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ABSTRACT

THE METALOGICON OF JOHN OF SALISBURY: MEDIEVAL RHETORIC AS EDUCATIONAL PRAXIS

By

Brian J. Gilchrist

May 2013

Dissertation supervised by Dr. Pat Arneson

This dissertation addresses the following question: what are the implications of John of Salisbury’s rhetorical theory for his approach to education? The Metalogicon, John’s defense of the trivium, represents the primary text analyzed throughout the project. John’s medieval rhetorical theory explicated the reciprocal relationship between rhetoric and education. The art of rhetoric acquired educational elements by providing ethical-theoretical frameworks to inform the practices of students and teachers. Experiences from the practices of students and teachers influenced the art of rhetoric. John called for an approach to medieval rhetorical education that could be placed into the service of all people living in God’s world. Five chapters offer answers to the guiding question.

Chapter One, “John of Salisbury: A Rhetorician of the Middle Ages,” situates John within the historical moment of the High Middle Ages in Western Europe. John’s
personal experiences and the overall significant historical events shaped his perspective about medieval rhetorical education. Chapter Two, “John of Salisbury’s Intellectual Influences: Cicero and Aristotle,” explores how the writings of Cicero and Aristotle informed John’s assumptions about the relationship between Ciceronian rhetoric and Aristotelian dialectics within medieval rhetorical education. John attempted to place the newly translated Latin writings of Aristotle, The *Organon*, into the service of medieval rhetorical education.

Chapter Three, “John of Salisbury’s The *Metalogicon*: An Artifact of Medieval Epideictic Rhetoric,” examines The *Metalogicon* as a composition representing medieval epideictic rhetoric. John offered an account of his educational experiences in which he praised teachers who promoted the liberal arts, blamed teachers who rejected the liberal arts, and celebrated the timeless values of a philosophical approach to education. Chapter Four, “The *Metalogicon* as Rhetorical Dialectical Synthesis,” articulates John’s contribution to medieval rhetorical theory. John synthesized Ciceronian rhetoric with Aristotelian dialectics to expand the scope of rhetorical practices. Chapter Five, “The *Metalogicon*: A Medieval Response to Contemporary Calls for Educational Praxis,” concludes the dissertation by announcing John’s call for praxis as the *telos* of medieval rhetorical education. The *Metalogicon* offered implications to the communication discipline by addressing John’s contribution to medieval rhetorical theory and articulating pedagogical practices beneficial to contemporary educators.
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CHAPTER ONE

John of Salisbury: A Rhetorician of the Middle Ages

Public education in contemporary, postmodern American society remains a contentious issue following the passage of The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The NCLB Act (2001) proposed to evaluate school performance in relationship with standardized test scores. This national piece of legislation granted individual states the right to create their own standardized tests. Standards of achievement in the test scores were determined on a state-by-state basis (ED.gov). In the years following the enactment of the NCLB Act (2001), elected representatives from both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party expressed reservations about the success of the legislation. While politicians from both parties may agree that the American public educational system from kindergarten through 12th grade should be reformed to meet the challenges of a globalized marketplace, they cannot arrive at a consensus to solve the problems.

Over the course of the next decade from 2001 to 2012, controversies emerged regarding how individual states developed practices for meeting standards of student learning outcomes. Since 2011, The Texas State Board of Education changed the content of textbooks, especially in United States history class, used in public schools to increase learning outcomes of students. Some of these proposals included alternative interpretations of historical events such as The Founding Fathers did not support the separation of Church and State and that Pres. Lyndon B. Johnson’s “Great Society” had unintended negative consequences like Affirmative Action and Title IX, and so forth (Moyers). The Texas State Board of Education adapted the textbooks not only to
improve standardized test scores, but also to provide an education that prepared students for the rigors of excelling in colleges or universities.

During the 2012 United States presidential campaigns, both Democratic and Republican politicians proposed solutions to address issues of American education. The parties articulated plans to improve K-12 public education and higher education. The Republican Party Platform advocated, among other ideas, merit pay among teachers in public schools (Republican Party Platform). The Democratic Party Platform vowed to increase in Pell Grants so more students could attend college (Kingkade). Both political parties announced that gaining employment functioned as the significant purpose of education.

The proposals to meet the challenges of American education have been informed by postmodern philosophical presuppositions. Postmodern philosophers acknowledge that ideas from the past may be used to inform contemporary practices by taking into account historicity, an assumption that links commonly asked questions and perspectives about similar issues across time. Politicians and educators alike have demonstrated a willingness to try a multiplicity of approaches. While stakeholders might disagree about possible solutions to the education crisis, many concerned publics may agree that classrooms represent the first place to begin restructuring the American educational system.

Within the postmodern framework, theorists from the past may be called upon to announce possible solutions for the contemporary crisis in American education. John of Salisbury lends an important voice that contemporary educators may use to answer that call. Although John of Salisbury lived during a period of time that historians call the
High Middle Ages, his assumptions about rhetorical educational practices might benefit contemporary educators and communication scholars. John of Salisbury’s approach to medieval rhetorical education provides theoretical and ethical frameworks from which instructors may develop classroom content that promotes praxis. Students could draw upon a multiplicity of ideas acquired from their education to inform their actions as they contribute to the common good of society.

John of Salisbury¹ (1115/1120-1180) lived during a tumultuous time period that featured conflicts between the Church and the State, The Papacy and The Holy Roman Empire, the Second Crusade, and educational tensions resulting from a shift from the liberal arts to specialized education. The overall goal of education shifted from a commitment to life-long learning to an obligation to enter into a career within the secular or non-secular realms. The term “secular” derives from the Latin noun saeculum, meaning “age” or “world” (Collins 432). The words “age” and “world” refer to temporal issues in the lifespan of human beings. While the secular realm indicates concerns about temporal things, the non-secular realm addresses both divine and eternal things.

John gained an incredible education, worked as a Church administrator, and maintained relationships with some of the most influential historical figures of the twelfth century (Durant 951). John’s studies in France exposed him to the teachings of masters Peter Abelard, Alberic of Paris, Robert of Melun, and William of Conches (Weijers 114). The well-rounded education served John while he worked as a Church administrator (Southern 209). John performed roles within the Church as a representative of Archbishop Theobald in the Papal Curia, as a clerk for the Archbishops of Canterbury,

¹ The name “John of Salisbury” will be shortened to “John” throughout the remainder of this dissertation.
and as Bishop of Chartres. He also acted as a rhetorician by creating rhetorical texts, such as The *Metalogicon*, and by synthesizing Aristotelian dialectics with Ciceronian rhetoric to produce a form of medieval rhetorical education that stressed praxis (theory-informed actions) that contributed to the common good of society. The historical moment of the High Middle Ages shaped John’s perspective about the relationship between rhetoric and education, which he would later articulate in The *Metalogicon*.

The relationship between John’s biography and his approach to rhetorical education is studied following the presuppositions of Aristotle, who claimed in The *Metaphysics* that experiences accrue to people from memory, which shapes them during their lives (11). Aristotle suggested that people change over the course of their lives as they seek to reach their natural ends by performing their roles. Working from that presupposition, this chapter seeks to address the following question: how might John of Salisbury’s life experiences during the Middle Ages affect his approach to rhetoric?

John’s historical moment of the High Middle Ages is analyzed at both the macro and the micro level. First, the dominant philosophical presuppositions informing the High Middle Ages, both the secular and the non-secular realms of society, are examined. Second, key historical events such as the Reign of Anarchy, the Investiture Controversy, the Second Crusade, and the King Henry II-Thomas Becket Dispute are explored. Third, John’s educational experiences are discussed, including some of his significant teachers. Fourth, John’s career in the Church, ranging from his service as secretary to the Archbishops of Canterbury to the final years as Bishop of Chartres, is profiled. Fifth, John’s writings are identified and explicated.
The High Middle Ages

The period that historians call the Middle Ages lacks both definitive starting and end points. Scholars disagree about when precisely the Middle Ages began or when the Middle Ages concluded. Josef Pieper asserted that the Middle Ages began in the year 529. In 529, the Christian Emperor Justinian closed the Platonic Academy of Athens and St. Benedict founded the monastery at Monte Cassino. The monastery became the center of education (17). Historians also divide the Middle Ages into three eras: the Early Middle Ages, the High Middle Ages, and the Late Middle Ages.

David C. Lindberg suggested the Early Middle Ages began in 400 and concluded in 1000 (155). In Medieval History: The Life and Death of a Civilization, Norman F. Cantor noted that the High Middle Ages, the period between 1050 and 1325, are often viewed as the real Middle Ages. The Early Middle Ages could be conceived as immature or promising, while the following stage, the Late Middle Ages, might be critiqued as declining and decadent (259). Steven Ozment classified the Late Middle Ages (1300-1500) as a time of crises featuring the Black Death, the Hundred Years War between England and France, and the rise of European nation-states (8). This dissertation assumes the Middle Ages began in 400 and concluded in 1500 and shares Cantor’s timeline of the High Middle Ages (1050-1324).

John entered a world that held different cultural assumptions from the contemporary postmodern philosophical movement of the early twenty-first century. Numerous historical events shaped medieval beliefs and values, which then informed John’s perspective. The High Middle Ages represented an epoch beginning with the Crusades, a series of holy wars between Christian armies and Muslim armies located in
the Middle East, and concluding shortly before the Black Death, a widespread bubonic
plague that claimed millions of lives across the European and Asian continents. The
High Middle Ages, a period of transformation, reintroduced Europeans not only to luxury
goods from the East, such as silks, but also brought about a rediscovery of knowledge,
including Aristotle’s philosophy, which was translated into Latin.

David C. Lindberg asserted that Muslim scholars from the twelfth century,
especially by Avicenna (Ibn Sina) and Averroes (Ibn Rushd), composed commentaries
and translations of Aristotle’s logical, physical, and metaphysical texts. Aristotle’s
philosophical system found particular resonance in the urban schools (217). Norman F.
Cantor described the twelfth century as an international movement of creativity lacking
overt nationalism or division caused by political borders (306). As Greek philosophy
flowed across Asia Minor, Europe, and Northern Africa, these ideas challenged
preexisting cultural assumptions, leading to a synthesis of ancient philosophy with
medieval philosophy.

During the High Middle Ages, many people operating from religious frameworks
assumed that the purpose of the temporal world was to prepare the soul for eternal life
with God. John privileged the afterlife in accordance with Catholicism. He believed that
one’s soul had three options of residence for all of eternity: Heaven (the City of God),
Purgatory (a middle space where souls had to be cleansed of their sins before entering
Paradise), and Hell (the final resting place of the damned). John’s ideas developed from
the major religious presuppositions that textured medieval thought.
Medieval Religious Assumptions

Four major religious movements competed for souls and affected political action during the Middle Ages: Roman Catholicism, Greek Orthodox Christianity, Islam, and Judaism. All four religions included similar tenets of beliefs. The practices of the faithful shaped the cultural landscape of the Middle Ages. Judaism, the oldest of the four religions, may be understood as the roots of the other religions.

Christian communities, by the year 700, had spread throughout the known world, ranging from Central Asia to Ireland (Brown 41). Greek Orthodox Christianity and Roman Catholicism shared a common dogma, but then diverged over languages (Greek liturgy versus Latin liturgy) and spheres of influence (Constantinople versus Rome as the primary bishopric). Islam extended the arguments of the other three religions, but reached different conclusions. Muslims accepted the narratives of the Old Testament as true, but Muslims believed Jesus was simply an important prophet and not the Messiah.

Roman Catholicism developed an identity from the Latin liturgy practiced in the former part of the Western Roman Empire. Greek Orthodox Christianity represented the Greek liturgy throughout the lands of the Eastern Roman Empire, whose rulers continued to refer to themselves as Romans. The Bishop of Rome (later called the Pope, meaning “Father,” or the Pontifex Maximus, the “Highest Priest,”) established religious doctrine by claiming a spiritual connection to St. Peter, one of Apostles of Jesus. St. Clement I, the first Apostolic Father, assisted St. Peter, eventually becoming the Bishop of Rome. As one of the earliest Bishops of Rome, St. Clement’s practices of Catholicism blended themes from the Old Testament, New Testament, and Hellenistic philosophy (Richardson 37).
During the Middle Ages, Catholicism could be distinguished from the Greek Orthodox Faith far more easily than during the first century. By citing the passages of Mathew 16: 13-19, Medieval Catholics regarded the pope as God’s chosen spiritual leader on earth. John would have read this section from St. Jerome’s The Nova Vulgata, under the title *Evangelium Secundum Matthaeum*. This portion is quoted in full because these lines announced the Catholic belief that St. Peter functioned as the first pope\(^2\). As St. Matthew recalled:

Jesus entered into another part of Caesareae Philippi and He asked his disciples saying, ‘Who do the people say is the Son of man?’ The men said, ‘Some say John the Baptist, others say Elijah, others say truly Jeremiah, or one of the prophets.’ He said to them, ‘Who do you say I am?’ Simon Peter, responding, said, ‘You are the Christ, Son of the living God.’ Jesus, responding, said to him, ‘Simon Bariona, blessed are you because flesh and blood do not reveal this to you, but my Father who is in heaven.’ And I say unto you, ‘You are Peter, and upon this rock I shall build my Church.’ (Translation mine)

Peter had been called Simon until Jesus changed Simon’s name to the Aramaic *Cephas*, meaning “stone.” The Aramaic *cephas* translates to the Greek *petros*, a masculine form of the feminine noun *πέτρα, πέτρας*, meaning “rock” (Crosby and Schaeffer 24). Later, Jesus granted Peter the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven with the power and responsibility to forgive the sins. Medieval Catholics interpreted these passages as the central lines of

---

Scripture indicating that the pope should have primacy over all the other bishops throughout Christendom.

Greek Orthodox Christianity shared many religious tenets of Roman Catholicism. The religious leaders from the two branches of Christianity disagreed about the role of the Bishop of Rome. The Catholic Church positioned the pope as the titular head of Christianity, while the Greek Orthodox Church endorsed the Archbishop of Constantinople should lead all of Christendom. While the Catholic Church cited Scripture to support the primacy of the Papacy, the Eastern Orthodox Church placed more emphasis on historical precedent to lay claim to prestige.

Constantine the Great moved the capitol of the Roman Empire from Rome to Byzantium, which Constantine renamed “Constantinople,” meaning “Constantine’s City,” in 324. Constantinople became a “New Rome” as the ruling city of the empire, which experienced a population boom: almost half a million people lived in the city by the year 500 (Brown 57). If Constantine the Great preferred Constantinople, then Rome declined to the status secondary consideration. Rome fell into further disrepair following a succession of attacks by armies led by Goths, Lombard, Vandals, and Muslims over the next 600 years. Because Constantinople shined as the primary city of the Roman Empire, the Archbishop of Constantinople claimed leadership of all Christians.

Islam emerged as the third powerful stream of faith from the Saudi Arabian peninsula during the sixth century. Founded by the Prophet Mohammed, Islam included presuppositions from both Judaism and Christianity. Mohammad connected religion and warfare into a spiritual movement that conquered people in the lands that had once been part of the Persian Empire and the Eastern Roman Empire. The religion flourished in
these lands, in part, because Islamic rulers did not privilege one of the various sects of Christianity over another sect. These Islamic leaders held Roman Catholicism, the Greek Orthodox Faith, and all the heretical sects of Christianity in the same esteem.

The Islamic rulers gave their newly-conquered subjects two choices: either convert to Islam or pay a tax not to convert to Islam. Stephen O’Shea asserted that as Muslim armies conquered lands in the Middle East and Egypt, Christians could worship freely provided that they paid taxes. For monophysites (a group of Christians who believed Jesus had a divine nature without any human nature) and other heretical Christian sects, Islam extended tolerance not granted by Greek Orthodox or Roman Catholicism (52). Thus, Nestorians, Arians, Manicheans, and any other heretical sect of Christians could practice their religion as long as they paid the necessary taxes to their Islamic rulers.

The last major religion, Judaism, was the oldest but often most marginalized faith of the Middle Ages. Judaism was dominated throughout the lands by Roman Catholicism, Greek Orthodox Christianity, and Islam. In 1290, King Edward I signed the Edict of Expulsion, forcibly removing Jews from England, a law that lasted until 1656 (Holmes). This law announced the prevalence of Anti-Semitism during the Middle Ages. Jews often had greater opportunities in Muslim lands. Convivencia, living together, occurred in Spain where Muslims, Christians, and Jews lived cooperatively within Islamic cities. Within these communities, people of different faith perspectives shared Greco-Roman philosophy and other ideas (O’Shea 79). The cosmopolitan atmosphere of Islamic Spain created a climate of scholarship and intellectual development that fostered
the translation of philosophical texts, like Aristotelian dialectics, from Greek and Arabic into Latin.

The Middle Ages featured four major religious movements. Catholicism functioned as the main religious practice in Western Europe. Greek Orthodox Christianity extended a sphere of influence from Constantinople to Eastern Europe and lands of near the Middle East. Islam spread throughout much of the former territory of the Eastern Roman Empire, flowing down the Middle East across Northern Africa and settling in Spain. Judaism was observed where the other three major religions were practiced. The religious presuppositions of the Middle Ages directly informed political theory and political practices.

**Medieval Political Assumptions**

Religious beliefs directly informed medieval political assumptions. People of the Middle Ages believed that the Church and the State should interact within a cooperative relationship. Medieval Catholics imagined the State as a human body. If the State were a body, then the Church acted as the body’s soul.

Within a Catholic religious framework, the human body functioned as a synecdoche to understand both the secular hierarchy of government and the universe during the High Middle Ages. In The *Poetics*, Aristotle implicitly used synecdoche when describing metaphors that involve transference from genus to species or species to genus, a part that is representative of a greater whole (251). By comprehending enough information of the particular thing, one could gain insight about a greater reality. The High Middle Ages continued Antiquity’s presupposition that human beings lived in an organic world.
People living during the High Middle Ages understood society through the image of the human body, a synecdoche explaining both the political reality of the here and now and the spiritual assumptions of the hereafter. To better understand the relationship between the human being and society, Catholics had to grasp the relationship between the human being and God. God created human beings in His image. Adam and Eve were the first of God’s children, and their transgression against God’s law led to their removal from Eden and they suffered a subsequent death in which no soul could enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Jesus, the Son of God, entered the world through the womb of the Virgin Mary as a helpless infant, an event called the Incarnation. Having lived as a man, Jesus suffered, died, and was buried as a man.

According to popular interpretation during the Middle Ages, Jesus descended into Hell, and then freed all of the righteous souls. The actions of Jesus in Hell are called the harrowing of Hell (Warren). On the third day following his burial, Jesus rose again in fulfillment of the Scriptures and spent a number of days communicating with his disciples so that His message may be spread throughout every land. This quick summation of Jewish and Christian religious beliefs addresses the relationship between God and mankind. Because Adam and Eve were made in God’s image, shared belief held by both Jews and Christians, and since God sent His only Son as a sacrifice to redeem mankind of sin, a Christian presupposition, the human body can be understood as a synecdoche of God.

If the human body represents a synecdoche of God, then the human body can also be a synecdoche of the political structure of the Middle Ages. Imagine the figure of a person, having a head, body, limbs, hands, feet, and also a soul. These parts cooperated
in a spirit of reciprocity allowing the person to flourish in God’s world. In the head, thought and decision-making occurred, which compelled the body to act. Each anatomical part moved in unison with other body parts for the common good of the whole body. The soul bent the will toward God because the soul naturally sought the good, and God is the highest Good.

This presupposition about body parts fulfilling necessary roles was informed by The Bible specifically verses 14-26 in St. Paul’s First Letter to the Corinthians\(^3\). As St. Paul claimed:

For the body is not one member but many. If the foot were to say ‘I am not a hand, I am not part of the body,’ this is not a reason for the foot not to be part of the body. And if the ear were to say ‘I am not an eye, I am not part of the body,’ this is not a reason for the ear not to be part of the body. If the entire body were an eye, where would hearing be? If the whole body were hearing, where would smelling be? (Translation mine)

St. Paul created an imaginative discussion among the different body parts. The fundament argument from St. Paul rested on the assumption that each part was necessary for the survival of the entire body. St. Paul wrote that God assigned each part a place and a vital role for the body. As St. Paul continued:

---

\(^3\)“Nam et corpus non est unum membrum sed multa. Si dixerit pes: “Non sum manus, non sum de corpore”, non ideo non est de corpore; et si dixerit auris: “ Non sum oculus, non sum de corpore ”, non ideo non est de corpore. Si totum corpus oculus est, ubi auditus? Si totum auditus, ubi odoratus? Nunc autem posuit Deus membra, unumquodque eorum in corpore, sicut voluit. Quod si essent omnia unum membrum, ubi corpus? Nunc autem multa quidem membra, unum autem corpus. Non potest dicere oculus manu: “Non es mihi necessaria”; aut iterum caput pedibus: “ Non estis mihi necessarit!” Sed multo magis, quae videntur membra corporis infirmiora esse, necessaria sunt; et, quae putamus ignobiliora membra esse corporis, his honorem abundantiorem circumdamus; et, quae inhonesta sunt nostra, abundantiorem honestatem habent, honesta autem nostra nullius egent. Sed Deus temperavit corpus, ei, cui dearet, abundantiorem tribuendo honorem, ut non sit schisma in corpore, sed idipsnum pro invicem sollicita sint membra. Et sive patitur unum membrum, compatiantur omnia membra; sive glorificatur unum membrum, congaudent omnia membra” (Epistula I ad Corinthios).
God placed the parts, each member, in the body as He wished. But if all parts were one member, then where would the body be? Now there are many members, but one body. The eye is not able to say to the hand, ‘You are not necessary for me!’ nor for the head to say to the foot ‘You are not necessary for me!’ But the many parts that seem inferior are necessary parts. And those parts of the body which are considered less worthy, we surround with many honors. And our less presentable parts are treated with greater honor, but our more presentable parts do not need this. (Translation mine)

St. Paul noted that human beings had a natural inclination to favor some body parts over other body parts. The declamations of the angry body parts reached absurdity when some parts called other parts unnecessary. St. Paul’s allegorical message was interpreted by medieval philosophers to reflect the absurdity that members from one class of society did not need members from other classes of society. St. Paul’s writings indicated that God required that all parts work cooperatively for the health of the entire body. As St. Paul concluded:

But God has tempered the body as to grant greater honor to a part lacking honor, so that there might be no division in the body, but that those members may have the same care for one another. And if one member were to suffer, then all parts should suffer together; if one member were to be glorified, then all members should share in this joy. (Translation mine)

This passage has been quoted at length to explain that the medieval presuppositions about politics had been grounded in religious doctrine. Each member of society had been religiously sanctioned to perform their roles for the health of the entire society.
St. Paul’s *First Letter to the Corinthians* discussion about party parts provided a religious framework for justifying the assigned roles of medieval society, as represented by the three estates. The three estates included those who fought, those who worked, and those who prayed. The Latin nouns for each category were *bellatores*, *laboratores*, and *oratores*. The *bellatores*, the nobility, protected the other estates. The *laboratores*, the peasants, fed all three estates. Finally, the *oratores* represented the Church, the spiritual leaders and religious practitioners of the three estates (Le Goff 131).

These estates fit within different parts of the body politic. The head of the body signified the king or emperor; the king reigned over the rest of the people as the head ruled the entire body. The arms and hands carrying weapons represented the nobility. In exchange for land, the nobles protected the king. The lowest extremities, the feet, corresponded to the peasants. The feet established contact with the land, allowing the body to move. The peasants’ labored in harmony with the cycle of agriculture: they produced food to maintain the health of society and feed the armies. The *oratores*, the Church, acted as the soul of the body. The soul inclined the body toward God because the goal of the mortal life was to gain access to eternal life in the Kingdom of Heaven.

The kingdom became a synecdoche of Heaven’s political structure. The Kingdom of Heaven, a synonymous phrase of St. Augustine for *The City of God*, presupposed that God was the King and that all the angels and saints and faithful souls dwelt together as a hierarchy within the Kingdom of Heaven. St. Augustine identified Jesus as the founder of the City of God (1116). These beliefs informed political assumptions of medieval society. If one were born a king, then one should function as a head of the body politic. If one were born to wield a sword, then that man must act as the armed hand of the body
Finally, if one were born a peasant like most people of the Middle Ages, then those people must raise food for the common good.

Most people often died in the same station into which they were born. People accepted this belief because they assumed that God had ordained their lot in life. Recall the body politic analogy. Why would a foot want to become a head or an arm? What duties of the head could the foot perform? The foot could only fulfill the role of the foot. The foot could only achieve happiness by completing its assigned role.

Human beings performed their assigned roles as a means of enacting God’s will. Peasants did not work in the soil to become kings. Kings did not perform manual labor; royalty did not work in the soil as one of the common people. Medieval people lived in a social structure designed by God. Yet, social mobility became a feature of medieval society tied to the issue of education (Lindberg 203). Educated people were expected to contribute to the common good of society.

Medieval assumptions about religion and politics led to conflicts about sphere of influences of Church and State. If all sections of society (as body parts) performed their assigned roles, then the entire society flourished (as a healthy body). If the body parts failed to cooperate, then the entire body risked illness. The Investiture Controversy represented a significant crisis to the health of the body politic of Western Europe.

**The Investiture Controversy**

The Investiture Controversy refers to the struggle between Holy Roman Emperors and the popes during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The Holy Roman Empire emerged as a political unit assembled from Frankish kingdoms controlled by the Carolingian family. The Carolingians ruled an empire that contained lands from modern
day France, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, The Czech Republic, Slovenia, Croatia, The Netherlands, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia. First, the relationship between the Carolingians and the popes transitioned from protection to control. Second, the Carolingians began making ecclesiastical appointments, which threatened the power of the Papacy. The popes believed that they alone had the right to make ecclesiastical appointments.

The changing relationship between the Carolingians, the ruling Frankish families, and the Papacy functioned as the first cause of the Investiture Controversy. The Carolingians protected popes from Lombards, a barbarian tribe that settled in Northern Italy. Desmond O’Grady suggested that the Franks protected the Papacy against the Lombards, establishing a relationship of dependence. Frankish rulers provided political protection, while popes and ecclesiastical officials offered spiritual guidance (180). In exchange for delivering the Papacy from the hands of the Lombards, the Carolingians assumed the role of protectors of the Papacy. During the Christmas mass in 800, Pope Leo III crowned Charlemagne as emperor, an unexpected event that had far reaching implications for the affiliation between the Holy Roman Empire and the Papacy. As Luitpold Wallach explains, “Charlemagne was, first of all, the divinely appointed defender and protector (defensor et rector) of the Church. He was the rector morum, who prudently supervised the moral life of his subjects” (13).

Charlemagne did not appreciate that the pope symbolically crowned him as emperor, meaning that the pope had the power to select emperors. Charlemagne expanded the Frankish sphere of influence after decades of war; the armies of Charlemagne were never defeated. After years of bloody conflict against the Slavs, the
Avars, the Saxons, and other tribes throughout Italy, Charlemagne dominated the battlefield. Consequently, Charlemagne crowned his own successor without any participation by the pope. Charlemagne wanted the Papacy to provide non-secular assistance to the Franks.

The second cause of the investiture controversy was that the Carolingian rulers believed that they, as political rulers, had the right to appoint bishops and other ecclesiastical offices. When a person became bishop, he received specific vestments tied to the office; therefore, he was invested. Following the actions of Charlemagne, the Carolingians assumed that they could select ecclesiastical positions, while the popes believed that the Papacy alone had the right to select bishops. The investiture controversy conflated two spheres of influence: the secular world of the state and the non-secular world of the Church. Although Catholicism grounded both the Church and the state, Church members recognized that they belonged to both secular and non-secular cultures. John was born into a culture of conflict between non-secular and secular leaders.

