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INTRODUCTION.

By most students of Medieval History, John of Salisbury is remembered—if at all—by the legend that he lost his arm in trying to ward off the fatal blow which fell on Thomas à Becket. Very few, indeed, know him for any other distinction. He has, however, a more certain claim to our attention as the greatest classicist of the Middle Ages. Nor is this all. Were he merely a sedentary classicist—a scholar of the cloister or the school—he might arouse only a limited interest. But John is more than that. A man interested primarily in the world politics of his time, he stands forth as the great partisan of the classics against the rising tendencies toward a more “practical” and speedy system of education.

This may sound unusually familiar. It is not so long since the classics were routed from their dictatorial position in modern educational systems by the more “practical” courses and the teachers of Latin and Greek are far from accepting their defeat. Every person who goes on in higher education, to-day, is forced to settle for himself the problem of whether a liberal or a “practical” education is the best preparation for the rather fatuous struggle of life. It is therefore decidedly interesting to find John of Salisbury battling with almost the same problem eight centuries ago. It is still more surprising to discover that almost every argument urged in favor of a
liberal education to-day was employed by him then. Not only does he fight with the weapons of a modern humanist but, what is more astonishing, he bases his fight upon a knowledge of the ancient writers such as is possessed by comparatively few men to-day, as will be demonstrated in the present paper.

The only safe basis for determining what classical authors he really knew, lies in the quotations, direct and indirect, which he makes from those authors. To credit him, however, with a personal knowledge of every writer whom he quotes would be even more erroneous than such a test could be to-day, for the man of the Middle Ages did not have our system of teaching grammar but had to rely for his training in this subject upon Donatus, Priscian, Nonius Marcellus and Servius. These grammarians treated the subject by quoting passages from classical authors in illustration of each point. When it is remembered that all instruction was in Latin and that for want of extensive libraries, grammar was very much emphasized, it will at once be apparent that very many of the quotations made by medieval writers found their origin in these grammars. Priscian alone quotes over ten thousand lines from ancient authors. Though these quotations were usually of single lines, yet a skillful teacher might be able to combine them and supply the missing words. That John had studied these works like every other medieval student, cannot, of course, be doubted.

Furthermore, John had also a thorough knowledge of the works of St. Augustine, Jerome, Isidore, Lactantius, Martianus Capella, Macrobius and Boëthius. These works, too, were an integral part of the education of every scholar of those times, and John’s frequent references to them show clearly that he was no exception. These writers had used the ancient authors very extensively and a student could obtain an almost endless fund of quotations from them alone without consulting any of the authors themselves.

Mere quotation, therefore, cannot be considered as conclusive evidence that John had certain authors. If, however, he makes frequent and long quotations from such authors; if his quotations adhere more closely to the original texts than do
those of intermediate sources; and if he not only quotes but shows great familiarity with the works of an ancient writer, it is usually safe to conclude that he had read that author. Furthermore, if the works in question were current in John’s day; if they were used as text-books in the schools, this conclusion would be materially strengthened. Lastly, if he makes such statements as “in ... legisse memini” or “nostre auctor” or if the work of an author is mentioned in John’s will as a gift to some library, he can reasonably be credited with having had the work.

Whether or not John gets his quotations from one of these common intermediate sources must be determined by a comparison of the passages in which such quotations occur. The accuracy of the comparisons made for this essay is unfortunately but unavoidably marred by the circumstance that the only accessible edition of John’s works is contained in Migne’s colossal work which was so hurriedly put together that in questions of close textual criticism it is sometimes impossible to decide whether a variation is due to John or to the editor. In determining his familiarity with an author there are to be considered the freeness of quotation, the general similarity in the treatment of subject matter and his comments, or his criticisms of the author.

The problem in the case of John, however, is further complicated by the great number of his quotations from the classics—one thousand would be a very conservative estimate—very few of which can be found in the grammars and other standard books of that time. It is necessary, therefore, to ascertain his attitude toward the study of the classics, i. e. whether or not he was the kind of man who would go to the original for quotations. Then arises the question of whether or not it was possible at that time for him to have had access to so many classical works and lastly, on the basis of his quotations, what works he seems to have read. The first chapter accordingly will consider his attitude toward the study of the classics.
CHAPTER I.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CLASSICS.

John of Salisbury, the great exponent of the classics in an age which was turning to practical studies, lived at a time when the Church was still the great, if not the sole educator of western Europe. The first Crusade had taken place, bringing with it greater prosperity and power to the Church than it had ever before enjoyed. The settlement of the investiture struggle at Worms had proclaimed the practical supremacy of the Popes, while the more peaceful conditions in the West were reflected in an increasing devotion to learning. It is not surprising then, that the studious activities of the age have won for it the fame of a great renaissance, the so-called Renaissance of the twelfth century. Peace, prosperity and leisure were widespread. Latin was the universal language of scholars, and the Church, in practically unquestioned supremacy, was in a position not only to tolerate learning but even to encourage it so long as it was not absolutely antagonistic to its teachings. The revival of the liberal, the classical studies, came therefore as a not unnatural result of existing conditions and it was amidst these conditions that John was born and educated.

Born in the village of Salisbury in England between the years 1115-1120, he seems from the very beginning to have been gifted with an unusual amount of hard, English common-sense. The oft-told story of how he refused to be a party to the magic exhibitions of his teacher well illustrates this trait of John’s character, and his later education was not of a kind to diminish it. At a comparatively early age he went to the continent to carry on his studies and Paris was his first stopping place. There at the feet of the great Abelard he spent one year, learning his Aristotle in a way that was new and bold, and it was a source of great regret to John that he could be with
Abelard only a year. Notwithstanding this regret, however, John did not permit it to stand in the way of his learning the other side of the great philosophic controversy of the age. He studied with Robert of Melun and Alberic, the leaders of the Nominalist school and from William of Conches he gained what so many brilliant men of his time had failed to acquire—a knowledge of Plato, from the Timaeus which William had had for the first time translated. Then he went to Chartres which was at that time the center of the classical studies, and there for three years he reviewed his grammar, not only learning but also teaching the subject under the standards of this great school. Here, too, he had the advantage of studying rhetoric from its recognized master, Bernard, the head of the school, and his praise of the subject and its teacher have been often repeated. But John was not content even with this comprehensive knowledge. His keen mind felt the need of further study and accordingly, he went back to Paris. Here, he studied logic and spent two years in the pursuit of theology, the sine qua non of the medieval scholar. Law and medicine he also cultivated and the statement that he was the best read scholar of his age seems hardly an exaggeration.¹

Yet his education was not confined to schools and teachers. He numbered among his personal friends not only the great scholars of his time but also the great statesmen. It was upon the recommendation of Bernard of Clairvaux that he became secretary to Theobald, the Archbishop of Canterbury. In this post which he retained under Thomas à Becket, he was thrown into contact with the greatest political movements of his time. Twelve times, he relates in his Polycraticus, he journeyed across the Alps on business for Thomas, for Henry II, and for his personal friends. He also made journeys through France on his own account. So well was he liked by Pope Adrian that that worthy made him dine at the papal table and treated him as a guest whenever he came to Rome. On one occasion, it is related, Adrian kept him two months and only with the greatest reluctance finally consented to let him depart.² With Adrian’s

¹ Schaarschmidt, Johannes Saresberiensis, pp. 1–81.
successor, Alexander III, an almost equal intimacy was enjoyed by John. Thus, acquainted with all classes of men from the highest in the Church and politics to the humble Monks and clerks, he was peculiarly well qualified to criticize the world about him. A scholar by nature, to whom leisure without letters was death in life, he was fortunately in a position to gratify his desires to the full. The activities of the world passed, as it were, before his eyes, and that cool common-sense which had enabled him to delight in the teachings of Abelard, and yet not be carried away by them; which made him pleasing alike to Bernard and to Abelard, and which had in his boyhood repelled the magical leanings of his teacher, now served him as a guide in contemplating those activities. He saw their vanities and their weaknesses, and to trace these down to their origins, to find the arguments for and against them, and to show what their results had been, with a view toward determining what they would be, had long been his desire. A period of enforced idleness, due to a temporary estrangement with Henry II, gave him his opportunity and by the year 1159 while Thomas was still with the King before the walls of Toulouse, John published the Polycraticus, a compendium of his reflections and researches “De Nugiis Curialibus et Vestigiis Philosophorum.” This he dedicated to his friend and patron, the Archbishop to whom he owed so much.

