Hierosolymitana, PL CLV, col. 729.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid.

are outnumbered. There are at least two possible explanations for its frequent appearance. Perhaps a medieval army often had to confront an enemy that greatly outnumbered it. Or, perhaps this is a rhetorical device to enhance the reputation of a duke or army.

The argument can take different forms. It can be claimed that if they show sufficient bravery and valor, they will beat the multitudes of the enemy. It can also be claimed that what they need to win is piety and God's help, and with those, will defeat the enemy. Often a combination argument is used, not relying solely on secular or divine actions for victory.

In the Relatio de Standardo Walter Espec argues that although the Scots are numerous, victory depends not on numbers but on God and a just cause. Add to that the military superiority of the English, and the Scots cannot win. He concludes the appeal with the claim that the greater the numbers of the Scots, the greater will be our glory when they are beaten.

Alberic of Aix uses this appeal in two speeches. The first one was discussed above for its example of the argument that God will aid them. That appeal ends with the claim that it is easy for God to have few beat a multitude. In the second speech, the argument is merely implied. The speaker says, "Hi in virtute sua, nos vero in nomine Dei

viventis adunati sumus."<sup>53</sup> ("They are assembled in their strength, we however in the name of the living God.") The implication is clear, but the argument is not developed.

The Gesta Consulum Andegavorum presents a situation in which the specific rhetorical problem the count faced was to get his men to fight against a multitude. The men first spoke to him: "Quomodo pauci pugnare possumus ad multitudinem tantam, tam fortem? et nos fatigati sumus hodie!" ("How are we so few able to fight against such a multitude, such strength? and we are tired today!") To which the count replied, "Facile est concludi multos in manu paucorum, et non est differentia in conspectu Dei coeli liberare in multis aut in paucis, quia non in multitudine exercitus victoria belli, sed de coelo fortitudo est."<sup>54</sup> ("It is easy for many to be beaten by the hands of a few, and it makes no difference in the sight of the God of heaven whether he frees in large numbers or in small, since victory in a war depends not on the multitude of the army, but on the strength of heaven.")

Giraldus Cambrensis uses this argument twice. In the first speech, the appeal seems to be the central focus.

---

<sup>53</sup> Albert of Aix, op. cit., col. 473 (III, lx).

<sup>54</sup> Gesta Consulum Andegavorum et Dominorum Ambazien-  
sium, in Chroniques d'Anjou, ed. by Paul Marchegay and  
Andre Salmon (Paris: Jules Renouard, 1856; New York:  
Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1965), p. 146. Hereinafter  
cited as: Gesta Consulum.

It appears three different times, each time after a comparison of the respective causes for which the two sides were about to fight. Dermotius is speaking, and begins by calling the opponent Roderic wicked, out to tyrannize over them or massacre them. "De multitudine superbus et elatus, ambitionem suam brachio metitur: sed inermi multitudini et inertii plerumque gravis esse solet animosa paucitas et armata." ("Arrogant in his numbers, he measures his ambition by the strength of his arm; but a small and well-armed band, if brave, have often discomfited an unarmed and ill-organized rabble.") Then Dermotius challenges the justice of Roderic's claim to the land, and refers to his desire to be sole master. "Multi sunt, et de multitudine forte confidunt: sed congregari cum multis ausos noverint Lagenienses. Non enim virorum, seu virium, sed virtutum copia bella vincuntur." ("Many there are who boast of their great numbers and trust therein, but let them be well assured that the men of Leinster never shrunk from engaging a host of men; for victory is not won by numbers, but by valour and resolution.") Finally, Dermotius compares the virtues of his army with the vices of Roderic's, concluding, "Numerosis virtutibus, non viribus innumeris, viri victoriam consequuntur"<sup>55</sup> ("men gain the victory by numerous virtues, not by innumerable forces.")<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (Latin), p. 241 (I, viii).

<sup>56</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (English), p. 199.

The other speech is by Maurice Fitzgerald, who explains to his army their desperate situation. He concludes that there is no way out but to fight. "Moram itaque rumpentes et ignaviam, quoniam 'Audentes fortuna juvat,' dum nobis jamjam deficientia vires adhuc alimenta ministrant, hostes viriliter aggrediamur; animosaque paucitas et armata, solita strenuitatis opera, consuetaque belli victoria, multitudinem inermem conterat et imbellem."<sup>57</sup>

Away then with hesitation and cowardice, and let us boldly attack the enemy, while our short stock of provisions yet supplies us with sufficient strength. Fortune helps the brave, and a well-armed though scanty force, inured to war, and animated by the recollection of former triumphs, may yet crush this rude and disorderly rabble.<sup>58</sup>

The quotation is from Vergil's Aeneid, and the speech is immediately followed by another quotation from the same source. While there is mentioned the appeal to remember past victories, clearly it is subordinate to the dominant one that it is yet possible for a few to beat many.

Henry of Huntingdon's speech at the Battle of the Standard includes an extended argument of this type. The bishop begins by asking what it is they fear, the numbers of the enemy? He then states that valor, not numbers, is decisive, and indeed, a multitude of undisciplined soldiers is a hindrance. He combines this with the argument that

---

<sup>57</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (Latin), p. 267 (I, xxiii).

<sup>58</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (English), p. 223.

their ancestors were often successful against much larger armies. He ends the development by enumerating their ancestors' renown, their military training, their discipline, and asking what they avail if they do not make them able to conquer larger armies.

The treatise on the Crusade attributed to Ralph of Coggeshall uses this appeal. The Master of the Templars says, "Scitote vero patres vestros non tam multitudine, apparatu armato, quam fide et justitia, et observatione mandatorum Dei, victores ubique fuisse, quis non est difficile vel in multis vel in paucis vincere, quando victoria e coelo est."<sup>59</sup> ("Know in truth that your fathers were victors everywhere not so much by their multitude, well armed, as by faith and justice and by following the commands of God, since it is not difficult to conquer either with many or with few when the victory is from heaven.") In the speech immediately following, the Master of the Hospitallers recalls the victory of Abraham with only three hundred slaves, over four kings: "mementote Abraham, qui cum ccc. vernaculis quatuor reges persecutus est atque percussit, et praedam excussit."<sup>60</sup>

In Simeon's History of St. Cuthbert, it is the saint himself who uses this approach. He told the king, "Ne

---

<sup>59</sup> Ralph of Coggeshall, op. cit., p. 212.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

timeas, inquit, quis ego tecum sum, neque diffidas paucitati militum, quia hostes mei adhuc vivi jam coram Deo sunt mortui, nec poterunt tibi resistere, qui pacem Dei et meam non timuerunt violare."<sup>61</sup> ("Do not fear since I am with you; you ought not despair of the small number of your soldiers, since the enemy of mine, at this point yet alive, are already dead before God, nor are they able to resist you, as they did not fear to violate God's peace and mine.") Here, as so often, it is divine aid that will allow a few to conquer many. The same argument is also presented in Simeon's treatise on the miracles of St. Cuthbert, again by the saint himself. "Ne diffidas tuorum paucitati militum cum Dei meumque habeas auxilium; Deo enim nequaquam est impossibile sive in multis sive in paucis salvare."<sup>62</sup> ("You should not despair of your small number of knights, when you may have God's aid and mine. For to God it is by no means impossible to save you whether you are many or few.") The rest of the speech is nearly the same as the former one, at least in substance.

William of Poitiers adopts this topic, but does not give it prominence. Before crossing the channel, Duke William tells his men that wars are won by courage, not by numbers. And before the Battle of Hastings, William tells

---

<sup>61</sup>Simeon of Durham, Historia de Sancto Cuthberto, p. 214.

<sup>62</sup>Simeon of Durham, Capitula, p. 242.



the troops that the numbers of the English should not scare them, for they are in the habit of losing and have never been famous as soldiers.

A combination of this argument with one from immediately past success is found in the chronicle by Ekkehard of Aura. King Baldwin begins his exhortation by reminding the soldiers that not long ago they had carried off much booty with only a few men; today, therefore, they should not yield to a multitude of the enemy. "Rex Balduvinus, suos hortatus ut sicut ante paucos dies per Dei gratiam parva manu multam de Arabia praedam tulerant, ita nunc hostium multitudini non cedant."<sup>63</sup>

Another appeal that seems to have been relatively popular particularly in accounts of the battles of the Crusaders, is the request that the army fight and either die or conquer for Christ. The speaker often extends the argument, claiming that either outcome is good, and sometimes draws the further conclusion that of the two it is preferable to die for Christ, to become a martyr. Sometimes the speaker takes as support Romans xiv, 8: sive vivimus sive morimur Domini sumus. This was found in speeches by Fulcher of Chartres,<sup>64</sup> by Lisiard,<sup>65</sup> and by

---

<sup>63</sup>Ekkehard of Aura, Chronica, PL CLIV, col. 982.

<sup>64</sup>Fulcher of Chartres, Historia Hierosolymitana, PL CLV, col. 877 (II, xvii).

<sup>65</sup>Lisiardus Turonensis, Historia Hierosolymitana, PL CLXXIV, col. 1607.

Alberic of Aix.<sup>66</sup>

Alberic uses the general topic in other speeches as well. As most fully developed in his work, it appears at the end of a speech.

Si autem morti et contritioni destinati sumus, fiduciam et spem habeamus, quia, si corpus nostram pro nomine Jesu et sanctis Jerusalem nunc in praesenti saeculo occidi permiserimus, in futuro animas nostras in vitam aeternam una cum fratribus nostris, hesterno praelio pro Christo jugulatis et attritis, conservare poterimus.<sup>67</sup>

If however, we are destined to die and to be worn down, let us have faith and hope, since, if we will permit our bodies to be killed now in the present age for the name of Jesus and holy Jerusalem, we will be able to save our spirits in the future in eternal life, together with our brothers who were murdered and destroyed for Christ in yesterday's battle.

Balderic of Dol describes the battle for Jerusalem in the first Crusade. The pre-battle exhortation ends with the claim that, as co-helpers of God, they should let death be beautiful for Christ, since in this city Christ died for them: "et pulchrum sit mori vobis pro Christo, in ista regione, pro quibus Christus mortuus est in ista civitate."<sup>68</sup>

Ekkehard develops the argument more fully. He claims that it is honorable to fight for the inheritance of Christ ("Porro pro Christi hereditate . . . pugnare honestum

---

<sup>66</sup> Alberic of Aix, op. cit., col. 473 (III, lx).

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., col. 604 (VII, lxviii).

<sup>68</sup> Baldricus Dolensis, op. cit., col. 1143.

est"), concluding that "Francos mortem non timere, immo Christi peregrinos aut in Christo vincere aut pro Christo mori velle!"<sup>69</sup> ("Franks do not fear death, on the contrary, pilgrims of Christ wish either to conquer in Christ or to die for Christ!")

The priest's sermon before the walls of Lisbon also includes this appeal, developed to the furthest conclusion. "In hoc vexillo, solum non hesitetis, vincetis. Quia si quem hoc insignitum mori contigerit, sibi vitam tolli non credimus, sed in melius mutari non ambigimus. Hic ergo vivere gloria est, et mori luctrum." ("Under this ensign, if only you falter not, you shall conquer. Because, if it should happen that anyone signed with this cross should die, we do not believe that life has been taken from him, for we have no doubt that he is changed into something better. Here, therefore, to live is glory, and to die is gain.")<sup>70</sup>

In the Chronica Majora Matthew Paris puts such an argument in the mouth of the Welsh chief, Llewellyn. He begins by claiming that the Lord has been protecting them or they would have already been defeated by the English. He then argues that, given the way the English act, they can expect no mercy from them. The speech concludes with the

---

<sup>69</sup>Ekkehard of Aura, op. cit., col. 982.

<sup>70</sup>De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi, pp. 156f.

statement, "Melius est mori, et ad Deum migrare, quam in angaria vivere, et ad arbitrium tandem hostium deperire."<sup>71</sup>

("It is better for us to die and to depart to the Lord, than to live in oppression and to die in the end at the will of our enemies.")<sup>72</sup>

Ordericus Vitalis uses an argument praising martyrdom.

Vere beati et amici Dei estis, quos ut suae beatitudinis participes praestolatur curia coelestis. Ecce jam, si flagrat in vobis fides integra, eadem sine dubio vobis propinatur martyrii causa, pro qua sancti athletae Christi Georgius et Theodorus, Demetrius et Sebastianus, contra sathanam ejusque satellites laboriose dimicaverunt, acriter certantes gloriose superaverunt, et perennem coronam triumphantes a rege sabaoth acceperunt. Similis, oro, fortuna vobis comitetur, nec dispar merces a Deo vobis donetur.<sup>73</sup>

Ye are truly blessed and beloved of God, for the heavenly court expects you to become partakers of its blessedness. Lo! now if a pure faith burns within you, doubtless an opportunity of martyrdom is offered to you, similar to that for which the holy champions of Christ, George and Theodore, Demetrius and Sebastian, devotedly contended against Satan and his crew, and gloriously conquering them after a sharp encounter, received in triumph the eternal crown from the King of Sabaoth. I pray that a like fortune may attend you, and that he may bestow on you a like reward.<sup>74</sup>

Ralph of Coggeshall presents an exhortation which,

---

<sup>71</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), Vol. V, p. 647.

<sup>72</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (English), Vol. III, p. 244.

<sup>73</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (Latin), Vol. V, pp. 95f (XIII, xxxiii).

<sup>74</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (English), Vol. III, p. 188.

after describing how the army is fighting for Christ, ends, "Hoc scientes, sive vivimus sive morimur, in nomine Jesu semper esse victores."<sup>75</sup> ("Knowing this, whether we live or die, we are always victors in the name of Jesus.")

Robert the Monk, immediately prior to the argument that the Crusaders will get the aid of the saints, has the speaker claim:

Et quid timeretis? nullum vobis contingere potest omnino infortunium. Qui hic morietur, vivente felicior erit, quia pro temporali vita gaudia adipiscetur aeterna: Qui vero remanserit superstes, super inimicorum suorum triumphabit victoria, divitiisque illorum ditabitur, et nulla angustabitur inopia.<sup>76</sup>

And what should you fear? No misfortune is able to touch you at all. He who will die here, will be more happy than the living, since for a temporal life, he will win eternal joy: who remains surviving will triumph over his enemies by victory, and will be enriched by their riches and will suffer from no lack.

As a final example, Guibert uses the commonplace.

"Si hic vobis fuerit obeundum, regnum vos coeleste manet, felici obituros exitio; si vivendum, exspectat vos, si de fide praesumitis, certa victoria . . . ex hostium divitiis opulentia copiosa. Utrumlibet ergo accidat, inest vobis utrobique securitas."<sup>77</sup> ("If this has been undertaken by you, the heavenly kingdom awaits you, going to die, as an

---

<sup>75</sup> /Ralph of Coggeshall, op. cit., p. 212.

<sup>76</sup> Robert the Monk, op. cit., col. 728.

<sup>77</sup> Guibert of Nogent, op. cit., col. 724.

exit of happiness; if living, certain victory awaits you, if you hold to your faith . . . from the riches of the enemies, plentiful riches. Therefore whichever should happen, security is in it for you either way.")

Of relatively frequent occurrence is the demand for vengeance. The leader is often portrayed asking his men to avenge the deaths of their comrades, or to make sure that their own deaths are avenged in advance, and sometimes even to take vengeance for God.

The saintly Aelred includes this appeal, but does not give it prominence, in the Relatio de Standardo. The army is asked to avenge Christ's injuries, i.e., the injuries the Scots had inflicted on churches, shrines, priests and the like. But only one sentence is given to the request.

Balderic of Dol includes a similar appeal, asking the troops to take vengeance for God, using the form of a comparison.

Patribus et filiis et fratribus et nepotibus dico: Nunquid si quis externus vestrum aliquem percusserit, sanguinem vestrum non ulciscemini? Multo magis Deum vestrum, Patrem vestrum, fratrem vestrum ulcisci debetis, quem exprobrari, quem proscribi, quem crucifigi videtis; quem clamantem et desolatum et auxilium poscentum auditis: "Torcular calcavi solus, et de gentibus non est vir mecum (Isa. lxiii, 3)."<sup>78</sup>

I say, if someone foreign shall kill any of your fathers or sons or brothers or grandsons: will you not avenge your blood? By much more ought you to avenge your God, your Father, your brother,

---

<sup>78</sup>Baldricus Dolensis, op. cit., col. 1143.

whom you see blamed, outlawed, crucified; whom you hear crying and forsaken and begging for aid: "I have trodden the wine press alone, and from the peoples no one was with me."

The use of a scriptural quotation in a battle oration, while not unique, is yet rather rare.

In the chronicle of Helmold, the argument for vengeance to be taken appears several times. Apparently it was more important as a motive in that part of Europe at that time, or so it would seem; or, perhaps it was simply Helmold's own preference. One use of the argument comes from a speech attributed to the whole Saxon army. Their prince had been offered money as satisfaction for the murder of his son, which offer he presented to the army for them either to accept or reject. They demanded that he avenge the death by war.

Ranos igitur, qui filium tuum occiderunt, pro ducentis marcis in gratiam recipiendos nostro consilio dicis? Revera nomini tuo magno condigna satisfactio! Absit a nobis talis iniuria, ut unquam facto huic assentiamus; nec enim ideo uxores, filios, denique patrias sedes reliquimus, ut hostibus cavillationem et filiis nostris obprobrium sempiternum hereditemus. Quin potius perge ut cepisti, transi mare, utere ponte, quem stravit tibi bonus artifex, admove inimicis tuis manus: videbis gloriosam mortem nobis maximo esse lucro.<sup>79</sup>

You say, then, that the Rani who slew your son may by our counsel be received back into favor for two hundred marks? Satisfaction, indeed, worthy of your great name! Far be from us such

---

<sup>79</sup> Helmold of Bosau, Slavenchronik (Cronica Slavorum), MGH SS Rerum Germanicarum in Usus Scholarum, Vol. 32 (Hannover, 1937), p. 75 (I, xxxviii).

ignominy that we should ever assent to this proposition. We did not leave our wives, our children, in fine, our fathers' estates, to incur the mockery of the enemy and the everlasting reproach of our children. Nay, rather go on as you began, cross the sea, use the bridge which the good Artisan has fashioned for you, attack the enemy. You will see that a glorious death is our greatest reward.<sup>80</sup>

On another occasion, the Frisians were besieged in a fortress by the Slavs. The Slavs offered to let them out, if they would surrender their arms. A priest inside the fortress exhorted them not to accept the terms, for they would simply be butchered without possibility of defending themselves. He urged them at the very least to avenge their coming deaths: "Gladios igitur vestros, quos ultro sibi expetunt, mergite prius in medullis eorum et estote ultores sanguinis vestri. Hauriant gustum audaciae vestrae nec victoria redeant incruenta."<sup>81</sup> ("Rather, plunge into their vitals your swords, which of their own accord they bespeak for themselves, and be avengers of your blood. Let them taste your valor. Let them not go back with a bloodless victory.")<sup>82</sup>

The final example from Helmold is a speech largely based on the appeal to vengeance. The Slav leader begins,

---

<sup>80</sup>Helmold of Bosau, The Chronicle of the Slavs, trans. by Francis Joseph Tschan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1935), p. 129.