Religious beliefs informed political theories, such as the cooperative relationship between the Church and State. The human body functioned as a synecdoche of medieval society. The king, as the head, ruled the body, while the Church attended to the soul of the body. The Investiture Controversy emerged as a crisis about the relationship between secular and non-secular power structures. John entered a world in which religion had a direct impact on politics and politics took on religious sanction. John found himself embroiled in controversies that emerged in the liminal spaces between the secular and non-secular realms.
Portrait of John’s Early Life

John’s birth to the beginning of his career in the Church represented the time of John’s early life. Although John was born in England, he traveled to France to receive an education in the liberal arts, especially the trivium. The trivium included grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric. John used the cultural wisdom gained from his education to inform his practices as a Church administrator.

Specific details surrounding John’s birth remain unknown today. Astrik L. Gabriel proposes that John was born in Old Salisbury, England in an area called “Old Sarum” around 1115-1120. John’s family might not have been noble, but they were not as lowly as John suggested (xii). Clement C.J. Webb agreed that John’s early life lacks many details (4). Since no scholars can locate John’s birth record, John likely was born into the peasantry.

John Herman Randall, Jr. described medieval society as a hierarchy, in which God places people at each level who are responsible for specific duties and enjoy particular rights (58). Under most circumstances, people died in the same station into which they were born. John, however, lived a world where education could lead to social mobility. The liberal arts, a well-rounded education, provided wisdom for people to inform their practices within their societal roles.

John witnessed educational shifts during the rise of the scholastic movement. Randall claimed that scholasticism emerged within the intellectual environment of the University of Paris, the foremost university that developed in towns of the twelfth century to provide educational alternatives to monastic schools (93). Scholasticism, a philosophical-theological movement that will be addressed in chapter two, promoted
specialized education tailored for specific careers. Charles G. Nauert asserted that humanists disliked the specialized focus of the scholastic educational system (9). John favored the integrated approach to education situated within the liberal arts.

John’s early life remains a point of conjecture because detailed records about John no longer exist. Since John was probably born into the peasantry, he would not have access to a rigorous education in England. John’s early life consisted of a minimal education most likely grounded in grammar. John left his home in England to pursue educational opportunities in France where he would study the *trivium*.

After leaving his native homeland of England, John traveled to France to receive a liberal arts education. Christopher Brooke described John as a student, scholar, Church administrator, and bishop. John’s career led him from Salisbury to Paris, Canterbury, Rome, and finally Chartres (1). John may have been as young as a teenager when he embarked upon his continental education. Although John likely received some lessons in grammar as a child in England, he received a rigorous education in France. John entered into academic conversations through studies in the *trivium*.

The word *trivium* derives from two Latin words *tri* meaning “three” and *via* meaning “way,” “road,” or “street” (Collins 438). Educators understood the *trivium* as three pathways to wisdom consisting of grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric. The relationship between grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric will be explained using a grid system. The x-axis identifies the horizontal line. The y-axis indicates the vertical line. The z-axis signifies the third dimension of space within the grid system. Since the study of grammar functions as an entrance point into learning about language, grammar is placed along the x-axis. The study of dialectics is placed along the y-axis because the
goal of dialectics is to promote transcendence to a higher level of consciousness. Rhetoric may be placed along the z-axis because the telos of rhetoric is action. Rhetoric concludes by propelling the audience to move across distance and time.

Grammar formed the basis of the trivium because grammar included not only the definitions of words (the categories of words like nouns and adjectives), but also both oral and written literacy. In Being and Truth, Martin Heidegger suggested that all grammatical concepts about word formation and linguistic structures derive from logic, the theory of thinking as a comprehension of human beings (82). Grammar provides a structure from which human beings may generate discourse. Alcuin of York, like the Ancient Greeks before him, explained grammar as a broad subject of study.

C.J.B. Gaskoin posited that grammar in the High Middle Ages contained elements from Priscian and Donatus to literature and philology (36). James J. Murphy argued that Romans studied grammar in preparation for rhetorical studies, while Christians, such as St. Augustine, claimed that grammar prepared students to study Scripture. Medieval educators recognized grammar as the basic art of the trivium (137). Students entered the liberal arts through studying grammar, which provided ground for understanding language.

Dialectics, though often articulated today as “logic,” included argumentation, rebuttal, refutation, testing of knowledge, proofs, and propositions like thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. Murphy situated Aristotelian dialectics in reasoning tied to opinion, which is close to rhetoric because rhetoric also addresses opinion. Although neither dialectics nor rhetoric may claim their own subject matter, both arts concerned themselves with non-absolute things, such as human variables (143). Dialectics may be
used by speakers for rhetorical effects. Richard McKeon differentiated dialectics from logic by citing Cicero. Cicero divided dialectics into one part concerned about judgments and the other about discovery. Boethius called dialectics concerning judgments “analytic,” while he called dialectics about discovery “topics” (132).

Teachers valued dialectics as an art that helped people test knowledge. Dialecticians argued that their art could lead to transcendence through the movement between theses and antitheses, resulting in syntheses. The continuous upward movement along the y-axis could reveal a greater understanding about the reality. Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, who received an education steeped in Sophistic Dialectics, promoted the study of dialectics. In privileging dialectics over the other two arts of the trivium, dialecticians threatened the integrated approach of the liberal arts.

Dialecticians had positioned their art as the epitome of the trivium since Socrates. In Book VII of the Republic, Plato spoke through his interlocutor, his teacher Socrates, in the “ Allegory of the Cave” to suggest that mankind lives in shadow preventing people from seeing the truth of the Ideal Forms (1132). The Forms were ethereal entities that provided form for material objects in the natural world. According to Plato, a thing in the world was but a representation deriving from an Ideal Form.

In Being and Truth, Martin Heidegger suggested that Plato’s ideal Forms were directly tied to vision. Etymologically, ideas share a connection with the eye because sight allows human beings to grasp ideas. Heidegger explained that the Ancient Greeks, from Parmenides and Socrates onward, conceived of essence (ousias) as presence, and that eidos referred to what a thing looks like. Idea, another form of eidos, is the appearance or seeing of a thing (119). The Platonic project connects philosophy and
ontology as to vision; the philosopher kings should rule because they can see being more clearly. Transcendence defines the quest to move from the material world to the realm of the Ideal Forms. Although Plato presumed that the physical world represented the Ideal Forms, human beings could attain a higher level of consciousness through dialectics.

By means of discourse, Plato could hope to reach transcendence. If grammar operates along the x-axis, then dialectics could be situated along the y-axis. Plato, however, distrusted language because words represented ideas. Aristotle, in *De Interpretatione*, agreed with his teacher’s argument. For Aristotle, spoken words functioned as signs of ideas, while written words acted as signs of spoken words (25).

The irony of Aristotle’s semiotic approach was tied to the issue of writing. Plato distrusted writing as well because writing would weaken the faculty of memory. Neither oral nor written communication, according to Plato, permitted human beings to comprehend absolute Truth. Yet, Plato practiced dialogic dialectics as a means of achieving transcendence.

Rhetoric represented the final art of the *trivium*. Rhetoric acted as the capstone of the *trivium* because rhetoric concluded in action. Alcuin of York recognized rhetoric as both an oral and a written form of persuasion. C.J.B. Gaskoin argued that both prose and verse composition were situated within rhetoric, and the practice of law was considered important as well (36). Rhetoric allows human beings to think in images, apply language to define these images, and then share these ideas to other people using discourse as persuasion to act in the community. Rhetoric, when coupled with reflective thinking, ended in praxis, theory-informed action.
The **trivium** functioned as the broadest form of medieval education. The arts of grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric comprised the *trivium*. After students completed studying the *trivium*, they could take additional subjects like mathematics, medicine, theology, and so forth. Medieval educators promoted an integrated approach to learning where students would carry across the ideas from one art into another art. John experienced an integrated approach to education, which he preferred to specialized education, a growing educational trend during his lifetime.

As a student, John witnessed the shift of cultural expectations about education that began favoring specialization over general knowledge. Rodney Thomson asserted that John was a participant in the scholastic educational model that promoted specialization. John, however, preferred the well-rounded education of the liberal arts (125). While studying in France, John learned grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric from masters who were a veritable who’s who of medieval philosophy.

W.J. Millor commented that John pursued studies in France following the death of King Henry I. For two years, he studied dialectics under Peter Abelard, Master Alberic, and Robert of Melun; for the next three years, he learned grammar from William of Conches at Chartres. He also studied rhetoric and some of the *quadrivium* at Chartres as well (xvi). John also studied rhetoric from Theirry of Chartres. While John never acted as a disciple of any of these teachers, John used their ideas to inform his practices. John demonstrated a major benefit of the liberal arts, the ability to move theory into action when confronting existence.

As the basis of the liberal arts, the *trivium* represented education that moved ideas into ethical action by means of discourse. John understood the *trivium* as the verbal arts.
Grammar offered interpretation of phenomena, things in the world; dialectics tested knowledge; rhetoric provided people a means of persuasion that ended in action. Cantor contended that John assumed that the purpose of schools should be to maintain tradition and to teach values; to counter the intellectual, financial, and political power that may corrupt uneducated people; to teach how to live rightly (324). When the *trivium* was put into the service of the Church, educated people could make positive contributions to God’s world.

John became concerned about the narrow focus of education. Lindberg asserted that the curriculum of the twelfth century emphasized logic (dialectics) at the expense of grammar. Specialized study replaced a general, well-rounded education. Students presupposed practical application of their knowledge for careers as clerks, doctors, lawyers, or other professions (224). John praised the values of the liberal arts, especially the *trivium*, because John appreciated the integrated approach to education that could be used for rhetorical effects to enact ethical actions.

John studied Latin grammar in far greater depth in France than during his early childhood in England. The Latin language formed a cultural link between England and France. Hans Liebschütz stated that reading connects the present to the past. In the Middle Ages, the Latin language functioned as that cultural bridge (64). The primacy of the Latin can be traced to the rise of the Latin liturgy of the Catholic Church. Jeffrey Walker recalled that students, in the Hellenistic kingdoms, pursued careers in the imperial bureaucracy.

The origins of Hellenistic bureaucracies derived from Alexander’s successors through the Roman Empire to the Byzantine Empire (4). The Hellenistic world,
particularly in the East from the days of Alexander the Great to the Byzantine Empire, featured a vibrant culture whose philosophy was expressed in the Greek language. The Latin language called people into a tradition originating with Rome, and then extending over centuries into the contemporary Catholic Church, the keepers of Roman heritage. Without fluency in the dominant language, one would be barred from entering into the ongoing conversation of life.

Medieval grammar was far more expansive than contemporary forms of grammar. John studied a version of grammar that included vocabulary, syntax, and rules of written word usage. David C. Lindberg asserted that William of Conches acknowledged that God created everything in the world. Studying the physical world allowed people to appreciate God’s work. Searching for secondary causes of the world does not seek to deny the existence of God, but affirm His goodness (213). Medieval educators assumed that grammar could inform interpretation of the world in an attempt to understand God. John positioned grammar as a tool offering a systematic approach to reading the world as God’s book. Human beings, having acquired literacy, could engage in discourse to share wisdom that could be placed into the service of God.

William of Conches taught John as a master of grammar. The word “master” derives from the Latin word *magister*, meaning “teacher,” “master,” or “rabbi” (Collins 424). William Turner noted that William of Conches also tutored Henry Plantagenet, the future King Henry II of England (“William of Conches”). William of Conches also explained rhetoric in grammatical terms to John. William of Conches examined the underlying structure of language, and then studied the role of language by interpreting phenomena, including literature, in the world. William of Conches defined eloquence as
the ability to produce discourse about known things using well-turned phrases and sentences. Both eloquence and philosophy supported the intellectual goals of the liberal arts (Liebschütz 85). From William of Conches, John presupposed that rhetoric and philosophy formed a cooperative relationship in which speech connected thoughts and actions. In addition to learning grammar, John studied dialectics.

While studying at the Mont Sainte-Geneviève near Paris, France, John heard the lectures of Abelard. Durant contended that students from over a dozen countries listened to Abelard’s lectures; Abelard’s class rosters were so large that he acquired both significant income and international notoriety (935). In The Metalogicon, John called Abelard the Peripatetic from Pallet because John argued that alone really understood the dialectical project of Aristotle (22).

John respected Abelard’s expertise of Aristotelian dialectics. Michael Wilks noted that John called Abelard as the greatest dialectician of the era (268). Although John enjoyed the lectures of Abelard, John dismissed Abelard’s fundamental presupposition that dialectics alone could provide a proper education. Brian D. FitzGerald cautioned that elevating dialectics prevented people from reaching wisdom because they ignored the relationship among the other subjects (581). While in France, John studied dialectics from other masters.

Robert of Melun represented a second significant teacher of dialectics for John. Both John and Thomas Becket also studied philosophy and theology with Robert (Gietman). Robert himself studied under Peter Abelard and Hugh of Saint Victor. Hugh of Saint Victor’s The Didascalicon, a defense of the liberal arts, influenced John’s The Metalogicon. Hugh of Saint Victor synthesized the method of Scholasticism with
Catholicism, which differentiated him from the actions of Abelard, who tried to subordinate theology to dialectics (Myers). Hugh of Saint Victor promoted the liberal arts, while Peter Abelard privileged dialectics, an educational shift leading to specialized education characteristic of scholasticism. John sided with Hugh of Saint Victor’s approach of an integrated education over Abelard’s elevation of dialectics. John studied rhetoric as well as grammar and dialectics.

Although John studied rhetoric, he did not recall much enthusiasm about his rhetoric teachers in The Metalogicon. Murphy noted that John referred to Thierry of Chartres as an assiduous investigator of rhetoric. Although Thierry of Chartres was John’s first rhetoric teacher, John claimed that Peter Helias taught rhetoric more clearly. Ironically, Peter Helias instructed John in grammar (117). Murphy suggested a pattern of John’s rhetorical lessons: John admitted to learning more about rhetoric from grammarians than rhetoricians.

Rhetoric, the pinnacle of the trivium, represented an advanced form of study for people seeking administrative careers. Jeffery Walker posited that students who desired to enter the professional ranks entered rhetorical education, which often involved a great deal of travel to larger cities that had more teachers available. The ages of students might range from 15 to 20, and the length of study varied (3). While Walker studied an educational system from Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome, he noted that rhetoric functioned as the conclusive art of the trivium. Students who learned rhetoric often entered careers in law or politics.

While studying the trivium in France, John interacted with some of the most influential thinkers during the High Middle Ages. John learned grammar from William...
of Conches, dialectics from Abelard and Robert of Melun, and rhetoric from Theirry of Chartres and Peter Helias. John’s education prepared him for a career in the Church. As a cleric, John would be responsible for maintaining the flow of information from the Archbishop of Canterbury throughout the hierarchy of the Church in England. John would read and write letters on his own behalf and on behalf of the Archbishop of Canterbury and also enact diplomatic missions in service of the Church and the state.

John entered his ecclesiastical post following a series of civil wars in England called The Reign of Anarchy.

The Reign of Anarchy

Historians refer to the Reign of Anarchy as an historical period from 1135 to 1153 in England, in which two political factions fought a civil war over the English throne. The seeds of this strife were sewn when King Henry I’s son and heir, William, died when the White Ship, the vessel carrying him from France to England, caught fire and sank in the English Channel (Phillips 34). Due to his son’s death, King Henry I, the fourth son of William the Conqueror, named another member of his household as heir; King Henry I chose his daughter Matilda. The barons and other nobles initially pledged their loyalty to Matilda, so there should have been a smooth transition of power following the king’s death. On 1135, King Henry I died suddenly after feasting on eels. Scholars cannot agree if his food had been poisoned or not, but his death elevated Matilda to become Queen of England.

Stephen of Blois, Queen Matilda’s cousin and a grandson of William the Conqueror, refused to pledge fealty to the new queen and declared himself the King of England. Because both King Stephen and Queen Matilda disputed the throne, they began
a civil war that would last over two decades. Not only did the nobility choose sides in the conflict, but so too did members of the clergy. Although Archbishop Theobald initially supported King Stephen, the archbishop eventually sided with Queen Matilda. The conflict consumed much of England and Northern France as both claimants possessed lands in England and in France.

During the Reign of Anarchy, John gained the position of secretary for the Archbishop of Canterbury, the most important religious post in England. The Archbishop of Canterbury led all the other English bishops and answered only to the pope. John served two archbishops: Theobald of Bec and later Thomas Becket. John, as secretary, practiced rhetoric by creating correspondence, letter writing assumed to have rhetorical effects, and composing both poetry and prose.

While serving Archbishop Theobald, John first experienced a political conflict between Church and State. Archbishop Theobald became disillusioned over the prolonged civil war, and then refused to crown King Stephen’s son, Eustace, in 1152 as successor. Archbishop Theobald fled England to France to join Matilda’s court. In 1153, Archbishop Theobald reconciled King Stephen with Queen Matilda with the Treaty of Wallingford, which ended the civil war by naming Matilda’s son Henry of Anjou as the successor of Stephen (Chibnall 86; Burton). Henry of Anjou would later rule both English and French lands for a reign of 34 years (1154-1189) as King Henry II of England.

Thomas Becket became the Archbishop of Canterbury following the death of Theobald. While Becket served Theobald as a clerk, he also worked with John. In 1154, Theobald ordained Becket as a deacon, and favored Becket for skilled work and granted
Becket the Archdeanory of Canterbury, a religious post. King Henry II selected Becket, called “Thomas of London,” as chancellor at the age of 36 (Thurston). Although Becket was 12 years older than King Henry II, the two men became great friends who hunted together, shared council, and traveled with the army (Thurston). King Henry II chose Becket as Archbishop of Canterbury following the death of Theobald on Sunday, June 3, 1162. John maintained his position as secretary under Archbishop Becket.

While serving both Theobald and Becket, John witnessed conflicts between Church and State. During the Reign of Anarchy, two political factions fought to rule England. Not only did the nobility take sides during the conflict, but clergy members also entered into the struggle. When John was sent to the Papal Curia as a diplomat on behalf of the English Church, he learned about the contemporary battles of the Second Crusade.

The Second Crusade

The Second Crusade (1147-1149) signified the warfare enacted by Christian armies seeking to regain the lost lands of Edessa. The word “crusade” derives from the French word croiserie, referring to the cross emblem worn on the outer garments of those warriors (Bréhier). The call for the Second Crusade began with the preaching of St. Bernard of Clairvaux. The two key figures of the Second Crusade were King Louis VII of France and Emperor Conrad III of the Holy Roman Empire. Each leader had different reasons for undertaking this adventure: King Louis VII used the opportunity to establish his reputation and legitimize his dynasty, while Emperor Conrad III sought to resolve domestic trouble and expand German political influence (Tyerman 294). The rulers
assumed that the combined might of their armies would allow the Christians to retake Edessa. The Second Crusade, however, ended in disaster.

John expressed his disappointment in his *Memoirs of the Papal Court* (The *Historia Pontificalis*). Marjorie Chibnall observed that John provided insight into European political affairs from the perspective of an intelligent observer (xviii). As John recalled, “Besides the misfortunes that befell the Christians through the deceit of the Byzantine Emperor and the forces of the Turks, their army was weakened by the jealousy of princes and the wrangling of priests (54). Instead of contributing to the common goal of the crusade, internal conflicts distracted the leaders of both armies. King Louis VII and Emperor Conrad III amassed their remaining troops and engaged in sieging Damascus, but their armies failed to capture Damascus or retake Edessa.

The Second Crusade failed to achieve the main objective of retaking Edessa. John recorded in his memoir the reactions of members within the Papal Curia. John learned that the Church and State could join together in a military adventure, but that cooperation did not guarantee successful outcomes. In a later diplomatic mission with the Papal Curia, John suffered disgrace from King Henry II.

**John’s Disgrace from King Henry II**

John suffered the disgrace of King Henry II during a subsequent mission with the Papal Curia. The exact series of events causing the disgrace remain open to interpretation. Giles Constable suggested that John suffered disgrace from the king during the years 1156 to 1157. The cause may have been John’s defense of ecclesiastical liberty or by his claim for papal supremacy, which was a significant concern during his lifetime (76). King Henry II received word from an unnamed source that John did not
have absolute loyalty to the king. John experienced the tensions caused by trying to negotiate his obligations between the Church and the State.

John suggested that another English clergyman attending the Papal Curia at the same time had spread rumors to King Henry II. John asserted that he never said anything that should result in suffering disgrace from the king. In a letter, called “Letter 162,” written to Master Geoffrey of St. Edmund during the summer of 1166, John explained his hypothesis of the origins of his disgrace. John stated that he wanted his detractor to make the accusation public because John wanted to defend his actions. Second, John asked that his friends should continue to support him if his innocence were proven (81). In a letter from June of 1166 to his brother Richard, identified as “Letter 169,” John described his disgrace as punishment for sins. John acknowledged that he had been humbled (119). King Henry II never gave John a chance to defend himself. Regardless of this disgrace, John remained an assistant to the Archbishop of Canterbury and continued to perform his duties as secretary.

The episode of disgrace from King Henry II entangled John in political intrigue. Although John was not physically punished by King Henry II, the king never trusted John again. John was a rising star in the English Church, but the king’s disgrace limited John’s career. While John was both highly educated and highly competent, he remained a clerk in the English Church. Later, John experienced another conflict between Church and State: the dispute between King Henry II and Archbishop Thomas Becket.
The King Henry II-Thomas Becket Dispute

The King Henry II-Thomas Becket dispute, a struggle that lasted over a decade, profoundly influenced John both personally and professionally. In performing his role as secretary, John assisted Thomas Becket, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Chibnall 177). John composed letters on behalf of Becket and corresponded with other clergymen. While fulfilling this administrative duty, John composed The Metalogicon.

The dispute between King Henry II and Thomas Becket emerged over the issue of jurisdiction. King Henry II tried to extend the reach of his power by resolving ecclesiastic disputes. Archbishop Becket condemned the king’s actions. King Henry II selected Becket as Archbishop of Canterbury because they had been friends; the king likely assumed that Becket would be grateful for the position and continue to be his ally. King Henry II might have presupposed that Becket would place his loyalty to the king above his loyalty to the pope. R.W. Southern cited John’s complaint that many people assumed that ecclesiastical positions were under the purview of the royal office, and that King Henry II may have encouraged this belief (94). Archbishop Becket exerted a level of independence that threatened King Henry II.

King Henry II argued that clergymen should have trials in secular courts, while Archbishop Becket asserted that clergymen could only be judged in ecclesiastical trials. Archbishop Becket announced that he was loyal to the Church above the State. After the dispute between King Henry II and Archbishop Becket began, both Archbishop Becket and John fled to France into exile. Although they did not live in the same dwelling, Archbishop Becket and John continued their friendship and professional relationship.
John advised Archbishop Becket to reconcile with the king. In a few letters, John expressed misgivings about Becket’s actions and urged Becket to respect the authority of the king (Nederman 29). This advice could be interpreted in a few ways. First, John genuinely believed that Becket should reunite with the king for the health of England. Second, John might have been motivated by egoism instead of altruism. The king might have rewarded John had John convinced the archbishop to resolve the conflict. John might have wanted to demonstrate his usefulness to Archbishop Becket.

After many years, King Henry II and Archbishop Becket resolved their issues peacefully. Both Archbishop Becket and John returned to England to resume their ecclesiastical duties. Charles Phillips recounted that Becket soon angered the king by excommunicating clergymen who opposed Becket during his exile in France. Henry II was reported to have cried, ‘Will no one rid me of this turbulent priest?’ Consequently, four knights led by Sir Reginald FitzUrse killed Becket during a service in Canterbury Cathedral (39). John had been in Canterbury Cathedral the night Archbishop Becket was assassinated. John provided an account of Archbishop Becket’s murder in Canterbury Cathedral. In a letter to John of Canterbury, the Bishop of Poitiers, written in 1171, John reconstructed the murder. As John expressed in vivid details:

One of the knight-assassins flung at him in fury: ‘That you die now! That you should live longer is impossible.’ No martyr seems ever to have been more steadfast in giving to all the martyrs their due respect; and thus, steadfast in speech as in spirit, he replied: ‘And I am prepared to die for my God, to preserve justice and my church’s liberty’ (731).
John himself ran and hid in another room in the cathedral; he could not have witnessed the murder or heard Archbishop Becket’s final words. Yet, John reconstructed the final moments of Archbishop Becket’s life. As John suggested, “They defiled the cathedral and the holy season with the bishop’s blood and with slaughter; but that was not enough. They sliced off the crown of his head, which had been specially dedicated to God by anointing with holy chrism—a fearful thing even to describe” (733). John proposed that the knights stabbed Becket’s brain, and then smeared the remnants of brain over the pavement. John juxtaposed Becket’s murderers with the executioners of Jesus Christ.

Following the martyrdom of Thomas Becket, John began writing *The Life of Saint Thomas*, a work that John never completed.

The King Henry II-Thomas Becket Dispute began as a conflict about jurisdiction, but ended with Becket’s murder. King Henry II claimed power that had been assigned to Archbishop Becket. John, as Archbishop Becket’s secretary, experienced a series of events that culminated in Becket’s martyrdom. King Henry II viewed John as a man more loyal to the Church than to the State. Although John’s career in the English Church stagnated, the King of France selected John as the Bishop of Chartres.

John as the Bishop of Chartres

John concluded his ecclesiastical career as Bishop of Chartres. After Becket’s murder, King Henry II relegated John to lesser positions within the Church. John returned to France to receive his bishopric. C.N.L. Brooke suggested that King Louis VII nominated John in an attempt to gain favor from the pope and all Christians deriving from John’s personal connection with St. Thomas Becket (xlvii). King Louis VII could simultaneously increase his reputation in the Church and humiliate King Henry II.
John performed as the Bishop of Chartres from 1176 to 1180. Information about John’s actions as bishop remains scant. Tilman Struve suggested that John deferred to spiritual power over secular power. Although the secular ruler received the sword to rule from the Church, the ruler’s hand was guided by the Church (314). First, John began a fundraising campaign to build the gothic-style Cathedral of Chartres (Cantor, b. 123). Second, John tried to reform the liturgy. Durant recalled that John stopped the complexity of polyphony from the religious fear that the music was becoming a lure and an end unto itself (899).

In 1177, John attended the treaty ceremony between the English and French kings who pledged, but never fulfilled, a joint crusade to the Holy Land. In 1179, John was among the bishops at the Third Lateran Council (Webb 124). Shortly after attending the Third Lateran Council, John died in 1180. As Keith Sidwell noted, “The cathedral obituary record (Necrologium) calls him a ‘deeply religious man, lit up by the rays of al learning, a shepherd loved by all for his words, his life and his character, cruel only to himself, at all times mortifying his flesh with a hair shirt from neck to feet’” (256). Of all the books that John bequeathed the Cathedral of Chartres, only The Polieraticus represents one of the books actually written by him (125). John was interned at the monastery of St. Josaphat, near Chartres.

After many years serving as clerk in the English Church, John concluded his ecclesiastical career as the Bishop of Chartres. Very little information about John’s performance as bishop exists. During his four years as bishop, John tried to reconstruct his cathedral and participated in the Third Lateran Council. Since John often sided against King Henry II, John has not remained a celebrated figure in English history.
Although historians caution against engaging in “what if?” scenarios, one could imagine John as a successful bishop in England had he placed loyalty to his king above loyalty to his Church.

