

The Natural Rhetoric of Ramon Llull**Mark D. Johnston**

The Catalan theologian and philosopher Ramon Llull (1232-1316) is one of the most unusual figures of the later Middle Ages.¹ His career is typically eccentric in the best medieval fashion. The son of a merchant nobleman on the island of Mallorca, he was raised at the court of Aragon, where he became a royal official; sometime around 1263 he experienced a profound religious awakening that left him committed to one great goal spreading the Christian Faith among nonbelievers by proving philosophically the truth of its beliefs to them. After several years of academic preparation (how and what is still unclear), he spent the rest of his long life engaged in missionary journeys to infidel lands, even reaching Armenia in 1301, visiting kings and popes in order to promote his plans, and writing nearly 300 works in Latin, Arabic, and his native Catalan.

The foundation of all Llull's works is his peculiar system for philosophical argument, the so-called Great Universal Art of Finding Truth,² which he claimed as a divine revelation and which is indeed so idiosyncratic that it easily appears to be a wholly original creation. The most notorious feature of this General Art is Llull's selection of nine attributes of the Christian Godhead as fundamental components of all being and knowledge. He designates these Divine Dignities, or Absolute and Relative Principles as he variously calls them, with the letters B through K of the alphabet. By arranging these letters in circular and tabular figures, Llull generates double or triple

page 175

combinations of the letters, and these combinations are supposed to symbolize exhaustively all theological and philosophical propositions as expressions of Christian truth. Although the basis of Llull's General Art is patently Neoplatonic and his arguments typically resemble those of twelfth-century speculative theologians, various modern scholars have sought to discover a genuine formal validity, in Llull's General Art³ and have even proclaimed it a precursor of modern symbolic logic.⁴ Other less enthusiastic critics have concluded that Llull's General Art relies fundamentally on arguments from analogy and proportion, which most readily express a Neoplatonic metaphysics of participation, proportion, and resemblance.⁵ While this conclusion seems fundamentally correct, it does not by itself explain exactly how or why Llull constructs the arguments that he does. In order to understand fully his method, another, nondiscursive tenet of Llull's philosophy must be recognized. This is his doctrine of the "two intentions," set forth very early in his career and repeated, or simply assumed, by all his later work.⁶ According to Llull, every created being bears in its nature the obligations directly to serve, honor, and know its Creator or, indirectly, to contribute to these ends.⁷ These two intentions evidently combine Augustine's famous distinction between use and enjoyment⁸ with Anselm's doctrine of *rectitudo*⁹ and apply them universally to every creature. The practical realization of this application comprises the whole work of Llull's career. All the versions of his General Art and his other writings represent one global effort to reinterpret spiritually, as moral allegory or "moralization" in the Scholastic sense, all of creation. Llull regarded this project as an especially efficacious means of turning the arts and sciences to the service of Christian truth,

page 176

and he attempted to write new plans, based on his General Art, for each of the seven liberal arts and other Scholastic sciences. The fact that Llull did not have formal Scholastic training and that his knowledge of these fields evidently derived almost entirely from vernacular translations or Latin encyclopedias made such a task much easier and explains the popularizing character of his work, which he regularly believed would make truth more accessible to laymen. In a forthcoming study of Llull's logical doctrines, I show how his accounts of this art, which include such peculiar features as syllogisms with tautological premises, are only comprehensible as a popularizing "moralization" of the rudiments of Aristotelian logic.¹⁰ In this study, I wish to show how a similar explanation is possible for Llull's accounts of rhetoric, which display equally unusual features. Although Llull treats the rhetorical arts in many of his writings, my comments here are based primarily on his one major rhetorical work, the *Rethorica nova*, a treatise evidently begun early in his career but only finished in 1303.¹¹ The *Rethorica nova* divides its subject under four rubrics Order (*Ordo*), Beauty (*Pulchritudo*), Knowledge (*Scientia*), and love (*Caritas*) and I will use these to organize my own analysis, explaining how Llull attempts to "moralize" rhetorical practice into a kind of naturally and therefore irrefutably persuasive communication, taking that word in its literal sense of "sharing."