<sup>81</sup>Helmold of Bosau, (Latin), p. 121 (I, lxiv).

<sup>82</sup>Helmold of Bosau, (English), p. 179.



in addressing his army, by referring to the calamities the enemy has inflicted on them in the past, for which his own father took revenge and died in the process ("Hanc iniuriam zelatus est pater meus usque ad mortem"). His own brother, at the same time, was imprisoned. Therefore, the speaker asks the army to rouse their spirits and take the fortress they were besieging and the men in it, "ut ulciscar in eos, sicut ultus sum in eos qui invaserant Mikilenburg"<sup>83</sup> ("that I may take vengeance upon them as I took vengeance upon those who had seized Mecklenburg.")<sup>84</sup>

Henry of Huntingdon portrays William at the Battle of Hastings asking for revenge as the final appeal in the speech. At the Battle of Lincoln, according to Henry, the first part of Earl Robert's speech clearly implies an appeal for revenge, as Robert outlines the various wrongs Stephen has committed, including disinheriting many in Robert's army of their property. At the end, he asks the army to take the vengeance which God Himself offers to them.

In 1250 the French king is described by Matthew Paris animating his army, ending with the appeal, "inimicos nostros fraterno sanguine cruentatos unanimiter cum fiducia impetamus et cruorem amicorum nostrorum fusum de manibus hostium condigna ultione constanter requiramus. Et quis

---

<sup>83</sup>Helmold of Bosau, (Latin), p. 193 (II, xcviij).

<sup>84</sup>Helmold of Bosau, (English), p. 256.

posset ulterius aequanimiter tantam Christi injuriam tolerare?"<sup>85</sup> ("Let us with condign vengeance require the blood of our friends, which has been shed at the hands of our enemies. And who, indeed, could any longer patiently endure such a great injury offered to Christ?")<sup>86</sup>

Ordericus Vitalis includes a speech by the king to the army of Crusaders at Joppa in 1102, which seems built around the appeal for revenge. The speaker begins by claiming that the enemy are hateful to God and all Christian men, and enemies of goodness. "Ad faciendam ultionem Dei viriliter armamini, sociis appropinquantibus urbem egredimini, fideque fortes, in Dei protectione praeliamini. Injurias vestras et damna medullitus recensete, manusque vestras haud segnes sentiant alienigenae."<sup>87</sup>

Let us put on our armour that we may take vengeance in the name of God, and sally out to meet our friends who are marching to our aid, and strong in the faith give the enemy battle under God's protection. Reflect in your inmost souls on the wrongs and losses you have sustained, and let the aliens feel the weight of your arms in full vigour.<sup>88</sup>

Then follows a list of the nobles the enemy has carried off.

---

<sup>85</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), Vol. V, p. 155.

<sup>86</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (English), Vol. II, p. 373.

<sup>87</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (Latin), Vol. IV, p. 136 (X, xxi).

<sup>88</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (English), Vol. III, p. 303.

"Recens dolor de morte amicorum inflammet vos, et exacerbet ad perniciem inimicorum."<sup>89</sup> ("Let your fresh grief at the loss of your friends inflame your rage and sharpen your swords for the destruction of the enemy.")<sup>90</sup>

Roger of Hoveden, in the speech presented earlier, portrays King Richard beginning his speech by asking for vengeance against the emperor of Cyprus for the injuries he has done to God and the Crusaders and pilgrims.

William of Tyre, too, presents a speech in which the appeal for revenge is strong. The Crusaders had received word that another Christian army had just been beaten badly by the infidel. The duke explains this to his army and turns immediately to this line of appeal:

nihil aliud restare video, viri illustres, quam ut cum eis moriamur, aut tantam Domino Jesu Christo illatam ulciscamur injuriam. Mihi, credite, quia nec vita, nec salus, morete vel quolibet aegritudinis genere, charior est, si tantorum principum sanguis impune effusus est super terram, aut tanta Deo devoti populi strages maturam non invenerit ultionem.<sup>91</sup>

I perceive that nothing remains for us, illustrious men, but to avenge the great injury done to our Lord Jesus Christ or to die with them. Believe me, neither life nor safety is preferable to death or any kind of suffering, if the blood of these great lords has been poured forth upon the earth in vain, if so terrible a slaughter of

---

<sup>89</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (Latin), Vol. IV, p. 136 (X, xxi).

<sup>90</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (English), Vol. III, p. 304.

<sup>91</sup>William of Tyre, (Latin), col. 330 (V, v).

people dedicated to God does not meet with a swift vengeance.<sup>92</sup>

And at the end of the speech, he asks the Christians to fight, remembering the injuries inflicted upon them ("injuriae memores illatae").

One of the more interesting appeals was the frequent reminder to the troops that they cannot escape by flight. Such an argument, of course, is more situation-bound than many others. Yet it appears quite frequently. Apparently it was a very real possibility that the army might turn and flee, and was not considered degrading to the army for the historian to insert such an appeal in his chronicle. Perhaps the commander had, in some cases at least, purposely chosen such a location for his army to make his men fight more valiantly.<sup>93</sup>

One situation of an unusual nature appears in Alberic of Aix's chronicle. The Crusaders were in a desperate situation, their enemies advancing well armed, themselves greatly reduced in numbers and worn out by a recent battle. They had to face the enemy: "locus et possibilitas ab eis divertendi non est,"<sup>94</sup> and therefore the leader simply asks that they stand in Jesus' name and hope for divine aid.

---

<sup>92</sup>William of Tyre, (English), Vol. I, p. 231.

<sup>93</sup>This possibility was suggested to the writer by Dr. Lynn Nelson.

<sup>94</sup>Albert of Aix, op. cit., col. 604 (VII, lxviii).

A more normal situation appears in Benedict of Peterborough's chronicle, in the speech before the Battle of Breteuil. This time, the relevant argument comes from the section borrowed not from Henry of Huntingdon but from a letter of the king of Sicily. "Praeterea unum est, fortissimi proceres, quod vobis firmiter ingerere volo; quod nulla potest esse fugientibus reversio. Nam ita circumdati sumus undique hostibus nostris, et ideo quia nulla spes fugae est, hoc solum superest, ut vincamus vel occumbamus."<sup>95</sup> ("Moreover, there is one thing, most brave nobles, that I want to stress firmly: that turning back as fugitives is in no way possible. For we are so surrounded from all sides by our enemies that since there is no hope of flight, this alone remains, that we conquer or we fall.")

Richard, canon of Holy Trinity, utilizes this argument. The speaker claims simply that the enemy surrounds us, so to flee is certain death.<sup>96</sup>

In the Gesta Consulum Andegavorum the appeal is presented very briefly. "De fuga nullus cogitet unquam, quoniam longe nimis a nobis Andegavis abest."<sup>97</sup> ("Of flight

---

<sup>95</sup>Benedict of Peterborough, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 53. The editor claims in a marginal note that this is taken from a letter by the king of Sicily. But the phrasing is, in this passage, very similar to that in Henry of Huntingdon's account of Earl Robert's speech.

<sup>96</sup>Richard of Holy Trinity, op. cit., p. 417 (VI, xxii).

<sup>97</sup>Gesta Consulum, p. 120.

let no one ever think, for Anjou is very far from us.") Lisiard closes a speech by developing this appeal in the same manner: "De fuga, nullus cogitet unquam: quos longe nimis nostra nobis Francia abest."<sup>98</sup> ("Of flight, let no one ever think, since our France is too far away from us.") Similar statements, that flight will not save you because your homeland is far away, appear in several of the shorter speeches as well.

Giraldus Cambrensis, in the speech attributed to Maurice Fitzgerald, uses this appeal. Maurice has described the low state into which fortune has cast them, after they had previously been very successful. They are now beset by the enemy from all sides, by land and sea, and their provisions have failed ("en clausis undique hoste marique victualis jam deficiunt.") The speech then describes the futility of expecting any aid, for which reason they must now fight while they yet have their strength.<sup>99</sup>

Henry of Huntingdon inserts such an appeal in the speech by Earl Robert. The Earl stresses the point: "Unum vero est, proceres fortissimi militesque universi, quod vobis animo firmiter ingerere volo, quod per paludes, quas vix pertransitis, nulla potest esse fugientibus reversio. Hic igitur vel vincendum vel occumbendum; spes fugae nulla;

---

<sup>98</sup>Lisiardus, op. cit., col. 1603.

<sup>99</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (Latin), p. 267 (I, xxiii).

hoc solum superest, ut in urbem gladiis viam paretis."<sup>100</sup>

Ralph of Coggeshall presents a speech in which the danger asserted in flight is quite different. The speaker ends his speech: "Quod si aliquem vestrum prae timore nutantem, et inimicis locum intra nos praebentem, aut alicubi diffugientem perspexero, juro Omnipotentem Deum, quod ei caput ictu cleri amputabo."<sup>101</sup> ("But if any of you hesitate for fear, and give the enemy an opening among us, or if I see anyone fleeing anywhere, I swear by Almighty God, I will with one swift blow cut off his head.") This was the only instance of such a threat that was found.

Simeon of Durham presents King Alfred using this argument, but in a rather different mood. He referred to the barbarians tormenting their parents in times past, and then turns to the present: "et nos ipse, qui die noctuque ad similia per eosdem exquirimur, quomodo nullum habeamus jam tutum fugae locum, videmus, immo miserabiliter profugi sustinemus"<sup>102</sup> ("and we ourselves, who day and night are likewise hunted by the same ones, so that we might now have no safe place for flight, we see, rather than to flee miserably let us hold on.")

William of Poitiers places this argument in the mouth

---

<sup>100</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (Latin), p. 269.

<sup>101</sup>Ralph of Coggeshall, op. cit., p. 47.

<sup>102</sup>Simeon of Durham, Capitula, p. 233.

of Duke William before the Battle of Hastings. William stresses that they are fighting not only for conquest but for survival. He then adds that there is no road for retreat, for there is the enemy army and a hostile land ahead of them, and behind them the sea and an enemy fleet.

Matthew Paris presents a slightly different approach to this commonplace. The French king is exhorting his men and argues that they must stand and fight now, for although they have the possibility of retreat, if they do so the enemy will not only exult, but will pursue them and will soon destroy them from the face of the earth, which will also be bad for Christianity, the Church will be thereby ruined, and France will be disgraced.<sup>103</sup> This was the only case discovered in which the argument was clearly focused on other than the immediate future.

Another line of appeal that occurs with relatively great frequency, especially in the chronicles of the Crusades, reminds the army that they have come for the express purpose of this battle. Alberic begins two speeches with this claim. "Mementote in cuius nomine a terra et cognatione vestra existiis, et quomodo terrenae vitae abrenuntiastis, nulla pericula mortis pro Christo inire metuentes."<sup>104</sup> ("Remember in whose name you came out from your

---

<sup>103</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), Vol. V, pp. 154f.

<sup>104</sup>Alberic of Aix, op. cit., col. 489 (IV, xviii).



native land and your family, and in what manner you renounced earthly life, fearing no danger to go to death for Christ.") The second one starts, "Ah, miseri et inutiles, ad quid de terra et cognatione vestra existiis, nisi ut animas vestras usque ad mortem pro nomine Jesu daretis, et redemptione sanctae Ecclesiae et liberatione confratrum vestrorum."<sup>105</sup> ("Ah, wretched and useless ones, for what have you left your land and families, if not that you might give your spirits up to death for the name of Jesus, and for the redemption of holy Church and for the deliverance of your brothers?")

Balderic does the same. The speaker claims that it is now time for the battle. "Ad hoc patriam egressi estis; ad hoc venistis: Bellum semper desiderastis. Ecce quod diu optastis et orastis."<sup>106</sup> ("For this you came out of your country, for this you have come: you have always wanted war. Behold what you have desired and prayed for for a long time.")

Ekkehard uses the appeal in passing. "Ecce bellum, o boni milites, quod olim optarimus, pro quo patriam, parentes pacemque contempsimus."<sup>107</sup> ("Behold the war, oh good knights, which once we chose, for which we disregarded the

---

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., col. 570-1 (VII,iv).

<sup>106</sup> Baldricus Dolensis, op. cit., col. 1084-5.

<sup>107</sup> Ekkehard of Aura, op. cit., col. 982.

fatherland, parents, and peace.")

The Gesta Consulium Andegavorum contains a battle oration which begins with this line. "Eia milites! videtis et invenistis ad quod venistis."<sup>108</sup> ("Hey, knights! you see and you have found that for which you came," i.e., the battle.)

Lisiard also begins a speech this way. "Eia, milites Christi, videtis quod de tam longinquis regionibus per tot et tanta maris et terrae pericula quaesistis; venistis sponte offerre animas vestras pro Christo discrimini: invenistis, ad quod venistis. Non respuat ignavia, quod devotio sancta quaesivit, et tandem invenit."<sup>109</sup> ("Hey, knights of Christ, you see that for which you, from such far away regions, have sought through so many and such great dangers of seas and land; you have come by voluntary decision to offer your spirits for Christ; you have found that for which you have come. Let no one refuse by cowardice that holy self-sacrifice he sought and at last has found.")

Finally, Ordericus uses this appeal, too.

Nunc ergo, vos qui de natali solo pro coelesti amore progressi estis et dilectas conjuges divitiasque diu quaesitas reliquistis et huc per plures in mari et in terra molestias pervenistis, exempla sanctorum sumentes, scutum fidei prae-

---

<sup>108</sup>Gesta Consulium, pp. 119f.

<sup>109</sup>Lisiardus, op. cit., col. 1603.

tendite, et sanctuario Dei, quod de longinquo  
expetitis, constanter succurrite.<sup>110</sup>

Now, therefore, you who, for the love of heaven,  
have quitted your native land, leaving your be-  
loved wives and long-sought wealth, and encounter-  
ing many sufferings by sea and land, have come  
hither, following the example of the saints,  
take the shield of faith, and succour the sanc-  
tuary of God which you have sought from afar.<sup>111</sup>

Another line of appeal concerns defense. The speaker asks the soldiers to fight valiantly to defend themselves and/or their families and/or their country or king. Interestingly enough, this line of appeal was not used nearly as often as one might expect, but was still relatively frequent.

The most bizarre example of a speech based on this appeal is found in Geoffrey of Monmouth's British History. The British invaded Ireland for the purpose of bringing back the huge stones known as the Giant's Dance. The Irish king urges his soldiers to fight:

Non miror, si ignava gens Saxonum, insulam  
Britonum devastare potuit, cum Britones bruti  
sint et stulti. Quis etenim hujusmodi stultitiam  
audivit? Nunquid meliora sunt saxa Hiberniae  
quam Britanniae: ut regnum nostrum pro ipsis  
ad praeliandum provocetur? Armate vos viri, at  
defendite patriam vestram, quia dum mihi vita  
inerit, non auferent nobis etiam minimum lapidem  
choreae.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (Latin), Vol. V, p. 96 (XIII, xxxiii).

<sup>111</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (English), Vol. III, p. 189.

<sup>112</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (Latin), pp. 141f (VIII, xii).

No wonder a cowardly race of people were able to make so great a devastation in the island of Britain, when the Britons are such brutes and fools. Was ever the like folly heard of? What are the stones of Ireland better than those of Britain, that our kingdom must be put to this disturbance for them? To arms, soldiers, and defend your country; while I have life they shall not take from us the least stone of the Giant's Dance.<sup>113</sup>

Aelred uses the argument in his Genealogia Regum Anglorum. The speaker lists things for the army to defend, including the Church, the Christian name, and so on. "Postremo ne diripiantur uxores nostrae, ne captiventur filii, ne virgines violentur ne impii et perversi totam Anglorum nobilitatem ad degenerem transferant servitutem."<sup>114</sup> ("Last of all, lest your wives be taken away, lest your sons be captured, lest young girls be violated, lest the impious and perverse bear over to ignoble servitude all nobility of the English.") But for Saint Aelred, these are last in the list.

The Gesta Consulium Andegavorum mentions this argument in passing. "Nos autem pugnemus pro justitia nostra, pro terra nostra et pro animabus nostris, et ipse Dominus conteret eos ante faciem nostram," the speaker claims after listing the evil things for which the enemy was fighting.<sup>115</sup> ("However let us fight for our justice, for our land, and

---

<sup>113</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (English), pp. 216f.

<sup>114</sup>Aelred of Rievaulx, Genealogia, col. 721.

<sup>115</sup>Gesta Consulium, p. 146.

for our spirits and the Lord himself may pulverize them before our face.")

Helmold combines this appeal with one for pride. The speaker first justifies his recent actions, and then says, "Animequior autem ero, si vestra concors mecum fuerit voluntas, si in defensionem patriae mecum coniurata manu steteritis. Hoc enim loco presidium pugnae flagitat et verecundia fugae et certissimum patriae excidium."<sup>116</sup> ("I shall, however, feel easier if your will is in accord with mine, if you stand with me, a sworn band, in the defense of the fatherland. For in this place both the shame of flight and the most certain destruction of our fatherland demand recourse to battle.")<sup>117</sup>

Matthew Paris puts such an argument into the mouth of the Soldan in 1250. The Saracen first argues that they have already beaten half the French army, and this other half will be easy. Then he asks, "Quae enim eos temeraria exagitat dementia, ut nos impetant volentes exhaeredare, qui post diluvium hanc dignissimam inhabitavimus regionem?"<sup>118</sup> ("For what rash madness excites them to attack and endeavour to deprive us of our inheritance, who have in-

---

<sup>116</sup>Helmold of Bosau, (Latin), p. 127 (I, lxvii).

<sup>117</sup>Helmold of Bosau, (English), p. 185.

<sup>118</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), Vol. V, pp. 156f.

habited this noble country since the Flood?")<sup>119</sup> Matthew also includes this argument in Llewellyn's speech.

Nunc autem et de caetero rem agi sciatis pro capite. Si capiamur, nulla penitus sequetur misericordia. . . . Videmus luce clarius, quod Anglorum rex suos Anglos naturales depauperat, exhaeredat, et degenerare compellit; quomodo nobis parceret, qui eum provocantes laesioni et vindictae intendimus? Nos de sub caelo delere proponit.<sup>120</sup>

But you must know that now and henceforth we are fighting for our lives; if we are taken prisoners, we shall obtain no mercy at all. . . . We see as clear as the day how the English king impoverishes, disinherits, and debases his natural subjects the English; how then would he spare us, who seek to injure him and provoke him to vengeance? He purposes to blot us out from the face of the earth.<sup>121</sup>

A speech written by Ordericus urges the knights to defend their king's land, and thereby their own position:

Ecce adversarii regis per terram ejus debacchantur, et securi sunt, et unum de optimatibus ejus, cui defensionem regni sui commisit, captum abducunt. Quid faciemus? Numquid illos impune depopulari totam regionem sinemus? . . . Si enim ignavia torpentes baronem regis ab hostibus duci vinctum sine ictu dimiserimus, quomodo ante vultum regis astare audebimus? Stipendia cum laude nostra merito perdemus, nec pane regio vesci ulterius, me judice, debemus.<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (English), Vol. II, p. 375.