**John’s Writings**

John created a number of texts during his years as a Church administrator. These compositions include The *Historia Pontificalis*, The *Entheticus Major* and The *Entheticus Minor*, The *Policraticus*, The *Metalogicon*, The *Life of St. Anselm*, and The *Life of St. Thomas Becket*. Also, many letters of personal correspondence written by John from 1153-1180 have been preserved. The *Historia Pontificalis* provided an account of John’s experiences in the Papal Curia during the Second Crusade. The *Entheticus Major* and The *Entheticus Minor*, satirical poems, described life of the English court during the Reign of Anarchy. The *Policraticus* articulated John’s political theories. The *Metalogicon* promoted a liberal arts education over the scholastic emphasis on dialectics. The *Life of St. Anselm* and The *Life of St. Thomas Becket*, although never completed, fit within the genre of Saints Lives. John’s letters of personal correspondence revealed his opinions about many incidents during his career in the Church.

W.J. Millor suggested that the majority of John’s writings were addressed to two specific people: Peter of Celle and Thomas Becket. John sent Peter of Celle The *Historia Pontificalis*, while he sent Thomas Becket The *Policraticus*, The *Metalogicon* and The *Entheticus* (xi). Jan Van Laarhoven noted that John composed The *Entheticus Maior* and The *Entheticus Major* to satirize members of the English court. John used pseudonyms, like calling King Stephen “Hircanus,” and esoteric language to appeal to his limited,
highly erudite reader (56). John expanded passages from The *Entheticus* to create The *Policraticus* and The *Metalogicon*.

After John completed The *Metalogicon* in 1159, he sent his text as a gift to his friend Thomas Becket. The *Metalogicon* contained four books with four corresponding prologues. In the Prologue section before Book I, John articulated his purpose for writing The *Metalogicon*. As John revealed, “This treatise, which I have taken care to divide into four books for the reader’s refreshment, is called THE METALOGICON. For, in it, I undertake to defend logic” (5). John defined “logic” in The *Metalogicon* as an expression of the *trivium*. As John claimed, “‘Logic’ (in its broadest sense) is ‘the science of verbal expression and [argumentative] reasoning’” (32). Since John indicated he plans to defend logic, Carol Dana Lanham interpreted The *Metalogicon* as John’s defense of the *trivium* (93).

John understood logic as the *trivium*, the science of the verbal arts. The *quadrivium* and *trivium*, when combined within a general field of study, formed the liberal arts. John concerned himself mostly with commenting on the *trivium* in The *Metalogicon*. John promoted the liberal arts because that approach to education allowed students achieve meaningful lives.

Conclusion

This chapter situated John in the historical moment of the High Middle Ages by providing biographical information and addressing significant events during John’s life. John’s perspective was shaped by his experiences and historical events. Significant historical events such as the Investiture Controversy, the Reign of Anarchy, and the Second Crusade were examined. John’s early life, his experiences as a student, his career
in the English Church, his involvement in the King Henry II-Thomas Becket Dispute, and his performance as Bishop of Chartres were analyzed. John’s writings, including The Metalogicon, reflected his experiences and perspectives shaped by his medieval presuppositions.

While performing his roles as clerk and bishop, John put his rhetorical education into the service of the Church. John drew from the well spring of cultural wisdom to inform his actions, demonstrating praxis. The experiences of John’s actions informed his knowledge and wisdom. John situated education within rhetoric because both education and rhetoric ended in action. The education gained from those actions would influence John’s rhetorical practices. The subsequent chapters explore the implications of John’s rhetorical theory to his approach to education. Chapter two analyzes Cicero and Aristotle as intellectual influences on John. Chapter three examines The Metalogicon as an artifact of medieval epideictic rhetoric. Chapter four articulates John’s contribution to medieval rhetorical theory. Chapter five concludes the dissertation by analyzing the praxis component of John’s approach to medieval rhetorical education.
CHAPTER TWO

John of Salisbury’s Intellectual Influences: Cicero and Aristotle

In Chapter One, John was situated within the historical moment of the High Middle Ages. Significant historical events and John’s personal experiences shaped his perspective about the relationship between Church and State in medieval society. John described his presuppositions about education, history, politics, and religion throughout his writings. The Metalogicon functioned as a means for John to articulate his views about medieval rhetorical education. In addition to recalling events from his past, John also drew from a vibrant medieval philosophical tradition to compose The Metalogicon. The writings of Cicero and Aristotle offered John rhetorical and dialectical coordinates to express the cultural values of medieval rhetorical education.

Contemporary scholars of postmodernity address questions about human communication using philosophical frameworks from a multiplicity of historical moments. John acknowledged that theories from previous historical moments could inform his actions as a cleric in the Church. Specifically, John engaged the rhetorical approach of Cicero and the dialectical project of Aristotle. John framed his perspective about medieval rhetorical education through the texts of both Cicero and Aristotle.

This chapter analyzes the intellectual influences of Cicero and Aristotle on John. First, the influence of Cicero on medieval assumptions about society and education are expressed. Second, the influence of Aristotle on medieval presuppositions about society and education are articulated. Third, a description of John’s intellectual influences of Cicero and Aristotle are provided. In following Cicero’s translation of logos as ratio et oratio, meaning “reason and speech,” John could envision the trivium as logic or the
verbal arts. John learned from Cicero that education should benefit all members of a society. John learned from Aristotle that dialectics could inform rhetorical theory.

Cicero’s Influences on the Middle Ages

Cicero represented one of the most important philosophical voices that carried throughout the collapse of the Western Roman Empire until the High Middle Ages. Cicero represented the heroic ideal of humanists from the Middle Ages because he combined the roles of orator, philosopher, and statesman with an emphasis on attaining encyclopedic knowledge (Miller 45). His writings bestrode the liminal space between the worlds of Antiquity and the Middle Ages. The significance of Cicero to the development of medieval rhetorical education should not be underestimated. First, Cicero influenced a number of Early Church Fathers, such as St. Jerome and St. Augustine, who attempted to create a new culture by synthesizing Hellenism, particularly Platonic philosophy, with Christianity. Second, and perhaps most importantly, Cicero’s Latin language continued to operate as the primary language of Western Europe and Northern Africa from the collapse of the Western Roman Empire to the conclusion of the Middle Ages in the fifteenth century.

Because the Latin language remained culturally relevant after the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, Ciceronian texts continued to speak to educators throughout the Middle Ages. Although literacy in the Greek language remained a feature of everyday life for some parts of Italy, Sicily, and Eastern Europe, most Western Europeans shared cultures tied to Latin, the language of the Catholic Church. Because the Catholic Church became the most important institution of Western Europe during the fifth century, Christians turned to the Church as the primary institution for education.
During the Early Middle Ages, the monastery provided an educational method that focused on teaching grammar. Grammar, the first art of the *trivium*, represented an introduction for students into an ongoing conversation tied to traditional cultural wisdom tracing back to Ancient Greece. Marshall McLuhan argued that St. Augustine adapted the entire *enkyklios paideia* (well-rounded education) for Christian philosophy, resulting in the elevation of grammar for scriptural exegesis and theology. St. Augustine’s actions allowed grammar to re-emerge as the central art of the Early Middle Ages (15). Students acquired written and oral literacy, as well as instruction about textual interpretation, by studying grammar (Southern 171).

Assumptions about literacy during the Middle Ages differed greatly from the present historical moment. In contemporary American society, literacy is usually defined as the ability to read and write a specific language. In the Middle Ages, literacy had a much broader connotation among the populace. Harold A. Innis noted that Pope Gregory I regarded images within churches as beneficial for those who could read by looking at walls if not in books (142). Literacy could signify the interpretation of signs. A peasant in the Middle Ages likely could neither read Latin writing nor comprehend spoken Latin. The peasant could demonstrate literacy by explaining a story from Scripture or explicate a saint’s life by connecting a religious story to artwork within a church.

During the Mass, however, the peasant could discern the significance of the Eucharist. The Eucharist, bread and wine, is defined as “an outward sign of an inward grace instituted by Christ” (Pohle). The Eucharist reenacted the Last Supper, a communal meal between Jesus and His disciples. When the priest raised the Eucharist
above his head while facing the altar, he said, “This is my body, which is for you.”

Although the peasants might not fully comprehend the Latin phrase, they could interpret the bread and wine as signs of the body and blood of Jesus. Peasants acquired literacy about the Mass by watching the performance of the priest. Thus, the peasant could be considered literate from a medieval philosophical framework.

A second form of literacy developed from interpreting statues and other forms of artwork in the churches. The statue required a code for the peasants to understand the meaning of the artwork. Walter Ong noted that codes require explanation in pictures, words, or a total human context (83). The peasant could see a statue, and then remember a story from Scripture connected to that religious image. By looking at a crucifix, the peasant could recall the Biblical narrative in which Jesus was crucified by Pontius Pilate and that Jesus suffered and died for all mankind. The peasant could view a statue of St. Francis of Assisi and remember how St. Francis stripped himself of his garments and gave them to his father as indication that St. Francis only desired Our Father who art in Heaven (Robinson). Interpretation of signs functioned as literacy during the Middle Ages.

Because grammar held a central educational role, Latin texts influenced cultural assumptions of the Middle Ages. Ciceronian texts supplied educators with abundant material to teach students. Cicero had long been a part of the reservoir of cultural knowledge, what Jeffery Walker, in Rhetoric and Poetics of Antiquity, called the epos, the “winged words” of the gods and bards (6). In Parmenides, Martin Heidegger defined epos as words, connecting the poetized word epos with “epic” (69). Both Walker and
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4 “Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis est” (Collins 231).
Heidegger connected cultural wisdom and language, a role completed by Cicero’s writings. Cicero influenced both St. Augustine and St. Jerome.

The writings of Cicero also influenced medieval philosophical assumptions. Cicero translated some Greek philosophical works, most notably The Timaeus, into Latin. As Donald J. Zeyl noted, “Timaeus was a central text of Platonism in later antiquity and the Middle Ages—it was almost the only work of Plato’s available in Latin—and the subject of many controversies” (1224). Plato’s The Timaeus offered medieval Christians a philosophical ground for interpreting the creation of the world. M.D. Chenu asserted that many scholars of the twelfth century embraced the systematic philosophy of Aristotle, but ultimately rejected his pantheism. Because Genesis claims that God created the world, The Timaeus became a central philosophical text as a result of the creation of the cosmos ex nihilo by the demiurge.

Medieval Christians interpreted Plato’s demiurge as God (76). Because Plato argued that the demiurge created the world ex nihilo, meaning “from nothing,” Platonic philosophy found an accepting audience among the Early Christian Fathers. These theologians could reposition the demiurge as God. David C. Lindberg asserted that Calcidius, a clergyman living in the fourth century, translated Plato’s The Timaeus into Latin; this version of Plato’s treatise rather than Cicero’s translation of The Timaeus survived into the Middle Ages and was identified with Medieval Platonism (147). Calcidius may have eclipsed Cicero by producing the definitive translation of The Timaeus, but Cicero remained a relevant voice in the Middle Ages.

The writings of Cicero continued to exert a significant influence on medieval thought. Since Cicero wrote in Latin, his compositions were easier to preserve and
disseminate throughout the former lands of the Western Roman Empire where Latin functioned as the dominant language of the Catholic Church. During the Middle Ages, sign interpretation corresponded to literacy. Although peasants most likely could neither read nor write in the Latin language, they could comprehend the Mass by interpreting the actions of the priest and the artwork within the churches. Cicero’s writings textured medieval presuppositions about society.

Cicero’s Influence on Medieval Social Theory

Cicero’s writings affected medieval presuppositions about society, resulting in a sustained contribution to political theory. Both Cicero and his medieval counterparts assumed that society was organized around a hierarchy. Collin Wells asserted that Cicero understood that societies were created by gathering people of different classes and occupations and establishing a political structure in which all people worked together for the benefit of the republic (89). By best utilizing the diverse skill sets of people, the cooperation of the citizens benefitted the highest good of society. Tilman Struve posited that the material world of nature expressed the divine order, which human communities could use to model organizational structures (305). Struve suggested that nature provided the most appropriate model from which to build systems of language or thought or politics.

Because the linguistic capabilities of human beings led to the formation of communities, the political structure was organized around a community (Ray 64). Just as in Antiquity, medieval thinkers situated each individual person within a larger community. The resulting hierarchical system established interdependence among all levels of the social system. As discussed in chapter one, members of one estate fulfilled
their roles by depending on members from the other estates to complete their roles. Peasants produced food; the nobles offered protection; the Church prayed for all. During the Middle Ages, many people assumed that the entire community would benefit through cooperative action.

The second reason Cicero remained influential in the political sphere was that he lived under a political system that changed from a republic to a dictatorship. Michael Crawford claimed that Cicero participated in the Roman Republic by delivering orations on the floor of the Senate to advance policy. Cicero put his rhetoric into practice during a time when Rome underwent drastic changes: civil wars and dictatorships (168). Cicero experienced an era when free speech rights enjoyed as a Roman Senator declined during the reign of Julius Caesar and the Second Triumvirate, a group of politicians and generals including Mark Antony, Lepidus, and Octavian Caesar.

Cicero delivered rhetorical orations as a Senator during a time when Julius Caesar ruled Rome as a tyrant, having been granted the status of a living god (187). John, although not a politician like Cicero, negotiated the halls of power as a Church operative. Hans Liebschütz noted that John’s interpretation of liberty differed from Cicero. While Cicero lived under a government in transition from republic to empire, John only experienced life under a monarchy. For John, liberty meant a harmony of different spheres of life enjoying their special rights (54). With the murder of Archbishop Becket, John witnessed the worst result of a contemptuous relationship between Church and state.

Cicero’s writings influenced medieval presuppositions about society. First, Cicero argued that society should be arranged within a hierarchical order. Members from different classes cooperated for the benefit of the entire society. Second, Cicero
participated in a political structure that shifted to a dictatorship. During the Middle Ages, kings and popes demanded deference from their subjects. In addition to medieval beliefs about society, Cicero’s theories shaped medieval ideas about education.

**Cicero’s Influence on Medieval Educational Theory**

Cicero had a dramatic impact on the educational system of the Middle Ages. Until the twelfth century, masters grounded rhetorical education in Ciceronian texts. The use of Cicero’s writings continued the legacy of the *enkyklios paideia*. As Charles G. Nauert suggested, “*Studia humanitatis*, a Latin phrase with classical origins. It appears in the work of Cicero, the Roman author most admired by the Renaissance humanists ... Cicero spoke of ‘the humanities and letters’ (*studia humanitatis ac litterarum*)” (12). The *studia humanitatis* leads to the contemporary term “humanities,” a branch of education about cultural wisdom. Nauert connected *studia humanitatis* with the German word *bildung* because both metaphors combine knowledge and cultural wisdom through education (12).

Cicero situated education within culture by asserting that people could not fully participate as citizens unless they acquired an education. Education, as the *studia humanitatis*, disseminated cultural wisdom informing how one might encounter existence and the constraints of society. Medieval rhetorical education reflected Cicero’s educational assumptions. Nauert purported that the Roman Republic and early Roman Empire featured an educational system that emphasized skills in Latin oratory, grounded in grammar and rhetoric, and an appreciation of Roman culture, including the participation in government (12).
Cicero had a significant impact on medieval thought. First, the writings of Cicero influence medieval presuppositions about society. Cicero promoted a belief that society should be arranged as both a communal and hierarchical system. Second, Cicero influenced medieval assumptions about education. Medieval educators supported the issue of a well-rounded education. Although Cicero functioned as a major intellectual influence during the Middle Ages, Aristotle represented a second important philosophical influence during the Middle Ages.

Aristotle’s Influences on the Middle Ages

Aristotle provided an important philosophical voice during the Middle Ages. Two strains of Aristotelian thought are explored. First, the translation by Boethius of Aristotle’s logical treatises, later called the “Old Logic” is examined. Second, Islamic translations and commentaries about Aristotle’s writings are analyzed. The Islamic Latin translations of Aristotle’s logical treatises, known as The Organon, would be called the “New Logic.” Prior to the Latin translations of Aristotle, medieval educators recognized Plato as the primary philosopher and Cicero as the main rhetorician. Beginning in the twelfth century, however, Aristotle’s writings ushered in a paradigm shift of medieval rhetorical education. The word “paradigm” referred to philosophical models that scientists used to analyze the world (Kuhn 10). New paradigms could emerge and replace older paradigms; scientists could ignore new paradigms until circumstances change to make the new paradigm favorable. The Organon enacted an educational paradigm shift that influenced John’s approach to rhetorical theory.

In the European culture of the Middle Ages, Aristotle’s lacked philosophical esteem prior to the twelfth century. Eugene R. Fairweather asserted that the history of
medieval thought can be organized as the rediscovery of Aristotle’s texts, which stimulated Christian philosophy (27). Edward Grant suggested that Aristotle’s works represented the epitome of reason during Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Aristotelian thought and methodology emerged and drove medieval thought in Europe between 1200 and 1650, and possibly into 1700 (97).

Aristotle’s contribution to medieval thought can be understood through a visual sign. If the writings of Cicero exerted a continuous influence from the rise of the Roman Empire throughout the Middle Ages, then Cicero’s contribution to medieval thought can be understood as a straight line. Aristotle’s contribution is representative of a wishbone. One line from extended far longer than the other side.

Aristotle remained a significant voice from Greek Antiquity throughout the Roman Republic, which is indicated as a straight line. James Hannam provided an account about how Aristotle’s lecture notes were discovered, returned to Athens, and then brought to Rome by the general Sulla (66). Following the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, Aristotle’s writings diverge forming the other two ends of a wishbone. The shorter segment signifies the translations and commentaries of Aristotle by Boethius. The much longer segment represents the translations and commentaries of Islamic scholars.

Audiences from both Antiquity and the Middle Ages appreciated Aristotelian philosophy. Many theorists embraced Aristotelian philosophy because Aristotle emphasized human reason as the primary means of interpreting the world. He offered an alternative approach to Plato. Aristotle’s philosophical project announced the importance
of experience, suggesting that people across social classes could gain insight about their world.

Aristotle situated his philosophical approach in dialectics. Aristotle, lecturing more scientifically than the philosophical artistry of Plato, placed knowledge in three categories: practical, ethics and politics, productive, creative pursuits like rhetoric and poetry, and theoretical knowledge, physics, mathematics, and metaphysics (Grant 95). Aristotle regarded metaphysics, called theology or first philosophy, as the most exalted discipline because this art studied immaterial, unchangeable substances that were separate from matter. A substance came closer to perfection the less the substance changed. Within this class of beings was the supreme substance, God, also called the Unmoved Mover or the Prime Mover. Aristotle did not include logic within theoretical knowledge because he assumed that educated people would use logic as an instrument (organon) to determine what a demonstration is and what a demonstration is not (96).

Aristotle’s The Organon became a central text later in the Middle Ages because scholastic philosophers grew interested in dialectics. In Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from St. Augustine to the Renaissance, James J. Murphy defined Aristotelian dialectics as a form of reasoning based on opinion, and that dialectics relates to rhetoric because rhetoric addresses the common opinions of mankind. According to Aristotle, neither rhetoric nor dialectics had their own subject matter because these arts addressed the non-absolute and human variables (143). Aristotle’s approach could be used by a wider audience than Plato’s philosophy because Aristotle advocated that people should use reason to solve problems (91).
People of the Middle Ages, regardless of their stations in life, had to resolve issues of existence. The diplomat exercised reason by attempting to discern how best to negotiate with another dignitary to reach a favorable outcome, likely resulting in his receiving bestowed favors from the king. The bishop used reason to examine whether or not the clergymen in the diocese were practicing their faith in accordance with Catholic doctrine. The peasant practiced reason by deciding which fields should be plowed and which fields should remain fallow. Diplomats, bishops, peasants, and other members of medieval society could put their wisdom into practice by contributing to the community by completing their assigned roles. For much of the Middle Ages, however, medieval educators lacked Aristotelian texts because most of Aristotle’s writings had yet to be translated into Latin.

Aristotle exerted a significant influence of medieval thought. Aristotle’s philosophical project was embraced because he advocated the use of reason when encountering existence. Unlike Plato’s philosophy, Aristotelian thought suggested that people across social classes could exercise their reason and draw from their personal experiences to interpret the world. Until the twelfth century, most European scholars read the writings of Aristotle through the translations and commentaries from Boethius.

Boethius’ Translations of and Commentaries on Aristotle

Boethius re-introduced Aristotle to Western Europe by composing commentaries and making Latin translations. Boethius, born Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius into a noble family in Rome, developed a reputation for his wisdom. William Turner claimed that Boethius earned an advisory position to King Theodoric, the Ostrogoth King
Boethius could read and write both in Latin, the official language of the Catholic Church and of legal writs in Europe, and in Greek.

William A. Wallace distinguished Boethius as a mediator between scholasticism and the ancient culture because Boethius introduced the liberal arts (trivium and quadrivium) and grounded rational inquiry within logic (94). If the trivium could be understood as the verbal arts, then the quadrivium could be called the mathematical arts. The quadrivium derives from two Latin terms: quad, meaning “four,” and via, meaning “road,” “street,” and “way” (Wheelock 487). Arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music represent the four arts of the quadrivium. Mathematical principles connect arithmetic and geometry through the focus on numbers and the analysis of objects in space, while the other two arts, astronomy and music, investigate the movements and sounds generated by heavenly bodies.

Boethius had a productive career, which included the production of commentaries, translations, and the composition of his own philosophical treaties, the Consultation of Philosophy, in the service of King Theodoric. Boethius provided Latin translations of some of Aristotle’s logical texts, which became the standard Aristotelian texts in Europe from the sixth century to the twelfth century. Lindberg noted that Boethius translated Euclid’s Elements and the Introduction to Aristotle’s Logic by Porphyry into Latin (148). Until the twelfth century, European educators copied and preserved the limited number of Aristotle’s writings in Latin translation. Educators from the Eastern Roman Empire and Islamic kingdoms had access to a greater supply of Aristotelian texts during the same time period.
Islamic Scholars’ Translations of and Commentaries on Aristotle

Christian scholars of Western Europe gained access to the writings of Aristotle because Islamic scholars preserved Greek philosophical texts and translated those writings from Greek to Arabic to Latin. Translation of Greek texts into Arabic began in the second half of the eighth century and crested in the latter ninth century. From the ninth century to the fourteenth century, Islamic scholars contributed scientific treatises within in branches of Greek philosophy. This knowledge, in turn, spread throughout the Islamic world (Lindberg 189). Without the assistance of the Muslim scholars, the culture of Western Europe might have developed in a different direction.

Aristotle’s writings became influential texts in the Eastern Roman Empire and later within Islamic kingdoms. The Eastern Roman Empire grew to distrust Greek philosophy because heretical Christians used elements of Greek philosophy to support their heretical beliefs (Davis 196). Unlike the emperors of the Eastern Roman Empire or the Byzantine Empire, Islamic rulers did not persecute the Christian heretics. If the Christians paid a religious tax, they could worship as Christians without interference, As Islamic rulers staffed their bureaucracies with Christians and Jews who studied Aristotle, the Islamic kingdoms became Hellenized (Lindberg 168). Aristotelian though spread throughout the Islamic world, moving from the Middle East to North Africa and Spain.

Islamic Spain gained a reputation as one of the foremost intellectual centers during the Middle Ages. The culture featured cosmopolitanism driven by scholarship and openness to religious diversity. European and Eastern Roman Empire rulers turned inward by driving away philosophies and religious practices that ran counter to dominant culture. Islamic rulers of Spain, however, fostered a permeable intellectual climate where
leaders and educators remained open to new ideas and wisdom that could be put to use for highest good of their kingdoms.

Wallace posited that schoolmen read previously unknown texts of Aristotle, including commentaries and treatises about Aristotle composed by Jewish and Arab thinkers, through Latin translations. The schoolmen, in turn, discovered new texts for learning that they attempted to synthesize with the existing philosophical and theological perspectives (94). Greek philosophy and mathematics were studied and translated in Arabic, the same language of the Koran, the holy book of Muslims. Brian Stock recounted that Averroes had such an important influence on the development of medieval philosophers that Averroes was often called “the Commentator” on Aristotle. Averroes became an intellectual reference for Albert the Great, St. Thomas Aquinas, and a variety of philosophers during the Italian Renaissance (21). Averroes and other Islamic scholars reintroduced Western Europe to Greek philosophical voices that had been silent for nearly 1,000 years.

Aristotle offered an important voice for medieval thought. Aristotle’s dialectical approach promoted a belief that human beings across social classes could use their abilities of reason to comprehend their world. Initially, medieval Europeans relied on commentaries and translations from Boethius to learn about Aristotle. During that same period of history, the writings of Aristotle remained significant texts among educators of the Eastern Roman Empire and later the Islamic kingdoms. Islamic scholars re-introduced a multiplicity of Aristotelian texts to European scholars of the twelfth century through commentaries and translations in Latin.
Cicero’s and Aristotle’s Influences on John

The writings of Cicero and Aristotle had a significant impact as intellectual influences on John. Cicero and Aristotle framed John’s presuppositions about society and medieval rhetorical education. John agreed with Cicero and Aristotle that society should be structured according to hierarchical roles wherein members of society contributed to the common good. Cicero taught John that education should conclude in praxis. Aristotle taught John the importance of dialectics in education. John learned from both Cicero and Aristotle that medieval rhetorical education should conclude in praxis, which benefits all members of society.

John’s Social Theory

The writings of Cicero exerted significant influence on John’s presuppositions about society. John preferred a well-ordered community, wherein people of different classes and roles cooperated for the common good. Hans Liebschütz claimed that John read Cicero’s De Officiis to understand the metaphor of tyranny, the sway of terror, civil war, and the end of fundamental laws. Cicero composed speeches as a public man during the wane of the Roman Republic, the era of Civil Wars. The death of one tyrant, Julius Caesar, preceded the rule of another tyrant, Mark Anthony (54). Unlike Cicero, John never experienced a society like the Roman Republic.

The world of the Middle Ages drew more inspiration from the Roman Empire than the Roman Republic. Cicero experienced the shift between republic and empire, affecting Cicero’s rhetorical practices. While living in unstable times that included the Reign of Anarchy and the King Henry II–Thomas Becket Dispute, John adapted his rhetorical practices. In the article “The Nature and Teaching of the Humanities,”
McKeon suggested that Cicero was convinced that the Romans could not afford to ignore the arts of the Greeks. Alcuin of York integrated the liberal arts within the Carolingian court. Finally, John situated politics within cultural contexts (290). By following the argument of Cicero, John learned that rhetoric provided an intellectual framework to negotiate the demands of society. While Cicero functioned as the dominant influence on John’s assumptions about the role of rhetoric for negotiating society, both Cicero and Aristotle informed John’s assumptions about education.

**John’s Educational Theory**

Cicero and Aristotle provided important theory that informed John’s presuppositions about education. Aristotle’s dialectical project affected John by giving rise to scholasticism and emphasizing the educational exercise called the disputation. Ciceronian rhetorical texts influenced the way John wrote in Latin, the language of educated members of society in Western Europe during the High Middle Ages. The writings of both Cicero and Aristotle led John to presume that education should conclude in praxis, in which students would make positive contributions to society.