The most prominent category in Llull's accounts of rhetoric is unquestionably Beauty. He regularly and unequivocally identifies the beauty of words with the beauty of the things that they name. One example from his *Ars generalis ultima* of 1308 is sufficient: "April and May ... are more beautiful words

page 177

than ... October and November because they signify flowers and leaves and birdsong and the renewal of the seasons and growing things, while October and November do not at all."¹² This beauty obviously covers both the denotative and connotative value of words, regarded in the broadest manner possible. Indeed, it is the breadth of Llull's perspective that allows him to embrace under the general heading of Beauty a mass of commonplace medieval grammatical and rhetorical lore as well as his own highly idiosyncratic doctrines of verbal beauty. Examples of commonplace precepts are the display of truth, courage, affection, humility, controlled gesture, suitable dress, and smooth diction that ornament the speaker and his discourse,¹³ as Classical authorities and medieval preaching manuals habitually insist;¹⁴ another is the use of appropriate comparisons, *exempla*, or proverbs,¹⁵ as contemporary sermon and poetry theorists alike advise;¹⁶ still another is the fitting modification, called *determinatio* in twelfth-century *artes poetriae*,¹⁷ of nouns by adjectives or verbs by adverbs suitable to them.¹⁸ Considered in the company of these commonplace doctrines, Llull's new procedures are very different, to say the least, and indeed seem almost wholly incompatible with the practice of those medieval language arts. For example, he claims that the sentence "Beautiful is the queen" is ugly and disordered because it does not place the noun before the adjective, in their order of "dignity";¹⁹ or, he states that the sentence "the queen and the servant-girl are very lovely" is not beautiful, but that the sentence "the queen and the noblewoman are very lovely" is beautiful, evidently because the social ranks of the latter are more comparable;²⁰ or, he explains that the sentence "the beautiful queen is not good" is more beautiful if rephrased as

page 178

"It is disturbing that the beautiful queen of great dignity and high position, as the wife of the king, should be defiled by sin, since through the stain of sin all beauty is made foul";²¹ finally, he argues in his *Ars generalis ultima* that phrases using the superlative degree of adjectives are always more beautiful than those using the comparative and those using the comparative than those using the positive.²² Considered broadly, Llull's category of Beauty perhaps corresponds to the traditional rhetorical canon of style, which the *artes poetriae* especially developed and may even recall the work of preaching theorists such as Robert of Basevorn, who labels all rhetorical devices "ornaments."²³ Nonetheless, I think that it is obvious from the examples cited that Llull's view depends fundamentally on his referential conception of verbal beauty as the manifestation in words of the beauty or value of the things that they name. Llull clearly regards this Beauty as a transcendental feature of being, but his explanation of its metaphysical status is so vague, as subsequent examples will show, that it would be hazardous to claim any source for his views in specific Franciscan authorities or other Scholastics who also treated the transcendental status of beauty.²⁴

It is interesting to observe, however, that Llull invariably associates Beauty with his second most prominent rhetorical category, Order, which he sets out first in the *Rethorica nova*. This connection not only recalls the broad Neoplatonic functions of universal hierarchy in his entire General Art, but also reflects the traditional identification of beauty with "due proportion."²⁵ Llull defines proportion as "the beauty of measured order"²⁶ and asserts that this order creates the efficacy and force of words in the speaker as well as the

page 179

audience.²⁷ His accounts of Order from the *Rethorica nova* and other works show the same conflation of well-known commonplaces from the medieval language arts with idiosyncratic precepts of his own. For example, he often refers to basic grammatical rules for the collocation of nouns, verbs, and adjectives;²⁸ he describes the artful position of beginnings, middles, and ends²⁹ as taught in the *artes poetriae*;³⁰ he summarizes the arrangement of parts in a letter or political speech³¹ as prescribed in the *ars dictaminis* and *ars arengandi*.³² At the same time, Llull suggests for Order, just as he does for Beauty, various outrageously impractical precepts of his own. For example, the words that name the most beautiful thing should come first in a sentence;³³ or, the sentence "The queen has great beauty and great evil" is unrhetorical because the essential character of a queen does not allow these contrary accidental qualities;³⁴ or, as he argues elsewhere, the two sentences "Goodness is great" and "Goodness is eternal" form a better order when combined as "Goodness is great and eternal."³⁵ The order that Llull thus recognizes perhaps corresponds to the traditional rhetorical canon of disposition or arrangement but subordinated completely to the sheerly representational use of linguistic relationships as verbal icons of real-world relationships.