<sup>120</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), Vol. V, pp. 646f.

<sup>121</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (English), Vol. III, p. 244.

<sup>122</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (Latin), Vol. IV, p. 457 (XII, xxxix).

The king's enemies ravage his lands in security, and have captured and are carrying off one of his lords, to whom he had entrusted the defence of the country. What are we to do? Are we to suffer them to lay waste the whole neighbourhood with impunity? . . . and if we, through our cowardice, suffer the king's baron to be carried off in fetters before our eyes, without striking a blow, how shall we ever venture to appear in the royal presence? We shall justly forfeit both pay and honour, and in my opinion ought no longer to eat the king's bread.<sup>123</sup>

Another argument that occurs several times urges the soldiers to fight in the hopes of material gain. We have already seen two examples of this. In the Gesta Francorum, the message passed along the lines urged the men to fight for Christ and booty. And Richard, canon of Holy Trinity, reports that King Richard once established a price list for rewards in besieging a town.

King Arthur was urging his men to defeat Lucius Tiberius, and ended his exhortation with the promise of riches:

Quantos honores quisque vestrum possidebit, si voluntati meae atque praeceptis meis, ut fideles commilitones, acieveritis? Subjugatis etenim ipsis, continuo Romam petemus, petitam capiemus, captam possidebimus: et sic aurum, argentum, palatia, turres, oppida, civitates, et ceteras victorum divitias habebitis.<sup>124</sup>

You shall want no rewards of honour, if as faithful soldiers you do but strictly obey my commands. For as soon as we have routed them, we will march straight to Rome, and take it; and then all the gold, silver, palaces, towers, towns, cities,

---

<sup>123</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (English), Vol. IV, p. 73.

<sup>124</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (Latin), p. 191 (X, vii).

and other riches of the vanquished shall be yours.<sup>125</sup>

Giraldus Cambrensis, in the speech by Robert Fitz-Stephen, uses this type of argument. Robert reminded the army that they had come not for pay or plunder but on the promise of the grant of land and towns, if they would help reinstate the prince.<sup>126</sup>

Simeon of Durham presents a speech by King Alfred in which he asks the army to recover the land they had rightly inherited but the barbarians had taken away.

"Asseruit etiam illis . . . vincerent, et terram haereditario jure obtinerent."<sup>127</sup>

As a final example, Guibert of Nogent, in arguing that it really does not matter whether the Crusaders live or die, for each has its rewards, includes for the former possibility the promise that they will obtain riches. "Ad haec ex hostium divitiis opulentia copiosa."<sup>128</sup>

There are many other topics that were used, but in so few speeches that there would be no point in considering many of them here. Furthermore, there are many battle orations that simply do not contain classifiable material, as they are relevant only to the one situation. A few examples

---

<sup>125</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (English), p. 261.

<sup>126</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (Latin), p. 242 (I, ix).

<sup>127</sup>Simeon of Durham, Historia de S. Cuthberto, p. 206.

<sup>128</sup>Guibert of Nogent, op. cit., col. 724.



of these cases will suffice here.

One series of arguments that appears a few times centers around the concepts that it is good to obtain glory, and since one has to die sometime, a glorious death would be desirable. One of the more elaborately developed examples, combining both these possibilities, was written by Giraldus Cambrensis. In it he even includes a philosophical dissertation on death. The speech is attributed to Robert FitzStephen, who exhorts his followers to fight valiantly to restore the Irish prince to his throne.

Si nostra manu parta fuerit victoria, et Murchardides restituitur, et nostro aggressu regnum Hibernicum nobis et nostris in perpetuum retinetur, O quanta haec gloria, quantisque periculis, et quanto tam vitae dispendio quam mortis contemptu viris appetenda! Quid enim aliud mors quam interpolatio quaedam, modicique temporis mora, et quasi somnus inter momentaneam hanc vitam medius et manentem? Quid aliud mors, quam brevis quidam transitus a transitoriis ad aeterna? Moriendum quoque est, quia inevitabile est illud et commune, etsi nullo egregio facinore vel gloria vitam illustret, vel mortem laudis memoria consequatur. Illis itaque mors terribilis, quorum omnia simul cum morte mori videntur; non his, quorum laus emori non potest. Id igitur, viri viribus insignes et virtute praeclari, id unanimiter aggrediamur, ut in nobis hodie genus nostrum non degeneret; et in hoc conflictu, seu vincendo seu moriendo, perpetuam nobis gloriam strenuitate comparemus.<sup>129</sup>

If the victory be won by our prowess, and Mac Murchard be restored, and the realm of Ireland be secured by our enterprise for us and our heirs for ever, how great will be our glory, how worthy of being achieved even by the loss of life and the contempt of death.

---

<sup>129</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (Latin), p. 243 (I, ix).

For what is death, but a momentary interval of time, a brief delay, and, as it were, a short sleep between this fleeting life and that which is enduring? What is death but a short passage from things transitory to things eternal? We must all die, because that is the inevitable and common fate of mankind; and though no splendid or glorious actions may have made us illustrious during life, by our deaths, at least, we may make our names memorable in future ages. Death is only to be feared by those who when they die appear as though all had perished with them; but it has no terror for such as have gained honour which can never fall into oblivion. Wherefore, ye valiant men, whose renown is already known to fame, let us strive to shew this day that our race has not degenerated, but in this conflict, either by victory or death, gain immortal fame as the reward of your valour.<sup>130</sup>

Normally, however, the argument only appears in partial form. Thus Alberic inserts the statement, "Mori enim habemus quocunque modo,"<sup>131</sup> ("For we have to die in some manner"), and exhorts the troops to go and offer their lives for God. The other partial form appears in Helmold's account of the Saxon army that wished for a glorious death. For them, the glory itself was sufficient: "videbis gloriosam mortem nobis maximo esse lucro."<sup>132</sup>

In a similar vein is the argument that the troops should show their valor, for it will be seen. Ordericus has the leaders exhorting their troops, "In hoc hodie campo

---

<sup>130</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (English), p. 201.

<sup>131</sup>Albert of Aix, op. cit., col. 489 (IV, xviii).

<sup>132</sup>Helmold of Bosau, (Latin), p. 75 (I, xxxviii).

cujusque pugilis audacia, vigorque palam apparebit"<sup>133</sup>

("On the plain which is the field of battle this day, each man's valour and prowess will be distinctly seen.")<sup>134</sup> The extreme case appears in the chronicle of Richard of Holy Trinity. He describes a Crusading army that became so impressed with their own valor that, as King Guy set out to attack the Saracens in 1189, some of the army said, "Quae potentia praeualebit? quae multitudo resistet? Deus nec nobis nec adversariis adiutor veniat, victoria in nostra consistat."<sup>135</sup> ("What power shall prevail, what multitude shall withstand us? Let the Lord assist neither us nor our adversaries; the victory rests in our own valour.")<sup>136</sup> This sentiment, naturally, Richard severely criticizes.

Over all, however, the concept of valor seems to have been used seldom as an argument, although it frequently appears as a term supporting other arguments and appeals. While more appeals were based on the concept of glory, in general the same could be said of it: it is a supporting term where it normally appears, not a separate commonplace.

Most of the short speeches are simply brief presentations of arguments already considered. However, there are

---

<sup>133</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (Latin), Vol. IV, p. 457 (XII, xxxix).

<sup>134</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (English), Vol. IV, p. 73.

<sup>135</sup>Richard of Holy Trinity, op. cit., p. 69 (I, xxix).

<sup>136</sup>Geoffrey of Vinsauf, op. cit., p. 108.

quite a few that are unique. Several examples will be given here, to provide some idea of the range these speeches cover.

Sometimes they are simply reports of orders given by the commander. For example, Ordericus reports that at one point there was a strong band of knights in a castle, eager to go outside to do battle with an invading army. Their leader spoke: "Armamini, et estote parati; sed de munitione non exeatis, donec ego jubeam vobis. Sinite hostes praeda onerari, et discedentes mecum viriliter insectamini."<sup>137</sup>

("Arm yourselves and stand ready, but do not leave the fortress until I give the order. Permit the enemy to encumber himself with booty, and we will fall upon him as he is retreating.")<sup>138</sup>

The desire for booty appears in two unique speeches. At the battle for Jerusalem, as the city had just been taken, Count Raymond spoke to his own men: "Quid, inquit ad suos, istic moramini? Nonne Francos, civitate obtenta, celebri spoliolum raptu jam triumphare conspicitis?"<sup>139</sup>

("Why do you delay here? Don't you see the Franks, having obtained the city, are now triumphing, taking the best of the spoils?") The opposite problem appears in a speech in

---

<sup>137</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (Latin), Vol. III, p. 347 (VIII, xiv).

<sup>138</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, (English), Vol. II, p. 496.

<sup>139</sup>Guibert of Nogent, op. cit., col. 794.

Alberic's chronicle. The commander has to say, "O viri rebelles et incorrigibiles, quis vos fascinavit, ut ad praedam vetitam et illicitam manus vestrae converterentur, donec inimici vestri, Deo auxiliante, in gladio corruissent! Eia, relinquire praedam, et hostibus insistite, et nolite cedere nunc insurgentibus, et amaram de vobis vindictam quaerentibus."<sup>140</sup> ("Oh rebellious and incorrigible men, who bewitched you so that your hands are turned to prohibited and unlawful booty just when your enemies, by God's aid, have succumbed to the sword? Come on, put down the booty, and pursue the enemy, and do not now leave future insurgents and seekers for bitter revenge against you.")

A line of appeal unique to its situation also appears in a speech written by Geoffrey of Monmouth.

Quoniam nesciente Arturo istud praelium incepimus, cavendum nobis est, ne in pejorem partem incepti nostri decidamus. Nam si in illam deciderimus, et maximum damnum militum nostrorum incurremus, et regem nostrum ad execrandum nos commovebimus. Resumite audaciam: et sequimini me per catervas Romanorum: ut si fortuna faverit, Petreium interficiamus sive capiamus.<sup>141</sup>

Since we have begun this fight without Arthur's knowledge, we must take care that we be not defeated in the enterprise. For if we should, we shall both very much endanger our men, and incur the king's high displeasure. Rouse up your courage, and follow me through the Roman squadrons, that with the favour of good fortune we may either kill or take Petreius prisoner.<sup>142</sup>

---

<sup>140</sup>Albert of Aix, op. cit., col. 561 (VI, xlviiii).

<sup>141</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (Latin), pp. 186f (X, iv).

<sup>142</sup>Geoffrey of Monmouth, (English), p. 257.

Also unique due to its situation is a speech in Richard of Holy Trinity's work. The speech is by King Richard.

Numquid navem intactam et illaesam sustinetis abire? proh dolor! post tot triumphos exactos irrepente desidia, ceditis ignavi? Nondum quiescendi tempus advenit,  
'Dum restant hostes, et quos sors obtulit ultro;' noverit revera universitas vestra vos omnes in cruce suspendendos, vel ultimis afficiendos suppliciis, si hos sustinueritis abire.<sup>143</sup>

Will you allow the ship to get away untouched and uninjured? Shame upon you! are you grown cowards from sloth, after so many triumphs? The whole world knows that you engaged in the service of the Cross, and you will have to undergo the severest punishment, if you permit an enemy to escape while he lives, and is thrown in your way.<sup>144</sup>

Speeches like this one, and the one above by Alberic of Aix, where the speaker scolds the army, are extremely rare.

Finally, note must be made of something that occurs quite frequently but that does not seem to be a true line of appeal or argument. Often, when the speaker is a priest or bishop, the speech ends with the promise that whoever falls in the battle is absolved from his sins. Presumably, if one knew he could die in such a state, he might be more prepared to risk his life. However, never was such a claim found developed explicitly, although many times absolution is given.

---

<sup>143</sup>Richard of Holy Trinity, op. cit., p. 207 (II,xlii).

<sup>144</sup>Geoffrey of Vinsauf, op. cit., p. 198.

## CHAPTER VII

### CLASSICAL MODELS

One of the many notable achievements of the twelfth century was the rebirth of historical writing. During this period, interest developed in writing historical accounts that were much more detailed than the annals which had previously been written. As scholars turned their efforts to composing histories, they naturally had available the classical Latin historians as models. The extent to which a medieval chronicler patterned his work after one or more classical models would be difficult to determine, except for the use of specific quotations or close paraphrases. However, as the classics were generally available, and included numerous examples of battle orations, it does seem worth while at least to present the problem here. A complete comparison of the medieval battle orations with classical models is outside the scope of this study. Furthermore, if Haskins is correct, a detailed comparison would probably yield few results.

Curiously enough, classical influence, so marked in other phases of twelfth-century literature, scarcely shows itself in history; it is not a period of the revival of classical models, but of new life which seeks spontaneous expression in a more abundant and more varied historiog-

raphy, both in Latin and, later in the century, in the vernacular.<sup>1</sup>

He continues, "The Latin historians who really delighted the mediaeval, as they did the later Roman, world were the epitomators, Florus, Justin and Eutropius,"<sup>2</sup> whose summaries do not include the many speeches the greater historians wrote. Yet the potential for borrowing was there. Therefore, those classical Latin historians whose works contain battle orations will be considered briefly. Their relative availability during the period in question varied greatly, so some evidence bearing on this factor will also be presented.

Taking them in roughly chronological order, we will start with Caesar and Sallust, with whom Haskins puts Suetonius.

Caesar, Sallust, and Suetonius were not unknown to the twelfth century, but their influence was slight. Manuscripts of Caesar are rare and few historians know him. Sallust, "the favorite model of style for the historians of the ninth and tenth centuries," can be traced in Adam of Bremen and later in Rahewin, but he had small influence in the twelfth century, unless it be in such extracts from the Catiline and Jugurtha as are incorporated in the Gesta of the Angevin counts. Suetonius was copied in the twelfth century and was much cited by John of Salisbury, but he can show no subsequent imitator equal to Einhard in his Life of Charlemagne; indeed, the medieval biography rarely affects classical models.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Haskins, Renaissance, p. 224.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 226.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.



Buttenwieser finds it strange that Haskins would put all three of these ancient historians in the same class. "Sallust far outstripped the other two and the wide dissemination of his manuscripts would seem to indicate that his influence was anything but slight. Indeed only Cicero and Seneca, among prose authors, were represented by more numerous codices."<sup>4</sup> She goes so far as to conclude that "Sallust provided the pattern for history and as such he occupied a place among the school texts of the Middle Ages as well as on the shelves of medieval scholars."<sup>5</sup>

Many manuscripts of Sallust survive, distributed widely:

10th century: one German, four French with both Catiline and Jugurtha; two fragments of the latter, one German, one French.

10th or 11th century: one German copy containing both works with commentary, one French fragment of Jugurtha.

11th century: eleven German, eight French, three Italian, two English complete manuscripts, plus one Spanish copy of Jugurtha.

11th or 12th century: one each for Germany, France

---

<sup>4</sup>Hilda Buttenwieser, "Popular Authors of the Middle Ages: The Testimony of the Manuscripts," Speculum, XVII (1942), 50.

<sup>5</sup>Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 45.

and Italy, all complete.

12th century: 48 manuscripts, 37 of them with complete texts: 14 from Germany, 10 from France, 8 from Italy, and 5 from England. Catiline alone: two copies from France, two from England, one from Spain. Jugurtha alone: one each from Germany, Italy and England. Excerpts: one each from Germany, France and England.

12th or 13th century: one complete copy each from Germany, England and Spain, two from Italy; one of excerpts from France.

13th century: complete copies, 16 from Germany, 4 from France, 6 from Italy, one from England. Catiline alone: two German, one French, two English copies. Jugurtha alone: one each from Germany, England and Italy. Excerpts: two German, four French, one English and one Spanish copy.<sup>6</sup>

Buttenwieser concludes from this evidence:

The large number of manuscripts—a total of one hundred, forty—shows clearly that Sallust was the favorite Roman historian of the Middle Ages. One hundred four manuscripts contain both the Catilina and the Jugurtha; ten contain the Catilina alone, ten the Jugurtha; sixteen florilegia include ex-

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 39-41.

cerpts of varying length, and six separate manuscripts contain commentary.<sup>7</sup>

Manitius notes copies of Sallust in many library catalogues. In French catalogues there are thirteen citations in twelve libraries.

Bibl. incogn. s. XI (Delisle II, 446 f.) N. 70

Salustii II.

Cluny 1158-61 (Delisle II, 459 ff.) N. 516 Salustius

de bello Catiline et Iugurthe; 559 Salustius

de Catilinario bello et Iugurthino.

S. Amand ca. 1160 (Mangeart etc. p. 32 f.) N. 30

Salustius=Delisle II 449 ff. N. 183.

Beziers 1162 (Delisle II 504 f.) N. 31 Tertia pars

Sallustii.

Anchin s. XII (B. 121) 10 Salustius I.

S. Bertin s. XII (B. 77) 266 Salustii liber.

Marseille s. XII (Mélanges historiques I 657 ff.)

N. 181 Volumen Salustius.

Corbie 1200 (B. 136) 325 Salustius.

Richard de Fournival ca. 1250 (Delisle II, 524 ff.)

tab. II 34 Salustii accusatio in dictum

Catylinam que sunt Invective Catylinarie

Salustiane.

S. Pons de Tomieres 1276 (Delisle II 536 ff.) Liber

Salusti Crispi qui tractat de bello facto

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

inter Catilinam et Romanos.

Marchiennes s. XIII (Catal. général des mscr. des  
depart. (4<sup>o</sup>) VI, 767 f.) N. 121 Salustius de  
Lucio Catilina.

Bibl. incogn. s. XIII (Schum, de amplonian Hdschr.  
S. 361) duo Salustii.

More citations appear in German catalogues:

Bernardus s. XI (B. 54) 17 Duo Salustii.

Blaubeuern s. XI (B. 74) 65 Salustius glosatus.

91 Salustius cum suis glossis. 184 Salustium.

Freising s. XI (B. 65) 4 Salustium.

Toul s. XI (B. 68) 258 Salustii vol. I.

Weihestephan s. XI (B. 73) 47 et Iugurthinus.

Verdun 1070 (Catal. codd. lat. bibl. Medic. Laurent.  
II 40) Salustius I.

S. Egmond 1090 (Arch. voor Nederl. Kerkgeschiedenis  
II 152) Salustium.

Krakau 1110 (Bielowski, Mon. Pol. Hist. I 377) Sal-  
ustius.

Bamberg (Michelsberg) s. XI (Beitr. z. Lit. u.  
Kunstgesch. I XXI ff.) N. 83 Salustius; 1120  
ib. XIX ff. N. 35 Sallustius de Iugurtino  
bello glossatus. (B. 80) 16 f. Salustii II;  
ca 1130 Beitr S. XXVI ff. N. 81 Salustius  
in duplo, unus glossatus. ib. p. XXXIV  
Sallustius glossatus.