Aristotle represented the major influence on the medieval rhetorical education project of John. A. Mac C Armstrong proposed that John composed The *Metalogicon* as a summation of The *Organon* (374). Throughout The *Metalogicon*, John referenced Aristotle for a total of 111 times (McGarry 298). John examined metaphors described by Aristotle, such as reason, dialectics, induction, and accidents. John also referenced Aristotelian texts, including *Prior Analytics*, *Posterior Analytics*, *Categories*, *On Interpretation*, *Sophistical Refutations*, and the *Topics*. 
In Book II of The Metalogicon, John offered effusive praise of Aristotle. As John extolled, “The common noun ‘philosopher’ has, with a certain preeminence, come to be preserved for Aristotle. For Aristotle is called by antonomasia or par excellence ‘The Philosopher’” (110). In multiple compositions, John praised the writings of Aristotle that addressed education.

In a letter from the 1160s to a Master Richard l’Évêque, archdeacon of Countances, called “Letter 201,” John requested additional writings from the Aristotelian corpus. As John wrote, “Have a copy made for me of the books of Aristotle which you have, and of the glosses on Mark, at my expense (and no cost spared here on any account, I beg). And once again I ask you to provide glosses on the more difficult points in Aristotle’s works, since I do not altogether trust the translator” (295). Since John lacked Greek fluency, John required Latin glosses of the Greek terms. Rita Copeland articulates glosses as text written above a line in the manuscript or located in the margins to explain the literal meanings of words, acting as precursors to expositions, explications, of the text (82). John, like many contemporary educators, has concerns about the quality of the translated books.

The Policraticus, John’s political treatise, also referenced Aristotle. John cited Aristotle four times as an example of authority in The Policraticus. Peter Von Moos indicated that the exemplum consists of a proof by analogy drawn from empirical data, which then confirms a decision about taking a course of action (208). Von Moos continued to explain the exemplum as the comparison of an action’s uncertain outcome to a similar action of the past whose positive outcome is known, providing a commendable choice (208).
The exemplum functioned as a literary device in which the author relied on historical evidence or an anecdote to provide a reader with information on which to make a decision. John used exempla throughout The Policraticus. As John remarked, “The book also busies itself with the footprints of philosophers; it is left to the determination of the wise which footprints should be avoided and which followed in each case” (5). John explained that the use of footprints or exempla, the best available means of persuasion, should be determined by the circumstances, any given case. Aristotle’s rhetorical theory, which John would have learned by reading Cicero, influenced John’s rhetorical practices of including exempla.

Aristotle also affected John’s approach to medieval rhetorical education. FitzGerald purported that John borrowed the Aristotelian metaphor habitus, an assumption that people do not possess knowledge until they continue to put knowledge into practice, to supplement John’s pedagogical theory (580). Habits are acquired through cultivation, a repetition of actions associated with practices. John, as a Church secretary, practiced the wisdom gained from an extensive education. In the article “Two Medieval Textbooks in Debate,” Murphy argued that John promoted the “New Logic” as important texts for study (3). John acquired his education during the scholastic era.

Scholasticism, the dominant philosophical and theological movement for the remainder of the Middle Ages, emerged following the wake of the reclamation of the Aristotelian corpus. Scholasticus, the originative term for “Scholasticism,” translates to “schoolmen” (Durant 949). These philosophers and theologians earned the nicknames of “schoolmen” because they studied in schools. Fairweather defined the schoolmen as men living, studying, teaching, and praying in the intellectual centers of society, the
monasteries and cathedral schools of the eleventh and twelfth centuries (18). While studying the newly-translated works of Aristotle, the schoolmen sought to synthesize Greek philosophy with Catholicism.

During the twelfth century, scholastic educators studied nature as a secular science. The tension between the secular and non-secular worlds generated conflicts in philosophy, politics, and theology (Chenu 47). Medieval educators positioned Aristotle’s Prime Mover as God, and then rejected Aristotle’s pantheistic beliefs. The Catholic Church established a tradition of placing Greek philosophy into the service of the Christian religion. If the Early Middle Ages could be understood as an era when Christians interpreted their religion using a Platonic lens, then the High Middle Ages could be recognized as a time when Aristotle colored the lens of Christian interpretation.

St. Anselm of Canterbury represented the first major philosophical figure to develop scholasticism. Before concluding his ecclesiastical career as Archbishop of Canterbury beginning in 1093, St. Anselm pursued a life of contemplation while serving of the Church (Kent). Hannam suggested that theologians of the eleventh century, such as St. Anselm of Canterbury, constructed rational arguments using available logical texts of Aristotle (39). St. Anselm proposed an ontological proof of God in his Proslogion (c. 1074) with the following argument: God is the most perfect being that people can conceive; if God were merely an idea in people’s heads, then He would lack one element of perfection, existence: therefore, God exists (Durant 933).

St. Anselm placed dialectics in the service of theology, extending the capability of human rationality to better comprehend God and address theological questions. Durant
noted that St. Anselm accepted the motto “faith seeking understanding,” and inaugurated Scholastic philosophy by writing texts that attempted to provide a rational defense of the Christian faith (933). St. Anselm’s motto functioned as a play on St. Augustine’s dictum “believe so that you might understand” (Maritain Center). St. Anselm differentiated himself from St. Augustine by placing greater emphasis on the capacity of reason to allow human beings to understand God’s world.

Peter Abelard signified the second major scholastic philosopher to extend Aristotle’s dialectics. Abelard acquired fame among educators because his lectures on dialectics demonstrated Abelard’s mastery of the “Old Logic.” Logic contained both linguistic logic, the theory of the meanings of sentences and words, and formal logic, the theory of correctly systemizing known factual evidence and drawing conclusions (Radice xiv). Logic represented a form of the verbal arts that combined some elements of grammar, such as the meanings of words and sentences, with argumentation. Abelard contributed to the massive educational transition by elevating dialectics over grammar and rhetoric.

Hannum described the twelfth-century renaissance as the triumph of Peter Abelard over St. Bernard of Clairvaux. Logic became a critical tool for theological studies, and then universities were founded to offer locations for learning theology (68). While gaining a reputation as an outstanding teacher in Paris, Abelard’s success convinced more students and teachers to attend schools in urban areas. The development of city schools led to the formation of universities, the prime educational centers of the High Middle Ages.

---

5 “fides quaerens intellectum” (Durant 933).
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The Rise of European Universities

Universities developed as significant institutions of learning in major European cities. Universities replaced monasteries as centers of both educational and theological development. Grant characterized universities as places where citizens expected reason to be applied to numerous issues regarding nature, medicine, theology, law, and other areas of study (103). Fairweather asserted that scholastic theologians and philosophers concerned themselves about synthesizing grace and nature into their active and contemplative lives (20).

The university provided a space where students and teachers could meet to facilitate learning the arts of the trivium and quadrivium. Lindberg explained that the educational curricula of the urban schools differed from the rural monastic schools. Most students in monastic schools assumed that they would enter into the clergy upon completing their studies. Urban school students might enter careers in the Church, but they also seized opportunities to join the secular ranks. Educators recognized that urban schools offered broader curricula and emphasized practical application of theoretical knowledge (205). Cook and Herzman argued that the cathedral schools promoted both the study of logic and the liberal arts. Bernard of Chartres emphasized the importance of grammar and rhetoric to his pupil, John of Salisbury (218). Each university established an identity connected to the curriculum and the instructors; the University of Paris was widely acclaimed as a center for theological studies.

The earliest universities operated within the framework of a guild system. The medieval guild was an entity formed by the participation of people within a similar craft, such as masons, cloth manufacturers, or brewers. William Chester Jordan explained that
guilds often donated funds to assist in the building of cathedrals and other religious structures (141). Lindberg noted that universities rose to prominence during the twelfth century from a guild system. The guild, called a *universitas*, meant an association of people pursuing common ends. A group of teachers and students formed a guild for the purpose of education. Etymologically, the university referred to the people and not the land or the building for higher education (219). The earliest definition of the university denoted the agreement reached between the students and their teachers, but not the physical structure of the school.

The rise of universities coincided with the development of scholasticism. Aristotelian philosophy competed with Platonic philosophy among educators. As David Bloch claimed that the scholastics tested Aristotle’s arguments through dialectical inquiry. Although the scholars usually agreed with Aristotle, they admitted that Aristotle did commit errors (138). Scholars did not replace centuries of intellectual tradition with Aristotle. The schoolmen incorporated Aristotle with Plato and the Patristics, the Church Fathers, to develop Christian theology in the High Middle Ages.

Durant proposed that the University of Paris represented an unrivaled educational institution of the Middle Ages (923). During the course of three centuries, large numbers of students and central figures of philosophy attended the University of Paris. From 1100-1400, thinkers such as Peter Abelard, John of Salisbury, Siger of Brabant, St. Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great, St. Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, Roger Bacon and William of Occam matriculated at the university. The origins of each university revealed an intimate link between the secular and the non-secular worlds.
Since many universities were established near cathedrals, many clergymen often viewed that universities should be placed into the service of the Church. Over time, however, the universities gained degrees of autonomy. Lindberg noted that the first three universities to establish recognizable charters were at Bologna (1150), Paris (c. 1200), and Oxford (1220). These universities established self-government and control over their curricula. Kings and popes might patronize universities, but each university operated as an individual entity (219). Universities promoted academic freedom where teachers could expose students to heretical beliefs, provided that the teachers did not claim to be teaching the truth (220). Charters granted universities a means of exercising self-control.

The universities of the High Middle Ages also operated under different presuppositions from contemporary universities. Many high school seniors suffer from anxiety about SAT or ACT scores. The test scores of these entrance exams often determine acceptance into colleges or universities. Many schools in higher education require applicants to compose essays articulating why the students would make valuable additions to the learning community. During the High Middle Ages, students did not encounter those academic hurdles. Durant described the only requirements for attending university as the knowledge of Latin and an ability to pay a slight fee to the master, the teacher of the course. If the students were poor, then they might receive a scholarship from their village, their parish church, their friends, or their bishop (926). Lindberg proposed that boys enrolled at university around age 14 after studying Latin in grammar schools. They enrolled under a particular master, following an apprentice model.

After three or four years of the master’s lectures, the student took an examination for a bachelor’s degree. Earning a bachelor’s degree allowed the student to become a
journeyman, who could be permitted to give lectures under the guidance of a master much like a contemporary teaching assistant. By the age of 23, a student could take an examination for the Master of Arts (MA) degree. The MA degree allowed the student to become a full member of the arts faculty, permitting them to teach any course in the arts curriculum (221). Lindberg later noted that most students never completed their education or earned degrees because they ran out of money, they abhorred university life, or they took enough classes that fit the demands of their careers (221). Students of the High Middle Ages addressed similar questions about financing their education as contemporary students.

Student assessment linked education of the High Middle Ages to contemporary education. The purpose of assessment was to check the understanding of the student and ensure some way to devise a standard level of knowledge appropriate for each level of education. In contemporary times, many college students often have to take final examinations, compose a final paper, or complete a final project to pass the class. The High Middle Ages engaged in different means of assessment. Specifically, most students participated in an oral examination known as a disputation.

In *The Birth of Purgatory*, Jacques Le Goff explored how the disputation had implications for theology. Le Goff claimed that *disputationes*, a learning exercise made fashionable by Peter Abelard, became an aspect of theological studies in the second part of the twelfth century and which Peter the Chanter applied to biblical exegesis. St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Hugh of Saint Victor, Stephen of Tournai, and John of Salisbury opposed the growing presence of the disputation within education (166). John dismissed the effectiveness of disputations when educators began teaching disputations as ends.
John appreciated disputations as means to exercise reason, but John rejected practicing disputations without any practical application.

**The Emphasis on Disputations**

The disputation developed into a critical exercise that influenced John’s presuppositions about dialectics. The disputation featured the student (*discipulus*) arguing against the teacher (*magister*). As an educational tool, the disputation would prove valuable as students practiced synthesizing wisdom to be placed into the service of the Church. During the High Middle Ages, however, many versions of the disputation were taught according to the goals of each exercise. John Marenbon noted that during the latter part of the twelfth century, masters moved away from relying on both “Old Logic” and “New Logic” to organize “Modern Logic.” Special logical disputations called “obligations” were emphasized to study matters of semantics (177). Obligations addressed definitions of words and the proper means of using language.

Linguistic grammar guided the practices of dialecticians. Throughout all examples of the disputations, both students and teachers referenced sources of authority to support their arguments. During the lifetime of John, educators cited Aristotle as a leading philosopher. David Bloch noted that question commentaries and literal commentaries on Aristotle, as well as other forms of disputations, in many instances developed as a result of discussing some reference or line of argument in an Aristotelian text. Question and literal commentaries led educators to take a scientific approach to study the arts (137). As European scholars acquired a greater number of Aristotelian texts, they could reference Aristotle’s writings in disputations.
The antecedent of medieval disputations grew from educational practices of Ancient Greece. In Platonic dialogues, Socrates engaged in dialectical exercises with a host of other characters to gain a higher level of consciousness. In the “Allegory of the Cave” in Book VII of The Republic, Plato argued that prisoners, once free of their ignorance, could see things more correctly the closer they came to entering the light of wisdom (1133). Although Plato articulated the role of disputations for increasing wisdom, the exercise of disputations continued throughout the duration of the Roman Empire.

Philosophers of the Middle Ages provided a religious justification for teaching disputations. St. Augustine practiced disputations against heretics to correct them of their errors in Christian faith and to return them into the fold of the Church (Fitzgerald 270). St. Augustine practiced dialectics for theological purposes that led to rhetorical effects. Peter Abelard claimed that the Bible sanctioned disputations by citing the story of Jesus arguing with learned men in Temple (Durant 939). Abelard justified the practice of disputations by connecting Greek philosophy with Christian Scripture.

During the twelfth century, however, the disputation became highly stylized and more complicated. Philipp W. Rosemann claimed that disputations provided scholastic training for medieval students, meaning the students thought as dialecticians with open minds, but with an assumption that any possible solution must be defended before the academic community (83). The public performances of the disputations allowed teachers to vet the capabilities of their students. After completing the disputation requirements of their education, students could either pursue careers or study additional subjects.
Students and teachers practiced disputation by following specific formats. Grant outlined the standard medieval question forming the basis of the disputation in the following manner: 1) the statement of the question; 2) the statement of the principle arguments (*rationes principales*), usually representing alternatives opposing the author’s position; 3) the statement of the opposite opinion (*oppositum*, or *sed contra*), a version defended by the author. The author cited major authority figures like Aristotle, commentaries on Aristotle’s works, or theological texts like Peter Lombard’s *Book of the Sentences*; 4) the statement of the Qualifications or doubts about questions and terms (optional); 5) the statement of the body of the argument, in which the authors expressed their opinions by a sequence of conclusions; 6) the brief response to refute each principle argument (107).

The first part of the disputation indicates the guiding question. The student’s answer to the question generated the thesis, while the opponent, the teacher, would articulate an antithesis. The second part of the disputation featured the student listing all the arguments supporting the antithesis. The third part of the disputation reflected the thesis of the student.

The next three sections of the disputation included qualifications, a declamation of the main argument, and, finally, responses to refute the opponent. Part four, an optional element, allowed students to qualify statements or define terms in specific ways to make claims more acceptable to the judges, other faculty members. Part five functioned as the main thrust of the student’s argument, the longest and most significant section of the disputation. Throughout part five, the student cited numerous sources of authority. Lastly, the sixth part operated as a section of refutation. Students and teachers
attacked each critical point of their opponent’s argument by referencing the Bible or a work by the Church Fathers.

Grant explained that humanists objected to logic because the discipline grew too convoluted through the inclusion of terms, definitions, and expansive rules. Logicians began focusing their attention on the values of propositions to illustrate fine points of logic instead of examining the content of the propositions (124). Grant used the term “logician” as a synonym for “dialectician.” As the disputations grew more complex, their original purpose as tools to exercise reason for practical application became lost within interwoven patterns of the multiplicity of disputation forms.

In The Metalogicon, John lambasted absurd questions that began disputation exercises. As John critiqued, “The philosophers of that day argued interminably over such questions as whether a pig being taken to market is held by the man or by the rope; and whether one who buys a whole cape also simultaneously purchased the hood” (14). John appreciated the disputation because the exercise developed reason, supporting the decision-making process to meet the needs of existence. John, however, rejected the practice of engaging in disputation just for the sake participating in abstract argumentation.

The writings of Aristotle represented the most significant influence on John’s assumptions about medieval rhetorical education. The Latin translations of Aristotelian dialectics initiated the scholastic era. The scholastic era led to the rise of European universities and to an emphasis on practicing disputation. John appreciated Aristotle’s dialectics, but John preferred to maintain the integrated approach to education. From Aristotle, John assumed that rhetoric formed a cooperative relationship with dialectics.
While Aristotle functioned as the main influence for John’s assumptions about education, Cicero offered a secondary source to texture John’s beliefs about education.

Cicero’s writings also affected John’s presuppositions about medieval rhetorical education. In The *Metalogicon*, John cited Cicero a total of 49 times (McGarry 299). John addressed such Ciceronian metaphors such as eloquence, figures of speech, and reason. John also referenced Cicero’s texts, including *The Commonwealth*, *On Offices*, *Rhetorical Questions*, *Tusculan Disputations*, and *Topics*.

In a letter written between June and July 1166 to his brother Richard, listed as “Letter 172,” John praised the writings of Cicero. As John wrote, “The greatest of orators too in his [Cicero] book on the art of speaking teaches that to apply principles to an art or to discuss the art is very easy, but to speak from a basis of art, that is, to practice what you preach, is very hard indeed” (129). In a moment of candor, John admitted that gaining knowledge about a subject is easier than putting that knowledge into practice. In this letter, John responded to the simultaneous value and burden of praxis.

In The *Entheticus Major* and The *Entheticus Minor*, John praised the intellectual contribution of Cicero. In lines 1215-1216, John articulated the implications of Cicero’s style on the Latin language. As John announced, “The Latin world held nothing greater than Cicero; compared to his eloquence Greece was dumb” (184). By the twelfth century, however, John and other philosophers, educators, and theologians no longer apologized for preferring Latin to Greek. In *Entheticus de Philosophorum: Commentaries and Notes*, Jan Van Laarhoven underscored John’s affinity for the work of Cicero, especially *De Officiis* and *De Oratore*. Cicero’s Latin style influenced John’s
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7 “*Orbis nil habuit maius Cicerone Latinus, cuius ad eloquium Graecia muta fuit*” (185).
writing style (365). John’s sophisticated style of Latin closely matched Cicero’s ornate Latin.

Lastly, John agreed with Cicero’s presupposition that education concluded in action. Cicero placed ideas into the service of Roman citizens through enacting legislation. John acted in a similar manner in his role as a Church administrator. John often gained insight or shared knowledge through letter writing, a rhetorical practice of the Middle Ages. As Liebschütz claimed, “The exchange of letters in the Latin language by which the governing classes of his day had intercourse with and influence on each other throughout the world, was John’s equivalent for the Roman forum, which had been the centre of Cicero’s thought” (88). John continued to put theories from education into practice throughout his career as a Church administrator.

Conclusion

The writings of Cicero and Aristotle influenced medieval presuppositions about society and education. John, in particular, drew from Ciceronian and Aristotelian texts to inform his beliefs about society and education. Cicero had the most impact on John’s views on society, while Aristotle functioned as the dominant influence on John’s perspective about education. The newly-translated Latin texts of Aristotle’s The Organon initiated the rise of scholasticism and the emphasis of the disputation as a teaching exercise.

During the scholastic era, many educators attempted to elevate dialectics above grammar and rhetoric. Cicero’s definition of logos as ratio et oratio guided John’s articulation of the trivium as the verbal arts. John referred to the entire trivium and each of the three arts as “logic.” John assumed that the arts of the trivium should be
integrated, much like the cooperative relationship fostered among people of different social classes. Although rhetoric remained the epitome of the *trivium*, one needed thorough training in both grammar and dialectics. From Aristotle, John learned an elaborate approach to dialectics. Dialectics, in turn, could be put into the service of other branches of knowledge. In chapter three, John’s medieval rhetorical educational theory is articulated as a synthesis of Ciceronian rhetoric and Aristotelian dialectics.
CHAPTER THREE

John of Salisbury’s The *Metalogicon*: An Artifact of Medieval Epideictic Rhetoric

In Chapter Two, John’s approach to rhetorical education was situated within a medieval intellectual framework. The writings of Cicero and Aristotle provided the greatest influences on John’s presuppositions about society and education. Ciceronian rhetoric and Aristotelian dialectics inspired John to develop his own rhetorical theory. Within the pages of The *Metalogicon*, John synthesized the writings of Cicero and Aristotle to express his rhetorical theory.

Chapter three provides an analysis of The *Metalogicon* as an artifact of medieval epideictic rhetoric. First, an overview of medieval epideictic rhetoric is provided. John expressed his views about medieval rhetorical education in The *Metalogicon*. Second, The *Metalogicon* contains elements suggestive of an author who had command of a broad range of rhetorical practices. John praised the liberal arts because this well-rounded form of education connected contemporary students to a living history of cultural wisdom. Students presupposed that they had an obligation to inform their practices with that cultural wisdom for the benefit of society. Third, John censured the Cornificians, a composite model of bad teachers whose methods rejected the integrated approach of the liberal arts. Fourth, John celebrated the timeless values of philosophy. In The *Metalogicon*, John called for a philosophical approach to medieval rhetorical education.

Medieval Epideictic Rhetorical Tradition

Medieval rhetoricians extended a tradition of epideictic rhetorical practices that originated in Ancient Greece. The modern English word “epideictic” derived from the Greek verb ἐπιδεικνύμενα, meaning “to display” or “to exhibit” (Liddell et al. 629). The
future form, επιδειξω, and the aorist form, επεδειξα, contribute to definitions of the verb associated with speeches and compositions. Additional meanings include “to show off” and “to displays one’s powers.”

The verb is also related to rhetoricians and epideictic orators. The phrase επιδεικτικη λόγοι means “speeches for display, orations.” Liddell et al. noted that Aristotle, in Book I 3588 of Rhetoric, used the phrase επιδεικτικη γένος λόγων to mean “declamatory speaker.” Robert Wardy asserted that rhetoricians and philosophers have been in dispute for thousands of years over the proper definition of logos (11). Since John translated logos as “reason and speech,” he could frame the trivium as “logic.” In defending the teaching of logic in The Metalogicon, John composed a medieval epideictic text.

Epideictic rhetoric continued to exert a significant influence as a wide-spread practice during the Early Middle Ages and High Middle Ages. Citizens throughout Western Europe learned rhetoric in an attempt to further their careers, especially within the Church. Luitpold Wallach argued that Alcuin of York generated much of his treatise on rhetoric using Cicero’s De Inventione as a source (36). Alcuin held positions as both educator and clergyman under Charlemagne during the ninth century. As Bruce A Kimball explained, “The term trivium for the three language arts came into use among Alcuin’s circle of scholars in the Carolingian era, and this fact is just as telling about them as the coining of quadrivium is about Boethius” (51).

Three works attributed to Cicero continued his rhetorical legacy: On Invention (De Inventione), On the Ideal Orator (De Optimo Genere Oratorum), and the Rhetoric to Herennius (Rhetorica ad Herennium). Rhetoricians of the Middle Ages continued to
look favorably on the writings of Cicero because they assumed that rhetoric had implications for civil philosophy (McKeon 4). Because educators in the Middle Ages assumed a form of rhetoric quite broad in scope, they also conceived of enacting a diverse array of rhetorical practices.

Educated members of society could practice rhetoric when writing letters to friends and colleagues. In his article “Rhetoric in the Middle Ages,” Richard McKeon critiqued the history of rhetoric following the Italian Renaissance because many historians failed to interpret many works of composition, which would later be categorized as literature, as rhetorical artifacts (1). In addition to writing letters, preaching and composing both poetry and prose demonstrated rhetorical practices. Consequently, examples of medieval literature, from the Confessions of St. Augustine of the fifth century to The Canterbury Tales of Chaucer during the fourteenth century, could function as artifacts of medieval epideictic rhetoric.

The Metalogicon functioned as an artifact of medieval epideictic rhetoric. John learned about the principles of epideictic rhetoric from listening to lectures in classes from his teachers and by reading manuscripts that he considered authoritative sources. Roger Ray claimed that John, in following the suggestions of his grammar teacher William of Conches, situated rhetoric within logic and philosophy. John’s other rhetoric teachers, Thierry of Chartres and Peter Helias, agreed with Cicero’s argument and placed rhetoric within a framework of civil science (65). Ray asserted that John, Thierry of Chartres, and Peter Helias all shared the assumption that rhetoric closely matched the classical view positioning rhetoric with eloquence, the highest form of a social art (68). Although John agreed with Cicero that rhetoric should be put into the service of society,
John’s approach to rhetoric had more philosophical nuance. Cicero’s expansive form of rhetoric led to the development of different rhetorical practices during the Middle Ages. As Thomas M. Conley indicated, “Ciceronian rhetoric was adapted and transformed in three different kinds of ars: the art of letter writing (artes dictaminis), or preaching (artes praedicandi), and of prose and/or verse composition (artes prosandi/poetriae)” (93). Conley claimed that these divisions of rhetorical practices resulted in sustained influence from circa 1100 to the first decades of the Italian Renaissance. By accepting these divisions of rhetoric, people in the Middle Ages assumed that encountering epideictic rhetorical artifacts constituted a common feature of everyday life. In creating The Metalogicon, John referenced authoritative sources to bolster his arguments.

The act of writing demonstrates rhetorical elements. John had to persuade himself about what sources should be included and what cultural values should be explicated. His second person to persuade would have been Thomas Becket, the main audience of The Metalogicon. By choosing passages from literature as references within his composition, John revealed his assumptions about which ideas represented timeless cultural values. In particular, John called on the voice of Cicero to inform his approach to epideictic rhetoric

John’s Approach to Epideictic Rhetoric

John drew mainly from the writings of Cicero to inform his assumptions about epideictic rhetoric. Marshall McLuhan contended that John, like Cicero, elevated rhetoric above dialectics because logic was the handmaiden to eloquence and wisdom (188). Although Aristotle’s Rhetoric was not yet available in Latin translation for John, John discover Aristotle’s rhetorical approach from references made by Cicero. John
referenced three primary texts from Cicero: *De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum,* and *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* Cicero composed *De Inventione* and *De Optimo Genere Oratorum,* but *Rhetorica ad Herennium* was falsely attributed to Cicero.

**De Inventione and De Optimo Genere Oratorum**

The writings of Cicero provided significant sources to texture John’s assumptions about epideictic rhetoric. Two of Cicero’s most important works were *De Inventione* (On Invention) and *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* (On the Ideal Orator). As Thomas M. Conley expressed, “The *De inventione* of Cicero and The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* attributed to Cicero continued to exercise important influence, both directly and indirectly, over a thousand-year period” (110). Conley admitted that Quintilian’s *Institutes* also had a lasting effect on medieval rhetorical theory, but medieval educators considered Quintilian little more than an imitator of Cicero.

In *De Inventione,* Cicero argued that epideictic rhetoric featured three elements. First, the speakers could praise ideas or people who act in such a way as to uphold cultural values. Second, the speakers could censure ideas or people who fail to engage in accepted cultural practices (17). Cicero’s approach to epideictic rhetoric presupposed human action within a cultural framework. Epideictic rhetoric grew more complex in the Middle Ages. Thomas M. Conley suggested that Cicero’s rhetorical theory was adapted during the Middle Ages into the following arts: letter writing, *artes dictaminis,* preaching, *artes praedicandi,* and prose or poetry, *artes prosandi/poetriae* (93). Conley noted that these new rhetorical forms provided intellectual fodder for teachers from the High Middle Ages to the Italian Renaissance.
John agreed with Cicero’s presupposition that rhetoric concluded in action. As Marcia L. Colish explained, “In his *Metalogicon*, he laments what he sees as runaway overspecialization in liberal studies, in favor of a more integrated model of education, harking back to the Ciceronian notion that eloquence should be combined with wisdom and virtue” (177). Just as Cicero claimed that rhetoric concluded in action, so did John; actions derived from rhetorical practices should benefit the community. Joseph M. Miller, Michael H. Prosser, and Thomas W. Benson asserted that, in following the argument of Cicero, John presupposes that eloquence is in direct proportion to a person’s wisdom (217). One gained wisdom not simply through reading or studying, which would suggest acquiring knowledge, but through experience, suggesting actions informed by knowledge.