The section of Llull's *Rethorica nova* entitled Knowledge reflects no traditional rhetorical canon but may recall an important requirement often stated in the *artes praedicandi*³⁶ and ultimately authorized by Augustine:³⁷ this is the preacher's obligation to possess adequate training in the literary arts and any other branches of knowledge relevant to the material that he must expound. Llull attempts to fulfill this requirement by

page 180

offering a miscellaneous assembly of grammatical, poetic, and rhetorical lore, organized and classified with the nine Absolute Principles, nine Relative Principles, and nine Questions of his General Art. Similar, though much briefer, classifications also appear in his *Liber de praedicatione* of 1304 (a sermon collection)³⁸ and *Ars generalis ultima* of 1308.³⁹ The doctrines offered are very eclectic and simple, characteristics that readily suggest the banally popularizing scope of so much of Llull's work. From grammar he cites the distinctions between letters and sounds, the eight parts of speech, and the degrees of adjectives;⁴⁰ from the *ars praedicandi* the division of natural and moral subjects⁴¹ and the advice to speak humbly⁴² and to consider the audience's character;⁴³ from the *ars poetriae* the procedures of *determinatio* and "coloring" one word with another;⁴⁴ from the *ars dictaminis* the parts of a letter;⁴⁵ from logic the distinctions of subject and predicate and simple and compound *voces significativae*;⁴⁶ from moral literature on speech the injunction to think before speaking and comparisons of words spoken in the heart and mouth;⁴⁷ from Classical rhetorical authorities advice on delivery and pronunciation, the three considerations of time, place, and audience,⁴⁸ the divisions of probable and necessary argument, as well as praise and blame, and useful, just, honorable, and true subjects.⁴⁹ To these well-known and rudimentary precepts Llull adds his own typically idiosyncratic teachings. For example, masculine nouns should precede neuter, and neuter should precede feminine in any sentence;⁵⁰ words of more syllables should come at the end of a sentence, words of equal syllables in the middle, and words of fewer syllables in the beginning;⁵¹ and a phrase such as "rex bonus" with words of one gender is more beautiful than

page 181

the phrase "rex et bonitas" with words of different genders.⁵² Thus the Knowledge that Llull offers as a guide to rhetorical practice always maintains an orientation toward that representational function of language as verbal icon that we have already observed in his remarks on Beauty and Order. Ultimately, this Knowledge consists in correctly using or "moralizing" words according to the ethical and metaphysical values inherent in them by virtue of their constitution from the Divine Dignities that inform all being in the system of Llull's General Art.

The brief final section of the *Rethorica nova*, entitled Love, offers the most conventional material in this text: a series of ten proverbs, each illustrated with an *exemplum*, that show how words spoken with love are most effective. Part Two on Beauty also includes sets of *exempla* and proverbs,⁵³ and Llull in fact wrote many works of this type,⁵⁴ which were common ancillary preaching aids.⁵⁵ In theory this section on Love observes in general Augustine's axiom that the end of all Christian instruction is love,⁵⁶ and in particular the counsel of love for one's audience found in most sermon manuals.⁵⁷ This Love constitutes, then, the most direct contribution to Llull's rhetorical program of his fundamental doctrine of two intentions; the preacher who speaks from love fulfills his natural, divinely instituted purpose.

Now the four sections of Llull's *Rethorica nova* all rely to one degree or another on modes of spiritual reinterpretation or "moralization" in defining the role of Order, Beauty, Knowledge, or Love in rhetorical practice. At the most fundamental level, the simple collocation of traditional rhetorical lore with Llull's own idiosyncratic precepts implies a common basis for that lore and his precepts and

page 182

effectively makes them analogues of one another. This analogizing function is explicit in several passages on rhetoric from Llull's *Ars generalis ultima*, as when he states that "just as the logician seeks natural conjunctions of subjects and predicates to make a true conclusion in the syllogism, so the rhetorician seeks natural conjunctions between subject and predicate in order to ornament a beautiful subject with its essential predicates."⁵⁸ We must remember, however, that for Llull every analogy in word or thought corresponds to an analogy in being as well. Llull is a super-Realist, for whom language, thought, and being are perfectly congruent, and this congruence results from the real constituents, especially Llull's own Principles, that they share. Llull's "moralization" is never just a discursive exercise but always assumes a metaphysical justification.