- Pfäffers 1155 (B. 94) 101 Salustius.
- Halberstadt s. XII (Arch. d. Ges. f. Ält. d. Geschichtskunde VIII 658) Salustium.
- Muri. s. XII (B. 122) 129 Salustius.
- S. Nicolai b. Passau s. XII (Pez, thesaur. I. p. LII) Salustius.
- Oberaltaich s. XII (Mittheil d. Inst. f. Österr. Gesch. IV 288) duo Salustii.
- Prüfening s. XII (B. 95) 174 glose Salustii.
- Reisbach s. XII (B. 133) 14 duo salii (probably Salustii).
- Wessobrunn s. XII (B. 112) 97 f. Salustii II. 99. Catilinarius I; (B. 113) 110 Salustius.
- Neumünster b. Würzburg 1233 (Arch. etc. f. Unterfranken 16, 253) Salustius.
- Benedictbeuern ca. 1250 (Pez, thesaur. III 3, 614 ff.) Salustius. Item pars Salustii.
- Arnstein s. XIII (Gottlieb S. 294) Salustium cum g.s. Salustius.
- Hammersleben s. XIII (B. 56) 17 Salustium cum glossis. 22 librum qui sic incipit: Omnes homines qui sese student; in eodem Sallustium.
- Klosterneuburg s. XIII (Serapeum 11, Intelligbl. S. 186) Invectiva Salustii contra Catilinam.
- Pegau s. XIII (Serapeum 24, Intelligbl. S. 53) Salustius duo.

Salzburg s. XIII (B. 115) 8 Salustius.

But few citations appear in English catalogues:

Durham s. XII (B. 117) 227 ff. Salustii III.

Rochester 1202 (Archaeologia Cantiana III 54 ff.) N.  
182 Salustii IV.

Glastonbury 1247 (Joh. Glaston. chron. ed. Hearne  
II) p. 435 Salustii libri duo; p. 439  
Salustius. Item Salustius.<sup>8</sup>

Thus all the evidence would indicate that Sallust was both popular and widespread. Furthermore, de Ghellinck argues that his influence was pervasive among the twelfth century historians.

Dans une proportion dépassant largement tous les autres historiens, même Cassiodore, Josephé, Bède et Paul Diacre, Salluste maintient magnifiquement sa vogue dans les bibliothèques du XI<sup>e</sup> et du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle; cette vogue s'affirme aussi dans l'utilisation constante qu'en font les historiens et l'estime qu'ils lui témoignent, jusqu'à Lubeck et dans le duché de Pologne,<sup>9</sup> chez Helmold et dans les Chronicae Polonorum.

At any rate, Sallust was popular enough throughout the area and period that it would be potentially profitable to try to trace his influence in the histories and chronicles.

The popularity of Sallust is particularly important here because he includes battle orations at several places. There are two long speeches in the Bellum Catilinae, at

---

<sup>8</sup>Manitius, op. cit., pp. 24-7.

<sup>9</sup>de Ghellinck, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 78.

xx. 2-17 and lviii. 1-21, and one description, lix. 5. In the Bellum Iugurthinum there is one detailed description of a battle oration, at xlix. 2-4, and two short descriptions, li. 4-5 and cvii. 1-2. Furthermore, it is possible that part of the interest in Sallust was rhetorical. As Rolfe points out, "the orations in all of Sallust's works were greatly admired in antiquity, and collections of them were made for use in the schools of rhetoric; yet he is not mentioned by Cicero among the great speakers of the day, and Quintilian expressly warns orators against taking him as a model. (4.2.45)"<sup>10</sup> Two of the library catalogue citations, Richard de Fournivals' and Klosterneuburg's, seem to indicate copies of the speeches, and it is entirely possible that some of the other citations are for these, too.

In the above quotation, Haskins grouped Sallust with Caesar and Suetonius. Although Suetonius wrote much later, he need not detain us here. His work does not seem to have been very popular in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, although Manitius located eleven listings in the library catalogues of this period.<sup>11</sup> Whatever the case might be, Suetonius is not of concern here, for he includes no battle orations. Caesar, on the other hand, has a few very short ones. In the Gallic War there are short descriptions of

---

<sup>10</sup> Sallust, trans. by J.C. Rolfe, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. xiv.

<sup>11</sup> Manitius, op. cit., p. 70.

battle orations at ii. 21 and vii. 62, and short speeches at vi. 8 and iv. 25. In the Civil Wars there is one long speech at ii. 32, a shorter one at iii. 86 which is partially described as well, and two short speeches at ii. 39 and iii. 85.

Buttenwieser found 35 manuscripts of Caesar, divided into two groups, those which contain all Caesar's works and those containing only the Gallic War. The latter class is the more numerous.

Eleven manuscripts contain the entire corpus. . . . It is interesting to note that about half the manuscripts were copied in the eleventh century. France, Germany and Italy shared equally in carrying on the tradition, and England is also represented.

The Bellum Civile was apparently not copied separately but only in conjunction with the other works, while the Bellum Gallicum claimed wider interest on its own account.<sup>12</sup>

Manitius discovered Caesar listed in relatively few catalogues.<sup>13</sup> In France, eight libraries list him.

S. Gildas s. XI (Bibl. de l'ec. des chartres 47, 101)

N. 10 Gesta Iulii Caesaris.

Massay s. XI (Delisle II 441 ff.) N. 83 Historia

Iulii Caesaris.

Angouleme 1101-35 (B. 83) 16 historiam Iulii Caesaris.

Bec ca 1150 (B. 86) 101 gesta Caesaris.

Corbie s. XII (B. 79) 167 Gai Caesaris historia=136,

---

<sup>12</sup>Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 16.

<sup>13</sup>Manitius, op. cit., pp. 22-4.



131 historia Gaii Caesaris belli Gallici.  
Limoges s. XII (Delisle II 498 ff.) N. 194 Titus  
Livius cum istoria Iulii Caesaris.  
Marseille s. XII (Mélanges historiques I 657 ff.)  
N. 114 Volumen gesta Iulii.  
Pontigny s. XIII (Catal. general des mscr. des  
depart. (4<sup>o</sup>) I 715) de bellis Gallicis his-  
toria Iulii Caesaris libris VII.

Three German libraries list Caesar.

Metz 1064 (Pitra Spicileg. Solesm. II p. XXXV)  
Gaius Cesar de narrationibus temporum.  
Toul s. XI (B. 68) 258 historia Iulii Casaris.  
Neumünster b. Würzburg 1233 (Arch. d. hist. Ver. f.  
Unterfranken 16, 251) S. 253 Liber lat. de  
gestis Caesaris.

None are given for England, but Thomson notes that St. Edmundsbury Abbey owned a copy of Caesar by 1150. He also generalizes that the work was rare "except in northern France, where it was quite common among the larger libraries from Carolingian times on."<sup>14</sup> However, Buttenwieser's conclusion seems well justified: "At no period, however, could Caesar claim to rank among the popular or well-known authors."<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Thomson, op. cit., p. 633.

<sup>15</sup> Buttenwieser, "Distribution," p. 22.

Livy puts many, many speeches in the mouths of his characters, so many, in fact, that their number alone would make it very difficult to trace all possible borrowings from him by the medieval chroniclers. Adding to the difficulty, and considerably reducing the probability that the chroniclers did use speeches from Livy, is the fact that all the evidence indicates that few copies of his history existed during the period in question, and most of these contained only portions.

Livy writes battle orations, or significant descriptions of them, at the following places:

- I. xxv. 1.
- II. xxxviii. 2-5.
- II. xlvi. 5-6.
- II. lxx. 4-5.
- III. lxi. 1-8.
- III. lxx. 5-6.
- IV. xxviii. 3-5.
- IV. xxxiii. 4-5.
- VI. vii. 3-6.
- VI. xii. 8-10.
- VII. xxiv. 4-6.
- VII. xxxii. 5-17.
- IX. xxiii. 8-13.
- IX. xxxi. 10-13.
- IX. xli. 16.
- X. xiv. 10-12.
- X. xxxv. 8-16.
- X. xxxix. 11-17.
  
- XXI. xl. 1-xli. 17.
- XXI. xliii. 1-xliv. 9.
- XXI. xlv. 4-8.
- XXII. 1. 6-9.
- XXIII. xlv. 1-10.
- XXV. xvi. 17-21.
- XXV. xxxviii. 2-22.
- XXVI. xli. 3-25.
- XXVI. xliii. 3-8.
- XXVII. xii. 1-8.

XXVII. xii. 11-13.  
XXVII. xviii. 8-9.  
XXVIII. xix. 6-8.  
XXX. xxxii. 6-10.  
XXX. xxxiii. 8-11.

XXXI. iii. 11-12.  
XXXI. iv. 1-2.  
XXXIII. viii. 3-5.  
XXXIV. xiii. 5-9.  
XXXVI. xvii. 2-16.  
XXXVIII. xvii. 1-20.  
XL. xxvii. 8-13.  
XL. xxxix. 8-9.

XLII. lii. 6-16.  
XLII. lxi. 4-8.  
XLIV. i. 9-12.  
XLIV. xxxvii. 5-9.

Clearly, tracing all these battle orations down through all those in the medieval chronicles to discover possible borrowings would be a considerable task.

The task would probably be of little profit, for Livy was, apparently, not a popular author during the period in question. In the few places where Livy was available for use, seldom was more than one decade included in the manuscript. "Of the forty-one manuscripts of Livy, twenty-two contain the first decade or portions of it, eleven contain the third decade, five contain the fourth, and one the fifth. A single late manuscript, Harley 2493, of the thirteenth century, contains all the extant portions."<sup>16</sup>

Only a few catalogues from our period list copies.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

<sup>17</sup>Manitius, op. cit., p. 37.

Cluny 1158-61 (Delisle II, 459 ff.) N. 31 prima  
decada Livii. 32 tertia decada. 33 similiter  
tertia decada.

Corbie s. XII (B. 79) 290 Titus Livius; 1200 (136,  
331) Titi Livii decada tertia. 332 idem.

Limoges s. XII (Delisle II 498 ff.) N. 194 Titus  
Livius.

Bibl. incogn. (German) s. XI (B. 63) 42 libros Titi  
Livi ab urbe condita C decades.<sup>18</sup>

Bamberg (Cathedral) s. XIII (Anzeig. f. Biblwiss.  
1877 S. 277) Titi Livi ab urbe condita . . .  
libri. Titus Livius ab urbe condita libri X.

Glastonbury 1247 (Joh. Glaston. chron. ed. Hearne  
II 423 ff.) p. 435 Livius de gestis Romanorum.

From the manuscript and catalogue evidence, Battenwieser  
concludes:

The manuscripts of Livy are noticeably more num-  
erous in the tenth and eleventh centuries than  
in the later period. At no time was Livy a favor-  
ite. His influence was strongest in Germany, and  
the first decade is everywhere the best represented.

A consideration of the items in the ancient  
library catalogues indicates the same general  
situation. Livy is seldom mentioned, nor is there  
anything to suggest that more decades were extant  
in the Middle Ages than today.<sup>19</sup>

In the twelfth century even John of Salisbury knew Livy only

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid. Manitius notes that this must be a mistake  
for either II or V.

<sup>19</sup>Battenwieser, "Distribution," p. 81.

at second hand.<sup>20</sup>

The elder Seneca has already been considered in the second chapter. While he was not an historian, he wrote a number of suasoriae which were fairly popular. A suasoria Edward defines as "a fictitious deliberative speech in which the speaker gives advice to a historical or semi-historical character regarding his future conduct."<sup>21</sup> Of Seneca's collection, one, Suasoria II, could have provided some ideas for battle orations. Its setting is Thermopylae, just before the battle. "The three hundred Spartans have been left alone. It is assumed that there are three hundred from each of the other Greek states. All these have retreated. The Spartans are now holding a council of war to decide whether they too should go or stay. The rhetor in each case speaks as one of the Spartans."<sup>22</sup> While this is not exactly a normal setting for a battle oration, several of the speeches Seneca gives are very like battle orations, attempts to rouse the spirits and courage of the Spartans, with many of the same arguments a commander might use just before engaging the enemy. The copies of the suasoriae were sufficiently widespread to make an investigation of their influence potentially profitable.

---

<sup>20</sup>Haskins, Renaissance, p. 225.

<sup>21</sup>William A. Edward, trans., The Suasoriae of Seneca the Elder (Cambridge, 1928), p. xxxi.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 101.

A later Roman historian who uses battle orations in his writings is Tacitus. However, Tacitus was practically unknown in the middle ages.<sup>23</sup> In the Agricola there is a long battle oration, but Hutton lists only three manuscripts of the work, all from the fifteenth century.<sup>24</sup> Manitius gives no library catalogue citations for this or any other work by Tacitus, listing only a few references to a Trojan war history by one Cornelius.<sup>25</sup>

Finally, among the classical Roman works, since Manitius lists several catalogue citations for Frontinus,<sup>26</sup> his work on Stratagems must be considered. While he does include a chapter on "How to arouse an Army's Enthusiasm for Battle," he gives no battle orations but merely a list of things that have been announced to the troops that inspired them.<sup>27</sup>

Also available as a model was the Latin translation of Josephus. Both in the Jewish Wars and the Jewish Antiquities Josephus presents battle orations of considerable

---

<sup>23</sup>Haskins, Renaissance, p. 224.

<sup>24</sup>Cornelius Tacitus, Dialogus, Agricola, Germania, trans. by Maurice Hutton, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), pp. 149f.

<sup>25</sup>Manitius, op. cit., p. 68.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 65.

<sup>27</sup>Sextus Julius Frontinus, Stratagems, trans. by Charles E. Bennett, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961), I. xi.

length. These appear at the following places:

Jewish Wars, I, 4; III, 2; III, 4; III, 25; IV, 6;  
VI, 5.

Jewish Antiquities, XII, 302-4; XV, 127-47.

In addition, Josephus, in the Jewish Antiquities, describes several other battle orations: III, 50-2; XII, 307; XII, 309; XII, 408-9; XII, 424-5; XIII, 12-3; XIII, 176.

Josephus' works were translated into Latin early in the middle ages. Copies of them were widely used during the period under investigation. "Josephus' History of the Jews was regarded in the Middle Ages as a sort of auxiliary to the study of the Bible, and manuscripts of it in translation were diffused very widely, the work being recorded more than forty times in the catalogues."<sup>28</sup> De Ghellinck reaches roughly the same conclusion: "Les ouvrages de Josephus sont extraordinairement répandus dans tous les pays des l'époque carolingienne en Allemagne et en France, un peu plus tard en Italy, au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle à Durham et ailleurs, en Angleterre; rares au XIII<sup>e</sup> . . ." <sup>29</sup>

Overall, then, the conclusion Wilson reached on the basis of the catalogue and manuscript evidence for England seems applicable to all the areas under investigation:

So far as the historians are concerned, Sallust alone is really common. . . . Apart from Sallust

---

<sup>28</sup>Beddie, "Classics," p. 7.

<sup>29</sup>de Ghellinck, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 85.

the only historians found at all frequently are Suetonius, and Pompeius Trogus. . . . Livy, Caesar, Ammianus, Valerius Maximus, are all extremely rare, while Tacitus, naturally enough, does not appear at all.

. . . Of the later historians proper Josephus is common in large and small libraries alike.<sup>30</sup>

Thus, the possibility for borrowing classical models of battle orations for use in the medieval chronicles clearly existed. The actual extent to which this was practised would require an extensive study in itself. And, it would often be difficult to determine whether a particular phrase, a particular combination of words that also appears in, say, Livy, was actually adopted by the chronicler from Livy, or was simply used by that chronicler on his own. Consequently it would only be the extensive borrowing from a classical model that could be detected with certainty.

That the classics were sometimes used as models by medieval chroniclers is well known. To take just one example, not of a speech, Rahewin describes the situation in Milan as Frederick Barbarossa advanced toward the city to lay siege to it, and borrows his description almost verbatim from Sallust.<sup>31</sup> For the battle orations, all we can do here is provide examples where such use has been discovered

---

<sup>30</sup>R.M. Wilson, "The Contents of the Mediaeval Library," in The English Library Before 1700, ed. by Francis Wormald and C.E. Wright (London: The Athlone Press, 1958), p. 99.

<sup>31</sup>Rahewin, (English), p. 207.



by the editors of the chronicles, and even then problems arise. For what it may be worth, the editors of the chronicles very rarely indicate classical borrowing in the battle orations.

An instance of the clear use of a classic model appears in the chronicles of Simeon of Durham, Roger of Hoveden, Florence of Worcester, Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris. The model used is Sallust's Catiline, and the passage adopted is identified in the Rolls Series editions of both Simeon and Roger, edited by Thomas Arnold and William Stubbs respectively. The chroniclers are describing the Battle of Sherstone, fought between the English Edmund and the Dane Cnute in 1016. Simeon writes:

Ubi exercitum pro loco et copiis instruit, . . .  
optimum quemque in primam aciem subducit . . .  
caeterum exercitum in subsidiis locat, unum-  
quemque nominans appellat, hortatur, rogat ut  
meminerint se . . . pro patria, pro liberis,  
pro conjugibus atque suis domibus certare, et  
optimis sermonibus militum animos accendebat.  
Deinde tubicines canere et cohortes paulatim  
incedere jubet. Idem facit hostium exercitus.<sup>32</sup>

He drew up his army as the situation and his own strength would allow him, and placing his best men in the front rank, the rest of the army he set in reserve; and then appealed to them, calling each by name, and exhorting and entreating them that they would bear in mind that they were fighting for their country, their children, their wives, and their homes; and, in the most encouraging language having kindled the spirits of the

---

<sup>32</sup>Simeon of Durham, Historia Regum, in Opera Omnia, Vol. II, ed. by Thomas Arnold, Rolls Series, Vol. 75:2 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1885; Kraus Reprint, 1965), p. 150.

soldiers, he then ordered the trumpets to sound, and his troops to advance at a gentle pace. The army of the enemy did the same.<sup>33</sup>

Roger of Hoveden uses almost exactly the same words, and exactly the same meaning. The only changes he makes are to reverse the order of "meminerint se" and to add another "pro" in the series, so the last item reads, "pro suis domibus."<sup>34</sup> Florence of Worcester also includes this passage, and is presumably the ultimate source.<sup>35</sup> Matthew Paris borrowed from Florence, but his description of the preparations for battle is slightly different:

. . . cui in provincia Wigorniensi in loco qui Scernstan dicitur occurrens, optimum quemque de exercitu prudenter instruxit, omnes hortatur ut meminerint se pro patria et liberis pro conjugibus et haereditatibus decertare, et sic optimis sermonibus bellicis animos omnium accendebat. Deinde tubicines strepere et paulatim cohortes incedere jubebat.<sup>36</sup>

While Matthew's account is different, it is nevertheless unmistakably taken from the same source as Simeon's and Roger's.

The material described here is taken from Sallust, Catiline 59 and 60. The ellipses Arnold uses (in the quote from Simeon) indicate omissions from Sallust's account.