John learned from the writings of Cicero about the relationship between eloquence and wisdom. In *De Inventione*, Cicero announced a direct link between the level of one’s wisdom and eloquence. As Cicero argued, “Wisdom without eloquence does too little for the good of states, but that eloquence does too little for the good of states, but that eloquence without wisdom is generally highly disadvantageous and never helpful” (3). Educators of the Middle Ages often used the terms “eloquence” and “rhetoric” synonymously. Cicero explained that eloquence and wisdom should be put into service of the state (5). Cicero’s assumptions about rhetoric would inform people living in the Middle Ages that rhetoric had distinct implications with politics and service to institutions like the Church and the state.

The writings of Cicero taught John about the relationship between communication and action. Cicero’s *De Inventione* provided an intellectual framework for understanding
the role of communication in human activity. Human beings separated themselves from animals through their use of language. As Cicero claimed, “I think that men, although lower and weaker than animals in many respects, excel them most by having the power of speech” (13). The power of speech formed relationships among people, resulting in the creation of social orders. Educators valued rhetoric because the art persuaded people to make positive contributions to their communities. One’s desired outcome of action determined which form of rhetoric should be used to fit the given circumstances.

John learned about Aristotle’s approaches to rhetoric through references in the writings of Cicero. Cicero, in following the writings of Aristotle, identified three types of rhetoric. As Cicero asserted, “The epideictic is devoted to the praise or censure of a particular individual; the deliberative is at home in political debate and involves the expression of an opinion; the judicial is at home in a court of law and involves accusation and defence or a claim and counter-plea” (17). Cicero presupposed that rhetoric could be practiced for a multiplicity of purposes. Rhetoric could be performed in courts of law, in the assemblies of legislative bodies, or in other locations. Cicero asserted that rhetoric could be put into the service of both the mighty and the humble, suggesting that rhetoric should not be characterized as merely an art that benefitted the elites.

John, as well as other medieval teachers and students, acquired an introduction about Ancient Greek rhetorical practices through references in the writings of Cicero. Cicero cited Aristotle’s writings about rhetoric, Tisias, the alleged inventor of rhetoric, and Isocrates, a contemporary rhetorician of Aristotle (171, 173). In *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from St. Augustine to the Renaissance*, James J. Murphy claimed that Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* was not available in Latin for
European scholars until the thirteenth century. Consequently, Cicero grounded medieval rhetorical theory until the scholastic era (90). Since John lacked access to Greek rhetorical texts, he gained insight about Greek rhetorical practices through reading the works of Cicero.

Cicero, in referencing Greek rhetoricians, also mentioned a rhetorical handbook crafted by Isocrates. The rhetorical manual of Isocrates has yet to be rediscovered. In *The Genuine Teachers of this Art: Rhetorical Education in Antiquity*, Jeffrey Walker asserted that Aristotle’s handbook about rhetoric survived because his students had taken notes during his lectures. Although a rhetorical handbook by Isocrates does not exist, Walker suggested Isocrates did construct a handbook. Aristotle would have been familiar with the work, and Cicero might have read that text as well (6). Both Murphy and Walker agreed that Cicero, based on his familiarity with Aristotle’s writings, granted people in the Middle Ages glimpses of Ancient Greek rhetorical theories that would not be made available to Western Europeans until the Latin translations of Aristotle’s texts in the twelfth century.

The rhetorical writings of Cicero also taught John about the role of the rhetorician. *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* contained Cicero’s beliefs about the traits necessary for a successful orator. As Cicero expressed, “The supreme orator, then, is the one whose speech instructs, delights and moves the minds of his audience. The orator is duty bound to instruct; giving pleasure is a free gift to the audience, to move them is indispensable” (357). For Cicero, the purpose of rhetoric is to teach, to delight, and to move, which means that rhetoric ends in action. The *telos* of rhetoric, informed action, has a significant role in medieval thought. Rita Copeland argued that, contrary to both
Plato and Aristotle, Cicero envisioned praxis as the outcome of rhetoric. Rhetoric activates wisdom and leads to social action (12). Cicero remained a relevant source for rhetoricians of the Middle Ages because Cicero’s rhetoric concluded in action that contributed to the benefit of the community.

*Rhetorica ad Herennium*

John referenced The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* in The *Metalogicon* to explain the relationship between grammar and rhetoric. In Book I, John asserted that human beings developed grammar as a means of imitating nature (39). John agreed that grammar provided a system for interpreting nature. Medieval Catholicism informed John’s assumptions about the relationship between grammar and nature. By studying grammar, people could interpret nature in an attempt to learn more about God’s world.

John cited The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* a second time to continue his discussion about grammar (59). John’s reference to this passage indicated an interest in semiotics. The study of semiotics had rich tradition in the communication discipline. Marcel Danesi argued that Hippocrates founded semiotics in Ancient Greece during the third century BCE. Hippocrates used the term *semeiotikos*, meaning “observant of signs” (6). Umberto Eco defined semiotics as a grammar of a particular sign system (5). Effective approaches to semiotics described how any filed of human communicative phenomena were governed through a signification system.

---

8 “Now nature herself teaches us what we should do” (Caplan 219).

9 “I know that most of the Greeks who have written on memory have taken the course of listing images that correspond to a great many words, so that persons who wished to learn these images by heart would have them ready without expending effort on a search for them” (Caplan 221).
In “Semiotic Phenomenology: A Theory of Human Communication Praxis,” Richard L. Lanigan characterized all human communication as semiotic as a result through the constitution of and the regulation by sign systems (63). Lanigan announced the roles of signs as signifiers (expressive elements) and signifieds (perceptive elements).

In The Human Science of Communicology: A Phenomenology of Discourse in Foucault and Merleau-Ponty, Lanigan argued that the medieval trivium influenced the projects of both Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Michel Foucault (xvi; 83). Having gained an education at the Sorbonne that included studies of grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric, Merleau-Ponty and Foucault developed their distinct approaches to semiotics and phenomenology. John’s perspectives about the trivium could be analyzed to discover any connections with or implications for the semiotic phenomenological works of Foucault, Lanigan, and Merleau-Ponty.

John’s final citation of The Rhetorica ad Herennium proposed a theory about the best practices of using language to generate a clear message. As John claimed, “Even Cicero condemns useless words, which are uttered without conferring advantage or pleasure either to the speaker or to the listener” (92)\(^{10}\). John noted that simple messages could be understood by an audience far easier than overly complex messages. In referencing this passage, John offered a covert critique of dialecticians who spoke at length during disputations without actually saying anything of substance.

John’s three references to Rhetorica ad Herennium revealed his beliefs about the relationship between grammar and rhetoric. Students learned grammar to develop literacy, and then they learned rhetoric to put theory into practice by serving their

---

\(^{10}\) The author criticized Greek rhetoricians who promised to be modest, which meant speaking briefly, but then continuing to speak at length by citing some ancient orator, poet, or literary work (Caplan 235).
John suggested that human beings developed grammar as a natural inclination to interpret God’s world. John’s approach to grammar expressed shared assumptions with contemporary semioticians. John concluded that orators could increase the effectiveness of their speeches by limiting the complexity of their oratory.

Although John appreciated the information in The *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero did not actually write that book. Harry Caplan suggested that The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* enjoyed prestige among educators for over one thousand years because the text first appeared during the lifetime of St. Jerome, (viii). Early medieval writers such as Quintillian, Gellius, Marius Victorinus, Severus, and Cassiodorus, never referenced The *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Later medieval readers assumed that Cicero wrote The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* because Cicero’s name was listed as the author and *De Inventione* preceded The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* in the compiled manuscripts. Many scholars called the latter text The *Rhetorica Secunda* (viii). Many medieval readers assumed that manuscripts contained information worthy of study.

Medieval readers often accepted information that they read in manuscripts because they deferred to textual authority. Educators assumed that if something were written in a manuscript, then there must have been some modicum of merit for the text to be transcribed. They assumed that monks would not perpetuate falsity or heresy by copying incorrect texts. Since books were expensive and difficult to create, many people believed the information in books must contain valuable insight or those books would not have been produced. The *Donation of Constantine* exemplified the impact an illegitimate text could make on cultural assumptions.
The *Donation of Constantine*, a legal writ, claimed that the Emperor Constantine gave the Papacy exclusive rights and privileges over the lands of Italy while Constantine ensconced himself at Constantinople. John Jay Hughes suggested that, according to the story, Constantine gave the Italian lands as gifts to the popes as a means of thanking them for his baptism (94). Popes cited the *Donation of Constantine* to support their argument that emperors and kings lacked the authority to control Italy. John Julius Norwich posited that many European rulers had long recognized the *Donation of Constantine* was not a genuine document from the era of Constantine the Great. Although Otto III, the Holy Roman Emperor, returned the Italian cities of Ravenna, Rimini, Faro, Pesaro, Senigallia, and Acona to Pope Sylvester II, Otto II remarked that the transfer had nothing to do with the *Donation*, a text he knew was a forgery (92). Hughes asserted that the *Donation of Constantine* was revealed in the fifteenth century to be an eighth century forgery (94). According to Norwich, the Italian humanist Lorenzo Valla actually exposed the text as a fraud to the public in 1440 (17).

The writings of Cicero functioned as the primary influence for John’s approach to epideictic rhetoric. Through Cicero’s references to Greek rhetoricians, John gained insight about Greek rhetorical practices. By reading *De Inventione* and *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, John learned from Cicero that epideictic rhetoric had implications for medieval rhetorical education. John also referenced *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as an example of Ciceronian rhetoric. Historians would eventually reveal *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as a composition falsely attributed to Cicero. John learned an expansive form of epideictic rhetoric that included preaching, letter-writing, and the composition of
poetry and prose. John demonstrated these various forms of epideictic rhetoric throughout The *Metalogicon*.

The *Metalogicon* as an Artifact of Medieval Epideictic Rhetoric

John demonstrated epideictic practices within The *Metalogicon*. First, John praised teachers who promoted an education grounded in the liberal arts. Second, John censured the Cornificians for rejecting an approach to education tied to the liberal arts. Third, John celebrated ethics and philosophy as timeless cultural values. John noted the relationship between rhetorical practices and the maintenance of communities.

Roger Ray recalled that John began The *Metalogicon* by claiming that eloquence led to the rise of civilizations. The belief that virtuous reason and cultivated speech differentiated human beings from animals, which allowed people to form communities and nations, was held since Antiquity (64). In *Medieval Humanism*, R.W. Southern proposed that scholars of the twelfth century relied on ancient wisdom to equip themselves to meet the demands of their day. Ancient authors provided a significant amount of source material for practical purposes (126). John assumed that education should be translated into actions that benefitted the community.

John’s approach to epideictic rhetoric exemplified traits of twelfth century humanism. John borrowed ideas from ancient authors, especially Aristotle and Cicero, to create a richly-textured form of epideictic rhetoric. Norman F. Cantor concluded that the humanism that colored John of Salisbury’s perspective about education would be rejected in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but then would gain prominence again among intellectuals like Petrarch, Erasmus, and St. Thomas Moore (357). Christopher Brooke avowed that John represented the humanism of the twelfth century in two characteristics:
an affinity for the culture of the ancient world and an interest in expressing human emotions in the Latin language (66). Throughout The *Metalogicon*, John praised teachers who promoted an approach to education tied to the liberal arts.

**John’s Praise of the Liberal Arts**

Throughout The *Metalogicon*, John praised the liberal arts. The *Metalogicon* has been explained as a treatise summarizing arguments for the study of grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric at various institutions of learning in northern France (McGarry xvi). John composed The *Metalogicon* by gathering together texts from Aristotle’s dialectical approach, Patristic writings, and passages from the Bible. By grounding his work in ethics, John provided an intellectual framework to inform pedagogical practices of the Middle Ages.

John called for an education that echoed the qualities of the Roman *Studia Humanitatis* and the Greek *enkylion paideia*. Murphy credits The *Metalogicon* as the last treatise in the Middle Ages to promote a system of education tied to Quintillian (78). One of these characteristics can be identified as seeking knowledge to become informed members of society. As John commented, “By itself, logic is practically useless. Only when it is associated with other studies does logic shine, and then by virtue that is communicated by them” (244). John preferred taking a multidisciplinary approach to education rather than following a limited, specialized curriculum. Wilks discussed The *Metalogicon* as a plea for the right use of logic restrained by reason, based on the declaration of John (274). John desired that students should apply their knowledge for the good of their communities.
John crafted The *Metalogicon* as a response to the rise of dialectics in scholastic education. Marshal McLuhan argued that John attempted to circumvent the dialecticians by operating from a Patristic worldview by appropriating the liberal arts for the service of the Church (149). In following Cicero’s rhetorical approach, grammar formed the basis of the *trivium* and rhetoric was elevated over dialectics. McLuhan concluded that The *Metalogicon* defended the Ciceronian ideal before Petrarch. John defined “art” from a combination of words like *artant*, meaning to prescribe rules, *ares*, which strengthens the mind to assist the search for wisdom, or *arso*, from reason nourished by study (36). John borrowed from both Greek and Latin literature to connect the liberal arts to a living tradition of educational practices.

After providing a definition for arts, John explicated the meaning of the word “liberal.” The arts might be considered “liberal” because the Greeks instructed their children in those arts; the arts liberated students from cares so that they might pursue wisdom. The arts freed people from concerns about material possessions, allowing people to pursue philosophy (37). John’s definition of “liberal” evoked an image of movement, particularly the stages from childhood to adulthood.

John understood that the liberal arts allowed human beings to reach their full potential. John’s assumption about potentiality had been informed by Aristotle’s remarks about matter and form. Children represented matter, the potential, while adults signified form, the actual. Adults, especially educated men in Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome, participated in governing the *polis* or the *res publica*. Because slaves toiled in the fields or occupied themselves in other areas of drudgery, the free-born adults could pursue wisdom that informed the practices of their roles or positions. The slaves, because they
functioned as tools of their masters, could not perform as adults, and therefore remained in a perpetual infantile state.

John’s initial definition of the liberal arts connected the children of Antiquity to the serfs of the Middle Ages. Since John lived in a cultural that continued to practice slavery, John acknowledged that education was not permitted to all members of society. The feudal system complicated the issue of slavery. Serfs were owned by tracts of land, meaning that the owner of the lands also gained the services of the serfs. The serfs were often uneducated because their sole task was working in agriculture to produce food. Without a liberal arts education, the serfs could be framed as children.

Peasants (laboratores) lived as perpetual children who were protected physically by the nobility (bellatores) and spiritually by the clergy (oratores). John’s additional definitions of “liberal” would suggest freedom from concern. As a practicing Catholic, John presumed that the Church provided spiritual guidance necessary to reach Heaven. John was not so much concerned about a life of seeking the Truth because Jesus Christ, the Son of God, revealed the Truth to all mankind. Because the Truth was already a settled issue, John was far more interested in attending to issues about mortal existence.

John also suggested that the liberal arts freed people from worry or from a sense of inadequacy arising from the lack of material possessions. The assumptions informing the cultural beliefs of the Middle Ages shared similar expectations about the world from Antiquity. Human beings, organic things, lived with other human beings in a larger organic world. When all members of society performed their assigned roles, the entire polis or kingdom benefitted. The liberal arts liberated mankind from concerns about the
lack of material goods because the educated people should focus their attention on creating meaningful lives instead of accumulating material things.

John supported an integrated approach to studying the liberal arts. The liberal arts contained a multiplicity of subjects for students to study. During John’s lifetime, the liberal arts were composed of the trivium, the quadrivium, and other subjects. In the twelfth century, students could advance through a progression of subjects to practice law and medicine or learn theology.

Christopher Brooke defined the twelfth century renaissance as a cosmopolitan movement where scholars, like John, could move throughout Europe while participating in a shared intellectual tradition expressed in the Latin language (74). The Latin language provided a common language that allowed people from different parts of Europe to speak to each other during their shared pursuit of wisdom. As John articulated, “Our devotion to the arts should be augmented by the reflection that the latter stem from nature, the best of all mothers, and attest their noble lineage by the facile and successful accomplishment of their objects” (33). John argued that the liberal arts gave human beings the necessary coordinates to develop their talents.

John assumed that the liberal arts took on a religious sanction by combining both theory and practical application. Within the process of synthesis, educated people could demonstrate praxis in service of their communities. Ronald B. Begley and Joseph W. Koterski indicated that medieval schools stressed the relationship between preaching and teaching (83). Since John presupposed that God created all things, then everything created by God must be good. If God were the highest good, then all of God’s creation must be accepted as good. John envisioned nature as one of the things that God created.
If John were correct in assuming that the liberal arts reflected nature, then the liberal arts must also be good.

John viewed the liberal arts as a means of gaining insight about God’s world. When students cultivated habits conducive to learning, students gained greater insight about God. Janet Martin proposed that John drew his citations from the books found in the libraries at Canterbury, Christ Church, and Saint Augustine’s Abbey (180). As an intellectual craftsman, John presumed that students should engage the ideas found within the available literature as they pursued wisdom. John practiced the same habits of study that he articulated throughout The Metalogicon. John read Scripture intently to gain instruction about grammar and to develop the power of his memory. As one of the five canons of rhetoric, memory maintained an important position for medieval rhetoricians like John. During the disputation exercises, students quickly recalled passages from Scripture and other sources of authority to support their arguments and attack their opponents.

John understood that a liberal arts education allowed students to attend to the textures and nuances among ideas. Texture represented connections of thought among scholars, theorists, and the arts in general. John confessed that he studied the arts under a number of masters and disciples of those masters, but he did not acquire extended knowledge from each class (24). John suggested that learning occurred as a process over time wherein students committed themselves to pursue wisdom. While John might not have learned much from one master, John was open to learning about the same subject from a different master.
John noted that the liberal arts connected students with a living tradition of education. By studying the liberal arts, John suggested that students could free themselves from ignorance and learn more about God’s world. John lauded the liberal arts because he argued that ideas from different arts and a multiplicity of theorists could inform the practices of students. Although John praised the liberal arts, John censured the Cornificians with similar gusto.

John’s Censure of the Cornificians

The Cornificians represented John’s main targets of criticism throughout The Metalogicon. John abhorred the Cornificians because they rejected an approach to education tied to the liberal arts. The Cornificians eliminated a number of arts from their teaching, including eloquence. John rejected the educational shortcuts offered by the Cornificians. John interpreted the Cornificians’ approach to education as an obstacle for students to learn more about God’s world.

The Cornificians represented a great danger to medieval rhetorical education. In the index, “Cornificius” and “Cornificians” were listed to appear on the following pages: 5, 9-26, 28, 31, 32, 62, 73, 203, 241, and 242. Over the course of 27 pages, John attacked the Cornificians. Throughout chapter three, John operated as a Ciceronian lawyer by placing the Cornificians on a rhetorical trial for their absurd beliefs and their refusal to teach eloquence. In this section of chapter four, additional critiques of the Cornificians are analyzed.

John used the term “Cornificians” to refer to a group of teachers who privilege style over substance. The Cornificians promised their students shortcuts to gaining successful careers. While John advocated an integrated approach to education, the
Cornificians tried to unravel the threads of the liberal arts. On one level, the Cornificians signified the type of dialecticians who attempted to upset the harmony among the arts in the trivium by praising dialectics while censuring grammar and rhetoric.

In The Metalogicon, John tried to expose and vilify the fraudulent teachers who desired to destroy the approach to a well-rounded education in favor of a narrow, specialized approach to education. According to the Cornificians, gaining employment signified the purpose of education. As Joseph R Berrigan Jr. commented, “Throughout the book there is a chill wind blowing, freezing the blood and numbing the senses. What a short life these schools had, as the chilling breath of logic kills off interest in other fields” (77). Berrigan used the term “logic” in the same way as James J. Murphy. For those scholars, “logic” functioned as a synonymous term as “dialectics.” Throughout The Metalogicon, John used the term “logic” with far more complexity and not just as an equivalent term as “dialectics.”

Although John mentioned “Cornificius” in chapter one of The Metalogicon, John waited until chapter two to describe “Cornificus.” John refused to identify the real name of Cornificus because John claimed that he did not want to offend God. John should not be praised for his demonstration of altruism because John quickly launched into an attack against the Cornificians. John remarked about “his bloated gluttony, puffed-up pride, obscene mouth, rapacious greed, irresponsible conduct, loathsome habits (which nauseate all about him), foul lust, dissipated appearance, evil life, and ill repute” (12).

While John so magnanimously indicated that he would maintain the secret identity of Cornificus, John did not heed his own advice about refraining from ad hominem attacks. With a gleeful manner, John defined Cornificius as a filthy, lusty, and...
evil creature. John suggested that the wallowing in lust by Cornificius would even shame an Epicurean pig (13). Many of John’s attacks on Cornificius contained humorous zingers, alluding to Cicero’s practice of using jokes in the courtroom during trials.

During the opening section of Book I in chapter two, John claimed that he would limit his attacks to the arguments of the Cornificians and not engage in personal insults. John warned his readers that criticizing the character of opponents who share different views should be considered a despicable act (12). John’s promise to engage ideas and refrain from personal attacks differentiated him from the standard practices of the Cornificians. Not only did Cornificus disregard the appropriate responses in argumentation, but he also denounced the study of eloquence. While John connected eloquence to wisdom within rhetorical practices, Cornificius separated eloquence from wisdom. In effect, Cornificius censured the very form of medieval rhetorical education that John praised.

John critiqued the Cornificians for abandoning an integrated approach to education. Within an approach to education tied to the liberal arts, students progressed from one art to another. According to David Luscombe, the branches of the trivium relate, but eloquence [rhetoric] coordinates all the educational disciplines (25). Educators conceived of the trivium as an integration of different areas of study. The Cornificians, in opposition to standard educational practices, abandoned teaching rhetoric in favor of a shallow practice of dialectics.

John also criticized the Cornificians for pursuing money more than teaching their students valuable content. As John exclaimed, “They pay no heed to what philosophy teaches, and what it shows we should seek or shun. They have only one concern: to
‘Make money, by fair means, if possible, but otherwise in any way at all”’ (19). John also claimed that the Cornificians lent money at interest, a practice called “usury” forbidden by the Catholic Church. John and other people of the Middle Ages held a different set of assumptions about the connection between education and money. For medieval educators, the pursuit of money was an unnatural preoccupation. Educators should pursue the practices of teaching—not money. If John’s charges against the Cornificians were accurate, then the Cornificians were both shoddy teachers and heretics.

Within John’s religious framework, the accumulation of money did not signify the pursuit of happiness. John agreed with Aristotle that people achieved happiness by completing their roles. During the Middle Ages, the Church understood money as a means to facilitate the exchange of incommensurate goods and services. In that regard, the Church shared similar presuppositions with Aristotle. Only in a modern perspective tied to capitalism would the pursuit of money be recognized as an accepted practice. The Cornificians, however, focused their attention on gaining more money instead of developing good students. John criticized the Cornificians for placing a higher value on money than the intellectual needs of their students. Educated people could make positive contributions to society. Uneducated people who lacked guidance from educated people threatened the stability of medieval society.

Within the opening pages of the Prologue of Book II, John continued his critique of the Cornificians. John expressed himself using language associated with a courtroom trial. As John declaimed, “But they [the Cornificians] are still not silenced, and refuse to acquit logic. Though maimed, and destined to be further mutilated, Cornificius, beating against a solid wall like a blind man, rashly brings to trial, and still more brazenly accuses
logic” (73). John, once more performing his prosecutorial role, emphasized to the judge and jurors that the Cornificians refused to teach logic.

First, eliminating the study of logic hindered the intellectual development of students. Second, the reduction of education decreased the likelihood that students might achieve success in their careers. Urban T. Holmes, Jr. suggested that John of Salisbury advocated a multidisciplinary approach to gaining wisdom by reading texts representative of the liberal arts (24). John noted that studying multiple branches of the arts provided greater learning outcomes, while focusing on one particular art caused intellectual sterility (100).

John critiqued the Cornificians for the final time in Chapter 25 of Book IV. John drew from Greco-Roman mythological sources to insult the Cornificians. First, John likened the Cornificians to Bromius, a god who vilified logic. Athena, the goddess of wisdom, denounced Bromius as a sorcerer and a poisoner, reducing the role of Bromius to that of a court jester or fool among the gods at court. As John asserted, “Our Cornificus, opponent of logic, may likewise be deservedly despised as the clown of philosophers” (241). One could imagine John laughing to himself as he composed that line.

Although John claimed he would limit his criticism to the flawed arguments of the Cornificians, John engaged in personal attacks against them. John referred to the Cornificians as evil people, filthy pigs, and inept clowns. John juxtaposed the Cornificians with Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and St. Augustine. The latter group of philosophers articulated a connection between logic and wisdom. John aligned himself with those theorists as a means of positioning himself as a like-minded champion of the
liberal arts. John concluded the epideictic elements within The *Metalogicon* by celebrating the timeless values of philosophy.

**John’s Celebration of Philosophy’s Timeless Values**

John celebrated the timeless values of philosophy as the final epideictic component within The *Metalogicon*. Timeless values informed virtue structures situated within particular cultural frameworks. Alasdair MacIntyre proposed, “Virtues, as understood in the past, enabled us to identify the ends towards which good individuals are to direct themselves, and virtues, unlike skills, direct us only to good ends” (117). John recognized the virtue promoted by the practices of the liberal arts. The liberal arts, according to John, provided students cultural wisdom that could inform their actions.

John’s presuppositions about the virtue structures of the liberal arts were developed throughout his life experiences. The High Middle Ages featured significant events, such as the Crusades, the Reign of Anarchy, the Investiture Controversy, and the rise of scholasticism. John referenced these events in his writings. John suggested that philosophy provided him guidance during his life journey.

John presupposed a cooperative relationship between medieval rhetorical education and philosophy. In the index, “philosophy” was listed on the following page numbers: 25, 37, 60-64, 67, 76-78, 82-84, 86, 94, 100, 103, 108, 216, 224, 266, and 268-271. John referenced philosophy over 24 pages of text. Paul A. Soukup indicated that Christian teachers took elements from classical rhetoric and adapted it for their own use (181). John integrated philosophy into his approach to medieval rhetorical education.

John noted that studying grammar prepared students to pursue philosophical wisdom. Students learned grammar to understand ideas expressed through language.
Thus, all other arts had some dependence on grammar (60). John castigated those who denied teaching grammar because understanding language comprehension enabled students to study philosophy. John identified the significant aides to philosophical inquiry as reading, studying, contemplation, and wise application of theory (64). Educational practices assisted in the development of philosophical wisdom. Philosophy, in turn, promoted contemplation about God.

In the beginning of Book II, John addressed the relationship between philosophy and education. John presupposed that God revealed His Truth within the pages of Scripture. The Early Church Fathers provided commentaries on Scripture what formed Catholic Doctrine. God’s Truth is certain an immutable, which leaves little room for debate. John asserts that people who genuinely love the truth wrangling (73). John differentiated philosophy from dialectics based on the goals and practices of each art. Dialectics, especially when considering disputations exercises, operated as a form of verbal combat.