Throughout the *Rethorica nova* Llull attempts to explain this metaphysical basis through a tripartite hylemorphic

model of form, matter, and end in words. The latter term is Llull's own addition to standard Scholastic doctrine, which he needs in order to establish the ontological foundation of his doctrine of two intentions. As Llull explains it, words such as "god," "angel," "man," "king," "sun," "star," "lion," "rose," "ruby," and so forth all possess a form that beautifies any speech about them.⁵⁹ Words such as "sun" or "angel" are beautiful by virtue of the spiritual matter of the beings that they name.⁶⁰ Words such as "angel," "justice," "bread," "iron," "ship," or "castle" are all beautiful thanks to the "optimal" ends of the things that they name.⁶¹ Llull applies this model of form, matter, and end throughout his accounts of Beauty, Order, and Knowledge in the *Rethorica nova*, adapting it as needed to the particular grammatical or

page 183

rhetorical relationships that he describes. For example, he explains how the word "queen" possesses an essential form that beautifully "agrees" with the accidental form provided to it by the word "good" when the two words are combined in the phrase "the queen is good."⁶² Or he observes that "Speech is in its end, form, and matter. It is in the end that causes desire and appetite for something that cannot be had without words. Hence he who desires that chooses and joins words, which are the matter of speech. And since the form informs matter, then the form, matter, and end are that in which speech is and for which words were invented."⁶³ This diffuse explanation presumably answers Llull's standard question "In What?" asked of language. Llull applies his hylemorphic model so often and with such vague or superficial explanations that it ultimately becomes only a common pattern arbitrarily imposed on the many grammatical or rhetorical relationships that it pretends to explain. In this respect, the application of this model is itself an analogical argument; that is, the effect of this application is to insinuate that those grammatical and rhetorical relationships depend on a natural connection *like* that attributed to the union of form and matter in Scholastic metaphysics. Llull's model of form, matter, and end does not explain the metaphysical constitution of language ultimately but rather interprets it allegorically.

The same interpretative function is evident in Llull's other major metaphysical explanation of rhetorical practice, the catalogue of rhetorical lore under his Principles in the section on Knowledge. According to Llull, his Principles, as transcendental constituents of all being and knowledge, contain all beauty and all material for speaking, however various or diverse.⁶⁴ In most cases he simply asserts this

page 184

transcendental derivation, but in others he belies the analogical basis of his arguments as when he says of his Principle of Virtue (*Virtus*) that "if God has put special virtues in plants and stones, far more has He [done so] in words made virtuous by the moral and theological virtue existing in their speaker."⁶⁵ This argument relies not only on the topical warrant of greater to lesser but also on the multiple sense of the word "virtue" itself, which Llull thus exploits as an analogical *distinctio sensuum*. This word play suggests very well how sheer verbal analogy enables much of Llull's moralization of rhetorical doctrine. For example, Llull argues that his Absolute Principle of Greatness (*Magnitudo*) informs any speech about great beings and renders that speech beautiful, as when one says "God who has such great excellence created a great world and this greatness for a great end, namely to create angels and men with great memories for remembering, great minds for understanding, and great wills for desiring God."⁶⁶ Llull's simple repetition of the word "great" creates verbally, as a stylistic effect, the common quality that he attributes to the influence of his transcendental Principle of Greatness.

If we consider the contents of Llull's *Rethorica nova* as a whole, we can observe, then, a range of "moralizing" techniques at work: at one extreme stands the use of linguistic signs as verbal icons of the things that they name, as in his bizarre schemes for word order; at another extreme stand the purely verbal analogies that use words as instances of themselves, as in the example cited of discourse on "greatness." Somewhere between these extremes are the more usual types of allegory displayed in the groups of *exempla* and proverbs collected in the *Rethorica nova*. The whole range of these moralizing techniques serve one

page 185

end the reinterpretation of rhetorical practice to its first intention, namely, the honor, service, and praise of God. Llull recognizes this end explicitly in the introduction to his section on Love where he declares that "He who speaks in love beautifies his speech through love,"⁶⁷ and love, as he defines it elsewhere, is the union of one will to another.⁶⁸ The *Rethorica nova* also begins with the claim that "Speech is the means and instrument through which speakers and

listeners agree in one end," and this agreement is greater when one's listeners are more pleased, and they are more pleased when one's speech is more beautiful.⁶⁹ Beautiful speech is, then, the instrument of that union of wills called love, and more beautiful speech creates more love, thanks to, in Llull's view, the transcendental influence of his Principles in the form, matter, and end of that beautiful speech. What Llull seeks in his *Rethorica nova* is a natural means of communicating, in the literal sense of sharing, love. In this regard, it epitomizes his General Art as a whole, which seeks a natural means of communicating sharing Christian truth. Llull achieves this result, he believes, by reinterpreting or moralizing language as a being constituted from the same Divine Attributes as all other beings. Where Hugh of Saint Victor declared that "All nature speaks of God,"⁷⁰ Ramon Llull argues that all speaking is of God's nature. If nature is a sermon, a sermon is natural, for Llull.