---

<sup>33</sup>Roger of Hoveden, (English), Vol. I, p. 98.

<sup>34</sup>Roger of Hoveden, (Latin), Vol. I, p. 82.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

<sup>36</sup>Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Latin), Vol. I, p. 495.

Here is clearly a case of borrowing, for the passages are extensive. Sallust is describing preparations for a battle, also, and includes the order, "canere jubet," and describes how Catiline "exercitum pro loco atque copiis instruit." On the other side, Petreius spoke to his men, "unum quemque nominans appellat, hortatur, rogat ut meminerint se contra latrones inermis"—a phrase omitted by the medieval chroniclers—"pro patria, pro liberis"—Sallust adds "pro aris atque focis suis"—"certare." Sallust also describes the signal given by the trumpet. "Petreius tuba signum dat, cohortis paulatim incedere iubet. Idem facit hostium exercitus." Thus it is quite clear that some medieval chronicler has taken much of this description from Sallust and compressed it into an account of a single speech. The other chroniclers, then, copied from him. Apparently, Matthew Paris and Simeon of Durham both copied much from the chronicle of Florence of Worcester. Roger of Hoveden borrowed the account from either Simeon or Florence or both.<sup>37</sup> Whether the later chroniclers were aware that Florence took the account from Sallust probably can not be determined. At any rate, it is hardly surprising to find this happening as it did here, for Sallust was, as we have seen, popular during the twelfth century.

A second example of supposed borrowing from Sallust

---

<sup>37</sup>Roger of Hoveden, (Latin), Vol. I, p. 82.

is not so clear. Foreville, in his introduction to William of Poitiers' History of William the Conqueror, claims that the writer borrowed heavily from classical sources: from the Aeneid for the description of crossing the sea, from Sallust for the speeches, from Cicero for some of the discourse, from Caesar for some descriptions, from Caesar, Virgil and Sallust for the descriptions of combat, and from Cicero and Augustine for the philosophical dissertations.<sup>38</sup> This is all clearly possible, for William was a highly educated man. He went to Poitiers to study about 1045 at the famous school there, from whence he takes his name.<sup>39</sup> The result was, as Molinier describes him, an "esprit cultivé, versé dans la connaissance de la littérature antique (poètes et historiens)."<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, although he became chaplain to William the Conqueror, he was not himself present at the Battle of Hastings, and wrote the account at least five years after the event, and perhaps as long as ten or eleven years later.<sup>41</sup> Therefore, all the essentials for potential borrowing from the classics are present in William.

---

<sup>38</sup>William of Poitiers, (Latin), p. xxxix.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. ix.

<sup>40</sup>Auguste Molinier, Les Sources de l'Histoire de France, 6 vols. (New York: Burt Franklin, n.d.; Paris, 1901-6), #1965.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid.

While we are not here concerned with the possible borrowings by William for other parts of his history, Foreville gives one example to illustrate William's use of Sallust for the speech before the Battle of Hastings. Foreville prints in parallel columns a portion of William's speech, on the right, and an excerpt from the Bellum Catilinae, lviii, 5-21, on the left.<sup>42</sup>

Nunc vero quo loco res nostrae sint, juxta mecum omnes intelligitis. Exercitus hostium duo, unus ab urbe, alter a Gallia obstant . . . Quocumque ire placet, ferro iter aperiendum est. Quapropter vos moneo uti forti atque parato animo sitis, et cum proelium iribitis, memin-eritis vos divitias, decus, gloriam, praeterea libertatem atque patriam in dextris vestris portare. Si vincimus omnia nobis tuta erunt . . . Si metu<sup>43</sup> cesserimus, eadem illa adversa<sup>44</sup> fient. Nam in fuga salutem sperare, cum arma quibus corpus tegitur, ab hostibus avorteris, ea vero dementia est. Semper in proelio eis maxumum est periculum qui maxume timent, audacia pro muro habetur . . . Quodsi virtuti vestrae fortuna inviderit, cavete inulti animam amittatis, neu capti potius sic-uti pecora trucidemini, quam virorum more pugnantes cruentem atque luctuosam victoriam hostibus relinquatis.

Commonuit omnes patriae suae, nobilium gestorum, magnique nominis . . . Jam non id agi, quis regnans vivat, sed quis periculum imminens evadat. Si more virorum pugnent, victoriam, decus, divitias habituros. Alioquin aut otius trucidari aut captos ludibrio fore hostibus crudelissimis . . . Ad effugium nullam viam patere, cum hic arma et inimica ignotaque regio obsistant, illinc pontus et arma. Non decere viros multitudine terreri.

---

<sup>42</sup>William of Poitiers, (Latin), p. xxxix.

<sup>43</sup>The Loeb Classical Library edition reads "advorsa."

<sup>44</sup>There should be ellipses here, but Foreville omits them. Six lines have been deleted.

At this present time, moreover, you understand as well as I do in what condition our affairs stand. Two hostile armies, one towards Rome, the other towards Gaul, block our way. . . . Wherever we decide to go, we must hew a path with the sword. Therefore I counsel you to be brave and ready of spirit, and when you enter the battle to remember that you carry in your own right hands riches, honour, glory; yea even freedom and your native land. If we win, complete security will be ours . . . but if we yield to fear, the very reverse will be true . . . To hope for safety in flight when you have turned away from the enemy the arms which should protect your body, is surely the height of madness. In battle the greatest danger always threatens those who show the greatest fear; boldness is a bulwark. . . . But if Fortune frowns upon your bravery, take care not to die unavenged. Do not be captured and slaughtered like cattle, but, fighting like heroes, leave the enemy a bloody and tearful victory.<sup>45</sup>

He reminded them also of their fatherland, of its noble history, and of its great renown. . . . "You fight," he added, "not merely for victory but also for survival. If you bear yourselves valiantly you will obtain victory, honour and riches. If not, you will be ruthlessly butchered, or else led ignominiously captive into the hands of pitiless enemies. . . . There is no road for retreat. In front, your advance is blocked by an army and a hostile countryside; behind you, there is the sea where an enemy fleet bars your flight. Men, worthy of the name, do not allow themselves to be dismayed by the numbers of their foes."<sup>46</sup>

The italicized words in the Latin quotations are those Foreville has identified as the same in both accounts—although, it is to be noted, the verb form is different. He concludes that this, and one other example not of a speech, "suffiront à montrer comment il utilise son modèle, lui empruntant une idée ici, un ou deux mots là, un simple mouvement de

---

<sup>45</sup>Sallust, pp. 119-23.

<sup>46</sup>William of Poitiers, (English), p. 225.

phrase ou une démarche de la pensée, enfin."<sup>47</sup> However, after examining many battle orations, the present writer does not believe such a conclusion is all that clearly established. The appeals, to be sure, are largely the same, but are merely ones used many, many times by chroniclers in their battle orations: they are hardly unique either to Sallust among the ancients or William among the medievals. And, since there is so little obvious copying—so few common wordings, or even close paraphrases—it seems more reasonable to conclude that, rather than copy his speech from Sallust, William simply wrote what he thought a good battle oration on that occasion would have been. He very well may have remembered Sallust's speeches when writing, but it is also quite possible that he did not.

In general, the little evidence this writer discovered on the question of borrowing from the classics, tends to support Haskins' conclusion, given earlier, that the twelfth century historians did not rely much on the ancients for models.

---

<sup>47</sup>William of Poitiers, (Latin), p. xxxix.

## CHAPTER VIII

### CONCLUSION

The original purpose of this project was to analyze a category of rhetorical artifacts from a certain area and period, that is, from England, France and Germany, from 1050 to 1250. In order to undertake this analysis, it was first necessary to find out what of rhetoric the writer of a speech in this period and area would have studied. In attempting to answer this seemingly simple question, it was discovered that the secondary authorities disagreed considerably. Consequently a more extensive investigation had to be undertaken than had been originally planned into the whole question. The results form the first half of this study.

It was discovered, first, that an educated person would in all probability have studied rhetoric during the period in question. The probability was greater toward the earlier part of the period than toward the end. Nevertheless, even around 1250 there is still widespread evidence of knowledge and use of the basic rhetorical textbooks, even though such use was somewhat different than had earlier been the case.



The second basic fact established was that when rhetoric was studied it was thoroughly Ciceronian. The Aristotelian tradition did not exist, or rather, what did was mediated by way of Cicero. Aristotle's Rhetoric was not even available to the Latin west during the period investigated. Quintilian was available, at least in partial form, in many areas, but was not popular as a text for study. Quintilian's work seems to have been used more for the moral maxims and pedagogical techniques found there. At only a few schools was Quintilian studied as a rhetorical authority. For the most part, such study was simply on an individual basis. The two texts that were used were, first, De Inventione; the Rhetorica ad Herennium seems to have been studied as often as the former treatise toward the middle of our period, but less so earlier. By this time these texts were used themselves, not in summary form taken from the encyclopedias. Furthermore, many commentaries on these works were also employed, most popular being that by Victorinus. Medieval scholars also commented on these works, although it was not possible to examine and analyze any of these products of the medieval schools. Cicero's other works were hardly ever used in teaching and studying rhetoric, the only possibly significant exception being De Partitione Oratoria, which apparently was sometimes used as a textbook. Works such as De Oratore, which was available in several places, seem to have been read as literature

rather than used as textbooks in the schools.

From the above we have an idea of what a chronicler would know about rhetoric when he set out to compose a speech for his own work. The chroniclers were usually well educated men, often with extensive knowledge of the classics. When they wrote speeches in their histories, most of them knew of the precepts Cicero and the author of the Rhetorica ad Herennium had set down.

Turning then to the speeches themselves, it was discovered that many chroniclers did indeed write battle orations into their histories. It made little difference whether the writer was a monk, priest, bishop, deacon, or even knight, the propensity to write battle orations was about the same for all. Some of the chroniclers were literate but not educated extensively in the schools; they probably would not have studied rhetoric to any great extent. Yet, there was no discernible difference in propensity to include battle orations between highly and barely educated writers, either. Battle orations were written in many of the longer, fuller histories, but in only a few of the annalistic works. In all, slightly under one-quarter of all chronicles reviewed included battle orations; but perhaps over half of the longer, fuller ones did. Where battle orations were found, they appeared in several forms. Some were mere descriptions of a speech that was given. Others were short passages of direct discourse. Several

were lengthy, complete speeches.

When the chroniclers composed their histories, they do not seem to have used classical models to any great extent. When they wrote battle orations, the same generalization seems applicable. In rare cases there is clear evidence of borrowing from a classical author in a speech. In a few speeches, classical poetry is quoted, but such cases are also quite rare. And the medieval practice of including battle speeches also differed somewhat. For example, the classical historians, especially Livy, often wrote speeches of exhortation to an army on many different occasions. Whenever the commander thought the army needed a boost in morale, a speech was given. The medieval chroniclers, however, with very few exceptions, only wrote speeches of exhortation prior to a battle.

While the medieval historians did not borrow much from the ancient historians, they certainly did borrow extensively from each other. This is partially due to the manner in which many of the chronicles were composed. When one wanted to write a history, he would often pick some previous chronicle which he then copied, sometimes verbatim, sometimes with additions, deletions, embellishments, and then continued in his own time and area. But it also happened frequently that a chronicler found a passage he liked, and just used it some place in his own work. Several instances of such borrowing of speeches were presented above.

In giving a battle oration, the speaker is confronting a specific rhetorical problem: How to get his troops to fight with all their strength and bravery in the upcoming battle; how to motivate them so that they will win. One of the most interesting aspects of the battle orations is the different ways in which the speakers are portrayed attempting to solve this problem. Therefore, an analysis of the topics or commonplaces was made. Most common of all was a comparison of the causes or actions of the two sides, in which the speaker claims that his side is fighting a just war, the other an unjust one, or his side is acting piously, the other impiously. Following close behind this one in frequency of occurrence are several other arguments. One claims that we have always been victorious, or our ancestors have. Another claims that we possess some military advantage in this battle. Others argue that we will get aid from heaven; that though the enemy outnumber us victory does not depend on numbers; that we should either conquer or die for Christ; that we should take vengeance on the enemy, for ourselves or for God or both; that we have to fight, for there is no possibility of escape; that to find this particular battle is the reason we have traveled far. Somewhat less frequent are another series of topics: that we must defend ourselves and families and country; that we will get booty; that glory or valor are desirable and can be won or shown in this battle. These were the classifiable

topics, the last of which are used but seldom.

The appeals listed were sometimes developed in great detail and at great length. Other times they were simply but clearly implied or mentioned in passing. A large number of appeals can be presented in a very short space. One of the clearest examples of this is in a speech attributed to King Richard in Richard of Holy Trinity's chronicle. Toward the end appears the following passage:

Caeterum, ad fugam non patet locus. Cum cuncta loca jam hostes occupaverint, fugam tentare est mortem adsciscere. Durate igitur, et saevius urgens necessitas fiat materia virtutis. Virorum nimirum est aut fortiter triumphare, aut gloriose mori. Martyrium imminens animo gratanti est excipiendum. Sed antequam moriamur, vita comite, mortem nostram ulciscamur . . .<sup>1</sup>

There is no room for flight, for the enemy surround us, and to attempt to flee is to provoke certain death. Be brave, therefore, and let the urgency of the case sharpen up your valour: brave men should either conquer nobly or gloriously die. Martyrdom is a boon which we should receive with willing mind: but before we die, let us whilst still alive do what may avenge our deaths.<sup>2</sup>

In just over six lines, here are four separate classes of appeals. The first three lines are arguments that the army must fight bravely for there is no way to flee. This is then followed by a brief reference to a glorious death that is desirable, which leads into the claim that it is actually good to die for Christ, here only stated as suffering mar-

---

<sup>1</sup>Richard of Holy Trinity, op. cit., p. 417 (VI, xxii).

<sup>2</sup>Geoffrey of Vinsauf, op. cit., pp. 322f.

tyrdom. Finally, Richard asks that they take revenge in advance for their deaths.

Some battle orations are based on only one appeal. Many of the shorter ones contain only one topic, some longer ones use different appeals to support one dominant one. But of all the writers, three stand out as including in some of their speeches far more topics than any other chroniclers: Aelred, in his speech before the Battle of the Standard, Henry of Huntingdon, in his speech on the same occasion and in the two longest speeches before the Battle of Lincoln, and to a slightly lesser extent, William of Poitiers in the two speeches by Duke William. These six speeches each contain a large number of the total available commonplaces. While other chroniclers wrote speeches that contain many topics, as for example that just given by Richard, these six speeches contain most of the topics fully developed, not just mentioned in passing. It therefore might be of some interest to investigate the educational backgrounds of these three men more fully than is possible here. William was highly educated, and very knowledgeable in the classics, as was Henry. But Aelred had received rather a practical training at the court of King David. He had read some of the classics, but had not had the extensive formal rhetorical training the other two probably had.

On the basis of the commonplaces discovered in this study, perhaps a few generalizations can be made about what

motivated men to fight in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. First, the value of the evidence must be considered. It has been suggested several times that these speeches are possibly, even probably, the product of the chroniclers rather than reports of real speeches given to real armies. In either case, it seems to the present writer that, in general, they may be taken as trustworthy evidence for some things. In the first place, several of the chroniclers used extensively in this study were themselves knights, as for example the author of the Gesta Francorum and William of Poitiers, before he became a priest. Most, of course, were clerics, but many of them had close contacts with the fighting classes. Fulcher of Chartres was chaplain to Baldwin and accompanied him on the Crusade. William of Poitiers became chaplain to William the Conqueror. The author of the De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi was present at the battle scene. Even those chroniclers who were monks had often come from prominent families and had close relatives who were knights. At the very least, many monasteries seem to have been centers where travelers gathered, where important people stayed on their journeys, giving the monks many opportunities to hear of life on the outside. We may conclude that all chroniclers had some opportunity to learn about the motivations of twelfth century fighting men, and many had intimate knowledge of it. Therefore when a chronicler makes a claim that a speech was given, even though

he may say the speaker used words to this effect, or add some other disclaimer of accurate reporting, nevertheless we may use the rhetorical product as evidence here.

With this in mind, several points stand out from the battle orations. The first is the extent to which the chroniclers thought it necessary, and quite proper, to warn the troops that they will not be able to escape by fleeing. We must assume from this that such was a very real possibility. Furthermore, it does not seem that the chroniclers, even those closely connected with the armies, thought it degrading to the troops to write later that they had to be so warned.

In some cases, where the army is surrounded by enemies on all sides, the speaker may simply be emphasizing the point to show his men their predicament more vividly. In other cases, as suggested earlier, it is entirely possible that the commander had chosen such a location, and was pointing out to his men that they absolutely had to fight. On the other hand, it just may be the case that medieval men at arms often fled from the field of battle. There are, indeed, several outstanding instances of such flight reported as, for example, the Normans at the Battle of Hastings and the Christians at the Battle of Dorylaeum. But even though the speeches are generally literary efforts on the part of the chroniclers, the argument still is included. Consequently, it must be concluded that, at the very least, the



sense of preservation often outweighed the sense of honor in battle, and the chroniclers thought it not disgraceful for their dukes to have to remind the troops that flight would not help them here.

Since the comparison of the relative values of the two sides' causes was so frequent an argument, we must assume that it had special importance for the medieval army. Presumably, this is always an important argument, for the troops must think they are fighting for some worthy cause against some evil enemy. At any rate, it certainly was an important motivation in this period.

It was also somewhat surprising to find appeals to win glory, or to show valor to the whole world, so infrequently. Perhaps these were not the knights of literature who take every opportunity to demonstrate their valor, especially to the ladies. On the other hand, the terms "glory" and "valor" seem to appear quite frequently in the course of other appeals. Perhaps these two are rather appeals that were implicit, and, as part of the climate of opinion, so to speak, did not often get developed as detailed arguments. The terms were invoked and that was sufficient. Perhaps an analysis of the frequency with which various terms occur would help answer this question.

The argument to defend yourselves and your families and country also occurs relatively infrequently. Perhaps this is because so many of the chronicles and so many of

the speeches either relate to the Crusades or were written by someone from an invading army. Thus, for example, William of Poitiers presents two speeches by William before the Battle of Hastings, but none by Harold. Probably the opportunities for such an appeal were limited by the choices of occasions on which to write speeches. Despite its infrequency, therefore, this may be a relatively important argument.

Also of interest is the frequency of the topic that our ancestors or we ourselves have always been victorious. Apparently the tradition of valiant men at arms was an important one, one that, to preserve it intact, would motivate men to risk their lives in further combat.

The claim that we will get aid from heaven, of course, depends ultimately on the first, most frequent, claim, that we are fighting a just war. Two things, however, stand out about this appeal. In the first place, it is sometimes promised that such divine aid will be forthcoming. No indication is given that anyone ever would have doubted such a promise. Secondly, the argument often is approached not as a promise but as an appeal to hope for divine aid. The hope itself must have been perceived as somehow efficacious. According to the chroniclers, the armies did sometimes receive divine aid, and if the chroniclers believed this, presumably the ordinary knights and infantrymen would, too. If past armies had received divine help, then the promise

or the request that they hope for it would seem quite reasonable. The chroniclers must have thought this a good argument for animating the troops, judging by the number of times they included it in battle orations.