The chief importance of this work is that it is a calm, critical picture of the great activities of the time, made by one who was in the midst of it all, yet sufficiently aloof to have a clear view. It depicts the great struggle in philosophy and criticizes those who pursue Aristotle to the exclusion of all else. It gives quotations from the whole Organon of Aristotle and represents a wider knowledge of the great Peripatetic than was general at that time, yet, it ranks Plato as the first philosopher. John repeatedly enrols himself with the Academicians “as Augustine was and as Cicero had been in his later years.” He views pathetically the progress of those who were year in, year out, engaged in inextricably winding themselves up in the labyrinth

1Migne, 199, 338, “quia otium sine litteris mors est, et vivi hominis sepultura.”
of fine-spun logic without beginning or end, without a purpose in life, and he notes with pity the fact that men who were spending their whole lives in this fruitless occupation were nevertheless consoled with the conceit of their fine distinctions and biting personalities. John himself had studied logic, and his Metalogicus is as effective a polemic as the writings of men who were giving their lives to dialectics. He was however too level headed to make that the object of his life. These dialecticians were opposing the study of the classics as a waste of time and it is against them that John pointed his keenest criticism. ¹

During his life scholasticism was becoming more and more in vogue. Born and educated in a time when the classics were largely studied John had made them an integral part of himself. He had studied theology at the end of his early education and in his opinion excellence in theology required a thorough knowledge of the classics. To him the early Christian writing and doctrines of the Church were not the sole authority; but the great danger which he feared was that the authority of the classics might prejudice the pure reason as embodied in theology and Christian ethics. This attitude, his training, especially at Chartres, had taught him as the most natural one and, therefore, when these scholastics, these misguided dialecticians, asailed the classics as a waste of time, he looked upon their attacks as the height of folly, and he fought them with all the powers of his wide learning. ²

¹ This is treated more fully on pp. 955-963.
²Migne, pp. 658–62. John's statement that the classics should not be detrimental to the authority of pure reason has been treated by Poole: pp. 219–220.

"He is speaking now of the study of the Classics, and warns us so to read them that authority do not prejudice to reason. Authority here is that of the masters of antiquity, and reason is the mental faculty considered as educated and enlightened by Christianity. The typical opposites have for the moment changed places; and the change is highly indicative of the regard in which the classics could now be held even by men the correctness of whose religious character was no less assured than was that, let us say, of the arch-enemy of learning, the champion of a 'rustic' faith, Saint Peter Damiani, a century earlier.

"The classical and anti-Cornelian atmosphere of the School of Chartres is described by Clerval in his 'Les Écoles de Chartres au
Nor was John alone or the first in this struggle. When he was still acquiring his education this movement had already begun. The towns were growing rich, France and England were thriving and wealth was becoming a commodity. The money fever had begun to affect the schools, and students were in a hurry to get an education and go out to gather in the golden harvest. A good classical education occupied too much time. They must find a quicker method and dialectics offered itself to them as a royal road to power. With this knowledge of dialectics they could solve every problem, and make the most difficult subject clear in the briefest space of time. Such were the inducements held out to prospective students by the teachers. They assailed the classics as a waste of time not justified by results and the students, lured on by these sirens of dialectics, heeded not the safe haven of the classical schools. These, then, had to struggle for their very existence and they were not slow to meet the enemy. Theodoric, one of the masters of Chartres, was already, in the middle of the century, engaged in writing polemical essays against these enemies of the classics—these Cornificians as he called them—and John after a practical experience of eleven years together with the advantage of broad training, took up the fight where his great teacher had left it.¹

In a long but extremely significant passage John describes these “get-learning-quick” promoters. He describes not only their methods but also the character of the struggle and his own

---

attitude toward them. "They err and they err shamefully
who think that philosophy consists of mere words. They err
as much, who think virtue words, as those who think that chips
of wood make a grove; for the commendation of virtue lies in
deeds and virtue is the inseparable companion of wisdom.
Wherefore it is clear that those who cling to words alone, prefer
to appear, rather than be, wise men. They wander around the
highways, they wear away the thresholds of more learned men,
propound questions and purposely confuse their words so as to
convey almost any meaning, more ready to err than to examine
any difficulty that may arise. Yet they fear, these debasers,
not lovers of wisdom, to show their own ignorance and that
which they do not know, they prefer not to know through a
perverted sense of shame, especially if there are others present
to whom those things are known.

"Their arrogance is unendurable. They speak on the spur of
the moment on any subject; they judge everybody; others they
find fault with, themselves they extol, boasting that they have
discovered for the first time matter which was trite among the
ancients and by the witness of books has been brought through
many ages to our own time. Words are heaped on words so
that they are often less known for weight and more for multi-
tude than for any difficulty of subject matter. When one of
them has so concealed his meaning that no one understands him
he thinks that he deserves a place at the head of all philosophers
and often he who knows the least propounds the most questions
—questions which Pythagoras himself could not have answered.
The same material he revolves over and over again, never chang-
ing, but ever winding about in the same circle. As you listen
at a distance you wonder whether a third Cato has fallen from
the Heavens, for whoever the man he conveys the same impres-
sion. If you inquire after his profession or his art, it is 'Gram-
maticus, rhetor, geometres, pictor, aliptes, augur, schaeonobates,
medicus, magus, omnia novit.' And more famous by far than
the hungry Greek, he would upon request go into the very
Heavens, and more wise than Daedalus he would transport you
unharmed through the void whithersoever you wished.

"But should you go to find out what authors mean in their
writings; should you inquire about and discuss literature, he will assail you for your rashness and will tell you that you are more stupid than the ass of Arcadia. You are duller than lead if you ask him to explain a passage, and if you insist, you are advised to flee, for literature is pernicious and it is deadly in its effects. Beware lest ye be the serpent that eats up the world all the days of his life. You must be making sport or telling stories, or perhaps you are deceived.

"He who is the more verbose appears the more learned. He cares not whence or why or about what he is delivering opinions nor does he care about what anyone else propounds, so long as he is speaking. Nor does any one of these folk state for what reason he is debating, provided he can give not the true force but the mere shadow of the subject. What is true or what is false, what is probable or what is not probable, is looked for in vain, for the image of probability is prefixed to everything. State what you wish, something like it is taken up instead, for what holds in one thing, whether you will or not, they maintain holds in another that is like it. Yet it is clear that what is like the truth, is not necessarily true and what seems to be false is not always false; but if you attempt to disclose the real difference between two propositions that seem alike, they tell you that you are speaking nonsense. They will either prevent you with their shouting or will laugh at you for doing needless work since, they say, there must be some differences between all like things but that these things ought rightly to be called not like but the same things. To teach why this is not the case is considered by them not only frivolous but truly most laughable. They tell you that they have come to hear the Peripatetic and not to listen to Hermagoras; yet they are like the Peripatetics only in their circumambulations and circumlocations and not in any careful investigation of their subject matter.