Illinois State University

Notes

1. The best account of Llull's career is Jocelyn N. Hillgarth, *Ramon Lull and Lullism in Fourteenth Century France* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
2. For an explanation of Llull's General Art, its genesis, and possible sources, see Hillgarth, *Ramon Lull and Lullism*, pp. 1-45.
3. Most notably Erhard-Wolfram Platzeck, in his studies *La evolución de la lógica griega en el aspecto esencial de la analogia* (Barcelona: C.S.I.C., 1954), *Raimund Lull. Sein Leben Seine Werke*, 2 vols. (Rome: Editiones Franciscanae, 1962-64), and "Raimund Lulls Auffassung von der Logik (Was ist an Lulls Logik formale Logik?)," *Estudios Lulianos*, 2 (1958), 5-36 and 273-96.
4. Or, even more fancifully, of computer programming, as Ernest Moody suggests in his contribution to the article "History of Logic" in Paul Edwards, ed. *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 8 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1967), 4: 530. Virtually all such characterizations of Llull's combinatory methods are due to insufficient knowledge of their real methods.
5. Most notably Robert D. F. Pring-Mill in his studies "The Analogical Structure of the Lullian Art," in *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition: Essays presented to Richard Walzer* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1973), pp. 315-26; *El microcosmos lul·lià* (Oxford: Dolphin, 1961); and "The Trinitarian World-Picture of Ramon Lull," *Romanistisches Jahrbuch*, 7 (1955-56), 229-56.

6. See his *Libre de intenció*, composed before 1283, edited by Salvador Galmés in Llull's *Obres Originals*, vol. 18 (Palma de Mallorca: Diputació Provincial de Balears & Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1935), pp. 1-66.
7. See his *Libre de meravelles*, chaps. 3, 46, 63, and 68, in the edition of Salvador Galmés, 4 vols. (Barcelona: Barcino, 1931-34). For a survey of the traditional doctrines that form Llull's views, see Jean Rohmer, *La Finalité morale chez les theologiens de Saint Augustin à Duns Scot* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1939).
8. *De doctrina christiana* 1.3.3.
9. *Monologium*, chap. 68.
10. *The Spiritual Logic of Ramon Llull* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).
11. Quotations from the *Rethorica nova* are my translations from the Latin text in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS latinus 6443c, ff. 95vb-109va. Reference numbers indicate divisions of distinction, chapter, and paragraph suggested in this text and used in a critical edition currently in preparation. The only existing account of this text is Jordi Rubió Balaguer, "La 'Rethorica nova' de Ramon Llull," *Estudios Lulianos*, 3 (1959), 5-20 and 263-74.
12. 10.100; p. 536. All references are to the text printed in *Raymundi Lulli Opera* (Strasbourg: L. Zetzner, 1607), pp. 218-663. Reference numbers indicate part and chapter.
13. *Rethorica nova* 2.3; f. 97vb.

14. Among Classical texts, see *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1.4.6-7 and Cicero, *De oratore* 3.44.173-51.198; among preaching manuals, see Humbert of Romans, *De eruditione praedicatorum* 4.18-20, ed. Joachim Joseph Berthier in *Opera de vita regulari*, vol. 1 (Rome: A. Befani, 1888), pp. 373-484.
15. *Rethorica nova* 2.4,5,8; ff. 98va, 99fa, 102vb.
16. As in Robert of Basevorn, *Forma praedicandi*, chaps. 34 & 39, ed. Th.-M. Charland, *Artes praedicandi. Contribution à l'Histoire de la Rhetorique au Moyen Age* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1936), pp. 231-323, and Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria nova*, lines 146-7, ed. Edmond Faral, *Les Arts poétiques du xii et du xiiiè siècle* (Paris: Champion, 1923), pp. 194-262.
17. For example, Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria nova*, lines 1761-1841.
18. *Rethorica nova* 2.4 & 6-7; ff. 98va & 101vb-102rb. *Ars generalis ultima* 10. 100; p. 537.
19. *Rethorica nova* 2.4; f. 98va.
20. *Rethorica nova* 2.4 & 7; ff. 98vb & 101rb.
21. *Rethorica nova* 2.6; f. 102ra.
22. *Ars generalis ultima* 10.100; p. 537.