Often the speaker claims that though the enemy outnumber us, victory depends on valor or justice or something like that, and not on mere numbers. The speaker clearly is trying to shift the concern from quantity to quality, with his own army being superior in the latter category, if inferior in the former. This argument seems perfectly straightforward, and timeless as an appeal.

The argument that one should die for Christ or conquer for Him appears, naturally, most often in the accounts of the Crusades. The benefits from dying for Christ clearly suppose a concept of martyrdom that would be accepted by the troops.

The argument for vengeance on the enemy is also interesting. Sometimes it brings to mind the barbaric blood feud, as when the chronicler asks the army to require the blood of their brothers from the enemy, or when the speaker asks who, if a near relative is killed, will not require vengeance on his murderer. Apparently, these motive forces were still operative. They appear most often in Helmold's chronicle. Perhaps in the eastern marches this motive was even a dominant one. Sometimes it has been absorbed into religion, as when the army is asked to avenge

the injuries done to Christ, or when they are told that they are God's agents in taking vengeance for Him.

Comparing the battle orations as written by medieval chroniclers with the rhetorical principles they would have been taught in the schools presents several difficulties. In the first place, the classical rhetoricians placed speeches into three categories: deliberative, forensic and epideictic. Battle orations do not seem to fit in any of them. They certainly are not forensic. This alone makes classical rhetoric less applicable to them, for both text books used place most emphasis on forensic speaking. Under the discussion of topics, for example, the vast majority of space is devoted to forensic topics with deliberative and epideictic commonplaces being treated in both works very briefly. As the two textbooks conceive epideictic oratory it is not a category of miscellaneous speeches, but is limited quite definitely to praise and blame. The battle orations do not seem to fit this category, either, for although the speaker often praises his own troops and blames the enemy, it is not done in the classical manner. The topics given under external circumstances and physical attributes are related primarily to individuals. The qualities of character are the four classical virtues, and here may be a point of contact with battle speeches. But these speeches are not epideictic, as the textbooks conceive it. Nor are they clearly in the category of deliberative

speeches. They are seldom political in nature. However, both textbooks discuss as topics for deliberative speaking the four classical virtues: wisdom, justice, courage and temperance. It seems to this writer that if there is any direct contact with classical invention, it is at this point. Two of the classical virtues, justice and courage, appear often in the battle orations. Cicero includes in the category of justice topics of revenge, for example; and the Rhetorica ad Herennium does also, calling them topics on punishment of guilt. These arguments were indeed used by the chroniclers. Courage naturally is a topic that appears often, though never so neatly subdivided as in De Inventione. Also, the two treatises deal with glory and the praiseworthy as topics for deliberative speaking, and we have seen the use chroniclers made of such appeals. Advantage is also an end of deliberative oratory, and the speakers often discuss what would be to the advantage of the armies. But in general, the detailed, minutely analyzed topics of the ancients fall into a different category of speaking, and do not apply to the battle orations. Nor did the chroniclers attempt blindly to adopt them.

The same is true, perhaps to an even greater extent, with the canon of organization. Both textbooks prescribe rather rigid formats for organizing speeches, the Rhetorica ad Herennium going so far as to say that one ought not alter this except when the cause absolutely demands it. The

structure of exordium, narrative, division, proof, refutation, and peroration, does not seem to have been adopted by the chroniclers at all in the battle orations. Seldom is there any introduction, save perhaps for a cry to get the attention of the troops. Sometimes when the circumstances warrant it, there is a narrative or statement of facts that takes the form of describing their present predicament, or the situation they find themselves in. There often is little proof given and hardly ever any refutation. Nor is there a neat peroration in the typical battle speech. It seems to the present writer that the chroniclers, at least when they wrote these speeches, paid little attention to the classical precepts of disposition. Perhaps this is due to the circumstances in which these speeches were supposedly given, or were composed to fit. Sometimes they are in the midst of a battle, usually they are given immediately before the battle begins, when presumably the speaker would have little time so would want to say everything as rapidly as possible, without worrying about niceties of narratives and partitions. Or perhaps the chroniclers simply rejected the format as inapplicable to non-forensic speeches, although both textbooks attempt to adapt the method to other types. At any rate, in this case at least, it cannot be said that the medieval writers slavishly followed the ancients.

This is not to say that the speeches are disorganized,

simply that they do not follow the pattern prescribed in the textbooks. In general, battle orations are well organized, but transitions between points are almost wholly lacking. Devices like the partition appear very infrequently. Henry of Huntingdon's speech attributed to Baldwin is the most notable exception. In this speech, while there is no introduction, a partition is used, and then a proof of each subdivision set out in the partition. But the partition is not complete, and the speech then shifts to another issue not mentioned in it.

Often the organizational pattern was something like this: first the speaker addresses his men, with some term such as "nobilissimi proceres" or "fortissimi milites." Then often follows an order for the battle, especially in the shorter speeches. After the order are two or three appeals designed to get the army to carry out the order and fight bravely in the battle. In the longer speeches, usually the order is lacking. Sometimes a narrative is added depicting their current situation, followed by several lines of appeal to fight bravely.

The other three canons of classical rhetoric were not used in this analysis. Two of them, delivery and memory, clearly would not apply to written speeches. Style would indeed apply, but to deal with it would require an extensive analysis on its own.

The battle oration seems to be a reasonably well

defined category, a fairly formalized type of speech. With allowance for variations in situations, which the chroniclers naturally had to take into account, for the most part the speeches seem very similar. There are, however, a few exceptions, and they must now be considered.

The speech Aelred of Rievaulx wrote in his description of the Battle of the Standard in some respects does not fit the normal pattern. Two particulars were discussed above: the gory details presented, and the hatred of the enemy it seems to suggest. As it seems that Aelred was not attempting to prove his rhetorical ability, not even being very interested in the liberal arts,<sup>3</sup> we must assume that he was not simply trying to write the harshest invective possible. Furthermore, Henry of Huntingdon also states that the Scots committed the same sort of atrocities. As Aelred was closely connected with both sides in the conflict, it seems probable that he was indeed accurately reporting, if not Walter Espec's words, at least the sentiments of the northern English barons. Powicke's explanation that the English and the Scots fought each other with no unusual ill will but that the English were very upset at King David's use of barbarians,<sup>4</sup> does not seem to explain all the facts, but it does seem the best explanation available at this

---

<sup>3</sup>Walter Daniel, op. cit., pp. 26f.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. xlii.



point. Why, then, does Aelred write of the atrocities of the Scots? It may be, as Henry of Huntingdon says, that David caused his followers to commit these atrocities.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps it was just a very barbarous region, and not solely because of the presence of Picts and men of Galloway. Further research might be able to solve this problem. At any rate, Aelred's speech is not formalized like most battle orations. The introduction, also, is unlike any other. Most battle orations have no real introduction; this one has a fully developed one. It, and indeed the entire speech, seem much more personal than others. Given also Aelred's position at the time of the conflict, his lack of interest in formal rhetoric, this speech may well be close to one given at the time.

Another speech that simply does not fit the pattern appears in the Expugnatio Hibernica by Giraldus Cambrensis. An English army was about to fight the Thomond people. Duvenald or Donnell, the prince of Ossory, who was an enemy of the Thomonds, spoke to the English army which was spirited but small in size.

Viri, quorum victoriis cessit insula, hostes hodie viriliter aggrediamini: quoniam si solita strenuitate victores effecti fueritis, nostrae secures cum gladiis vestris hostes acriter a tergo persequentur. Sin autem victas, quod absit, acies vestras variata sorte viderimus, in vos cum hostibus proculdubio convertentur. Cavete, viri, cavete; procul hinc urbes, procul hinc

---

<sup>5</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (English), p. 266.

castra; fuga longissima. Et nos, victoribus  
semper adhaerentes, solum persequimur fugientes.  
De nobis itaque confidite, sed victores.<sup>6</sup>

Brave soldiers, and conquerors of this island,  
we must this day manfully attack the enemy; for  
if your wonted valour is victorious in the onset,  
the Irish battle-axes will second your swords in  
following up their defeat with effect. But if we  
find your ranks give way, which God forbid, it  
may chance that, in conjunction with the enemy,  
they will be turned against you. Look well,  
therefore, men, to yourselves; there are no  
strongholds near us, we are far from any place  
of refuge. It is our custom to side with the  
winning party, and to fall on those who run away.  
Trust to us,<sup>7</sup> therefore; but only while you are  
conquerors.

Now, Giraldus was an accomplished rhetorician, having studied  
the subject in Paris and made something of a name for him-  
self both by teaching rhetoric and later by teaching theol-  
ogy but lecturing eloquently, as he had learned from his  
arts course. It seems most unlikely that any leader would  
have given such a speech as this. It starts out like a  
perfectly ordinary battle oration, but ends up clearly  
characterizing the Irish as fickle allies. Presumably,  
Giraldus' purpose in including this speech was to so char-  
acterize the Irish, rather than to report on a speech  
actually given.

A third speech that does not fit the general pattern  
is the long sermon in the De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi. This  
particular speech is far too long to present here, but it

---

<sup>6</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (Latin), p. 330 (II, xiii).

<sup>7</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (English), p. 270.

is readily available in both Latin and an English translation in the same volume, edited by David.<sup>8</sup> The speech is a sermon preached by some priest before the final attack on the walls of Lisbon by the Crusaders. The first part is an appeal to the soldiers to repent and be reconciled with God, for God has brought them safely to Lisbon and will aid them if they confess truly all their sins. Towards the end of the speech it turns into a more normal exhortation before battle. The priest tells them the enemy will not be able to stand against them, that God has been strengthening their patience by not allowing them to take the city thus far. He assures them the enemy are weak and robbers, and that, under the standard of the Cross they will conquer if they do not falter. If they die in the battle, that is far the better. Then the priest tells them he himself will accompany the army in the attack, bearing the relics, and that St. Paul prays for them. It ends with an appeal for God to help them.

This sermon is the only such speech discovered. In the first place, it is by far the longest battle oration. There must have been some good reason for this particular chronicler to include such an extended speech. It is also the only speech in the form of a sermon. Several sermons given prior to battles were described, but this is the only

---

<sup>8</sup>De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi, trans. by Charles Wendell David (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936).

one that appears in full. And the final portion, where the speaker approaches the form of the normal battle oration, seems fairly weak as an exhortation to valor when compared with the normal speech. Add to this the fact that the chronicle was apparently written by a literate but unlearned priest who accompanied the Crusade. The material suggests, as David concludes, that the sermon was probably given by the author himself, although, he adds, "it is difficult to adduce any positive evidence in its support."<sup>9</sup> David drew his conclusion on the basis of the appearance of the manuscripts and the evidence surrounding them and the author of the chronicle. The comparison of this speech with other battle orations tends to support his conclusion.

The existence of speeches which do not seem to fit the normal pattern of medieval battle orations has once again brought up the problem of authenticity: If these speeches were generally the results of the chroniclers' fantasies and literary pretensions, what can one conclude about those that do not fit the pattern? With the sole exception of David's analysis of the probable authenticity of the priest's sermon, all historians used in this research who wrote anything about the speeches agree that they are not authentic. For example, Arnold edited Henry of Huntingdon's history, and concluded: "when he incorporated this

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 41.

mass of new matter in his Historia Anglorum /which includes the speeches at the Battle of Lincoln, he<sup>7</sup> was acting rather in the interest of his own literary reputation than in that of historical science."<sup>10</sup> Forester states that the speech Henry attributes to Julius Caesar was simply made up by the writer: "we may attribute it to his own invention."<sup>11</sup> Brewer, in his introduction to Giraldus Cambrensis' Expugnatio Hibernica praises it as an historical treatise, with one reservation: "The only drawback is the recurrence of artificial orations which Giraldus, following the Latin and some later historians, has thought fit to put in the mouths of his heroes."<sup>12</sup>

A second factor that must be considered is the conditions under which the battle orations would have been given and then recorded. The chronicles used were all written in Latin. But the speeches would have been given in the vernacular. At the very least, the speech as we have it would have gone through one translation. Most of the speeches were written by chroniclers who were not present at the battles they describe, and were often written long after the event. And the chroniclers were not so much interested in accurately reporting speeches as in recording

---

<sup>10</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (Latin), pp. xiv-xv.

<sup>11</sup>Henry of Huntingdon, (English), p. 14.

<sup>12</sup>Giraldus Cambrensis, (Latin), Vol. I, p. xlvi.

the essence of events and/or exercising their literary talents. Thus we find many of the speeches prefaced with a statement that the chronicler is not attempting to report the speech as it was actually given. In some speeches, the quotations from classical poetry surely mark them as purely literary productions. With these facts in mind, we must conclude that the speeches were mostly the product of the chroniclers, rather than of the military commanders.

Of the three speeches which do not conform to the general pattern, one, that by Giraldus Cambrensis, clearly must be discounted. However, the other two, since they are clearly not normal battle orations, may therefore be closer to the speeches as they were actually given. The one, indeed, may simply be a translation into Latin of the actual speech. The fact that they do not conform to the normal pattern supplies supporting evidence for such a conclusion, although it itself is far from decisive.

We have, then, a category of speeches from one area and period in history. They have been analyzed for certain characteristics. It would be possible to consider them in other ways. For example, it would be possible to analyze them for style, comparing their styles with the rhetorical precepts in the Rhetorica ad Herennium and the commentaries, and perhaps comparing stylistic devices used by highly educated chroniclers with those used by those less well educated. It might also be possible to compare the medieval

battle orations with the classical ones, or with ones from later periods. Here the classical speeches were only considered as possible sources for direct borrowing. Perhaps they used different topics in the ancient world. Perhaps they used different patterns of organization, or different styles than the medieval chroniclers. Thus, further study could be devoted to these same speeches.

This dissertation had to take a rather circuitous route to arrive at this point. Given the disagreement among the secondary sources as to what was studied under the heading of rhetoric, the question had to be investigated and the evidence presented in some detail. Then the rhetorical artifacts to be considered had to be presented and analyzed in some aspects. The conclusion that must be reached is that the medieval chroniclers had studied rhetoric, some of them with great enthusiasm, but when they came to write the battle orations, at least, they put their classical models and classical rhetorical precepts, at least concerning invention and disposition, aside. This would support the conclusion Haskins reached, quoted earlier, that the twelfth century's historical writing owed little to the classical tradition, but was its own development.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Medieval Rhetoric

- Abelard, Peter. The Story of My Misfortunes. Translated by Henry Adams Bellows. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.
- Abelson, Paul. The Seven Liberal Arts: A Study in Medieval Culture. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1965. First published, 1906.
- Alain de Lille. The Anticlaudian of Alain de Lille. Translated by William Hafner Cornog. Philadelphia, 1935.
- Alcuin. The Rhetoric of Alcuin and Charlemagne. Translated by Wilbur Samuel Howell. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1965. First published, 1941.
- Anstey, Henry, ed. Munimenta Academica or Documents Illustrative of Academical Life and Studies at Oxford. 2 vols. RS, Vol. 50. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1868. Kraus Reprint, 1966.
- Appuhn, Albert. Das Trivium und Quadrivium in Theorie und Praxis. I. Teil: Das Trivium. Erlangen, 1900.
- Arbusow, Leonid. Colores Rhetorici. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1948.
- Atkins, J.W.H. English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1961. First published, 1934.
- Baldwin, Charles Sears. Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959. First published, 1928.
- Becker, Gustavus. Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui. Bonnae, 1885.
- Beddie, James Stuart. "The Ancient Classics in the Medieval Libraries." Speculum, V (1930), 3-20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Libraries in the Twelfth Century: Their Cata-



- logues and Contents." Anniversary Essays in Medi-  
aeval History by Students of Charles Homer Haskins.  
Edited by C.H. Taylor. Freeport, New York: Books  
for Libraries Press, Inc., 1967. First published,  
1929.
- Bogges, William F. "Hermannus Alemannus's Rhetorical  
Translations." Viator, II (1971), 227-50.
- Bolgar, R.R. The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries.  
Cambridge: At the University Press, 1958.
- Boskoff, Priscilla S. "Quintilian in the Late Middle Ages."  
Speculum, XXVII (1952), 71-8.
- Brehaut, Ernest. An Encyclopedist of the Dark Ages: Isi-  
dore of Seville. Studies in History, Economics and  
Public Law, Vol. XLVIII, No. 1 New York: Columbia  
University Press, 1912.
- Bride, Sister Mary, O.P. "John of Salisbury's Theory of  
Rhetoric." Studies in Medieval Culture, Vol. II.  
Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University,  
1966.
- Buttenwieser, Hilda. "The Distribution of the Manuscripts  
of the Latin Classical Authors in the Middle Ages."  
Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chi-  
cago, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Popular Authors of the Middle Ages: The Testi-  
mony of the Manuscripts." Speculum, XVII (1942),  
50-5.
- Caplan, Harry. "Classical Rhetoric and the Mediaeval The-  
ory of Preaching." Classical Philology, XXVIII  
(1933), 73-96.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Mediaeval Commentary on the Rhetorica ad  
Herennium." Of Eloquence. Edited by Anne King and  
Helen North. Ithaca: Cornell University Press,  
1970.
- Cassiodorus. An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings.  
Translated by Leslie Webber Jones. New York: Octa-  
gon Books, Inc., 1966.
- Clark, Donald Lemen. "Rhetoric and the Literature of the  
English Middle Ages." Quarterly Journal of Speech,  
XLV (1959), 19-28.