The pursuit of philosophy concluded in gaining wisdom, while engaging in dialectics ended in achieving victory over an opponent. John characterized wisdom as most desirable because wisdom revealed what was good and articulated virtuous practices (74). Wisdom informed practices, and those practices yielded additional wisdom. Human beings demonstrated their virtue to other members of society by performing actions situated within ethical frameworks. John assumed that Catholicism granted both wisdom and ethical approaches to guide his actions.

In the beginning of Book III, John examined the value of authors introducing new ideas to their readers. For John, the term author derived from auctore, meaning one with
authority based on knowledge of a given subject. As A.J. Minnis noted, “The explication of an auctore in any discipline invariably began with an introductory lecture in which the master would say something about the discipline in general and the purpose and contents of the chosen text in particular. In subsequent lectures, the text would be discussed in minute detail” (14). Writers gained credibility from quoting accepted sources of authority. The term for this type of writer was “compiler,” meaning this person could gather quotations from authoritative texts to support their claims within the composition.

Unlike contemporary perspectives about the writing process, scholars of the Middle Ages preferred compilers to auctores. If one’s ideas were to be found within a manuscript, then those ideas must carry enough weight to warrant inclusion in the manuscript. As John claimed, “The truth of things endures, imperious to corruption. Something that is true in itself does not melt into thin air, simply because it is stated by a new author” (144). John announced his philosophical belief that God remained eternal while the world underwent change.

John expressed his philosophical position within a Catholic religious framework. John lived during the time when theologians began incorporating Aristotelian thought into Catholicism. As new knowledge or wisdom emerged throughout the centuries, the Catholic Church established ways to use that information to inform the faithful about God. As John avowed, “For my part, I seek not my own glory, but only that of Him from Whom precedes everything that is good, whether it be in myself or in others” (145).

Although John gleefully enjoyed insulting the Cornificians, John acted from a position of faith. The Cornificians not only threatened the liberal arts, but their methods undermined the philosophical pursuits of their students, which culminated in contemplation about
God. By rejecting philosophical studies, the Cornificians became an obstacle between their students and God.

John contended that faith played an important role in education, which echoed the philosophical position of medieval rhetorical education. Christians of the twelfth century viewed themselves as God’s children who were born into the world with the hope of entering the Kingdom of Heaven when they died. During their mortal lives, they viewed The Church as an institution of salvation. As a member of the Church, John placed faith at an intermediate position between opinion and science (223). John situated faith as a mean between the extreme positions of opinion (deficiency) and science (excess).

John understood opinion is an unfounded or unwarranted belief, while faith grew from a system of knowledge or religious tenets. The word “science” derives from the Latin verb *scio, scire, scivi/scii, and scitum* meaning “to know,” “to be aware of,” “to be versed in,” “to know how,” and “to realize” (Betts and Franklin 452). By placing faith between opinion and knowing, John announced his own theory of the relationship between faith and reason. As John explained, “Master Hugh says: ‘Faith is a voluntary certitude concerning something that is not present, a certitude which is greater than opinion, but which falls short of science’” (223). By citing Hugh of Saint Victor, John articulated the role of faith in human existence. Constraints limited the freedom of human beings, requiring people to engage in rhetorical practices to meet the needs of their given circumstances.

Unlike the omnipotent and omnipresent God, John recognized that human beings lacked access to all information. Human beings were forced to make decisions based on a limited amount of information. John assumed that faith supported his beliefs that his
decisions were correct depending on the circumstances. John argued that human beings should trust that they would make the correct decisions through a combination of faith in God and in wisdom acquired from the liberal arts.

John expressed the role of reason within philosophical inquiry. John used the writings of Aristotle to inform his beliefs about the value of reason. As John declared, “Reason watches out for both our body and soul, and serves as a moderator to bring them into [felicitous] cooperation. One who is contemptuous of both his body and his soul, is crippled and weak, while he who slights either is [thereby] lamed” (229). Reason functioned as mediator between the needs of the body and the needs of the soul. Reason established harmony in the human being by acting as the mean between the extremes of excess and deficiency for both the needs of the soul and the body. John’s articulation about the significance of reason announced the harmonization of Aristotle with Catholicism as one of the aims of the scholastic project.

John conceived of science (reason) as a means to apply theoretical knowledge, resulting in phronesis. John explicated the meaning of phronesis by explaining that the Greek word frono means “I relish,” referring to the satisfaction gained from satisfying a bodily appetite. Wisdom, however, consisted in the contemplation of the divine (247). People demonstrated phronesis by completing actions tied to prudence. John understood the appetitive delight as the need to satisfy bodily desires. John was more concerned that people should satisfy the needs of their soul by practicing phronesis, which benefitted all members of society. John asserted that the liberal arts provided wisdom for students to demonstrate phronesis. John emphasized the importance of strengthening the mind to increase the abilities of the body and nourish the soul.
John concluded Book IV by explaining the relationship between the minds and souls of students. John considered his writings to have spiritual implications. As John of stressed, “I piously beseech my reader and audience to intercede for me, a vain and miserable wretch, with the Virgin’s Son, Who is ‘the way, the truth, and the life’” (276). John had been familiar with the Catholic issue of intercession. Prayers of intercession asked the community of saints to intercede on behalf of the supplicant by imploring God to answer additional prayers. John’s concluding prayer reminds the readers that John crafted The Metalogicon in the name of Jesus Christ.

John defended the liberal arts as a means of glorifying God. Raymond Klibansky claimed that John emphasized the ethical and political role of education, leading to practical application of issues. John, taking a skeptic position akin to Cicero, favored the search for probable solutions as opposed to absolute certitude (11). John did not write The Metalogicon to find Jesus because John did not consider God to be missing from his life. John’s Catholic Faith already provided him certainty about the afterlife. John composed The Metalogicon to celebrate the timeless values of philosophy, which bestowed cultural wisdom that could inform the actions of people living on earth.

Conclusion

The Metalogicon exemplified an artifact of medieval epideictic rhetoric. First, John praised teachers who promoted a form of education tied to the liberal arts. Second, John censured the Cornificians because they sought to untangle the woven threads of the liberal arts. Third, John praised the timeless values of philosophy within an educational framework. John composed The Metalogicon to express the connection between
philosophy and medieval rhetorical education. John presumed that medieval rhetorical education concluded in praxis.

The *Metalogicon* offered a complex version of medieval epideictic rhetoric. John integrated philosophy within his approach to education. John announced a form of education based on a process of progression from one art to another. Studying grammar and dialectics could assist one’s comprehension of rhetorical practices. John criticized the Cornificians because their approach to pedagogy threatened to disrupt the sequence of learning tied to the liberal arts. The Cornificians promised their students shortcuts to successful careers, but John suggested that the Cornificians prevented students from experiencing a closer relationship with God. John’s spirited defense of the liberal arts offered an alternative to the growing trend in scholasticism that elevated dialectics above grammar and rhetoric.
Chapter three examined The *Metalogicon* as an artifact of medieval epideictic rhetoric. He carried on a vibrant rhetorical tradition through his writings and his practices. John praised teachers who promoted an approach to education tied to the liberal arts. John censured the Cornificians because they rejected the liberal arts as a viable approach to education. Lastly, John celebrated the timeless values of philosophy, which provided important intellectual coordinates for medieval rhetorical education.

Chapter four offers an articulation of John’s rhetorical theory. By synthesizing the Ciceronian rhetoric and Aristotelian dialectics, John contributed a unique form of rhetorical theory during the Middle Ages. Specifically, John identified an oratorical form of rhetoric that sought to sway the judgment of the crowd through induction. By privileging induction, John differentiated himself from many contemporary scholastics who preferred deduction.

Contemporary communication scholars often characterize the scholastic era as an historical moment in which educators elevated dialectics over both grammar and rhetoric. Dialecticians created elaborate systems tied to deductive reasoning in which students had navigate numerous chains of syllogisms to test knowledge or differentiate between truth and falsity. Scholastic teachers practiced a narrow, specialized focus of education that promised students a fast track to gaining employment. Many contemporary educators offer similar promises to students because the share a cultural assumption that landing a job represents the conclusion of education. John disagreed with the presupposition that
education concluded in gaining employment. For John, education represented a life-long commitment to learning.

John distinguished himself from the scholastic educators during his lifetime. First, John preferred inductive reasoning to deductive reasoning. Second, John promoted an integrated approach to studying the liberal arts. Third, John presupposed that praxis represented the conclusion of education. John argued that the purpose of education was for students to gain cultural wisdom that would inform their actions so they could make positive contributions to society. John’s medieval rhetorical theory textured his approach to education.

The *Metalogicon*, in which John articulated his rhetorical theory, is analyzed. First, the grammatical process of translation is framed as a rhetorical act. Second, the dominant perspective about John among communication scholars is examined. Third, a close-textual read of The *Metalogicon* is conducted. Specifically, the metaphors “rhetoric” and “eloquence” are examined in English edition of The *Metalogicon* and the Latin edition of The *Metalogicon*. Finally, the implications of John’s rhetorical theory, a synthesis of Ciceronian rhetoric and Aristotelian dialectics, are addressed. John suggested a reciprocal relationship between rhetoric and education. Rhetoric informed educational practices; the experiences from educational practices influenced rhetoric.

Interpretive Translation as a Rhetorical Act

The act of translation offers rhetorical implications because translation involves making choices about which set of words should be substituted for another set of words. The process of translation emerges as a rhetorical act. The word “translation” derives from two Latin words: *trans*, meaning across, and the verb *fero*, meaning “to bear, carry,
bring, suffer, endure, tolerate say, or report” (Wheelock 474). When combing *trans* and *latum*, modern English word translate is created, which means “to carry across.”

From the perspectives of Antiquity and the Middle Ages, “to carry across” could be understood as “to say across” and “to report across.” These latter choices represent the assumption that written text was formed to be read aloud. Scribes crafted texts to carry the spoken words of authors across time and space in concrete form: a scroll, a tablet, or a monument (Innis 3). Translation concluded in action, a report about what was said situated within a particular place during a specific moment of time. Acts of translation are tied to hermeneutic applications.

Western philosophy featured a long history of the study of hermeneutics. Don Ihde noted that Aristotle’s *Peri Hermeneias* (*Concerning Interpretation*) established hermeneutics within the philosophical canon (7). Ihde characterized hermeneutics as an interpretive activity tied to the issues of both language phenomena and perceptual phenomena. During the early Christian Era, hermeneutics acquired a theological role in conclusions about the proper interpretation of God’s words determined dogma. Long after modernity replaced John’s medieval world, hermeneutics continued to be an important facet of Western philosophy.

Hans-Georg Gadamer’s approach to hermeneutics has been used to describe the rhetorical implications of translation. In *Truth and Method*, Hans-Georg Gadamer expressed hermeneutics as the art of understanding texts (157). Gadamer suggested that people’s experiences shape their interpretative actions (Palmer 196). Gadamer argued that human beings try to make sense of their world within a horizon of meanings (Grondin 100). Additional insight and wisdom permitted people to open themselves to
the perspectives of others. Gadamer’s philosophical hermeneutics announced that, as human beings gained additional experiences, human acts of interpretation would reflect accumulated experiences.

The translator cannot reproduce the same text from one language to another because word for word translation is impossible. What the translator can only hope to achieve is to generate a translated text that follows the meaning of the other language in spirit but not the letter. In The Metalogicon, John articulated similar observations about translation. As John noted, “It must be admitted that idioms cannot easily be translated with full adequacy from one tongue to another” (240). The translator’s biography, cultural assumptions, traditions, and experiences of historical events shape the act of translation. Because translators lack access to all information, they are the measure of all words. The translator admits to genuine uncertainty, resulting in the need to make decisions based on a horizon of meanings.

While participating in a grammatical act, the translator simultaneously engaged in rhetoric. Translators first persuaded themselves about their word selections before persuading their readers. The act of translation operated within the horizon of Aristotle’s differentiation between matter and form in The Metaphysics. Aristotle described form as something produced that is cognizable to the senses (144). Production began with a potential thing (matter) before concluding with an actual thing (form) and concluded in form, an actual thing. The translator witnessed the horizon of possible meanings (matter) before selecting a word from one language to replace a word from a different language (form). The translated composition could be recognized as a written argument for rhetorical purposes, a text of epideictic rhetoric.
John made choices about which sources of textual authority to include in The Metalogicon. Hans Liebschütz noted that The Metalogicon is chiefly based on John’s experiences as a student, including his learning of logic and reading the recently discovered books of Aristotle’s The Organon (13). John positioned words to reach harmony among part and whole: the word with the sentence, the sentence with the paragraph, the paragraph with the page, and, ultimately, the page with the entire manuscript. The Metalogicon can be read as a demonstration of what Paul Ricoeur called the hermeneutic circle, a maxim demanding that readers believe in order to understand and understand in order to believe (28).

Medieval presuppositions about the issue of microcosm influenced John’s attentiveness to language. Man functioned as a synecdoche of God, of the cosmos, and of the state. The medieval thinker could engage in both positive and negative dialectical transcendence to gain insight about God’s world. John’s interpretive choices revealed his assumptions about how textual sources of authority may inform cultural wisdom.

Scholarly Perspectives about John

Although many communication scholars dismissed John as a rhetorician, theorists from other fields like history, literature, philosophy, political science and theology have noted John’s rhetorical practices (Talbot; McLuhan, Chenu; Nederman; Pieper). James J. Murphy’s review from 1956 of The Metalogicon might offer an explanation about why communication scholars do not associate John with rhetorical theory.

In a review of The Metalogicon published by The Quarterly Journal of Speech in 1956, James J. Murphy claimed that John’s use of “logic” implied that John lacked interest in rhetoric. As Murphy explained, “John’s title, then, means Defense of the
Logos, in the ancient Greek sense of logos as the double science of reasoning-expression. His method is to defend Grammar and Logic, which he sees as two sciences which provide men with rules for speech” (2). Murphy used a definition of logos similar to Cicero’s translation of logos. Cicero defined logos as ratio et oratio, meaning “reason and speech” (McLuhan 22). Murphy included grammar and logic, his term for “dialectics,” but he did not include rhetoric as a possible meaning for “logic.” Murphy’s next quotation likely created the significant communication perspective about John.

James J. Murphy dismissed John as a rhetorician because John addressed logic too often in The Metalogicon. As Murphy suggested:

His omission is significant, for later theorists were to follow his lead by substituting Aristotle’s Topics and Sophistical Refutations for the classical rhetorical works. John divides Logic into three types: demonstrative, probable (dialectic and rhetoric), and sophistical. It is evident that he cares little for rhetoric, since he mentions it no more than half a dozen times. On the other hand, he provides an extensive treatment of Logic (2).

Murphy noted that the number of references for the word “rhetoric” is quite small, twelve in total. The word “logic” appeared frequently in The Metalogicon, leading Murphy to conclude, perhaps reasonably so, that John lacked interest in rhetoric. By agreeing with Murphy’s remarks about The Metalogicon, many communication scholars might be hesitant to study John. John has been defined as a logician or dialectician, but not a rhetorician.

Murphy used the term “logic” as a synonym for “dialectics,” resulting in Murphy labeling John as a logician (dialectician). Murphy read John’s The Metalogicon as a
defense of dialectics, which educators had elevated about grammar and rhetoric during
the scholastic era. John, however, used the words “logic” and “rhetoric” interchangeably
because John understood the *trivium*, as well as each individual art within the *trivium*, as
logic, the verbal arts. Murphy would eventually agree with John’s position that rhetoric
was an expansive art during the Middle Ages and that medieval rhetoricians could
express rhetoric as logic, but Murphy never changed his initial position about John.
Murphy continued to associate John with logic and logicians instead of rhetoric and
rhetoricians of the Middle Ages.

Communication Scholarship about John

Although James J. Murphy provided the dominant perspective about John within
a medieval rhetorical theory, other communication scholars have offered alternative
views. The key communication scholars who have performed some studies about John
include Charles Sanders Peirce, Marshall McLuhan, and Joseph M. Miller, Michael H
Prosser, and Thomas W. Benson. Peirce explored the implications of The *Metalogicon*
for semiotics. McLuhan positioned John as a rhetorician alongside Isocrates and Cicero.
Miller, Prosser, and Benson examined John’s advocacy of the liberal arts.

The field of semiotics represented the first form of communication scholarship to
reference John. The American logician Charles Sanders Peirce admitted that The
*Metalogicus* (sic) supplied one of his favorite quotations: *Nominantur singularia, sed
universalis significanture*. Peirce found this phrase in Book II, chapter 20 of The
*Metalogicon*\(^{11}\). As John expressed “The well-known principle that what common names
mean and what they name are not identical, does not militate against what has just been

\(^{11}\) “Nec isitis praeiudcat quod fere in ominium ore celebre est, aliud scilicet esse quod appellatidia
significant, et aliud esse quod nominant. Nominantur singularia, sed universalia significantur” (Hall 90).
said. For their meaning is universal, even though they name particular things” (126).

Roman Jakobson claimed that Peirce used this Latin phrase to explain symbols in
*Speculative Grammar* (427). Both Peirce and Jakobson developed scholarship central to
the areas of linguistics, semiotics, structuralism, and communicology. Peirce and
Jakobson announced early recognition that John’s writings expressed implications for
studying human communication.

Marshall McLuhan framed John as a rhetorician within his Ph.D. Thesis for
Cambridge University called *The Classical Trivium: The Place of Thomas Nashe in the
Learning of his Time*. McLuhan studied the *trivium* as a professor of Literature.
Although McLuhan categorized John as a rhetorician, his arguments were not likely
accepted by contemporary or later communication scholars. As Marshall McLuhan
asserted, “Logic is understood as ‘logos,’ reason and speech, so that John treats the whole
*trivium* under the head of logic” (188). McLuhan arrived at the same definition of
“logic” as John, while James J. Murphy did not.

Joseph M. Miller, Michael H Prosser, and Thomas W. Benson referenced John in
*Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*. As Miller, Prosser, and Benson suggested, “though
himself a Scholastic, John was concerned about the lack of practical utility in such
subjects as logic, dialectic, and rhetoric, as they appeared in works both of the ancients
and of his own contemporaries” (215). While situating John within the scholastic era,
they noted that John did not share the common scholastic approach to education. Miller,
Prosser, and Benson noted that John labeled grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric as the
liberal arts because those arts freed people from ignorance. Studying the liberal arts
promoted the pursuit of wisdom (217). Miller, Prosser, and Benson did not associate John as a rhetorician.

Peirce, McLuhan, and Miller, Prosser, and Benson situated John within theoretical frameworks of communication. Peirce read The *Metalogicon* through the lens of semiotics. McLuhan called John a rhetorician, but McLuhan’s claims emerged in scholarship about literature. Miller, Prosser, and Benson noted that John’s approach to education differentiated him from his contemporary scholastic theorists. None of these communication scholars address John’s contribution to medieval rhetorical theory.

**John’s Rhetorical Theory in The *Metalogicon***

John articulated his rhetorical theory in The *Metalogicon*. John’s theory is revealed by performing a close-textual read of two representative texts of The *Metalogicon*: Daniel D. McGarry’s English edition from 1955 titled *The Metalogicon: A Twelfth-Century Defense of the Verbal and Logical Arts of the Trivium* and J.B. Hall’s Latin edition from 1991 titled *Ioannis Sareseriensis: Metalogicon*. The original Latin title of John’s composition was *Metalogicus*. Only within the pages of the Latin manuscript did John mention his goal to defend the teaching of logic. John did not include any language about defending logic in the title. The English edition of The *Metalogicon* from 1955 represented choices exercised by the translator. Although the English edition of The *Metalogicon* referenced the *trivium* in the title, communication scholars have dismissed John as a rhetorician.

John composed The *Metalogicon* to articulate his assumptions about education. Specifically, John defended the teaching of the *trivium* (logic). Thomas Becket received John’s completed version of The *Metalogicon*. Since Becket had also received a
thorough education, John included many esoteric statements, obscure references, and also witticisms throughout the text. Although John composed The *Metalogicon* only for Becket, surviving copies indicated a larger audience than John anticipated.

John used the word “logic” within the title of The *Metalogicon* to describe the human science of the *trivium*. John categorized science as a human activity tied to temporal, sensible things, while wisdom and understanding concern knowledge of spiritual things. John claimed that human beings could solve temporal problems and seek higher levels of wisdom, a contemplation of the divine. John understood logic as a human activity tied to speech and reason, representing all three facets of the *trivium*. Murphy, having read the English edition to formulate the review, would not have been aware that John chose the word *logicae* in the Latin version of The *Metalogicon*. In choosing the word *logicae*, John was not simply referring to dialectics. In discussing the importance of “logic,” John articulated a complex approach to medieval rhetorical theory.

John revealed a substantive and complex approach to rhetorical theory. John synthesized Ciceronian rhetoric with Aristotelian dialectics. John O. Ward noted that John of studied Latin *rhetorica* texts, many of which was based on the writings of Cicero (62). In keeping with medieval presuppositions, John addressed rhetorical practices when using the synonymous terms “rhetoric” and “eloquence.” The English edition of The *Metalogicon* from 1955 contained the word “rhetoric” and “eloquence.” The Latin edition of The *Metalogicon* from 1991 included words such as *rethorica*, *oratio*, *uerbi supellectilem*, and *eloquentiae*.

By using a close-textual read, a comparison of the English edition and Latin edition of The *Metalogicon* revealed that John’s Latin version of The *Metalogicon*
provided a more complex analysis of rhetoric than in the English edition. Medieval theorists often used the words “rhetoric” and “eloquence” interchangeably because both words expressed verbal wisdom that supported the act of persuasion. In the index for the English edition of *The Metalogicon*, “rhetoric” appears on the following pages: 16, 67, 79, 97-98, 102, 191, and 206\(^\text{12}\). “Eloquence” appears on the following pages: 10-14, 24-26, 28-31, 70, 73, 93, 190, 240-241, and 246. Each equivalent Latin passage is located in the footnotes\(^\text{13}\).

**Rhetoric**

The word “rhetoric” does not appear with much frequency in *The Metalogicon*. If the word “rhetoric” appeared only nine times in a book containing 276 pages, then Murphy’s dismissal of John as a rhetorician seems reasonable. My alternative approach suggests that John provided more of a textured understanding of rhetoric within the Latin edition than in the English edition. Murphy did not take into account John’s interchangeable use of the terms “rhetoric” and “eloquence.”

“Rhetoric” appears for the first time when John critiques the elevation of dialectics. As John suggested, “Grammar was [completely] made over; logic was remodeled; rhetoric was despised” (16)\(^\text{14}\). The Latin phrase *contemnebatur rethorica* means “rhetoric was held in contempt.” John referred to dialecticians he encountered at schools who subordinated rhetoric and grammar to dialectics. Because these dialecticians

---


\(^\text{13}\) I reference *Ioannis Saresberiensis: Metalogicon* edited by J.B. Hall when examining all Latin passages from *The Metalogicon* throughout this chapter. The corresponding Latin passages edited by Hall immediately follow the English passages.

\(^\text{14}\) “Ecce nova fiebant omina, innouabatur grammatica, dialectica immutabatur, *contemnebatur rethorica*, et novas totius quadruii uias, euacuatis priorum regulis de ipsis philosophiae adytis proferebant” (17).
sought to disrupt the unity of the *trivium*, John chastised them and labels these failed teachers with the term Cornificians.

John discussed rhetoric for a second time by exploring the relationship between rhetoric and logic. As John explained, “Logic, which contributes plausibility by its proofs, weaves the golden lightening of its reasons; while Rhetoric, where persuasion is in order, supplies the silvery luster of its resplendent eloquence” (67). The Latin phrase *rethorica in locis persuasionum* situates rhetoric within the place of persuasion. John connected rhetoric with eloquence, but also differentiated rhetoric from logic. Logic functioned as an umbrella term for the *trivium* and each art of the *trivium*, so a close textual read of the Latin source is necessary to distinguish when logic means rhetoric and when logic means something else.

In his chapter “Rhetoric and Dialectic in The Owl and the Nightingale,” James J. Murphy articulated his interpretation about John’s approach to the arts of the *trivium*. As Murphy contended, “This insistence upon ‘art’—as opposed to *formulae* or *materia*—helps to explain why John of Salisbury and his contemporaries saw no inherent conflict in this easy intermingling of the three arts of the *trivium* (209). Murphy asserted that the contemporaries of John assumed that all of the arts within the *trivium* developed similar abilities within students, resulting in John’s integration of Aristotle’s dialectical approach with the grammatical-rhetorical projects of Donatus, Priscian, Cicero, and Quintilian (209). Although the argument Murphy presents in this chapter rebuts the earlier claims in his review of The *Metalogicon*, Murphy does not refer to John as a rhetorician.

15 “Huic ut dici solet campo logica probandi colores afferens suas immittit rationes, in fulgore auri, et rethorica in locis persuasionum et nitore eloquii candorem argentum aemulatur” (52).
Rhetoric appeared for a third time when John linked rhetoric with Plato. As John stated, “Plato divided logic into dialectic and rhetoric” (79). The English edition transforms multiple clauses into multiple sentences, a common action of translation to address unwieldy Latin sentence construction. John showed his erudition by recalling Plato’s distinction between two arts of the *trivium*. John also carefully chose the term *dialecticam*, meaning “dialectics,” instead of *logica*, suggesting “logic,” which could either function as a substitute for “dialectics” or represent logic in a broader sense.

John mentioned rhetoric for a fourth time when discussing the connection between rhetoric and probable logic. As John described, “Probable logic includes dialectic and rhetoric” (79). The English edition contains a simple sentence for the sake of clarity instead of creating a long sentence comprised of multiple independent clauses. John connected probable logic to propositions that might seem valid to other people (79). He differentiates rhetoric from logic by examining the ends of each art. Dialectics test evidence, while rhetoric concerns persuasion. John assumed an integrated approach in that dialectics could provide support in an argument for rhetorical effects, in which speech or writing concludes in action.

Rhetoric appeared for a fifth and sixth time when John recalled his studies of rhetoric in France. As John recalled, “I also reviewed rhetoric, of which, together with certain other subjects, I had already learned a little in previous studies under Master Theodoric, but of which, as of these, I did not understand a great deal. Later, however, I

---

16 “Divitit eam Plato in dialecticam et rethoricam, sed qui efficaciam eius altius metiuntur, ei plura attribuunt” (60).

17 “Haec quidem dialecticam et rethoricam continent, quoniam dialecticus et orator persuadere nitentes, alter aduersio alter iudici, non multum referre arbitrantur uera an falsa sint argumenta eorum, dum modo ueri similitudinem teneant” (60).
learned more rhetoric from Peter Helias” (98). Although John wrote the term *rethoricam* once, the English edition contains “rhetoric” twice for one likely reason. *Eam* may function as a demonstrative pronoun meaning “that,” which refers to *rethoricam* from the previous sentence. In these sentences, John admitted that some of his early training in rhetoric was confusing. Peter Helias, however, proved to be a superior teacher of rhetoric for John.

While mentioning rhetoric for the eighth time, John articulated a definition of rhetorical theory. As John defined, “Rhetoric, which aims to sway the judgment of persons other than the contestants, usually employs prolonged oration and induction, owing to the fact that it is addressed to a larger number of people and generally solicits the assent of the crowd” (102). This selection is noteworthy for two reasons. First, John used the word *oratio*, translated as “rhetoric.” John could have meant “speech,” “oration,” or “spoken rhetoric” as a way of distinguishing oral forms of rhetoric from written forms of rhetoric. In the next sentence, John wrote *oratione*, meaning “oration.” In writing the word *oratione*, John expressed one of the forms of rhetoric practices, oratory. During the Middle Ages, rhetoric could be expressed as the persuasive use of language in both oral and written forms.