23. *Forma praedicandi*, chap. 14.

24. On beauty as a transcendental among the Scholastics, see Henri Pouillon, "La beauté, propriété transcendente chez les

page 189

Scholastiques," *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Age*, 15 (1946), 263-328.

25. As reported by Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* Ia.5.4 ad 1.

26. In his *Proverbis de Ramon* 169.1, ed. Salvador Galmés in *Obres Originals*, vol 14 (Palma de Mallorca: Diputació Provincial de Balears & Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1928), pp. 1-324.

27. *Rethorica nova* 1.1; f. 96ra.

28. *Rethorica nova* 2.4 & 7; ff. 98vb & 102rb-vb. Cf. *Ars generalis ultima* 10. 100; p. 537.

29. *Rethorica nova* 1.5-6; ff. 96va-b and cf. 3.12; 106rb. Cf. also *Ars generalis ultima* 10.100; p. 537.

30. As in Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria nova*, lines 151-52.

31. *Rethorica nova* 1.7; ff. 96vb-97rb and cf. 3.10; f. 105va.

32. As in the anonymous *Rationes dictandi*, chaps. 5 & 9, ed. Ludwig Rockinger, *Briefsteller und Formelbücher des eilften bis vierzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1863; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1961), pp. 9-28, and Giovanni Fiorentino da Vignano, *Somma d'arengare*, chap. 1, ed. Carlo Frati, "'Flore de parlare' o 'Somma d'arengare' attribuita a Ser Giovanni Fiorentino da Vignano in un codice Marciano," *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, 61 (1913), 1-31.

33. *Rethorica nova* 1.6; f. 96vb.

page 190

34. *Rethorica nova* 1.2; f. 96rb.

35. *Ars generalis ultima* 10.100; p. 536.

36. As in Humbert of Romans, *De eruditione praedicatorum* 2.8.

37. *De doctrina christiana* 2.16.23-26 and 2.28.42-31.48.

38. *Liber de praedicatione* 2.A.1-9, ed. Abraham Soria Flores in *Opera Latina*, vols. 3-4 (Palma Mallorca: C.S.I.C., 1961-63).

39. 10.100 & 113; pp. 536-7 & 554-5.

40. As in Donatus's *Ars grammatica*, ed. Heinrich Keil, *Probi Donati Servii qui feruntur de arte grammatica libri*, Grammatici Latini, vol. 4 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1864), pp. 367-402.

41. As in John of Garland, *Parisiana poetria* 1.161-65, ed. Traugott Lawler, *The Parisiana Poetria of John of Garland* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), or Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum doctrinale* 3.113 in *Bibliotheca mundi*, 4 vols. (Douay, 1624; rpt. Graz: Akademische Druck.v.Verlagsanstalt, 1964-65).

42. As in Humbert of Romans, *De eruditione praedicatorum* 4.20.

43. As urged by Gregory the Great in his *Regula pastoralis* 3.1; cf. Humbert of Romans, *De eruditione praedicatorum* 4.18.

44. Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria nova*, lines 1761-1841.

45. *Rationes dictandi*, chap. 5.

page 191

46. The best-known account was Peter of Spain, *Summule logicales* 1.3 & 7, ed. L.M. De Rijk, *Tractatus called afterwards Summule logicales* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1972).

47. An excellent example is the little treatise by Albertano da Brescia, *Tractatus de arte loquendi et tacendi* 1.1, ed. Thor Sundby, *Della Vita e delle Opere di Brunetto Latini* (Florence: Le Monier, 1884), pp. 475-506.

48. This triad was best known from Isidore, *Etymologiae*, 2.16.1.

49. Cicero, *De inventione* 1.29.44; 2.52.157; 2.59.177.

50. *Rethorica nova* 3.12; ff. 106rb-va.

51. *Rethorica nova* 3.13; f. 106vb.

52. *Rethorica nova* 3.11; f. 106ra.

53. *Rethorica nova* 2.5 & 8; ff. 99ra-101vb & 102vb-103va.

54. In his *Proverbis de Ramon*, *Mil proverbis*, and *Proverbis d-ensenyament*, ed. Salvador Galmés, *Obres Originals*, vol. 14 (Palma de Mallorca: Diputació Provincial de Balears & Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1928).

55. On these see the extremely useful study by Richard H. and Mary A. Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia, and Sermons: Studies on the Manipulus florum of Thomas of Ireland* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1979).

56. *De doctrina christiana* 1.35.39-36.40.