- Clerval, A. Les Ecoles de Chartres au Moyen Age (du V<sup>e</sup> au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siecle). Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1895.
- \_\_\_\_\_. L'Enseignement des Arts Liberaux a Chartres et a Paris dans la premiere Moitie de XII<sup>e</sup> Siecle d'apres l'Heptateuchon de Thierry de Chartres. Paris, 1889.
- Colson, F.H., ed. M. Fabii Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber I. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1924.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Quintilian I.9 and the 'Chria' in Ancient Education." The Classical Review, XXXV (1921), 150-4.
- Cranage, D.H.S. The Home of the Monk. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1926.
- Curtius, Ernst Robert. European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages. Translated by Willard Trask. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953.
- Daly, Lowrie J., S.J. The Medieval University, 1200-1400. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961.
- Delhaye, Philippe. "L'Enseignement de la Philosophie Morale au XII<sup>e</sup> Siecle." Medieval Studies, XI (1949), 77-99.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "L'Organisation Scolaire au XII<sup>e</sup> Siecle." Traditio, V (1947), 211-68.
- Delisle, Leopold. Le Cabinet des Manuscrits de la Bibliotheque Nationale. Tome II. Amsterdam: Gerard Th. van Heusden, 1969. First published, 1874.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Les Ecoles d'Orleans, au Douzieme et au Treizieme Siecle." Bulletin, Societe de l'Histoire de France, VII (1869), 139-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Remarks on the Life, Character, Work, and Times of Ordericus Vitalis." Ordericus Vitalis, The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy, Vol. IV. Translated by Thomas Forester. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1856.
- Dickey, Mary. "Some Commentaries on the De Inventione and Ad Herennium of the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries." Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies, VI (1968), 1-41.
- Dieter, Otto Alvin Loeb, and Kurth, William Charles. "The

- De Rhetorica of Aurelius Augustine." Speech Monographs, XXXV (1968), 90-108.
- Faral, Edmond. Les Arts Poétiques du XII<sup>e</sup> et du XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Tome 238. Paris, 1923.
- Fierville, Charles, ed. M.F. Quintiliani de Institutione Oratoria Liber Primus. Paris: Librairie de Firmin-Didot et Cie, 1890.
- FitzStephen, William. Vita Sancti Thomae, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi et Martyris. Materials for the History of Thomas Becket. Vol. III. Edited by James Craigie Robertson. RS, Vol. 67. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1877. Kraus Reprint, 1965.
- Gabriel, Astrik L. The Educational Ideas of Vincent of Beauvais. Texts and Studies in the History of Medieval Education, No. 4. Notre Dame, Indiana: The Mediaeval Institute, University of Notre Dame, 1956.
- de Ghellinck, J., S.J. L'Essor de la Littérature Latine au XII<sup>e</sup> Siècle. 2 tomes. Museum Lessianum, section historique, No. 5. Brussels et Paris, 1946.
- Gibson, Strickland, ed. Statuta Antiqua Universitatis Oxoniensis. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The University of Oxford." The Victoria History of the Counties of England: Oxfordshire. Vol. III. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Giraldus Cambrensis. De Rebus A Se Gestis, Libri III. Giraldi Cambrensis Opera. Vol. I. Edited by J.S. Brewer. RS, Vol. 21. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1861. Kraus Reprint, 1966.
- Grabmann, Martin. Thomas Aquinas: His Personality and Thought. Translated by Virgil Michel, O.S.B. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1963. First published, 1928.
- Grosser, Dorothy Evelyn. "Studies in the Influence of the Rhetorica ad Herennium and Cicero's De Inventione." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1953.
- Gundissalinus. "De divisione philosophiae." Edited by L. Baur. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, IV (1903), Heft 2-3.

- Hackett, M.B. The Original Statutes of Cambridge University: The Text and Its History. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1970.
- Halm, Carolus. Rhetores Latini Minores. Lipsiae, 1863.
- Haring, Nicholas M., S.A.C. "Thierry of Chartres and Dominicus Gundissalinus." Mediaeval Studies, XXVI (1964), 271-86.
- Haskins, Charles Homer. "A List of Text-Books From the Close of the Twelfth Century." Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century. Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1968. First published, 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Rise of Universities. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1957. First published, 1923.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Studies in Mediaeval Culture. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1958. First published, 1929.
- Herrick, Marvin T. "The Early History of Aristotle's Rhetoric in England." Philological Quarterly, V (1926), 242-57.
- Holmes, Urban Tigner, Jr. Daily Living in the Twelfth Century. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Transitions in European Education." Twelfth-Century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society. Edited by Marshall Clagett, Gaines Post and Robert Reynolds. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961.
- Howell, Wilbur Samuel. Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956.
- Hugh of St. Victor. The Didascalicon of Hugh of St. Victor. Translated by Jerome Taylor. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.
- Hunt, R.W. "English Learning in the Late Twelfth Century." Essays in Medieval History. Edited by R.W. Southern. London: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Introductions to the 'Artes' in the Twelfth

- Century." Studia Mediaevalia in honorem admodum reverendi patris Raymundi Josephi Martin, O.P. Bruges, 1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Studies on Priscian in the Twelfth Century—II: The School of Ralph of Beauvais." Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies, II (1950), 1-56.
- Jeauneau, Edouard. "Le Prologus in Eptateucon de Thierry de Chartres." Mediaeval Studies, XVI (1954), 171-5.
- John of Salisbury. Metalogicon. Translated by Daniel D. McGarry. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955.
- Jones, Leslie Webber. "The Scriptorium at Corbie: I. The Library." Speculum, XXII (1947), 191-204.
- Jourdain, Amable. Recherches Critiques sur l'Age et l'Origine des Traductions Latines d'Aristote. Edited by Charles Jourdain. New York: Burt Franklin, 1960. First published, 1843.
- Katzenellenbogen, Adolf. "The Representations of the Seven Liberal Arts." Twelfth-Century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society. Edited by Marshall Clagett, Gaines Post, and Robert Reynolds. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961.
- Klibansky, Raymond. "The School of Chartres." Twelfth-Century Europe and the Foundations of Modern Society. Edited by Marshall Clagett, Gaines Post and Robert Reynolds. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961.
- Knowles, David. The Monastic Order in England. 2nd. ed. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Religious Orders in England. Vol. II. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Thomas Becket. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1971.
- Koch, Josef. Artes Liberales, von der Antiken Bildung zur Wissenschaft des Mittelalters. Leiden und Köln: E.J. Brill, 1959.
- Laurie, S.S. The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1902.

- Leach, Arthur F. Early Yorkshire Schools. The Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series, Vol. XXVII, 1898.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. Educational Charters and Documents, 598 to 1909. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1911.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Schools." The Victoria History of the Counties of England: Warwickshire. Vol. II. London: University of London Institute of Historical Research, 1908. Reprinted, London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Schools of Medieval England. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1915.
- Leff, Gordon. Paris and Oxford Universities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.
- Lehmann, Paul. "Die Institutio oratoria des Quintilianus im Mittelalter." Philologus, LXXXIX (1934), 349-83.
- Little, A.G. Review of The Schools of Medieval England, by Arthur F. Leach. English Historical Review, XXX (1915), 525-9.
- Lloyd, Roger. The Golden Middle Age. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1939.
- MacKinney, Loren C. Bishop Fulbert and Education at the School of Chartres. Texts and Studies in the History of Mediaeval Education, No. 6. Notre Dame, Indiana: The Mediaeval Institute, Notre Dame University, 1957.
- McKeon, Richard. "Poetry and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century: The Renaissance of Rhetoric." Modern Philology, XLIII (1946), 217-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages." Speculum, XVII (1942), 1-32.
- Maitre, Leon. Les Ecoles Episcopales et Monastiques de l'Occident depuis Charlemagne jusqu'a Philippe-Auguste. Paris: Dumoulin, Libraire-Editeur, 1866.
- Mallet, Charles Edward. A History of the University of Oxford, Vol. I: The Mediaeval University and the Colleges Founded in the Middle Ages. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1924.

- Manitius, Max. Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters. Band III. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, IX 2.3. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Handschriften Antiker Autoren in Mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen. Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, 67. Beiheft. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Philologisches aus Alten Bibliothekskatalogen (bis 1300). Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, s. 3, Band 47:2. Frankfurt am Main, 1892.
- Marti, Berthe M. "Hugh Primas and Arnulf of Orleans." Speculum, XXX (1955), 233-8.
- Michaud, E. Guillaume de Champeaux et Les Ecoles de Paris au XII<sup>e</sup> Siecle. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Reprint Library, n.d. First published, 1867.
- Mollard, Auguste. "La Diffusion de l'Institution Oratoire au XII<sup>e</sup> Siecle." Le Moyen Age, 3<sup>e</sup> Serie, Tome V (1934), 161-75.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "La Diffusion de l'Institution Oratoire au XII<sup>e</sup> Siecle." Le Moyen Age, 3<sup>e</sup> Serie, Tome VI (1935), 1-9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "L'Imitation de Quintilien dans Guibert de Nogent." Le Moyen Age, 3<sup>e</sup> Serie, Tome V (1934), 81-7.
- Mullinger, James Bass. The University of Cambridge, Vol. I: From the Earliest Times to the Royal Injunctions of 1535. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1873.
- Munro, Dana C., trans. "Statutes of Robert de Courcon for Paris, 1215." Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History, Vol. II, No. 3. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1902.
- Murphy, James. "Aristotle's Rhetoric in the Middle Ages." Quarterly Journal of Speech, LII (1966), 109-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Arts of Discourse, 1050-1400." Mediaeval Studies, XXIII (1961), 194-205.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Cicero's Rhetoric in the Middle Ages." Quarterly Journal of Speech, LIII (1967), 334-41.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Earliest Teaching of Rhetoric at Oxford." Speech Monographs, XXVII (1960), 345-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Medieval Arts of Discourse: An Introductory Bibliography." Speech Monographs, XXIX (1962), 71-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Medieval Rhetoric, A Select Bibliography. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Modern' Elements in Medieval Rhetoric." Western Speech, XXVIII (1964), 206-11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Saint Augustine and Rabanus Maurus: The Genesis of Medieval Rhetoric." Western Speech, XXXI (1967), 88-96.
- Norden, Eduard. Die Antike Kunstprosa. Band II. Leipzig und Berlin: B.G. Teubner, 1909.
- Norton, Arthur O. Readings in the History of Education: Mediaeval Universities. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1909.
- Ogilvy, J.D.A. Books Known to the English, 597-1066. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1967.
- Ogle, Marbury Bladen. "Some Aspects of Mediaeval Latin Style." Speculum, I (1926), 170-89.
- Ordericus Vitalis. The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy. 4 vols. Translated by Thomas Forester. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853-56.
- Otto of Freising. The Two Cities. Translated by Charles Mierow. New York: Columbia University Press, 1928.
- Paetow, Louis John. The Arts Course at Medieval Universities with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Reprint Library, n.d. First published, 1910.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. and trans. La Bataille des VII Ars of Henry d'Andeli and the Morale Scolarium of John of Garland. Memoirs of the University of California, Vol. IV. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Neglect of the Ancient Classics at the Early Medieval Universities." Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters, XVI,



pt. 1 (1909), 311-9.

- Pare, G; Brunet, A; and Tremblay, P. La Renaissance du XIII<sup>e</sup> Siecle: Les Ecoles et l'Enseignement. Publications de l'Institut d'Etudes Medievaies d'Ottawa, Tome III. Paris et Ottawa, 1933.
- Parker, H. "The Seven Liberal Arts." English Historical Review, V (1890), 417-61.
- [Peter of Blois.] "Continuation of Ingulph's Chronicle of Croyland." Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland. Translated by Henry T. Riley. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854.
- Peterson, W. "Fierville's Quintilian." Review of M.F. Quintiliani de Institutione Oratoria Liber Primus, edited by Charles Fierville. The Classical Review, V (1891), 32-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae, Liber Decimus. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1891.
- Poole, Austin Lane. From Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 1087-1216. 2nd ed. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Poole, Reginald Lane. Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought and Learning. 2nd ed. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Masters of the Schools at Paris and Chartres in John of Salisbury's Time." English Historical Review, XXXV (1920), 321-42.
- Post, Gaines. "Masters' Salaries and Student Fees in the Mediaeval Universities." Speculum, VII (1932), 181-98.
- Powicke, Frederick Maurice. The Christian Life in the Middle Ages and Other Essays. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1935.
- Quain, Edwin A., S.J. "The Medieval Accessus ad Auctores." Traditio, III (1945), 215-64.
- Rand, Edward K. Cicero in the Courtroom of St. Thomas Aquinas. The Aquinas Lecture, 1945. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1946.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Classics in the Thirteenth Century."

- Speculum, IV (1929), 249-69.
- Rashdall, Hastings. The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages. 3 vols. Edited by F.M. Powicke and A.B. Emden. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- Richardson, H.G. "The Schools of Northampton in the Twelfth Century." English Historical Review, LVI (1941), 595-605.
- Roach, J.P.C. "The University of Cambridge." The Victoria History of the Counties of England: A History of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely. Vol. III. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Rolfe, John C. Cicero and His Influence. Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1923.
- Rubinstein, N. "Political Rhetoric in the Imperial Chancery During the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries." Medium Aevum, XIV (1945), 21-43.
- Russell, Josiah Cox. "Richard of Bardney's Account of Robert Grosseteste's Early and Middle Life." Medievalia et Humanistica, II (1943), 45-54.
- Ryan, Sister Mary Bride, O.P. John of Salisbury on the Arts of Language in the Trivium: An Abstract of a Dissertation. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1958.
- Sandys, John Edwin. A History of Classical Scholarship, Vol. I: From the Sixth Century B.C. to the End of the Middle Ages. 2nd ed. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1906.
- Sanford, Eva Matthews. "The Use of Classical Latin Authors in the Libri Manuales." Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, LV (1924), 190-248.
- Savage, Ernest A. Old English Libraries. Chicago: A.C. McClurg and Company, 1912.
- Smith, Cyril Eugene. The University of Toulouse in the Middle Ages. Milwaukee: The Marquette University Press, 1958.
- Southern, Richard William. Medieval Humanism. New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1970.

- Suringar, W.H.D. Historia Critica Scholiastarum Latinorum. Leiden, 1834.
- Sutherland, Priscilla Warren. "Quintilian in the Medieval Florilegia." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1950.
- Thomas, Paul. "Un Commentaire du Moyen Age sur la Rhetorique de Ciceron." Melanges Graux. Paris, 1884.
- Thompson, James Westfall. The Medieval Library. New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1957. First published, 1939.
- Thomson, R.M. "The Library of Bury St. Edmunds Abbey in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries." Speculum, XLVII (1972), 617-45.
- Thorndike, Lynn. "Elementary and Secondary Education in the Middle Ages." Speculum, XV (1940), 400-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. and trans. University Records and Life in the Middle Ages. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944.
- Thurot, Charles. De l'Organisation de l'Enseignement dans l'Universite de Paris, au Moyen-Age. Paris et Besancon, 1850.
- Ullman, B.L. "Classical Authors in Certain Mediaeval Florilegia." Classical Philology, XXVII (1932), 1-42.
- Vaughn, Earnest Vancourt. The Origin and Early Development of the English Universities to the Close of the Thirteenth Century. University of Missouri Studies, Social Science Series, Vol. II, No. 2. Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri, 1909.
- Wallach, Luitpold. "Onulf of Speyer, A Humanist of the Eleventh Century." Medievalia et Humanistica, VI (1950), 35-56.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of Colores Rhetorici, by Leonid Arbusow. Speculum, XXIV (1949), 416-8.
- Ward, J.O. "The Date of the Commentary on Cicero's De Inventione by Thierry of Chartres (ca. 1095-1160?) and the Cornifician Attack on the Liberal Arts." Viator, III (1972), 219-73.
- Watson, Foster. The English Grammar Schools to 1660: Their

- Curriculum and Practice. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1908.
- Weisheipl, James A., O.P. "Curriculum of the Faculty of Arts at Oxford in the Early Fourteenth Century." Mediaeval Studies, XXVI (1964), 143-85.
- Wieruszowski, Helene. The Medieval University. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1966.
- William of Malmesbury. Chronicle of the Kings of England. Translated by J.A. Giles. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1847.
- Williams, John R. "The Cathedral School of Reims in the Time of Master Alberic, 1118-1136." Traditio, XX (1964), 93-114.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Cathedral School of Rheims in the Eleventh Century." Speculum, XXIX (1954), 661-77.
- Wilson, R.M. "The Contents of the Mediaeval Library." The English Library Before 1700. Edited by Francis Wormald and C.E. Wright. London: The Athlone Press, 1958.
- Wright, R.A., and Sinclair, T.A. A History of Later Latin Literature. London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1931.

#### Chronicles with Battle Orations

The Latin editions of the chronicles are listed alphabetically by author, or title where the writer is anonymous. Immediately following the entry for the Latin edition used is the entry for the English translation, if any. Numbers in parentheses are citations for book and chapter or section.

- Aelred of Rievaulx. Genealogia Regum Anglorum. PL CXCIV, 711-38. Battle oration: col. 719-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Relatio de Standardo. Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I. Vol. III, pp. 179-99. Edited by Richard Howlett. RS, Vol. 82:3. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1886. Kraus Reprint, 1964. Battle orations: pp. 184-90, 197-8.
- Albert of Aix (Albericus Aquensis). Historia Hierosolymitanae Expeditionis. PL CLXVI, 389-716. Battle ora-

tions: col. 426 (II, xxvii), 473 (III, lx), 489-90 (IV, xviii), 502 (IV, xxxix), 561 (VI, xlvi), 570-1 (VII, iv), 581 (VII, xxiv), 604 (VII, lxviii).

Albricus. Chronica Albrici Monachi Trium Fontium, a monacho Novi Monasterii Hoiensis interpolata. MGH SS XXIII, 631-950. Battle oration: p. 900.

Annales de Margan. Annales Monastici, Vol. I, pp. 3-40. Edited by Henry Richards Luard. RS, Vol. 36:1 London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1864. Kraus Reprint, 1965. Battle oration: p. 34.

Annales Monasterii de Waverleia. Annales Monastici, Vol. II, pp. 129-411. Edited by Henry Richards Luard. RS, Vol. 36:2. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1865. Battle oration: p. 279.

Baudri of Bourgueil, Archbishop of Dol (Baldricus Dolensis Archiepiscopus). Historia Hierosolymitana. PL CLXVI, 1061-1152. Battle orations: col. 1084-5 (II), 1088 (II), 1096 (II), 1122 (III), 1142-3 (IV).

Benedict of Peterborough. The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II. and Richard I. 2 vols. Edited by William Stubbs. RS, Vol. 49. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1867. Kraus Reprint, 1965. Battle orations: Vol. I, pp. 52-3. Vol. II, pp. 163, 168-9, 191.

Brevis Relatio de Origine Willelmi Conquestoris. Scriptores Rerum Gestarum Willelmi Conquestoris, Regis Angliae, pp. 1-23. Edited by J.A. Giles. Caxton Society, Vol. III, 1845. New York: Burt Franklin reprint, 1967. Battle oration: p. 7.

Chronica episcoporum ecclesiae Merseburgensis. MGH SS X, 163-88. Battle oration: pp. 164-5.

Chronicon Monasterii de Bello. London: Impensis Societatis, 1846. Battle orations: pp. 3-4, 22.

The Chronicle of Battel Abbey, From 1066 to 1176. Translated by Mark Antony Lower. London: John Russell Smith, 1851. Battle orations: pp. 4, 25-6.

De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi. Translated by Charles Wendell David. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936. Battle oration: pp. 146-59.

Ekkehard of Aura (Ekkehardus Uraugiensis). Chronica. PL CLIV, 433-1060. Battle orations: col. 921, 982.

Florence of Worcester (Florentius Wigorniensis). Chronicon ex Chronicis, ab initio mundi usque ad annum Domini 1118 deductum. London, 1592. Battle orations: pp. 385, 387, 454.

---

. The Chronicle of Florence of Worcester. Translated by Thomas Forester. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854. Battle orations: pp. 127-8, 130, 190.

Fulcher of Chartres (Fulcherius Carnotensis). Historia Hierosolymitana. PL CLV, 821-940. Battle orations: col. 872 (II, x), 877 (II, xvii).