"However, if this deception is practiced for the purpose of gaining a supply of eloquence and if in likeness unlikelinesses are looked for, it is a praiseworthy practice and one for which I could not easily mention a substitute that would be more profitable for youth, provided they did not allow their faculties to be clouded by the endlessness of fallacies. Nothing is more
useful, nothing is more suitable for a youth in acquiring glory and wealth than the eloquence best to be gained, where there is an abundance of material for the mind and a ready supply of words for the tongue.

"To pour forth words, on the other hand, when the matter is not understood, is pardonable in a fool, but not in a teacher or a scholar. Yet you will see many of this kind, who spend the whole live-long day in one long harangue, saying nothing at all or very little. You are tired out from listening and they, unless they are too verbose, from talking; yet whither they are tending or what they are trying to say, you cannot ascertain. You think they are ending but they have just begun. If you stay to see where they are going to come out; if you try to recollect what they have woven together there will occur to you the lines—

'Velut aegri somnia, vanas
Fingentis species, ut nec pes, nec caput uni
Reddatur formae'—

You think that their brains are affected and that they cannot hold their tongues for want of the power of reason; you imagine that they have suffered continuous sleepless nights and their reason has therefore become dulled, giving rise to melancholy. If, however, you should on this account, be moved by a sense of pity for them and should urge them to moderation, they would be incensed and all the opprobriums which one man can heap upon another they would pile upon you. They rail alike at those who pity them as at those who deride them, and no one, be he friend or foe, can escape from their vituperation. Once you have begun with them you must of necessity bear with them to the end or you will sustain the evils of their insolent tongues. Stop therefore unless you wish to be defiled by a sordid mouth; the more foul matter is disturbed the greater the stench that arises therefrom, and as you sit there and ponder, the saying of that far-sighted man inevitably occurs to your mind—

'Vesanum tetigisse timent, fugiuntque poetam
Qui sapiant, agitant pueri, incautique sequuntur.'
“Though among those who live by themselves or lead a serious life, a man of this kind would most truly seem useless, yet amidst a crowd which delights in anything that affords material for hilarity and joyful jokes, he is very fit, for he is the best instrument for raising laughter, being more efficacious in this than a pantomime. To escape his poison you must lend patience to your ears and remain with the crazy man who spares no one and if perchance, you wish him to desist, beseech him most kindly to put more thought into his teaching and disputation, and to make up for this increase of thought by a decrease in the number of words.

“He who tempers words with knowledge and who suits his discussions to opportune occasions possesses the most temperate law of all eloquence and abundance of words gain praise from him alone in whom truth joins with virtue and kind words with all duties. To make many statements and make them falsely is a characteristic of a dealer in feminine fineries and of a man who has no regards for his reputation, for he gains thereby only the hatred and contempt of all serious-minded men. The spirit of wisdom is authority for the statement that he who speaks sophistically is odious; nevertheless a man must understand how to pierce these importuning sophisms, for without a knowledge of them he would proceed to the examination of truth and knowledge like an untried soldier who marches, unarmed, against an able and experienced enemy. It may be permissible, occasionally, for him who is acquiring training in disputation to make false statements, just as it is for a recruit to practice sportive battle among civilians. Where on the other hand, it is the intention of the disputants to enter upon a sober philosophical discussion, they lay aside all sophisms and if by chance, any do occur on either side, they are assailed by wise men just as in a state malignant treachery or trickery is coerced when it is shown in a fight between different parties.

“But the ability to temper words with knowledge, discussion with the opportunity of time, and to argue prudently any fallacies that may arise, is not to be acquired in a few days nor is it an easy task. Wherefore very many that strive after it go away again and, preferring the smallest fragment of philosophy's
garb, they glory among the untaught as if everything lay within their jurisdiction, for as someone has said (his name has disappeared from the fragment which remains of him).

'Gartio quisque duas postquam seint jungere partes
Sic stat, sic loquitur velut omnes noverit artes.'

"On genera and species these men bring forth a new theory which had escaped the notice of Boethius, which the learned Plato did not know, and one which they claim by some happy lot to have, just recently, discovered in the secrets of Aristotle. They are prepared to solve the old question in the labors of which the world has already grown old; in which more time has been consumed than the house of the Caesars spent in acquiring and ruling the empire of the world, and in which more money has been squandered than Croesus had with all his riches. This has occupied the attention of many men for so long a time that they have spent their whole lives in seeking this one thing, and have discovered neither it nor anything else. Perhaps this is due to the fact that what alone can be discovered does not satisfy their curiosity, for just as in the shadow of any body the substance of solidarity is sought for in vain, so in those matters of theory which, though universally conceived of, can not be universal, the substance of existing solidarity is never found. To waste a life-time in these pursuits is an occupation for a man who has nothing to do or for one who does not mind laboring in vain. These things are, indeed, like mists of fleeting clouds; the more eagerly they are sought after the more quickly they disappear. Over this question they labor in many ways and with a variety of expression; and though they use words with entire indifference as to their meaning yet somehow they manage to find various opinions and to leave abundant material for disputations to contentious men.

"Thence it is that, having selected the sensible and other singulars since these things alone are said to exist, they arrange them in a graduated order by which they fix the most general and the most special into singulars themselves. There are some who in the manner of mathematicians abstract the forms and apply to them what is said about the universals."
Others discuss the perceptions (intellectus) and maintain that these are to be considered with the names of universals. There were also some who said that words themselves were genera and species but their theory has already been exploded and it has disappeared with its author. There are still, however, those who follow in his footsteps and who though ashamed to acknowledge the author of his opinion, still cling to names alone and ascribe to speech what they have substracted from facts and theories—

Magno se judice quisque tuctur—

and from the words of the founders who indifferently placed names for things and things for names, each constructed his own opinion or error. Thence sprang up germs for many wordy battles and everyone collected, wherever he could, matter to prove his heresies. From genera and species they never depart but apply them wherever speech is possible. You suddenly wonder whether you have found that poetic painter who knew how to compare a cypress to everything that necessity demanded. Thus does Rufus trifle in Naevia from which, as ‘Coquus’ testified, necessity averted him—

Quidquid agit Rufus, nihil est nisi Naevia Rufo
Si gaudet, si flet, si tacet, hanc loquitur.
Cœnat, popinat, poscit, negat, immittit, una est
Naevia, si non sit Naevia, mutus erit.

“That subject matter appears more suitable for philosophic discussion in which there is a freer license for manufacturing what you wish, and there is less certitude on account of the difficulty of the subject or ignorance of those who judge. Often as the cautious soldier more easily guards the rough and narrow crossovers to check the enemy, so any difficult questions which they may stir up from the Scripture or from reason or anything else that is proposed they treat with such industry that they seem mere incidents. If you cannot satisfy them that there is no one who can explain all the questions that are asked by the uneducated, they straightway wink their eyes, distort their faces, beat their breasts, shout, leap and transfigure themselves with gestures which would seem foolish in a pan-
tomime. You cannot make yourself understood to them unless you answer them in their own words and say the things which they are accustomed to hear. Though they may be too scrupulous to speak upon the questions which you propound yet they are entirely ignorant of the solutions. In one thing, however, they look out for their own interests more cautiously, for they put everything into their purses so these may be filled thereby; yet every one of them is satisfied with one little word of wisdom even though that word be hidden in a multitude of fallacies.

"I do not consider those more fitted for a philosophical discussion, however, who hang a long oration onto every little word as if a speech has to be delivered to the people upon every question that was asked of them. It is a rule if any problem is brought forth that he who answers more or less than what is asked, is ignorant of the true line of disputation. So also when any one is to be taught, only those things ought to be mentioned which offer assistance to the solution. Wherefore it is clear that those who read everything in a single incident and when only one thing is sought try to explain everything, do not possess the formula for correct teaching. Either they do not know what the correct mode of teaching is or perchance they are trying to earn more money by misrepresenting their obligation and as Cicero says, they show not what the subject calls for but everything that they can.