Second, John offered a definition tied to the spoken form of rhetoric. According to John, spoken rhetoric contains the characteristics of oration and induction. The former would have been quite familiar to many medieval thinkers because they would have been

18 “Relegi quoque rethoricam, quam prius cum quibusdam aliis a magistro Theodoric tenuiter auditis paululum intelligebam. Sed eam postmodum a Petro Helia plenius accepi” (72).

19 “Porro instrumentum quo alterutra utitur porposit suo deseruiens, oratio est. Illa enim quae iudicem mouet alium a confligentibus, continua utitur oratione et inductione frequentius, eo quod ad plures est, et plerumque populum captat” (74).
educated in the *trivium*, reading many texts from Cicero. The Ciceronian approach situated rhetoric in civil affairs, in which elected officials or lawyers could persuade their audiences through the power of eloquence. John differs from other educators, especially scholastics, by including induction within the rhetorical process. Having read The *Organon*, John would have been exposed to the role of induction in dialectics. In *Topics*, Aristotle defined induction as the movement from individuals to universals (175).

Aristotle described induction by suggesting that a skilled charioteer was an effective charioteer; thus, skilled professionals, in general, were best suited to their particular tasks. Aristotle concluded that “induction is the more convincing and clear: it is more readily learnt by the use of the senses, and is applicable generally to the mass of men, though reasoning is more forcible and effective against contradictious people” (356). Aristotle expressed the value of induction as easy to understand because the audience need only comprehend a singular case to extrapolate ideas about a multitude of cases. Second, Aristotle claimed induction was effective against a skeptical audience.

John cited the former passage from *Topics* in The *Metalogicon*. As John reported, “Aristotle also explains the nature of induction, as well as in what cases the latter may be employed with the greatest profit” (174). The word “induction” appeared a total of five times on the following pages: 174, 193, 199, 211, and 215. John claimed that induction was more suitable to orators because induction uses inference and example for persuasion (193). John suggested that one should employ the syllogism when arguing against a learned person, but, in the case of arguing against an illiterate person, one should use induction (199). Later, John noted that induction may be understood as a rhetorical syllogism (211). John asserted that syllogisms may be used in their complete form or
through the enthymeme, wherein the second proposition is suppressed (192). Lastly, John referenced induction when discussing the term universals (215). In citing Aristotle, John explained a universal as an abstract concept conceived through inductive reasoning from a particular thing.

Rhetoric appeared for the ninth time when John announced the rhetorical links from Aristotle to Cicero to Quintilian. As John remarked:

It is undoubtedly true, as Cicero and Quintilian acknowledge, that this work [Topics] has not merely been helpful to rhetoricians, but has also, for both of them and writers on the arts, even served as the initial starting point for the study of rhetoric, which subsequently expanded and acquired its own particular rules (191)\(^2\).

Cicero both read and quoted the texts of Aristotle, and then Quintilian also read and cited both Cicero and Aristotle. John became one of the first European scholars to not only read attributions to Aristotle in the secondary literature of Cicero and Quintilian, but also in the primary texts of Aristotle’s The Organon through the use of Latin translations. Having acquired rhetorical wisdom from Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, John placed himself in the direct line of succession of rhetoricians.

In Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from St. Augustine to the Renaissance, James J. Murphy cited John’s reference to Topics. As Murphy recounted, “The New Logic was to have a decisive influence on disputation technique. Within a few years, for instance, John of Salisbury felt justified in devoting a considerable portion of Book Three of his Metalogicon (1159) to a praise of the Topica;

\(^2\)“Indubitanter enim uerum est quod fratentur Cicero et Quintilainus quia hinc non modo rethoricorum adiumentum, sed et principum rethores scriptores artium assumpserunt. Postmodum tamen, propiis dialata est institutis” (131).
he was particularly concerned to point out the usefulness of the book in disputation” (104). Murphy asserted that John cited the *Topics* mostly for the purposes of suggesting that text for assistance in disputations. A closer read of The *Metalogicon*, however, leads to a different possible conclusion. John claimed that if a student must choose among *Analytics*, *Refutations*, and *Topics*, the student should master *Topics* (171). *Topics* provided an excellent source of invention, the location of arguments, for the dialectician, the orator, demonstration, sophistry, and strife. John suggested that The *Topics* could be used to inform the study of each art within the trivium.

John expressed his ideas about rhetoric for the tenth and final time when discussing the relationship between rhetoric and science. As John claimed:

> Although its rules are not only useful, but even as indispensable prerequisites for [the] science [it teaches], this book [*Analytics*] is practically worthless for providing rhetorical expression. The latter may be explained as ‘a clothing with words,’ and consists in the ability to express oneself easily and adequately in a given language” (206).\(^{21}\)

The Latin phrase *uerbi supellectilem possimus appellare* may be translated as “providing rhetorical expression.” *Appellare* is an infinitive of the verb *appello*, meaning “to address,” “to appeal to,” “to name,” and “to mention” (Betts and Franklin 40). John expressed his beliefs about the spoken form of rhetoric. Clothing with words refers to stylistic language as the accoutrements of a speech.

\(^{21}\) “Sicut autem regulae utiles sunt et necessariae ad scientiam, sic liber fere inutilis est ad frasim instruendum, quam nos uerbi supellectilem possimus appellare. Est autem frasis commode uerbi facilitates, in quavis lingua. Ergo scientia memoriter est firmanda, et uerba pleraque excerpenda sunt” (142).
The appearance of the word “rhetoric” in the English edition lacked the nuance found in the Latin edition. When taking into account the Latin translation, rhetoric may take on elements of dialectics, like induction and the syllogism, the assumptions of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, spoken rhetoric, and also stylistic language. John provided a sophisticated, multilayered account of rhetoric whose depth failed to emerge the English edition. By tracing the emergence of the word “eloquence,” a close-textual read revealed additional information about John’s approach to medieval rhetorical theory.

**Eloquence**

John mentioned eloquence for the first time when linking eloquence to education. As John admitted, “I consequently wonder (though not sufficiently, as it is beyond me) what is the real aim of one who denies that eloquence should be studied” (10)\(^22\). In this portion of the text, John critiqued the Cornificians. John distrusted the Cornificians because they disregard any study of eloquence, a combination of wisdom and language.

In contemporary communication scholarship, metaphors require definitions and citations as soon as they are introduced within the texts. John, operating from a medieval perspective, did not define eloquence the first time he writes the term because he utilizes an enthymeme. John’s audience for The *Metalogicon* would have been St. Thomas Beckett and any other cleric who was allowed to read Beckett’s copy. Beckett and these other potential clerics received a similar education to John, so they too would have been aware of the definition of eloquence. John wrote with an enthymematical style because Becket likely already understood that “rhetoric” and “eloquence” could be used synonymously.

---

\(^{22}\) “Miror itaque non tamen satis, quia non possum, quid sibi uult qui eloquentiae negat esse studendeum” (13).
Eloquence appeared for the second time when John discussed the Cornificians’ presuppositions about eloquence. As John asserted, “Nothing is to be gained by learning the art [of eloquence], or at least that benefit accruing is not worth the effort that must be expended” (10)\textsuperscript{23}. The latter quotation revealed another example of John stringing together multiple independent clauses as a common stylistic practice of the Middle Ages. The English edition simplified John’s verbosity. The Cornificians argued that the benefits of training in eloquence failed to measure up to the effort spent during the period training.

John addressed eloquence for the third time when examining the role of eloquence with wisdom. As John explained, “Just as eloquence, unenlightened by reason, is rash and blind, so wisdom, without the power of expression, is feeble and maimed” (10)\textsuperscript{24}. In this section, John countered the claims of the Cornificians by engaging in a polemic. John noted the relationship between wisdom and expression by claiming that either a lack of eloquence or wisdom resulted in a state of deficiency for the human being. Because the Cornificians failed to develop eloquence, their teaching lessons privileged neither wisdom nor expression.

Eloquence appeared for a fourth time when John recalled a Greco-Roman myth. As John remarked, “One who would eliminate the teaching of eloquence from philosophical studies, begrudges Mercury [Eloquence] his possession of Philology, and

\textsuperscript{23} “Ipsamque sicut uisum non caeco, auditum non surdo, asserit gratis a natura prouenire ei qui mutus non est, sed plenius se naturae munus exercitio roboretur, nec tamen beneficium aliquod ab arte praestari, aut id munus quam labor artis exposcat” (13).

\textsuperscript{24} “Sicut eam eloquentia non modo temeraria est sed etiam caeca quam ratio non illustrat, sic et sapientia quae usu uerbi non proficit, non mododebilis est, sed quodam modo manca” (10).
wrests from Philology’s arms her beloved Mercury” (11). John alluded to Greco-Roman myth, which was used for allegorical purposes. During the twelfth century, the educational practices of the Church had grown sophisticated enough that teachers and students could read pagan literature and philosophy so that they could put those ideas into practice in the service of the Church. Citing Greco-Roman myths did not mark John as a heretic, but rather as a medieval thinker who received a well-rounded education.

Eloquence appeared for the fifth time when John juxtaposed eloquence with the teachings of the Cornificians. As John critiqued, “Verbose rather than eloquent, he is continually tossing to the winds verbal leaves that lack the fruit of meaning” (13). John’s use of the term *facundus* meant “eloquent,” “fluent,” and/or “readiness of speech.” Fluency and readiness of speech suggested aptitude and wisdom. John’s inclusion of *facundus* announced a speech act tied to wisdom within a moment of counsel, instruction, or rule.

John mentioned eloquence for the sixth time when discussing the boasts of the Cornificians. As John averred, “He boasts that he has a shortcut whereby he will make his disciples eloquent without the benefit of any art, and philosophers without the need of any work” (14). John attacked the Cornificians for promising their students eloquence by taking shortcuts. John rejected shortcuts because he functioned as a craftsman. In taking a craftsman approach to career in the Church or any other profession, John would

---

25 “Mercurio Philologiam inuidet, et ab amplexu Philologiae Mercurium auelit qui eloquentiae praeceptionem a studiis philosophiae eliminate” (13).

26 “Siquidem non facundus est sed uerbosus, et sine fructu sensuum, uerborum folia in uentum con	

27 “Fabellis tamen et nugis suos pascit interim auditors, quos sine artis beneficio si uera sunt quae promittit faciet eloquentes, et tramite compendioso sine labore philosophos” (15).
have likely assumed that practices functioned as an important part in developing a skill set. As a cleric, John put his education into rhetorical practices whenever he wrote letters on behalf of the Archbishop of Canterbury or when he was on a diplomatic mission representing King Henry II.

Eloquence appeared for the seventh time when John described the pedagogical theory of the Cornificians. In this section of the text, John articulated the erroneous belief of Cornificius regarding eloquence. As John recalled:

In the judgment of Cornificius (if a false opinion may be called a judgment), there is no point in studying the rules of eloquence, which is a gift that is either conceded or denied to each individual by nature. Work and diligence are superfluous where nature has spontaneously and gratuitously bestowed eloquence, whereas they are futile and silly where she has refused to grant it (24)²⁸.

John revealed the fundamental assumption grounding the Cornificians scorn for training in eloquence: people are either born eloquent or not. Nature, rather than nurture, determines who has the gift of eloquence. John’s attack on the Cornificians here can be explained in the Cornificians’ lazy approach to education. The Cornificians disregarded eloquence entirely as some innate, natural talent.

Eloquence appeared for the eighth time when John discussed the Cornificians. As John continued, “Even the most diligent study of rules cannot possibly make one eloquent” (25)²⁹. John revealed another Cornifician falsehood, which suggests that

²⁸ “Non est ergo ex eius sententia si tamen falsa opinion sentential dicenda est, studendum praeceptis eloquentiae, quoniam eam cunctus natura ministrat aut negat. Si ultro ministrat aut sponte, opera superfluit et diligentia. Si uero negat, inefficax est et inanis” (22).

²⁹ “Praeterea ratio praeceptorum quod polliceretur non efficit, et omnino impossibile est, ut quis eloquens etiam diligentissimo studio praeceptorum” (22).
training cannot lead to eloquence. First, the Cornificians claimed that eloquence was a trait determined at birth. Here, the Cornificians asserted that no amount of education can make a person eloquent. John exposed the subtlety of the Cornificians lies. The Cornificians refused to teach eloquence because eloquence could not be taught. After studying eloquence, John entered into a career in the Church. John’s personal experiences refuted the claims of the Cornificians.

Eloquence appeared for the ninth time when John articulated how the Cornificians dismiss the importance of developing eloquence. As John claimed, “Even though rules may be of some help in acquiring eloquence, still they involve more trouble than they are worth, and the return never compensates for the investment” (25) \(^{30}\). In this passage, John continued his polemic against the Cornificians. The Cornificians wavered by admitting that one might be educated to become eloquent, but the amount of time and effort spent during the education would not be worth the miniscule results. Although the Cornificians might allow for the possibility that education could lead to eloquence, the actual level of eloquence achieved would not be worth the intense pursuit.

John mentioned eloquence for the tenth time when John posed a rhetorical question about the beliefs of the Cornificians. As John asked, “Did they first have to await the art of verbal expression or the rules of eloquence?” (25) \(^{31}\). Beginning with this section, John attacked some of the faulty reasoning of the Cornificians. John’s query indicated a connection between the arts and eloquence. Any art required practice for improvement and eloquence demanded an active mind that linked wisdom and discourse.

\(^{30}\) “Ad haec et si eloquentiae praecepta proficerent, plus habent laboris quam utilitatis, nec dispendium operae aequa unquam compensabitur retributio mercedis” (23).

\(^{31}\) “Nunquid artem orationis expectant, aut praecepta eloquentiae?” (23).
John understood the role of practices tied to a given art or a career, countering the position of the Cornificians. They promise instant success without any of the long-term practices required to develop a craftsman approach.

John mentioned eloquence for the eleventh time when discussing the relationship between eloquence and philosophy. As John argued:

Finally [Cornificius argues], what can eloquence and philosophy possibly have in common? The former relates to language, but the latter seeks after, investigates, and applies itself to learning the ways of wisdom, which it sometimes efficaciously apprehends by its study. Clearly the rules of eloquence confer neither wisdom nor love of wisdom (25).32

These sections are quoted in full because the Cornificians separated eloquence from philosophy. Such a move should not be too surprising as philosophers since Plato have tried to separate rhetoric (eloquence) from philosophy. If John stood in opposition to the Cornificians, he must have assumed that eloquence, rhetoric, and philosophy shared an intellectual relationship. John shared similar presuppositions as articulated by Jeffrey Walker in Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity. Walker asserted that rhetoric derived from both epideiktikon and pragmatikon, rhetorical and poetic speeches informed by philosophia situated within Greek culture (7). John recognized the link between eloquence and philosophy without Walker’s access to Greek texts.

Eloquence appeared for the twelfth time when John explored the link between eloquence and philosophy. As John contended, “From what has been said [if we are to

32: Postremo quid est eloquentiae cum philosophia? Altera enim consistit in uerbo, altera sapientiae uias affectat, inuestigat et circuit, et interdum pro studio efficaciter apprehendit. Plane eloquentiae praecepta sapientiam non conferunt sed nec amorem eius, et saepissime quidem ei optinendae ei optinendae non conferunt” (23).
believe Cornificius], it is evident that philosophy eliminates the rules of eloquence from its activities” (25). John emphasized the Cornificians’ claim that separates philosophy from eloquence. Thus far, John has not expressed his own definition of eloquence or explained why the Cornificians have been wandering about in error. Clearly, John could exercise some restraint and reveal his arguments. John’s was purposely dragging out this section of The Metalogicon as an allusion to the courtroom practices of Cicero. John placed the Cornificians on a rhetorical trial. As prosecutor, John articulated all of their assumptions before providing his counter arguments.

Eloquence appeared for the thirteenth time when John restated the pedagogical beliefs of the Cornificians. As John suggested, “According to the Cornificians, ‘Rules of eloquence are superfluous, and the possession or lack of eloquence is dependent on nature.’ What could be farther from the truth? What is eloquence but the faculty of appropriate and effective verbal expression?” (26). Like one of Cicero’s prosecutorial speeches, John repeated the position of the Cornificians before attacking their argument. Second, and most importantly, John defined eloquence as a faculty of appropriate and effective speaking. If eloquence were a faculty, as John suggested, then that faculty could be improved through education and practices. In pointing out the absurdity of the Cornificians, John concluded that human beings can learn eloquence because eloquence is not simply a gift from nature.

This passage also revealed one of the when John discussed the importance of truth in medieval rhetorical education. The word “truth” appeared on the following pages: 50, 33

33 “Ex his itaque liquet, quia praecepta eloquentiae ab operis suis philosophia elminat” (23).

34 “Superflua sunt praecepta eloquentiae, quoniam ea naturaliter adest, aut abest. Quid inquam falsius? Est enim eloquentia facultas dicendi commode quod sibi uult animus expendiri” (24).
The most important use of the word truth is located on page 249 where John defined truth by citing St. Augustine. John defined the “truth” as true reason, meaning certitude, as sure and unwavering (249). John referenced St. Augustine who argued that God alone possess true reason, but He may grant some people genuine certitude and secure judgment. John, later in the same page, cited a passage from The City of God where St. Augustine called logic the science of the truth.

John defined eloquence the fourteenth time he used the term. As John explained, “Not everyone who speaks, nor even one who says what he wants to in some fashion, is eloquent. He alone is eloquent who fittingly and efficaciously expresses himself as he intends” (26). John added more requirements for eloquence. John initially used the words loquitur, which was tied to speech, but then used the term profert, the third-person singular active indicative, deriving from profero, a verb meaning “to carry forward,” “to bring forth,” “to display,” “to utter,” “to publish,” “to disclose,” and “to postpone” (Betts and Franklin 404). The Latin edition offered more subtlety than the English edition.

John linked eloquence to verbal expression when eloquence appeared for the fifteenth time. As John explained, “One who can with facility and adequacy verbally express his mental perceptions is eloquent. The faculty of doing this is appropriately called ‘eloquence’” (26). John connected eloquence to both written and oral forms in

---

35 “Siquidem non est eloquens quisquis loquitur, aut qui quod uoluerit utcumque loquitur, sed ille dumtaxat qui animi sui arbitrium commode profert” (24).

36 “Ergo cui facilitas adest commode exprimendi uerbo quidem quod sentit eloquens est; et hoc faciendis facultas rectissime eloquentia nominatur” (24).
which the speaker or the author brought forth wisdom or knowledge corresponding to the ideas in one’s mind.

Eloquence appeared for the sixteenth time when John expressed the usefulness of eloquence. As John admitted, “For myself, I am at a loss to see how anything could be more generally useful: more helpful in acquiring wealth, more reliable for winning favor, more suited for gaining fame, than is eloquence” (26). This passage represented a turn in John’s argument for eloquence because he proposed a practical application of eloquence. John posited that eloquence determined success, an antithesis of the Cornificians’s argument. While they promised shortcuts to success by refusing to teach eloquence, John reprimanded them, he attacked their argument, and then he claimed that success could be achieved by developing eloquence.

Eloquence appeared for the seventeenth time when John explained the value of eloquence to both young and old people. As John claimed, “Moreover, while eloquence both illumines and adorns men of whatever age, it especially becomes the young” (27). Eloquence, an educational activity that leads to rhetorical results, could assist students of any age. John advocated that people should become life-long learners.

John connected successful careers with eloquence when mentioning eloquence for the eighteenth time. As John asked, “Who are the most prosperous and wealthy among our fellow citizens? Who the most powerful and successful in all their enterprises? Is it

37 “Qua quid esse possit praestantius ad usum, compendiosius ad opes, fidelius ad gratiam, commodius ad gloriam, non facile uideo” (24).

38 “Haec autem cum omnem aetatem deceat et exornet, clariorem efficit iuuentute, eo quod aetas tenerior gratiae quodam modo lenocinatur, ut ingenium uenditet” (24).
not the eloquent?” (27). Once again, John connected eloquence with successful careers by asserting that the most prosperous people were also the most eloquent. John did not actually name any of those powerful citizens because he performed an enthymeme. Beckett might have suspected John was alluding to him, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

When John mentioned eloquence for the nineteenth time, John attacked the Cornificians. As John castigated, “He who despises such a great boon [as eloquence] is clearly in error; while he who appreciates, or rather pretends to appreciate it, without actually cultivating it, is grossly negligent and on the brink of insanity” (27). The English edition translated desipientiae as “insanity,” but “foolishness” would have been an English word closer to the meaning of the Latin term. John moved to using ad hominem attacks against the Cornificians. If students were willing to follow the Cornificians, then they demonstrated a high level of foolishness.

Eloquence appeared for the twentieth time when John continued his verbal assault on the Cornificians. As John remarked, “The Cornificians argue that nature herself gratuitously grants eloquence to anyone who ever comes to possess it, whereas she arbitrarily and irrevocably refuses and denies it to those fated never to become eloquent” (28). Almost in the middle of his attack against the Cornificians, John stopped his polemic to repeat the fundamental argument of the Cornificians. John operated as a

---

39 “Qui sunt enim qui florent inter conciues, qui sunt qui opibus pollent, qui sunt qui praevent praevalent uiribus, et in omnibus negotiis optinent, nisi eloquentes?” (25).

40 “Qui ergo tanti boni contemptor est, manifestissime despit. Qui autem diligit, immo se dilligere simulat et non excolit, nimis negligens est, et desipientiae proximus” (25).

41 “Ceterum hanc aliquando habituris gratis ipsa natura largitur, et non habituris eam negat et perpetuo subtrahit, ut liquido constet operam ulteriorum, aut inanem esse aut superuacuam” (25).
prosecuting attorney. John dramatically paused to restate the position of the Cornificians. A reader can sense that John has been enjoying his prosecution of the Cornificians.

Eloquence appeared for the twenty-first time when John noted that natural talents could be developed. As John asked, “Who has ever, by nature’s gift alone, and without study, had the privilege of being most eloquent in all tongues, or even in only one language?” (31). John’s use of questions indicated his return to his attack on the Cornificians. In this extended question, John relied on the enthymeme to rebut the propositions of the Cornificians. Becket was expected to provide the answer to these questions because he probably would have assumed that both education and practices resulted in eloquence.

The twenty-second appearance of eloquence coincides with John’s assertion that eloquence may be found among people in varying degrees. As John claimed:

If it is good to be eloquent, surely it is better to be very eloquent. The degrees of comparison are not here in the inverse ratio to the good proposed, as with ‘fluent’ and ‘extremely fluent,’ where the positive term connotes wisdom and eloquence, but wisdom diminishes, and the flow of speech swells to a flood, in proportion as the comparison increases (31).

These sections are quoted in full because John articulated his belief that eloquence could be developed through practices. People demonstrated their eloquence by varying degrees. John also made a passing observation about the changing assumptions of

---

42 “Quis autem ope naturae hunc assecutus est titulum, ut sine studio in omnibus immo uel in una linguarum eloquentissimus haberetur?” (27).

43 “Vitque si eloquentem esse bonum est, et eloquentissimum esse melius erit. Neque enim hic in contrarium bona quod proponitur comparationis gradus ex crescunt, quemadmodum in eo qui disertus dicitur aut disertior, cum positius sapientiae sensum habeat, et eloquentiae, quantum excrescit comparatio, tantum des crescit sapientia, et eloquii fluuis increscit” (27).
education. Instead of pursuing a well-rounded education, many students sought a narrow and faster form of education.

When John mentioned eloquence for the twenty-third time, John discussed the practicality of eloquence. As John accounted, “Although some of the arts pertaining to and imparting the power of eloquence are natural, still that art [of eloquence] which is practically as we would want it cannot be known by nature since it is not natural” (31) 44. John announced that developing eloquence is more of a human activity than a natural gift, suggesting that intense study may develop eloquence. John’s repetition about using one’s faculties of reason alluded to Aristotle. John proceeded on a dialectical path between Aristotle and Cicero to provide a synthesized approach to rhetoric that may inform educational practices in the High Middle Ages.

Eloquence appeared for the twenty-fourth time when John continued his attack on the Cornificians. As John alluded, “While this [Cornifician] sect does not condemn eloquence, which is necessary to everyone and approved by all, it holds that the arts which promise eloquence are useless (31) 45. John continued the rhetorical trial of the Cornificians by repeating their fundamental claim that teaching eloquence is a fruitless exercise. John walked a different dialectical path by moving from the Cornificians’ position to his own position as a method to support his argument while attacking their argument.

This section also functions as the last time John would attack the Cornificians. Specifically, he criticized their assumptions regarding eloquence. From this point in The

---

44 “Sed licet aliquae artium contingentium et docentium uirtutem eloquii, naturam attingant, illa tamen quae ad placitum fere est naturaliter sciri non potest, quia nec naturalis est” (28).

45 “At haec domus non eloquentiam criminatur quae omnibus necessaria est, et commendatur ab omnibus, sed artes eam pollicentium arguit esse inutiles” (28).
Metalogicon, John would continue to extol the value of eloquence without mentioning the Cornificians. John, as the rhetorical prosecutor, proceeded to his closing arguments against the Cornificians

When eloquence appeared for the twenty-fifth time, John promoted a communal approach to education. As John proclaimed, “Nothing serves better to foster the acquisition of eloquence and the attainment of knowledge than such conferences, which also have a salutary influence on practical conduct, provided that charity moderates enthusiasm, and that humility is not lost during progress in learning” (70). John chose the word “conferences” to express the appropriate use of communal learning. Earlier in this section, John described the teaching method of Bernard of Chartres. Bernard required that his students compose poetry and prose every day for a period of time every day that class was held.

“Conferences,” could also be replaced with “comparisons” or “criticisms.” John provided a glimpse of medieval cooperative learning. Cooperative learning is a learning methodology in which students work in groups to reach a goal or complete an assigned task by sharing information disseminated from the teacher or other texts (Chapman, Leornard, and Thomas 44). Chapman, Leonard, and Thomas link co-authoring to cooperative learning. In co-authoring, each student uses his or her knowledge of grammar and rules of composition to generate a section of the paper. Although cooperative learning has been an accepted educational practice in the United States since

---

46 “Et qui in toto praexercitamine erudiendorum nihil utilius est quam et quod fieri ex arte oportet assuuescere, prosas et poemata cotidie scriptitabant, et se mutuis exercebant collationibus, quo quidem exercitio nihil utilius ad eloquentiam, nihil expeditius ad scientam, et plurimum confert ad uitam, si tamen hanc sedulitatem regat caritas, si in profectu litterario servetur humilitas” (54).
the 1980s, John’s allusion to Bernard of Chartres suggested that cooperative learning, conferences, had been a feature of education in France nearly 900 years before.

When John mentioned eloquence for the twenty-sixth time, John linked eloquence with the study of grammar. As John revealed, “I feel that we have adequately demonstrated that, in absence of grammar, not only is perfect eloquence precluded, but also the gateway to other philosophical pursuits is blocked to those who would engage in them” (73). John argued that an integrated approach to the liberal arts allowed students to develop their levels of eloquence. By marginalizing any singular art, the teacher decreased the overall effect of education.

John connected eloquence with wisdom when eloquence appeared for the twenty-seventh time. As John asserted, “It is a well known fact that ‘Eloquence without wisdom is futile.’ Whence it is clear that eloquence derives its efficacy from wisdom. The utility of eloquence is, in fact, directly in proportion to the measure of wisdom a person may have attained. On the other hand, eloquence becomes positively harmful when it departs from wisdom” (93). In this section, John emphasized the connection between the level of eloquence and the level of wisdom by suggesting a relationship of direct proportionality.