---

. A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem. Translated by Francis Rita Ryan; edited by Harold S. Fink. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1969. Battle orations: pp. 157-8 (II, xi), 168 (II, xviii). (Note the chapter differences between this translation and the PL edition.)

Geoffrey of Monmouth (Galfredus Monumetensis). Galfredi Monumetensis Historia Britonum. Edited by J.A. Giles. Caxton Society, Vol. I, 1844. New York: Burt Franklin reprint, 1967. Battle orations: pp. 18 (I, xv), 134-5 (VIII, iv-v), 141-2 (VIII, xii), 160-1 (IX, iii-iv), 186-7 (X, iv), 191-3 (X, vii-viii), 195 (X, ix), 197 (X, xi), 202-3 (XI, ii), 221 (XII, x).

---

. British History. Six Old English Chronicles, pp. 87-292. Translated by J.A. Giles. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1848. New York: AMS Press, 1968. Battle orations: pp. 105, 209-11, 216-7, 233-4, 257, 260-2, 264, 266, 270, 285.

Geoffrey of Vinsauf. See below, after Richard, canon of Holy Trinity, London.

Gervase of Canterbury. Chronica. The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury, Vol. I. Edited by William Stubbs. RS, Vol. 73:1. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1879. Kraus Reprint, 1965. Battle oration: pp. 113-6.

Gesta Consulum Andegavorum et Dominorum Ambaziensium. Chroniques d'Anjou, pp. 1-225. Edited by Paul Marchegay and Andre Salmon. Paris: Jules Renouard, 1856. New York: Johnson Reprint Company, 1965. Battle orations: pp. 82-3, 107-8, 119-20, 146-7, 149, 196-7.

Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum. Edited and translated by Rosalind Hill. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1962. Battle orations: pp. 18-20 (III /ix/), 36-7 (VI /xvii/), 46 (VIII /xx/), 91 (X /xxxviii/).

Gerald of Wales (Giraldus Cambrensis). Expugnatio Hibernica. Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. V, pp. 207-411. Edited by James F. Dimock. RS Vol. 21:5. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1867; Kraus Reprint, 1964. Battle orations: pp. 238-43 (I, vii-ix), 266-8 (I, xxiii), 322 (II, vii), 330 (II, xiii).

. The History of the Conquest of Ireland. The Historical Works of Giraldus Cambrensis, pp. 165-324. Translated by Thomas Forester. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1863; New York: AMS Press, 1968. Battle orations: pp. 197-201, 222-3, 264, 270.

Gislebertus. Chronicon Hanoniense. MGH SS XXI, pp. 481-601. Battle oration: p. 544.

Guibert of Nogent (Guibertus, abbas Sanctae Mariae de Novigento). Gesta Dei Per Francos. PL CLVI, 675-838. Battle orations: col. 723-4 (III, v), 740-2 (IV, v), 751 (V, i), 794 (VII, iv).

Helmold of Bosau. Slavenchronik (Cronica Slavorum). MGH SS Rerum Germanicarum in Usus Scholarum, Vol. 32. Hannover, 1937. Battle orations: pp. 51-2 (I, 25), 74-6 (I, 38), 121 (I, 64), 127 (I, 67), 191-3 (II, 98).

. The Chronicle of the Slavs. Translated by Francis Joseph Tschan. New York: Columbia University Press, 1935. Battle orations: pp. 104, 129-30, 179, 185, 254-6.

Henry of Huntingdon. Historia Anglorum. Edited by Thomas Arnold. RS Vol. 74. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1879; Kraus Reprint, 1965. Battle orations: pp. 17, 200-2, 221, 262-3, 268-73.

. The Chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon. Translated by Thomas Forester. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853; New York: AMS Press, 1968. Battle orations: pp. 13-4, 210-1, 229, 267-9, 274-8.

Johannes, Monachus Majoris Monasterii. Historia Gaufredi Ducis Normannorum et Comitis Andegavorum. Chroniques d'Anjou, pp. 227-310. Edited by Paul Marchegay and

Andre Salmon. Paris: Jules Renouard, 1856; New York: Johnson Reprint Company, 1965. Battle orations: pp. 302-7.

Liber Eliensis. Edited by E.O. Blake. Camden Third Series, Vol. XCII. London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1962. Battle oration: p. 174.

Lisiardus, Turonensis Clericus. Historia Hierosolymitana. PL CLXXIV, 1589-1634. Battle orations: col. 1603, 1606-7.

Matthew of Westminster. Flores Historiarum. 2 vols. Edited by Henry Richards Luard. RS Vol. 95:1 and 2. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1890; Kraus Reprint, 1965. Battle oration: Vol. II, p. 29.

Matthew Paris. Chronica Majora. 7 vols. Edited by Henry Richards Luard. RS Vol. 57. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1872-83; Kraus Reprint, 1964. Battle orations:

Vol. I: pp. 216, 221-2, 279, 495, 497, 541.

Vol. II: pp. 64, 168.

Vol. III: p. 408.

Vol. IV: pp. 299-300, 341.

Vol. V: pp. 152, 154-7, 219-20, 315, 646-8, 651.

Vol. VI: p. 156.

---

. English History. 3 vols. Translated by J.A. Giles. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1852-4. Battle orations: Vol. I: p. 65. Vol. II: pp. 371, 373-5, 429, 509. Vol. III: pp. 243-5, 248.

---

. Historia Anglorum, sive, ut vulgo dicitur, Historia Minor. 3 vols. Edited by Sir Frederic Madden. RS Vol. 44. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1866-9; Kraus Reprint, 1964. Battle orations: Vol. I, pp. 85-6, 259.

Ordericus Vitalis. Historiae Ecclesiasticae. 5 vols. Edited by Augustus le Prevost. Paris: Jules Renouard, 1838-55. Battle orations:  
Vol. II: p. 148 (III, xiv).  
Vol. III: pp. 167 (VII, v), 179 (VII, vii), 347 (VIII, xiv), 353 (VIII, xv), 527 (IX, ix), 539 (IX, ix), 557 (IX, x), 601 (IX, xv), 604 (IX, xv).  
Vol. IV: pp. 135-6 (X, xxi), 151 (X, xxiii), 357-8 (XII, xviii), 457-8 (XII, xxxix).  
Vol. V: pp. 95-7 (XIII, xxxiii).



- . The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy. 4 vols. Translated by Thomas Forester. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853-6. Battle orations:  
Vol. I: p. 484.  
Vol. II: pp. 46, 355, 365, 452-5, 496, 500.  
Vol. III: pp. 114, 123, 138, 173, 175, 303-4, 316-7, 482.  
Vol. IV: pp. 72-5, 188-9.
- Otto of Freising. Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris. MGH SS Rerum Germanicarum in Usum Scholarum, Vol. 46. Hannoverae et Lipsiae, 1912. Battle oration: p. 148 (II, xl).
- . The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa. Translated by Charles Christopher Mierow and Richard Emery. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1953. Battle oration: p. 157.
- Otto de Sancto Blasio. Chronica. MGH SS Rerum Germanicarum in Usum Scholarum, Vol. 47. Hannoverae et Lipsiae, 1912. Battle oration: pp. 23-4 (xx).
- Peter of Vaux Cernay (Petrus Sarnensis sive Vallis Sarnaii Monachus). Historia Albigensium. PL CCXIII, 543-712. Battle orations: col. 672 (lxxii), 681 (lxxiii), 710 (lxxxvi).
- Rahewin. Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris. MGH SS Rerum Germanicarum in Usum Scholarum, Vol. 46. Hannoverae et Lipsiae, 1912. Battle orations: pp. 202-4 (III, xxix).
- . The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa. Translated by Charles Christopher Mierow and Richard Emery. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1953. Battle oration: pp. 205-6.
- Ralph de Diceto. Abbreviationes Chronicorum. The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto, Dean of London, Vol. I, pp. 3-263. Edited by William Stubbs. RS Vol. 68:1. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1876; Kraus Reprint, 1965. Battle oration: p. 222.
- Ralph of Caen (Radolfus Cadomensis). Gesta Tancredi in Expeditione Jerosolymitana. PL CLV, 489-590. Battle orations: col. 509 (xxii), 581 (cxliv), 590 (clvii).
- Ralph of Coggeshall. Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon Anglicanum. Edited by Joseph Stevenson. RS Vol. 66.

London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1875; Kraus Reprint, 1965. Battle orations: pp. 46-8.

[Ralph of Coggeshall.] Libellus de Expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum. Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon Anglicanum, pp. 209-62. Edited by Joseph Stevenson. RS Vol. 66. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1875; Kraus Reprint, 1965. Battle orations: pp. 211-2, 234.

Raymond d'Aguilers (Raimundus de Agiles). Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Jerusalem. PL CLV, 591-668. Battle orations: col. 605 (x), 613 (xv).

. Historia Francorum Qui Ceperunt Jerusalem.  
Translated by John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 71. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1968. Battle orations: pp. 56 (vii), 60 (viii). (Note the chapter differences between this and the PL edition.)

Richard, canon of Holy Trinity, London. Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi. Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I., Vol. I. Edited by William Stubbs. RS Vol. 38:1. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1864; Kraus Reprint, 1964. Battle orations: pp. 52 (I, xxiii), 69 (I, xxix), 104 (I, liii), 207 (II, xlii), 225-6 (III, xiii), 267-8 (IV, xix), 274 (IV, xix), 293-4 (IV, xxx), 416-7 (VI, xxii), 420 (VI, xxiii).

[Geoffrey of Vinsauf.] Chronicle of Richard the First's Crusade. Chronicles of the Crusades, pp. 65-339. London: George Bell and Sons, 1903. Battle orations: pp. 98, 108, 130, 198, 210, 237-8, 242, 251, 322-3, 325. In this English translation, as in many other instances, Richard's chronicle is attributed to Geoffrey of Vinsauf.

Robert of Torigni. The Chronicle of Robert of Torigni. Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I., Vol. 4. Edited by Richard Howlett. RS Vol. 82:4. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1882; Kraus Reprint, 1964. Battle orations: pp. 54, 74.

Robert the Monk (Robertus Monachus S. Remigii). Historia Hierosolymitana. PL CLV, 669-758. Battle orations: col. 671-3 (I, i-ii), 692 (III, iv), 728-9 (VII, iii), 753-6 (IX, iii-iv).

Roger of Hoveden. Chronica. 4 vols. Edited by William Stubbs. RS Vol. 51. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1868-71; Kraus Reprint, 1964. Battle orations: Vol. I, pp. 82, 193-4, 199-203. Vol. III, pp. 106, 112.

---

. The Annals of Roger de Hoveden. 2 vols. Translated by Henry T. Riley. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853; New York: AMS Press, 1968. Battle orations: Vol. I, pp. 98, 101, 231-3, 238-43. Vol. II, p. 201.

Roger of Wendover. The Flowers of History. 3 vols. Edited by Henry G. Hewlett. RS Vol. 84. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1886-9; Kraus Reprint, 1965. Battle orations: Vol. I, p. 215. Vol. II, p. 213. Vol. III, p. 84.

---

. Flowers of History. 2 vols. Translated by J.A. Giles. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1849. Battle orations: Vol. I, pp. 17, 82, 288-91, 332, 397, 488-9. Vol. II, pp. 120, 392-3, 589.

Simeon of Durham. Capitula de Miraculis et Translationibus Sancti Cuthberti. Opera Omnia, Vol. I, pp. 229-61. Edited by Thomas Arnold. RS Vol. 75:1. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1882; Kraus Reprint, 1965. Battle orations: pp. 233-4 (i), 241-2 (iv).

---

. Historia de Sancto Cuthberto. Opera Omnia, Vol. I, pp. 196-214. Edited by Thomas Arnold. RS Vol. 75:1. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1882; Kraus Reprint, 1965. Battle orations: pp. 206 (18), 214 (33).

---

. Historia Regum. Opera Omnia, Vol. II, pp. 3-283. Edited by Thomas Arnold. RS Vol. 75:2. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1885; Kraus Reprint, 1965. Battle orations: pp. 78 (72), 150 (127).

---

. History of the Kings of England. The Church Historians of England, Vol. III, Pt. ii, pp. 425-617. Translated by Joseph Stevenson. London, 1855. Battle oration: p. 472.

William of Newburgh. Historia Rerum Anglicarum. Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I., Vols. 1 and 2. Edited by Richard Howlett. RS Vol. 82:1 and 2. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1884; Kraus Reprint, 1964. Battle orations: Vol. I, pp. 184-5 (II, xxxiii), 326-7 (IV, xiii).

- . The History of William of Newburgh. The Church Historians of England, Vol. IV, Pt. ii, pp. 397-672. Translated by Joseph Stevenson. London, 1856. Battle oration: p. 492.
- William of Poitiers (Guillaume de Poitiers). Histoire de Guillaume le Conquerant. Edited and translated (into French) by Raymonde Foreville. Les Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Age, 23<sup>e</sup> tome. Paris: Societe d'Edition "Les Belles Lettres", 1952. Battle orations: pp. 98-9 (I, 40), 156-9 (II, 5), 182-5 (II, 15), 190-1 (II, 18).
- . Excerpts from the History of William the Conqueror. English Historical Documents, Vol. II, pp. 217-31. Edited by David C. Douglas and George W. Greenaway. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1953. Battle orations: pp. 220, 225-6.
- William of Tyre. Historia Rerum in Partibus Transmarinisi Gestarum. PL CCI, 209-1060. Battle orations: col. 281 (III, 8), 288 (III, 15), 330 (V, 5), 369 (VI, 16), 372 (VI, 20), 483 (X, 30), 487 (XI, 3), 529 (XII, 9), 531 (XII, 12), 566-7 (XIII, 18), 604-5 (XIV, 25), 772 (XIX, 25), 836 (XXI, 22), 845 (XXI, 29).
- . A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea. 2 vols. Translated by Emily Atwater Babcock and A.C. Krey. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943. Battle orations: Vol. I, pp. 161, 172, 231, 286, 291, 458-9, 465-6, 529, 533. Vol. II, pp. 28-9, 86, 331, 429-30, 442.
- William the Breton (Guillelmus Armorici). Gesta Philippi Augusti. Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton, tome premier, pp. 168-333. Edited by H. Francois Delaborde. Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1882. Battle orations: pp. 270-3 (183-4), 276-8 (186-7), 287 (195).
- . The speech by Philip before the Battle of Bouvines is translated in Hutton, William Holden. Philip Augustus. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1896, p. 103.

Classics (Histories with battle orations that were available in the middle ages, and classical rhetorical treatises)

Caesar, C. Julius. The Civil Wars. Translated by A.G. Peskett. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann; New York: Macmillan, 1914.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Gallic War. Translated by H.J. Edwards. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1930.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. Brutus. Translated by G.L. Hendrickson. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

\_\_\_\_\_. De Inventione. Translated by H.M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

\_\_\_\_\_. De Oratore. 2 vols. Translated by E.W. Sutton and H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959-60.

\_\_\_\_\_. De Partitione Oratoria. Translated by H. Rackham. In vol. II of De Oratore. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

\_\_\_\_\_. Orator. Translated by H.M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

[Cicero.] Ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium). Translated by Harry Caplan. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Frontinus, Sextus Julius. Stratagems. Translated by Charles E. Bennett. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Josephus, Flavius. Jewish Antiquities. Josephus' Works, vols. IV-IX. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961

\_\_\_\_\_. The Jewish War. Josephus' Works, vols. II and III. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.

\_\_\_\_\_. Flavii Josephi De Bello Judaico, libri septem.  
2 vols. Edited by Eduard Cardwell. Oxford, 1837.

Livius, Titus. Livy. 14 vols. Translated by B.O. Foster,  
Frank Gardner Moore, Evan T. Sage, and Alfred C.  
Schlesinger. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge:  
Harvard University Press, 1919-25.

Quintilianus, Marcus Fabius. Declamationes XIX Maiores.  
Edited by Georgius Lehnert. Lipsiae: Teubner,  
1905.

\_\_\_\_\_. Declamationes quae supersunt CXLV. Edited by  
Constantinus Ritter. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1884.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Institutio oratoria of Quintilian. 4 vols.  
Translated by H.E. Butler. Loeb Classical Library.  
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959-63.

Sallustius Crispus, C. Sallust. Translated by J.C. Rolfe.  
Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard Univer-  
sity Press, 1960.

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. The Suasoriae of Seneca the Elder.  
Translated by William A. Edward. Cambridge: At the  
University Press, 1928.

Tacitus, Cornelius. Agricola. Translated by Maurice  
Hutton. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard  
University Press, 1963.

#### Other sources used

Appleby, John T. The Troubled Reign of King Stephen. New  
York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1970.

Barber, R.W. Arthur of Albion. New York: Barnes and  
Noble, Inc., 1961.

Bryant, Donald C.; Arnold, Carroll C.; Haberman, Frederick  
W.; Murphy, Richard; and Wallace, Karl R., eds.  
An Historical Anthology of Select British Speeches.  
New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1967.

David, Charles Wendell. Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy.  
Harvard Historical Studies, vol. 25. Cambridge:  
Harvard University Press, 1920.

Davis, H.W.C. England Under the Normans and Angevins. 13th  
ed. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1949.

- Duff, J. Wight. A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age. 2nd ed. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1960.
- Dyer, Armel. "Great Military Captains Address Their Armies." Pacific Speech, III (1969), 15-21.
- Epstein, Steven L. "A Paradigm for Speeches Delivered by Military Leaders to their Troops Prior to Battle—Applied to a Shakespearean Speech." Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, San Francisco, December 28, 1971.
- Fletcher, Robert Huntington. The Arthurian Material in the Chronicles. New York: Burt Franklin, n.d. Originally published as Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, Vol. X, 1906.
- Fuller, John F.C. Julius Caesar: Man, Soldier, and Tyrant. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1965.
- Furieux, Ruper. Invasion: 1066. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- Gairdner, James. Early Chroniclers of Europe: England. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, n.d.
- Gross, Charles. The Sources and Literature of English History. 2nd ed. London: Longman's Green and Company, 1915; New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1970.
- Jenkins, Claude. The Monastic Chronicler and the Early School of St. Albans. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1922.
- Molinier, Auguste. Les Sources de l'Histoire de France. 6 vols. New York: Burt Franklin, n.d.; originally published, Paris, 1901-6.
- Nichols, Stephen G., Jr. "Discourse in Froissart's Chroniques." Speculum, XXXIX (1964), 279-87.
- Stenton, Frank M., ed. The Bayeux Tapestry. Revised ed. London: Phaidon Press, 1965.
- Stephen, Sir Leslie, and Lee, Sir Sidney, eds. The Dictionary of National Biography. 22 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1917 on.

- Thompson, James Westfall. The Literacy of the Laity in the Middle Ages. New York: Burt Franklin, 1960; first published, 1939.
- Walter, Daniel. The Life of Ailred of Rievaulx. Translated by F.M. Powicke. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Vaughan, Richard. Matthew Paris. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1958.
- Von Sybel, Heinrich. The History and Literature of the Crusades. Edited by Lady Duff Gordon. London, 1861.