"Therefore, those who fill the Porphyry with all the parts of philosophy, befog the minds of those who are being introduced to the study and spoil their memory, and the pupil who ought to be given an introduction they load down with so great a weight that he considers the burden which he has undertaken unbearable. I should perhaps grant that the books of the Scriptures, everyone of whose smallest particles is full of Divine sacrament ought to be read with great weight because the treasure of the Holy Spirit, by whose indication they were written can never be exhausted. Though the externals of the letters may be suited to one sense entirely yet within it are concealed numberless mysteries. By the same reason allegory builds up faith, while tropology builds up character in various
ways. Analogogy tends, again and again, to endow literature not only with words but also with substance. In the liberal arts, however, where the meaning consists of the signification of the words he, who is not content with the sense of the words as they stand, seems to me to be either woefully mistaken or else to wish to lead his hearers from an understanding of the truth. Surely, I would consider Porphyrius a fool if he had written so that his meaning could not be understood unless Aristotle, Plato and Plotinus were first read through. Anyone that was preparing me for any subject could introduce me with such a compendium, but I, indeed, would follow him who explained the literature as is patent on the surface and taught me, so to speak, the historical sense.1

Such is John's description of an important phase of the scholastic movement, and the fact that modern criticism has arrived at the same conclusion—less graphically expressed perhaps, yet the same—speaks well for John's surpassing insight. Not content with preaching their own narrow doctrines, these dialecticians assailed the classical education and, as it seems, attacked John himself. He answered them not only in their personal charges but also in behalf of the classics. This answer is embodied in the four books of the Metalogicus, as perfect an example of a controversial essay as the best which his opponents could produce and one that illustrates well John's doctrine that logic and dialectics should be a means to an end, not an end in themselves.

In the Metalogicus, after a liberal supply of personal abuse for his opponents, John takes up a serious defense of the classics. At the end of the first book he gives a brief account of the movement which has assailed the old system of the grammar and rhetoric schools and states his position in the matter. "It is not of the same man to serve alike letters and carnal vices! To the form of this maxim my instructors in grammar, William of Conches and Richard, surnamed the Bishop, now archdeacon in Constance, a man famed for his temperate life and teaching, ever instructed their students. Later, however, instead of this opinion some men used this to bear prejudice to truth and men

1 Migne, pp. 662–666.
preferred to seem rather than to be philosophers and the professors of the arts began to promise that they would transmit to their hearers the whole of philosophy in a shorter time than two or three years. Overcome by the rush of the untrained multitude they gave way and as a result less time and care were devoted to the study of grammar. Thus it happens that those who profess all arts, liberal as well as mechanical, do not even know the first art, without which a person proceeds in vain to the rest. However, though the other studies make for learning, this one by a singular privilege is said to make a person liberally educated. Romulus, indeed, called this 'literataram' but Varro called it 'literationem' and its professor or asserter 'literator.' The ancient man, however, was called a 'literator' as that saying of Catullus shows—

‘Munus dat tibi Sylla litterator.’

Whence it is probable that the despiser of grammar is not only not a grammarian (literator) but ought not even to be spoken of as a liberally educated man (literatus).”

Thus the struggle with the classics was a very natural result of existing conditions. The arguments used against the old education in grammar and rhetoric were that these subjects taught as they were, from pagan sources, were detrimental to Christianity; that these subjects as taught were a waste of time; that eloquence, the object of these studies, could not be acquired, but was allotted to each individual by nature; and that wisdom, the aim of every learned man, was lessened proportionately as he studied grammar.²

The first objection was the eternal question of the Middle Ages in regard to the study of the classics and if it were accepted it would condemn this study without appeal. But John does not accept it. That he is only too conscious of the question is plainly apparent from the constant contrast of the terms “Gentilis auctor” and “Christianus auctor” in all of his works. It was evidently a question to which he had devoted not a little thought and throughout his Polycraticus and Metalogicus, he aims to reconcile the study of the pagan authors with Christianity. The ingenuity with which he carries out this

¹ Migne, pp. 856.
² Migne, pp. 825–856.
aim is remarkable. In the Polycraticus in a chapter entitled "Omnes Scripturas esse legendas" he argues "Omnes tamen, Scripturas legendas esse probabile est, nisi sint reprobatae lectionis, cum omnia non modo quae scripta, sed etiam quae facta sunt ad utilitatem, licet eis abutatur interdum, institute credantur."

This he proves by an interpretation of the Divine command "Crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram" and then under cover of this entirely acceptable doctrine he cleverly introduces a defense of the study of the classics with the words: "Vix autem invenietur scriptum, in quo si non in sensu vel in verbis, non reperiatur aliquid, quod prudens lector emittit. Caeterum libri catholicci tutius leguntur et cautius; et gentiles simplicioribus periculorius patent; sed in utrisque exerceri fidelioribus ingeniiis utilissimum est."

There is objectionable matter in all writings, even the Scriptures, but that is no reason for condemning them entirely. The prudent reader can gather much that is useful from them. If you find anything at variance with the Christian faith lay it to the customs of age in which the writer lived and do not cast him aside on that account. Such in brief is the attitude of John and he carries out this attitude in practice. He reads the authors himself but in quoting them he strives to use only those passages wherein very little pagan theology is contained. If, however, he must use such a passage, he does so with expurgatorial freedom, or uses some Christian writer on the subject.

1 Migne, p. 658.
2 Migne, p. 659.
3 This is well illustrated in his use of Plutarch: "Nam, deducta superstitione, gentilium fidelis est in sententias, in verbis luculentus et in sacrario morum taurus arbiter, ut facile praeceptorem Trajanii possis agnoscere. Si quid autem aequum eam a fide dissentit, aut moribus tem- pori potius, quam vire ascrivatur." p. 539. Another example is:—"Eam usque quaque nititur evacuare Plutarchus et ex praemissis quatuor locis, natturae, officii, morum, conditionis, totius reverentiae manare credit originem. Superstitionis tamen hoc infidelium more exsequitur. Unde nonnulas sententias ejus, sensu et sermone catholicce curavi in-serere.

4 It is for this reason John says that he takes his quotations on the Roman Emperors from Orosius instead of from the great pagan accounts, though they give fuller descriptions, p. 788.
This is John’s own private opinion in favor of this study. In his Metalogicis, under stress of battle, he does not even conceive the possibility of grammar coming into conflict with Christianity. It is the Cornifici scent who are contravening the true teaching, for they are opposing eloquence by which alone man is able to make use of that power of reason which God has given to man in distinction from beasts. By doing away with eloquence they are ever widening the gulf between man and God, for man is then as low as the beasts.¹

Firmly entrenched behind this bold assertion of right he proceeds to overthrow the other objections. He refutes the fatalistic doctrine that eloquence is a gift of nature, not to be acquired by cultivation by citing two classic examples, Socrates and Rufus Scaurus who overcame the obstacles of nature by earnest endeavor.² Though nature may endow one person with more ability than another, yet without training that gift is naught and this training can only be truly obtained in the old-style grammar schools. Their practical value lies in the fact that they alone can give the student a complete mastery of the art of writing and reading both poetry and prose. The ability to use figures of speech, to understand the structure of a sentence and to master the mechanics of composition are to be acquired nowhere else, and yet, these are not the only benefits to be derived from a study of the classics.³ Men must study to become poets and it is still a celebrated fact that poetry is the cradle of philosophy. This training, however, does more than make poets: “Disciplinas liberales tantae utilitatis esse tradit antiquitas, ut quicunque eas plene norint libros omnes, et quaecunque Scripta sunt, possunt intelligere etiam sine doctore”⁴ it places a man in a position to understand whatever has been written, without the need of a teacher. The contention that a “grammaticus” confines himself to his books, stories or poems, is far from the truth, the real aim of the classics is to seek and transmit “informationem virtutis quae facit virum bonum”⁵ and that this is

¹ Migne, p. 824-7.
² Migne, p. 836.
³ Migne, p. 836-838.
⁴ Migne, p. 852.
⁵ Ibid.
John's aim is constantly impressed on his readers by the way in which he uses his quotations, especially in history. He chooses those passages which offer an example or lesson that will be of moral service to his own time.

After all, however, results afford the best criterion by which to judge any question. What these opponents of the classics have accomplished by their new method of instruction is expressed in the words: "Alii . . . monachorum aut clericorum claustrum ingressi sunt. Alii, autem, suum in philosophia intuentes defectum, Salernum vel ad Montempes-sulam prefeci, facti sunt clientuli medicorum et repente quales philosophi, tales in momento medici erupserunt," and "Nihil stultum, nisi paupertatis angustias et solas opes ducunt esse fructum sapientiae." Moved by sordid motives these men led equally sordid lives, for their education gave them no higher aim in life than the accumulation of money. In a passage whose effect would be greatly lost by translation, John contrasts with this the man trained in the classics. This man has been taught to seek out and spread the knowledge of virtue, for---Caeterum operationem cultumque virtutis, scientia naturaliter praecedet; nec enim virtus currit in incertum aut in pugna, quam exercet cum vitis aerem verberat,

'Sed videt quo tendit, et in quod dirigit arcum: Nec passim corvos sequitur testaque lutoque.'

At lectio, doctrina, et meditatio scientiam paruint. Unde constat quod grammatica, quae istorum fundamentum est et radix, quodammodo sementem jacit quasi in sulcis naturae, gratia tamen praeemulte; quae, si ei cooperatix quoque gratia adfuerit, in solidae virtutis robur coalescit et crescit multipliciter, ut boni operis fructum faciat, unde boni viri et nominatur, et sunt. Sola tamen gratia, quae et velle bonum et perficere operatur, virum bonum facit et prae caeteris omnibus recte scribendi et recte loquendi, quibus datum est, facultatem impertitur, artesque ministrat varias et cum se indigentibus benigne offert, contemni non debet. Si enim contemnitur, justi

1 Ibid, p. 836.
2 Ibid, p. 831.
recedit, nec contemptori relinquitur questionis locus." In this passage John has summed up his arguments for the study of the classics. He has shown how this study works hand in hand with the Divine Grace in making a man good, and thereby has left his opponents no ground on which to base any contention. Continuing in this strain he repeats his motto: "Non est enim ejusdem hominis, litteris et carnalibus virtutibus inservire" a motto which would do honor to any humanist of later ages. He ends his defense of the subject with a quotation from Quintilian on the praise of grammar. "Haec est igitur liberalium artium prima, necessaria pueris, jucunda senibus, dulcis secretorum comes; et quae sola, in omni studiorum genere, plus habet operis, quam ostentationis."\(^1\)

Such is the attitude of John of Salisbury toward the study of the classics. They should not be an end in themselves but "ad haec non modo pedum aut temporum ibi ratio habenda est, sed aetatum, locorum, temporum, aliorumque, quae sigillatum referre ad praesentem attinet; cum omnia a naturae officina proveniant." To study the past for the purpose of understanding and guiding the present became that cool, critical, contemplative mind, and the lines at the opening of the Polycraticus "Me curialibus nugiis paulisper ademi, illud volvens in animo, quia otium sine litteris mors est, et vivi hominis sepultura," show that John loved his letters as well, and probably quite as sincerely, as the humanists of the later Renaissance. It will be the aim of the remainder of this paper to show that he had not only an opportunity to satisfy his desire and love for the classics but that he also took advantage of this opportunity.

\(^1\) Migne, p. 853.
\(^2\) Migne, p. 856.
CHAPTER II.

KNOWLEDGE OF THE CLASSICAL AUTHORS AS SHOWN BY HIS QUOTATIONS.

That there was a classical revival in the twelfth century has become a generally recognized fact, but to what extent the scholars of that time were acquainted with the originals is not so well known. Sandys has traced the survival of certain authors in special localities and in his enumeration of extant manuscripts the significant fact appears that an unusual number of them were copied in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.¹ The general use of classical writers at this time is shown by several contemporary documents which describe the curricula of the schools. The most noteworthy is the so-called Dictionarius of John de Garland which is a work of the later twelfth and not of the thirteenth century.² The manuscript gives an exposition of the subjects and authors which are studied in the schools, prescribing the parts of a work which ought or ought not to be read.³ The great list of classical authors is certainly surprising but the work shows in addition that whole and not merely parts of them were used. The heptateuchon of Theodore⁴ of Chartres is a similar document which treats particularly of the curriculum of Chartres and it serves materially to confirm the general prevalence of classical studies. The will of John⁵ of Salisbury likewise enumerates a partial list of the books which he left to the library at Chartres and it contains

¹ A History of Classical Scholarship from the Sixth Century, B. C. See also Teuffel and Schwabe, and Norden: Die Antike Kunstprosa.
² Through the kindness of Dr. L. J. Paetow of Wisconsin, who has possession of a copy of this manuscript, the writer is enabled to present these facts.
³ Among the classical authors mentioned are Statius, Virgil, Juvenal, Horace, Ovid, Sallust, Cicero, Martial, Petronius, Symmachus, Suetonius, Livy and Seneca.
⁵ Migne, Intro. p. xii.
a number of ancient works. In view of this general survival of the classics; in view of John’s character, his travels, his friends, and his humanistic leanings, one would naturally expect to find in him an extensive knowledge of the classics.

Of the authors whom he quotes, Virgil is, of course, the foremost, as he was with preceding writers.* To John, Virgil is the world philosopher—“procedat tibi poeta Mantuanus, qui, sub imagine fabularum, totius philosophiae exprimit veritatem”1 and the Aeneid the book of life—“Virgilius in libro quo totius philosophiae rimatur arcana.”2 The conception of the Aeneid as held by the school of Chartres, John enlarges with great detail. The first book with its story of the shipwreck3 symbolizes the trials of sturdy childhood; the second book illustrates the development and frank curiosity of boyhood; the third, the errors of youth; the fourth pictures illicit love; the fifth shows manhood, fully developed, beginning to verge toward old age, while in the sixth old age with failing powers is awaiting impending death. This does not mean, however, that John knew only the first six books of the Aeneid. On the contrary some of his longest quotations are taken from the later books.

The Georgics and Eclogues are equally well known to him. In the first, especially, he finds many lessons for his own generation, and a very notable instance of this is the passage wherein he quotes sixty-seven lines from the fourth Georgie, introducing the quotation with the words “Poetarum doctissimus Maro ut civilem vitam ab apibus mutuetur”4 and concluding with the comment “Republicae omnes anchorae percurrere, rerum publicarum revolve historias, vita civilis tibi rectius et elegantius nus quam occuret. Essentque procul dubio beatae civitates, si hanc sibi vivendi praescriberent formam.”5 Such lessons he

* The detailed consideration of John’s use of each author has been omitted from this paper. This material may be had by reference to the original thesis in the library of the University of Wisconsin.

1 Migne, p. 621.
2 Migne, p. 430.
5 Migne, p. 620.
draws too from the Eclogues, and he ranks the wisdom of the rural shepherd as far superior to that of the men of his own time—"Unde apud Virgilium compos sui pastor, et sapientibus et viris nostri temporis doctior, ait" adding a quotation from the Eclogues. These are but instances of the constant use which he makes of these works. The whole Polycraticus fairly teems with Virgilian allusions and expressions.

Next to Virgil, Lucan occupies the second place in the affections of John for the ancient epics. This writer, whose Pharsalia Otto of Freising is said to have carried as a diversion on his journey to Rome, was a general favorite with the scholars of the twelfth century. The Pharsalia, John relates, was used along with the Aeneid as a text book full of ethical teachings, but he does not rank Lucan with Virgil. On the contrary, he accepts Quintilian's estimate of him "Immit enim poeta doctissimus; si tamen poeta dicendus est, qui vera narratione rerum ad historicos magis accedit * * * " and calls him "poeta gravissimus" and "Mathematicus" but his many and long quotations from this work show that he appreciated it none the less.

Statius, the other popular epic poet of the time is not so great a favorite with John, for he quotes him only ten times. These quotations, however, are taken from all the books of the Thebais and as but few of them can be found in the mediaeval text-books it would seem that the Thebes, at least, was not entirely unknown to John. His familiar use of titles like "apud Statium," "Papinius" and "Photinus," in introducing quotations from this source indicates that he knew Statius quite well.

That other much discussed poet, Ovid, who so greatly shocked some of the more orthodox and aged scholars of the Middle Ages, was treated by John as an ethical teacher. With the ultra-fastidious condemnation of this writer, John is not all

---

¹ Migne, p. 864.
² Ibid, p. 441.
³ Ennius and Accius, however, who are also quoted, were probably not known to John for the quotations from both of these can be traced back directly to other sources.
in sympathy. There is undoubtedly much in Ovid that is to be condemned, he says, but there is also much that is good and for that reason Ovid ought to be read by the educated.\(^1\) His quotations from Ovid are taken from all of the better known works of the poet. Though those from Metamorphoses and the Fasti are longer and more numerous, the Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris, Tristia, Heroides, Amores and the Epistulae ex Ponto are by no means neglected. The line from the Amores “Nitimur in vetitum semper”—is an especial favorite. Although John made use of Ovid as a moralist, he was not blind to his immorality. He condemns Ovid as the poet who filled not only the City but the whole world with his lascivious amours and taught the bashful and troubled suitor how to approach his maiden.\(^2\) He also characterizes Ovid as the poet who excelled\(^3\) all others in “levitatem versificandi.” John’s criticism of Ovid was very modern.

There are poets, however, who are thought of essentially as moralists. Of these, that great favorite, Horace, deserves first attention. For him John has great respect: “Consonat ei, si Lyricum conticenti lyra dignaris audire, Flaccus, aut si mavis, Horatius.”\(^4\) He speaks of Horace as the poet who excelled in the varieties of metres but his usual title is “Ethicus.”\(^5\) The Epistles, especially the Ars Poetica, are most frequently quoted though John’s familiarity with the Satires is equally extensive. In several places he has adapted whole satires, as for instance in his description of the feast of “Nasidienus.”\(^6\) John’s description of Horace as the lyrical poet has led Manitius to credit him with a knowledge of the Odes also. True, in one or two places he seems to echo them as in his use of “atavis editus” and “dulce est desipere in loco.” Furthermore, the Odes were known in John’s day in northern France; but it would seem that John probably would have quoted them more often had he really known them at first hand. These expres-

---

1. Migne, pp. 714-5.
3. Ibid, p. 484.
5. Ibid, p. 484.
sions, as Schaarschmidt has pointed out, had probably become familiar quotations and they are entirely insufficient to serve as a basis for a definite assertion of his familiarity with the Odes.

Under the title "Ethici" Juvenal and Persius are also quoted. They were special favorites with John. He takes more than eighty direct quotations from them. He confesses his weakness for them in several places but it is significant that he does not distinguish between the two.\(^1\) Nowhere does he mention Persius by name, nor does he designate him by any distinctive title though his possession of both of them is quite certain. This peculiarity may be explained by the theory that the two satirists were published, then as now, in the same edition, and that the name of the second may have been lost.\(^2\) From the frequency and accuracy of his quotations, however, it seems certain that he not only read the works of these writers but had them before him as he wrote.

Another satirist of the Roman world, whom John uses extensively is Petronius. The satires, like those of the writers just mentioned, are freely culled from and in one place he has copied word for word the whole story of the woman of Ephesus which covers two of the large pages in Migne's text. The accuracy of this quotation, coupled with the fact that the text was in general use can scarcely leave doubt as to his possession of the work. With respect to the "Cena Trimalechionis," which he also cites, there is not so much certainty. This work was very rare, the only manuscript of that time now extant having been discovered in Dalmatia. Still, the relative accuracy of his citations is such that there can be no doubt as to their source. He had probably read the work on one of his journeys and remembered it vividly enough to cite from it, for he could not have obtained his material in such shape from any intermediate source.

Martial’s Epigrammata must be considered with the works of the Satirists as one of the sources upon which John drew in his criticism of existing vanities. This writer whom for

---

\(^1\) Migne, p. 596, et passim.

\(^2\) Migne, p. 596, et passim.
some reason he has nick-named "Coquus" frequently thinks as John thinks "Sic Martialis, sie et ego; malens sie nugari quam ad formam Ganymedis leporis agitare"—1 and though the quotations are comparatively few, they are exceedingly precious, since in only one of the nineteen lines quoted is there any distinct variation from the text.

On the other hand, Terence is the only play-writer of antiquity with whom John exhibits any marked familiarity. In the "Eunuch" he delights especially because of its commentary on life—"Comici forte contemnis Eunuchum sed in Eunuchum fere omnium vitam expressit."2 Its happy touches on the follies of mankind meet with his heartfelt approval: "Jucundus est enim comicus, et aptus qui se nugis nostris frequenter immiscet." The Andria, too, is drawn upon for its lessons: "Quae vero ad gratiam sine invidia via expeditissima sit, senex docet in Andria, dum filium omnibus obsequi, neminem laedere reseet."3 The "Adelphi" is quoted only once, and as no other allusion is made to it and as this quotation can be traced to other sources, it is probable that John had not read the work. His mention of "miles gloriosus" cannot be construed as a mention of the play of Plautus by that name.

There are several renowned writers of ancient times not generally known in his day whom John quotes. These are Cato, Plautus, Varro and Catullus. The quotations from Cato and Varro can all be traced to other mediaeval sources. With Plautus it is the same, for although the characters "Mandrogerus," "Querolus" and "Sycophans" are used constantly in the Polycrates, this does not prove that he had read the plays. These characters were used as types by Christian writers from the days of Augustine. Furthermore there are no direct quotations from the plays. It is, then, safe to say that he had not read them. There is only one quotation from Catullus and that is evidently taken from Martianus Capella. With none of these writers does he exhibit any direct familiarity.

1 Migne, p. 825.
2 Ibid, p. 482.
Of the prose writers, Cicero, Quintilian and Seneca are used most frequently. That oft-quoted passage from the Entheticus "Orbis nil habuit maius Cicerone Latinus" shows in what great esteem John held this writer. Cicero is constantly quoted in almost every one of John's works and is ranked with the great fathers of the Church as the soundest authority on any subject he touches. To be "as Augustine was and as Cicero had been in his later years—an Academician" was his boast, and his similarity to this great writer is not confined to philosophy alone. So pure is his style and so much nearer to Cicero's than that of any of his contemporaries that the German scholars have justly considered it as modelled upon Cicero. A close inspection of John's writings reveals his wide knowledge of this author, who excels all others in "copiam dicendi." The so-called Ciceronian work "Ad Herrenium," the "de Partitio Oratoria" and the "de Inventione Rhetorica" were, of course, text-books at Chartres and had been known to John as such. He owned copies of the "De Officiis" and the "De Oratore," and bequeathed them to the library at Chartres. It is therefore perfectly natural that he should quote from these very frequently. In his letters especially, but in all his works he cites the "ad Familiare," and the frequency and accuracy of his quotations show that he probably obtained them directly from the original, which was well known at the time. The Tusculan Disputations and the New Academy are, of course, the works upon which he bases his statement that Cicero was an Academician in his latter years.¹ These works are constantly cited upon philosophical questions, and the extent of the familiarity seems to demonstrate the use of the originals. The same charm which the "De Amicitia" has for modern readers attracted John. He uses Laelius and Scipio for their views on friendship as devoutly as the most enthusiastic freshman. With the "Orator" and the "de Natura Deorum" also he appears quite familiar. Both works were well known in the Middle Ages, especially the latter, which was used by St. Augustine in the interpretation of the Scriptures. John's quotations

¹ Migne, p. 388, et passim.
² Migne, p. 388, et passim.
from them are, however, very few. The "De Senectute" is al-
luded to once or twice but in a way that suggests that the
quotations from this work were obtained from other sources.
The "De Fato," the "Paradoxa Stoicorum" and the "de Divina-
tione" were quite well known in John's day, but he uses them
in such a vague way that it is impossible to give him credit
for them through want of evidence. Schaarschmidt has ascribed
a knowledge of all of these works to him but as John only men-
tions them a single time and then only in an indirect man-
er such a statement cannot be justified. Of course it may
well be that John does not quote everything which he has read,
just as he may not know at first hand every work from which
he quotes. Still his allusions to these works could have
been made from any number of other sources, and his refer-
ences to them do not enable the writer to credit him with a
knowledge of the works themselves.

His familiarity with Quintilian is more certain than with
some of Cicero's works. At the end of a letter to an obscure
monk named Azo he expressly says, "Mihi autem nihil precor
nisi ut Quintilianum quem petii scriptum et emendatum mit-
tas" and that he here refers to the "Institutiones Oratoriae"
his numerous long quotations bear ample witness. John's edu-
cational system, as described in the Metalogicus, is based al-
most entirely upon Quintilian. He supports almost every
point which he makes with a quotation from this writer. As
against the Cornifician's use of Seneca as an authority against
the liberal arts John cites Quintilian's description of Seneca.
His final statement of the value of grammar is made in the
words of Quintilian. These are but instances of his vital
intimacy with the Institutions. The "Declamationes" are
cited but not so conclusively. Still, since they were well known
at Chartres and through France and England, it is probable
that he had read them, though the quotations themselves would
not establish this.

With the works of Seneca he seems to have been thoroughly
conversant. He knew that there were two great Senecas and
he makes it clear that it is the Younger from whom he quotes:

1 Migne, p. 313.
“Unde illud apud Senecam (alienum tandem).” Aristotele was explained to the beginner at that time by the interpretation of Seneca’s “de Clementia” and “de Beneficiis,” and that John was once such a beginner is shown by his quotations from these works. The “de Ira” and the Dialogues are also frequently drawn upon while the “Quaestiones Naturales” and the Letters are thoroughly ransacked. There is no allusion to the Tragedies. In the list of the works of Seneca which John says ought to be read, all those mentioned occur, with the strange exception of the Tragedies. He owned a copy of the “Quaestiones Naturales” and constantly quotes from it, especially in the Metalogicus. He was so familiar with Seneca that when the Cornificians cited him in support of the futility of the liberal education he was not only able to show that Seneca was not opposed to the study of grammar but that he was a writer who ought to be studied as well as for his style as for his great moral teachings. John found his own language inadequate to express his appreciation of Seneca and drew upon Quintilian. He regarded Seneca as almost Christian in sentiment: “Ratione Hebraeorum consentit Senecae definitio, est ille alius senserit.”

The great historians of antiquity do not occupy so high a place in his regard. The passage in which he quotes Orosius in preference to the greater writers because they are too pagan, has already been cited and in this he was quite consistent with himself and his age. In his eyes the great value of antiquity lay in the moral examples and teachings which it afforded. He did not quote passages merely for the sake of quoting them. They must be brief and pointed and long descriptions of men and events filled with pagan thought were of little use for his purposes. To be sure, he read some of them. For an educated man there was much of value in these histories but it would not be proper to quote long passages from them in a work that was to be extensively read. Accordingly only short, significant sentences are used in direct quotation,
though several stories are gleaned from them. These are related in John’s own words, as a rule, though statements of the source frequently appear.

There are very many passages from Suetonius, especially from his poetry and there are four from Sallust. Two of the latter can be traced to other sources but one from the Jugurtha and one from the Catiline cannot be accounted for except on the assumption of John’s knowledge of the texts. As these were current at the time and as John seems to be quite familiar with Sallust, it is probable that he knew both of these works. The third Decade of Livy which was often used in this time, seems also to have been known by John and though he quotes Julius Florus directly on the Punic wars yet his familiarity with the subject, his reference to Livy, as “scriptor belli Punicorum Livius referat,” and his use of material which could only have been obtained from the original, make it altogether probable that he had read at least a part of Livy.

John speaks also of Tacitus and Quintus Curtius as historians who give full descriptions of certain events, but his own works give no hint that he knew more than the names of these two. Naturally, he is more familiar with the epitomists and anecdotic historians. His use of these writers is aptly described by Schaarschmidt: “diese Autoren werden förmlich gepflanzt.” It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that if the fourth book of the Strategemata of Frontinus or the fourth book of the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia were lost they could be restored from the Poliorcetica. His quotations from them are not confined to these two books. The De Re Militari of Vegetius and the Epitoma of Justin are used almost as extensively. Julius Florus is quoted only twice but both passages are fairly long and quite accurate, so that he probably had the work.

He apparently read the natural histories of the Elder Pliny which were so commonly used at that time in Northern France as an encyclopedia. He says: “memor hominum, quos in libro Naturalis Historiae apud Plinium didici” and the

1 Migne, p. 500. “Crispo historicorum inter Latinos Postissimo.”
2 Migne, p. 495.
3 Schaarschmidt, p. 90.
4 Migne, p. 576.
quotation which follows this could hardly have been taken except from the original.

Aulus Gellius is the source of many quotations and the "Atticæ Noctes" is often mentioned. John had evidently read the work since he states "In Atticis Noctibus legisse memini" and the length and accuracy of his quotations quite corroborate this statement.

Three writers whom John quotes in but a single passage are Publilius Syrus, Serenus Sammonicus, and Solinius. His quotations, however, are so long and accurate that he could hardly have obtained them from mediaeval sources and it is reasonable to conclude that he had used the works in whole or in part. It is true that they were not very generally known and that he mentions Publilius Syrus calling him Publilius Clodius. On the other hand, the appreciative description seems to show that he was acquainted with this author. Five lines are quoted from the medical verses of Serenus Sammonicus and as this writer was coming into use about this time John probably obtained the quotation from the original. The same holds true of Solinius.

Of the later Latin writers Appolinari Sidonius, Dionysius Cato, Apuleius, Avienus, Macrobius and Claudianus can be credited to John without hesitation. Eutropius is not so certain. Of the four quotations from this writer in the Polycraticus, two can be traced directly to other sources while the others are too short to afford convincing evidence that John had the work. Schaarschmidt has attempted to prove that John was familiar with this writer by saying that he quotes him once without mentioning his name, but the passage in question is a word for word quotation from Orosius. On the other hand, John possessed this work before his death since he bequeathed it to Chartres. Schaarschmidt may, therefore, be correct, even though the evidence he adduces is bad.*

---

* Migne, p. 525.
1 Schaarschmidt, p. 2.
2 Migne, Introduction, p. xii.
3 Besides these writers who furnished John with most of this quotations, he introduces material which cannot be traced to any known Latin sources. Scholars, for the last fifty years, have been trying to
CONCLUSION.

Was John of Salisbury a humanist? Can he be considered a precursor of the later Renaissance? Schaarschmidt holds that he can be so considered. Voigt, on the other hand, claims that John did not have that “feeling for the Greek,” “that desire to live over again the ancient days”—and therefore was not truly imbued with the humanistic spirit. Before passing a final judgment, however, the circumstances under which he wrote ought to be noted.

His three great works, the Polycraticus, Entheticus and Metalogicus were all finished about the same time—1159. He was not master of a school, nor a librarian. His school days had ended eleven years before and, ever since, he had been engaged in looking after the confidential affairs of his superiors. The composition of these works, therefore, was entirely the occupation of his leisure moments. His temporary estrangement with Henry gave him an unusual amount of time so that he was able not only to finish his Polycraticus and Entheticus, upon which he had been working for some time, but also to write the Metalogicus in answer to the opponents of the classics.

It is, perhaps, unfortunate that John did not sing his own praises, that he did not proclaim himself as the only and original exponent of the true appreciation of the classics. In his early training at Chartres there had been impressed upon him the maxim that indulgence in vices could not exist where the love for letters held sway. He states, himself, that this love for letters meant more especially love for the classical works. Therefore when he took up his pen against the Cornificians, it

solve this vexatious problem on the basis that he knew no Greek. But while these quotations cannot be traced to Latin sources, they can almost all of them be traced to later Greek writers. However the question need not be discussed here. Wolffin, Reifferscheid, Schaarschmidt and Manlius have worried over the “lost Latin authors” quite sufficiently. See Philologic, 1861, pp. 12–26. Schaarschmidt, pp. 103–108, and Philologus, vol. 47, pp. 566–7. Whether or not John knew any Greek is discussed by Schaarschmidt, pp. 108–124; Poole, pp. 124–130; Clerval, p. 232.
was not to preach a new doctrine, but to defend a principle which had become thoroughly ingrained in his very being.

That "feeling for the Greek" is a rather vague term. John appreciated the fact that Greek philosophers were the source of all philosophy. It was on this account that he had John the Saracen translating Greek philosophy for him. He loved Virgil and considered the Aeneid the book of life but he did not forget to state that the ideas of this work were but an adaptation of a greater poet, Homer. If the feeling for Greek means an abandonment to pure aesthetic interests, then John was not a humanist.

John was an Englishman and a practical man. In him the purely aesthetic was distinctly subordinated to the ethical. The classics were primarily of use for the "informationem veritatis et virtutis." They must serve some useful end for his own time, but in using them he proceeded far ahead of his own time. He saw that even the Scriptures could be clarified by an appeal to antecedent philosophy and life, and he used them for this purpose as much as he did the writings of the Fathers. The truth must be found at the source of things, and it was to the sources that he was going when he had a Greek philosopher translated for him.

There was another side to his love for the classics. His "otium sine litteris mors est" is indeed a revelation. How much appreciation—true appreciation—does this imply? That he appreciated style in a writer, his comment on the writing of Bernard of Chartres and his own pure style bear witness. But did he find enjoyment in the study of the classics? This question can only be answered by another—why did he so strenuously advocate them as an occupation for leisure? Why "non ejusdem hominis est carnalibus vitiiis et litteris inservire" and why does he urge the people to a study of the classic letters?

Petrarch, "the great and first humanist," was content, according to tradition, to die with a copy of Homer, of which he understood hardly a word, at his head. If John had had a copy of Homer, he might have had it well translated and let the beautiful teachings of this work become general. His interests were primarily philosophical and his most busy moments
were none too busy for him to devote a little time to searching into the truths of philosophy. What an interesting picture that letter of his to John the Saracen presents. It is the fourth year of his exile, the third of his banishment from England, yet amid all the harrowing negotiations with Thomas a Becket, with the Pope and the Lords of Europe, he finds time to look over and correct the translation of Dionysius which the Saracen had sent to him and he asks him to finish it so that he can enjoy the full teachings of the work. Such was John's appreciation.

He lived in a time which was none too favorable to the classics; when the narrow religious bigotry was not yet dispelled as it is today, nor as it was a century and a half later in Italy. He was trying to reconcile the study of the classics with the teachings of religion—to make them serve a useful purpose in furthering those teachings just as today there is a movement to reconcile the discoveries of science with religion—to bring them to the support of Christianity.

John was indeed a humanist when humanism was not in vogue—when to uphold the classics meant to invite not mere silent indifference but the cutting sneers and jeers of a hostile public. Yet he did so willingly. Not even the charge which is brought so often against the advocates of Latin and Greek to-day—that they uphold the classics because it is their occupation—can be preferred against him. His occupation was political and diplomatic—his leisure, alone, could he give to this subject. Unaffected, therefore, by hope of any material gain, actuated only by the sincere motive of “informationem veritatis et virtutis,” he went out of his way to champion the cause of the liberal arts. If he had come two or three centuries later he might have been considered one of the greatest leaders in the history of scholarship. Coming when he did, he has suffered the fate of other great men who have had vociferous successors.
A tabular statement of John’s classical knowledge will serve to summarize these conclusions:

I. The classical writings which, according to the evidence presented, can be credited to John’s knowledge.

**Aulus Gellius**—Noctes Atticae.
**Cicero**—Ad Herennium, De Partitio Magistratus, De Inventione Rhetorica, De Oratore, De Officiis, Tusculani Disputationes, Nova Academia, Ad Familiares, De Amicitia.
**Frontinus**—Strategemata.
**Horatius**—Sermones et Epistulae.
**Juvenal**—Satyræ.
**Lucanus**—Pharsalia.
**Martial**—Epigrammatæ.
**Ovidius**—Metamorphoses, Fasti, Amores, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris, Epistulae ex-Ponto.
**Persius**—Satyræ.
**Petronius**—Satyræ, Cena Trimalchionis.
**Plinius**—Historiae Naturales.
**Quintilianus**—Institutiones Oratoriae.
**Sallustius**—Catilina, Jugurtha.
**Seneca**—De Clementia, De Beneficiis, Quaestiones Naturales, Epistulae et Dialogi.
**Statius**—Thebais.
**Suetonius**—Caesares.

**Publius Syrus.**
**Terentius**—Eunuchus et Andria.
**Valerius Maximus**—Memorabilia.
**Virgil**—Aeneid, Georgica, Eclogues.

II. Classical writings which John quotes and which cannot be credited to his knowledge for want of sufficient evidence.

**Aeciæs.**
**Cato.**
**Catullus.**
**Cicero**—De Fato, De Divinatione, De Senectute, De Natura Deorum, Orator, Orationes, Paradoxa Stoicorum.
Curtius.
Ennius.
Horatius—Carmina.
Ovidius—Tristia, Heroides.
Caecilius Plinius—Epistulae et Panegyricus.
Sallustius—Historiae.
Tacitus.
Terentius—Adelphi.
Varro.
Livius.

III. Later Latin writers who can be ascribed to John's knowledge.

Apollinaris Sidonius
Apuleius
Claudianus
Donatus
Dionysius Cato
Eutropius
Justinus
Julius Florus
Macrobius
Martianus Capella
Nonius Marcellus
Priscian
Serenus Sammonicus
Servius
Solinus
Vegetius
Krey—John of Salisbury and the Classics.
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