John used the writings of Cicero to place education and rhetoric into conversation with each other. Education functioned as a rhetorical act because educators disseminated cultural wisdom to students. If rhetoric informed education, then education also affected

---

47 “SYPERIORIS libri serie satis arbitror expeditum grammaticam non esse inutilem, et quod sine illa non modo eloquentia perfecta non constat, sed nec ad alias philosophiae professiones contendentibus aliqua patet ulla” (56).

48 “Eloquentiam sine sapientia, non prodesse celebre est et uerum. Vnde ipsam ut prosit, a sapientia contrahere manifestum est. Ergo et pro modulo sapientiae quam quisque adeptus es eloquentia prodest. Nocet enim haec si dissocietur ab illa” (69).
rhetoric. Experiences shaped people’s perspective. These experiences increased the wisdom of the participants, who then used that wisdom as a form of education to influence their rhetorical practices.

When John mentioned eloquence for the twenty-eighth time, John addressed the relationship between eloquence and dialectics. As John suggested, “It is accordingly evident that dialectic, the highly efficient and ever-ready servant of eloquence, is useful to anyone in proportion to the degree of knowledge he possess” (93)\(^49\). John articulated his belief that dialectics and rhetoric may cooperate in education. John also stated that the level of one’s knowledge had a direct proportionate effect on one’s success in dialectics. John distinguished between dialectics and rhetoric by associating knowledge with the former art and wisdom to the latter art.

Eloquence appeared for the twenty-ninth time when John alluded to Topics. As John declaimed, “It [Topics] instills its disciples such astute skill that one may clearly see that it is the principle source of the rules of all eloquence, for which it serves as a sort of primary fountainhead” (190)\(^50\). John claimed that dialectics might inform one’s practices of rhetoric. Although John already made a similar assertion in previous sections, John announced that dialectics, Topics in particular, may provide information about the rules of eloquence. Instead of separating Cicero and Aristotle into distinct, combative intellectual camps, John attempted to harmonize both the philosophers (Aristotle and Cicero) and their respective projects (dialectics and rhetoric).

\(^49\) “*Ex quo liquet dialecticam quae inter ministras eloquentiae expeditissima est et promptissima, unicuique prodesse ad mensuram scientiae suae*” (69).

\(^50\) “*Quia ergo exercitatio dialecticae ad alterum est, pares quos rationibus muniit, et locis, sua docet arma tractare, et sermones potius consrerere, quam dexteras, et tanta cautela imbuit, ut totius eloquentiae praecepta hinc tracta principaliter uelut a primituo fonte originis suae manare perspicuum sit*” (131).
Eloquence appeared for the thirtieth time when John referenced to The Refutations. As John recalled, “For the Refutations, while they exercise a student equally as much as the Analytics, are most easily understood and more effectively promote the development of eloquence” (241). John promoted another Aristotelian text, [Sophistical] Refutations, as a means of informing one’s rhetorical practices. John claimed that students who master the ideas found within Topics, Analytics, and Refutations and put those ideas into practice will have great command over invention, the source of arguments, and judgment in every branch of learning (171).

This section marked the last time John connected eloquence and dialectics. John concluded his argument by advocating an integrated approach to education. He suggested that all fields of inquiry should work together cooperatively. The result of this intellectual relationship could produce a well-rounded education. Student could then use their acquired theory to inform their practices and fulfill their roles in God’s world.

When eloquence appeared for the thirty-first time, John concluded his declamation about the significance of eloquence within education through a discussion of Greco-Roman mythology. As John asserted, “Mercury, the god of eloquence, in accordance with the exhortations of his mother, wed Philology” (246). John returned to the marriage of Mercury and Philology to remind Becket that communities were formed through brotherly charity and the reciprocal interchange of services within a relationship of education, philosophy, and humanity’s social contract (11). John began with an explanation about the mythological roots of eloquence, and then, having engaged in

---

51 “In eo autem mihi uidentur analetics praeferendi, quod non minus ad exercitium conferunt, et faciliior intellectus eloquentiam promouent” (162).
52 “Mercurius eloquentiae praesul hortatu matris in Philologiae nutptias transit” (165).
dialectical practices, returned to that same position over 230 pages later. John
demonstrated his belief that dialectics, which promoted transcendence, were static, unlike
rhetoric, which concluded in movement.

Eloquence appeared for thirty-second and last time when John linked eloquence
to Venus, the goddess of love. As John claimed, “Venus, who represents the happy
combination of wisdom and eloquence, derides the foolishness of nude, unarmed, windy
eloquence” (246). John suggested that Venus functioned as an allegory of the best kind
of eloquence, a happy combination of wisdom and eloquence. What might John be doing
here? Both John and Becket understood Venus as the goddess of sexual and erotic love.
Venus signified the most attractive qualities of the female body. On one level, John
revealed himself as a humanist. John has read enough pagan literature that he could
recall information to produce rhetorical effects in his writing. Reading Greco-Roman
myths as allegories would have been an educational exercise John learned as a student in
France.

On a second level, John told a joke. Beckett, as the Archbishop of Canterbury,
was not allowed to have sexual relationships with women following the movement
toward a celibate clergy. Roger Ray claimed that John wrote the Historia Pontificalis to
his friend Peter of Celle during a time of exile in Rheims. Ray’s argument provided
texture for understanding John’s joke in The Metalogicon.

The Historia Pontificalis contained many jokes and comedic turns of phrases. In
one account, Henry the Bishop of Beauvais, had an intense argument with his brother
during the Second Crusade and Henry asked Pope Eugenius to release him from
episcopal duties. Although the pope refused the request, John wrote that Henry forgot the

53 “Cipris enim quae mixtura condivuntur, inermis nudaque ventosaeque facundiae deridet ineptias” (165).
pope’s decision by the time Henry returned home. After sending a letter to the pope asking for clarification, Henry received one hand-written letter from the pope providing the decision and then a second letter displaying the pope’s irritation at Henry. Henry eventually was invested as the Archbishop of Rheims in 1162. John’s ridicule of Henry had comedic effect for Peter of Celle because Henry continued to perform the role of archbishop in the same city in which John and Peter were living (90).

Ray suggested that John followed the practices of Cicero by telling jokes. If John’s attacks on the Cornificians could be interpreted as placing the Cornificians on a lengthy rhetorical trial, then John announced his rhetorical theory within an elaborate mock trial. John had a devilish sense of humor, relying on obscure references and pieces of information that only a small number of highly educated people could appreciate. John’s esoteric humor was revealed throughout the prosecution of the Cornificians. John’s final joke left Becket with an image of a fleshy, sexual goddess. Becket, however, was not permitted to act on any sexual impulses. One could easily picture John sitting at his desk and laughing himself silly about this quip and the vision of Becket’s reaction.

John mentioned “rhetoric” few times throughout The Metalogicon. James J. Murphy dismissed John as a rhetorician because the word “rhetoric” appeared infrequently. John defined rhetoric as an art that seeks to influence the judgment of a great audience through means of oration and induction (102). Rhetoric, according to John, functioned best as a communal act. The inclusion of induction revealed Aristotle’s dialectical influence on John,

John mentioned “eloquence” numerous times throughout The Metalogicon. James J. Murphy ignored the 32 appearances of the word “eloquence.” For John,
“eloquence” functioned as an equivalent term with “rhetoric” because “eloquence” related to the verbal expression of wisdom. While John defined rhetoric within a framework of oratory, eloquence expressed the medieval presuppositions of an expanded form of rhetoric. Eloquence included oratory, preaching, the composition of both poetry and prose, letter-writing, and also medieval rhetorical education.

Conclusion

This chapter addressed John’s contribution to medieval rhetorical theory. First, translation was viewed as a rhetorical act. Second, James J. Murphy’s dismissal of John as a rhetorician was examined. Third, a close-textual read of The Metalogicon was performed. Specifically, the metaphors “rhetoric” and “eloquence” were compared between the English and Latin editions of The Metalogicon.

John’s rhetorical theory represented a synthesis of Ciceronian rhetoric and Aristotelian dialectics. After reading The Organon, John suggested that dialectics could inform rhetorical practices, which fostered the development of eloquence among students. John agreed with Cicero by asserting that the level of one’s eloquence is directly proportional to one’s level of wisdom. John countered the growing trend in education during the scholastic era by demanding an integration of the arts within the trivium instead of an elevation of dialectics. Although John lived during the scholastic era, his articulation of medieval rhetorical education positioned himself against both the Cornificians who refused to teach logic and the dialecticians who preferred a narrow, specialized version of education.
CHAPTER FIVE

The *Metalogicon*: A Medieval Response to Contemporary Calls for Educational Praxis

Chapter four expressed John’s contribution to medieval rhetorical theory. By synthesizing the Ciceronian rhetoric and Aristotelian dialectics, John expressed a unique rhetorical theory during the Middle Ages. Specifically, John identified an oratorical form of rhetoric that sought to sway the judgment of the crowd through induction. By privileging induction, John differentiated himself from many contemporary scholastics who preferred deduction.

This concluding chapter examines the implications of John’s medieval rhetorical approach to education for praxis. The *Metalogicon* provides intellectual frameworks for teaching rhetorical virtue. First, an overview of medieval rhetorical education is addressed. Second, an analysis of John’s assumptions about teaching is discussed. Third, the role of ethics in within education is explored. Fourth, John’s presuppositions about virtue are revealed. Fifth, The *Metalogicon* is studied as an expression of John’s beliefs that effective medieval rhetorical education concluded in praxis that benefitted all members of society.

Traditions of Medieval Rhetorical Education

John created The *Metalogicon* within a medieval cultural framework that established connections between education and rhetoric. Joseph R. Berrigan, Jr. announced that The *Metalogicon* contained a clear picture of the educational system in the twelfth century. John remarked on his educational experiences in a nostalgic manner (77). John both articulated his memories as a student in France and expressed his beliefs about the role of education in society. Roger Ray noted that John claimed that rhetoric
addressed sensible reality, phenomena in the world. Because sensible reality referred to
the domain of human beings and not God, people used rhetoric to find possible solutions
but not absolute truth (74). When students studied rhetoric, they gained cultural wisdom
that could be used to assist them as they confronted existence within God’s world. From
a medieval perspective, the liberal arts acquired rhetorical characteristics because
education concluded in praxis (theory-informed actions) that contributed to the common
good of society.

Medieval rhetorical education developed from the educational practices of
Antiquity. Desmond O’Grady posited that the Frankish Kingdom developed from an
integration of good administration methods and educational standards using the Latin
language (183). Two institutions, the Catholic Church and the Frankish Kingdom,
preserved and promoted rhetorical education during the Early Middle Ages. C.J.B.
Gaskoin noted that the study of law held an inferior position to the study of medieval
rhetoric, which included both prose and poetry (36).

The Catholic Church initiated actions that preserved knowledge. Rooms, called
*scriptoria*, within monasteries and other ecclesiastical buildings throughout Europe were
spaces dedicated for numerous monks to copy manuscripts. Rosamond McKitterick and
John Marenbon argued that the scriptoria supplied the needs of schools and libraries
(102). Clergymen within one scriptorium could generate multiple copies of one text, and
then disseminate those copies among other scriptoria or the households of the nobility.

These monks generated a product called manuscripts, a word whose origin derives
from the Latin words *manus*, meaning “hand,” “band,” and “handwriting” and *scibo*,
meaning “I write” or “I compose” (Wheelock 478; 484). Joining these two words created
a term meaning “writing by hand.” Since monks copied manuscripts by hand, variance across manuscripts became a common phenomenon. Variances represented slight alterations among the same text, containing slight differences of word choice or spelling. Janet Martin warned that determining the causes of variations in manuscripts can be problematic because the error could be copied through direct quotation or through an error during collation (183). If a cleric failed to correct an error, that mistake could be perpetuated into future manuscripts.

The amount of time needed to craft a copy of a manuscript also varied depending upon the requested detail or ornamentation. The level of craftsmanship necessary to create the manuscript had a direct correlation with the fee. A simple copy would cost less than an illuminated manuscript, which contained intricate pictures, flourished of calligraphy, or special inks composed of gold or silver. The simple copy offered functionality over ostentation. Wealthy nobles might have possessed many illuminated manuscripts, while peasants might not have any manuscripts in their homes. Paul Soukup argued that these manuscripts functioned as examples of visual rhetoric (181). Not all the clerics across Europe acquired an equal education, but they could appreciate the artistic form of the illuminated manuscripts.

Manuscripts, including holy writs, often contained jokes in the forms of strange images drawn by the copyists. Clerics revealed their senses of humor by depicting fantastic creatures, naked people, or covert sexual symbols in the margins of the manuscript. For example, a colorful bird with a very long beak might place the tip of the beak into a blooming flower. Sexual images could be juxtaposed with monstrous depictions. Robert Mills noted that some monks depicted Jesus as a monster (41),
Holy Trinity might be drawn as a person with three faces within the space of one head, as an entity with three heads, or as a being with two heads and dove wings attached to the central body, signifying the Holy Spirit.

Although the clerics might add some images for the purposes of humor, the clerics assumed that their practices had religious significance. Their physical labor, such as cramped hands, tired eyes, or exhausted minds, had spiritual implications. Clergymen considered the physical pain experienced during manuscript production to function as a form of penance. Le Goff presumed that the clerics equated copying as a work of penance that allowed them entrance into Heaven (9). The temporal, physical pain atoned for some of their sinful behavior.

The Frankish rulers promoted rhetorical education so the ecclesiastical ranks could be filled with educated people. Frankish nobles could use these educated clergymen as wise counselors. Pierre Riché recalled that Charlemagne established schools where children learned to read, and that monasteries should teach the psalms, writing, chant, basic mathematics, and grammar (191). During the early stages of education, grammar gained the distinction as the foremost art of the trivium by inviting students into academic conversations tied to cultural wisdom through language.

Riché asserted that Charlemagne took a grammatical approach to creating standardized Latin by instituting clerical reform throughout his realm. Alcuin of York, an educated ecclesiastical scholar himself, adapted his style of Latin to fit the king’s demands (11). The relationship between Charlemagne and Alcuin of York represented a synecdoche of the interaction among the Church and State during the Early Middle Ages.
Charlemagne protected Alcuin and offered his court for Alcuin to teach. Alcuin educated students who could be put into the service of Charlemagne and the Church.

Alcuin, in addition to teaching grammar, also pursued rhetorical wisdom. Luitpold Wallach claimed that Alcuin constructed a treatise on rhetoric as an epistle, an example of *littera exhortatoria*. During the lifetime of Alcuin, people conceived of letter writing as a rhetorical act, as assumption which lasted throughout the Middle Ages (53). Like John and future rhetoricians, Alcuin acquired insight about rhetorical perspectives from reading Ciceronian texts. Alcuin generated much of his treatise on rhetoric using Cicero’s *De Inventione* as a source (Wallach 36).

Alcuin’s rhetorical approach influenced educators well beyond the lifetime of John. Rhetoricians could be put into the service of both the Church and the State. Medieval rhetoricians assumed an expansive form of rhetoric that included letter writing. As a cleric, John engaged in rhetorical practices by writing numerous letters both on behalf of archbishops and on his own accord.

During the reigns of the Frankish kings, monasteries operated as the educational centers of Europe. While John was studying in France, however, monasteries competed for students with cathedral schools, which would grow into universities. Urban T. Holmes Jr. posited that the monastic schools experienced greater continuity in the quality of teaching than their cathedral school counterparts. Monastic schools did not depend on the abilities of the *scholasticus vagans*, the wandering scholar, employed for short periods of time by the cathedral schools (16).

These itinerant teachers, like Peter Abelard, traveled throughout Europe teaching at various cities along the way. University administrators could use the prestige of the
masters as a lure for students. These universities and monasteries could be envisioned as idea factories. Students learned cultural wisdom tied to Catholicism that could inform their actions to best serve society.

Medieval educators of the High Middle Ages welcomed the writings of Aristotle to curricula throughout Europe. Jacques Le Goff described the thinkers of the twelfth century as professionals who used Ancient texts as tools to complete their tasks (12). The Catholic Church established a tradition of synthesizing new ideas or the discovery of old knowledge to fit within Catholicism. Gaskoin indicated that the educational system was created to be put into service of the Church; any ideas that could be used either directly or indirectly by the Church would be preserved. If the Church could not apply those ideas, then those ideas would not be preserved (168). Educators within the Church could use pagan literature to teach students grammar by interpreting the texts allegorically and discussing how the ideas from pagan literature could be read through a Christian lens.

Medieval educators situated the liberal arts within a Christian framework, resulting in a Christian method of pedagogy. John cited the word *methodon* from the Greeks to describe a plan which assists thinking to better comprehend nature and avoid wandering (33). The word “wanderings” should not be underestimated. If one were to use the Latin available to John, then wanderings would derive from the verb *erro* whose principles parts were *erro, errare, erravi*, and *erratum* (Wheelock 474). The contemporary meaning for wandering shared similar meanings to the word “error.” People erred when they ventured away from the proper path, leading to heresy. Scholars themselves had to be careful not to stray too far from the accepted teachings of the
Church. If educators fell into heresy, they were given the opportunity to recant their statements.

Until scholasticism became the dominant philosophical and theological movement of the Middle Ages, rhetoric remained the preeminent art of the *trivium*. Nancy F. Partner claimed that rhetoric had been the center of education. Poetry and literary prose, legal discourse, eulogies and propaganda, and verbal displays for entertainment all flowed from the font of rhetoric during the Middle Ages (9). In *The Metalogicon*, John’s defense of logic included his argument that rhetoric could be studied and practiced in a multiplicity of ways. Teaching rhetoric included training in exposition of poetry and literature, in eloquence, speaking well and speaking wisely, and in effective letter writing, *ars dictaminis* (Holmes18).

John simultaneously expressed his beliefs about medieval rhetorical education with *The Metalogicon* and demonstrated medieval rhetorical practices. Medieval educators developed an integrated approach to studying the liberal arts. Students began learning the arts of the *trivium* before studying other arts. Medieval education acquired rhetorical elements because the practices of both education and rhetoric concluded in praxis that could benefit all members of society. John drew from the cultural wisdom he acquired from his education to establish his own perspective about teaching.

**John’s Perspective about Teaching**

Throughout *The Metalogicon*, John addressed the vocation of teaching and also described various pedagogical methods. When discussing teaching, John often called on his memory to give examples of his personal experiences. John coupled his past experiences with his present reflections on those events by creating a narrative. Averil
Cameron noted that Christian audiences were more likely to accept specific accounts that related to general structure-maintaining narratives (93). While reading The *Metalogicon*, Becket would have recognized elements of both forensic and epideictic rhetoric. If Becket had taken John’s pedagogical advice seriously, then he could have interpreted John’s text as political rhetoric by establishing an enthymemematic link between the shared leadership abilities of rhetoricians and educators.

Throughout The *Metalogicon*, John articulated his perspective about teaching. John used versions of the Latin verb *doceo*, meaning “to inform, “to demonstrate,” and “to teach” (Betts and Franklin 153). The definitions of the verb *doceo* revealed connections with the modern English word “education.” The word “education” derived from the Latin verb *duco*, meaning “to lead,” “to pull,” and “to draw forth” and the Latin verb *edo*, meaning “to put forth” (159). The last English word to be analyzed in its Latin form is “to call” because teaching is a vocation, a calling from God. “Calling” derives from the Latin verb *voco*, meaning “to call,” “to invoke,” “to summon,” “to challenge,” “to designate,” and “to name” (Betts and Franklin 550). The three Latin words *doceo*, *duco*, and *voco* established an intimate philosophical relationship that informed John’s presuppositions of medieval rhetorical education.

John presupposed a reciprocal relationship between education and rhetoric. Teachers disseminated knowledge and wisdom to their students. Knowledge represented temporal ideas that could be tested through Aristotelian dialectics, while wisdom contained timeless cultural values. Teachers persuaded students to follow them along a path of wisdom informed by the liberal arts. By practicing the rhetorical theory of Cicero, educators taught, delighted, and moved students into action. John suggested that
educators should situate their lessons in ethical frameworks. Students selected that cultural wisdom like drawing water from a deep well to frame their actions. By completing their roles, students contributed to the common good.

John’s Ethical Approach to Medieval Rhetorical Education

Throughout The *Metalogicon*, John announced that educational practices should be situated in ethical frameworks. As John espoused, “Of all branches of learning, that which confers the greatest beauty if Ethics, the most excellent part of philosophy, without which the latter would not even deserve its name” (67). Ethics functioned as a central component to philosophy. John revealed that the first part of understanding philosophy began with an articulation of one’s ethical position.

Catholicism informed John’s ethical framework. While Aristotle argued that ethical actions would contribute to the common good of the polis, John repositioned the polis as God’s world. Educated people could put their talents into service of the community and the Church. As John noted, “In ethics, materials for selection and rejection are provided by virtue, vice, and the like” (108). Marquita Walker argued that ethics classes were needed in education to raise awareness of ethical issues among students and to assist them in developing ethical behavior (70). Walker noted that students could make ethical decisions more effectively when ethical standards were announced and agreed upon by teachers and students. John suggested that both good and bad situations provided people the opportunities to make ethical decisions.

John connected ethical frameworks with philosophical positions. John referenced Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle as philosophers who contributed to the development of ethics. As John claimed, “For to physics and ethics, which Pythagoras and Socrates
respectively had already fully taught, Plato added logic” (77). “Logic” or *logicam* indicated that Plato addressed the issue of *logos*, reason and speech, and not merely dialectics. John’s philosophical references indicted an integrated of ethics and philosophy within education.

John suggested that ethics functioned as a line of inquiry within moral philosophy. Gina Weisblat and Christina Sell noted that ethics play promoted both academic and career growth (64). Weisblat and Sell contended that future teachers would need to develop skill sets beyond the discipline, such as writing and research methods, using technology, and effective oral communication skills. Philosophy, ethics, and logic were situated within a larger framework of wisdom. One’s level of wisdom informed the level of eloquence, which influenced one’s practices. John claimed that people should situate practices within ethics.

John argued that ethics may also inform dialectical practices. John proposed that Book III of The *Topics* could inform the study of physics and ethics because Aristotle discussed values of things that can be compared (178). John referenced Aristotle to suggest that dialectics could assist students with making ethical decisions. As John continued, “The three fields of philosophy: natural, moral, and rational, all provide material for dialectic. Each presents its own special problems. Ethics investigates [such questions as] whether it is better to obey one’s parents or the laws when they disagree” (103). Students could engage in dialectics to answer questions about whether loyalty to the family would be more important than loyalty to the state.

As a cleric assisting the Archbishops of Canterbury, John experienced similar ethical dilemmas. John suffered disgrace from King Henry II during the years 1156 to
1157 over the issue of loyalty. John was accused of placing his loyalty to the pope above his loyalty to the king. Fred Niederman, Sallie Taylor, Geoffrey N. Dick, and Lesley Peck Wee Land claimed that moral agents, either as individuals or members of a group, must make decisions based on limited information, scarce resources, unknown consequences, and reactions from stakeholders (240). Niederman, Taylor, Dick, and Land situated ethics within rhetorical practices by suggesting that teachers and students must make decisions based on the best available information. John acknowledged that ethics influenced the decision-making process and that people’s actions had consequences in society.

John placed the career of teaching within an ethical framework. Ethics, according to John, should be situated within philosophy (67). John presupposed that medieval rhetorical education contained branches of ethics and philosophy. John’s assumptions about ethics informed his beliefs about virtue.

John’s Medieval Rhetorical Education Promotes Virtue

Throughout The Metalogicon, John addressed the importance of virtue in human existence. John claimed that virtue should be understood as the most important quality to achieve happiness (10). John used the term “happiness” in the manner of Aristotle. Human beings achieved happiness by reaching their ends through completing their assigned roles within the polis. John situated Aristotle’s definition of happiness within Catholicism. Catholicism shaped medieval rhetorical education.

John articulated the role of virtue in medieval rhetorical education. Practices revealed one’s virtue to the other members of society. Gerrit de Moor defined speaking the language of virtue as announcing the connection between the child’s behavior and
virtues (55). Instilling virtue in students required that teachers allowed students to take ownership in the decision-making process. As Judy S. Richardson and Raymond F. Morgan stated, “The goal of teaching is to take students from being dependent on the teacher to being independent in their learning habits. We call this ‘making students autonomous learners.’” (27).

Teachers should announce ethical frameworks that students may use to solve problems. John suggested that human beings may only achieve happiness within an ordered human society. Whoever would hinder the contributions that ground that society would prevent other people from happiness (10). John understood people as social beings who practiced cooperation for the benefit of society. Medieval Catholics coupled their education with their religious ethical presuppositions, leading to actions that demonstrated their virtue to their fellow Christians.

John referenced philosophical texts to inform his beliefs about virtue. First, John cited Romans writers such as Seneca and Cicero. As John expressed, “[Seneca] is a strong advocate of virtue and a great teacher of morality. In the second place, his pithy epigrammatic style is admirable for its succinct brevity, while his diction is both beautiful and vivid. Consequently, those who love either virtue or eloquence cannot but be pleased [with Seneca]” (62). John noted the relationship between eloquence and virtue. If one possessed wisdom, then that person should also be eloquent. If these teachers or students were to achieve eloquence, then they should be able to differentiate between good actions and bad actions.

Virtue emerged in the practical application of education within a public setting. Witnesses could interpret whether or not the actions they saw represented proper conduct.
As John claimed, “Prudence, according to Cicero, is a virtue of the conscious soul, a virtue whose object is the investigation, perception, and skillful utilization of truth” (221). Wayne Melville, Bevis Yaxley, and John Wallace associated virtues with professional development (96). Melville, Yaxley, and Wallace suggested that teachers should be attentive to moral and ethical concerns about the subjects they teach so students recognize the efficacy between the lesson and real life situations.

Second, John cited medieval authors to expand the definition of virtue. John referenced Victorinus, a theorist who ranked virtue and wisdom, different words expressing the same meaning, above eloquence, health, and friends (27). John asserted that some philosophers conceived of the terms “virtue” and “wisdom” as synonymous terms. Bruce Martín, Alan Bright, Philip Cafaro, Robin Mittelstaedt, and Brett Bruyere noted that teachers could instill virtue ethics among students by means of the practical application of classroom content (294). Martín, Bright, Cafaro, Mittelstaedt, and Bruyere cautioned educators that students developed virtue over time by cultivating ethical practices, suggesting that students should acquire virtue in a proactive fashion.

John suggested that students could develop virtue by using ethics to inform their decisions. These actions, happening in either public or private spaces, should be coordinated by ethics. David Carr rejected the presupposition of a sharp division between personal and professional values among educators. Carr asserted that good teachers should not only follow rules but also act from positions of morality (172). Carr noted that teachers often confronted a complex set of moral and logistical problems that they must resolve without any guarantee of finding perfect solutions.
John connected virtue and educational practices. As John stated, “One who will not embrace demonstrative and probable logic is no lover of the truth; nor is he even trying to know what is probable. Furthermore, since it is clear that virtue necessitates knowledge of the truth, one who despises such knowledge is reprobate” (84). Virtuous people would be more likely to recognize the truth than people lacking virtue.

Thomas V. McGovern and Samantha Leigh Miller noted that educators have the ability to change the future. Over time, successive generations of students would learn the values of reflection, acquisition of skill sets, and an enthusiasm for life-long learning (278). McGovern and Miller concluded that teacher-scholars should integrate personal reflection with interpretive conversations with colleagues to foster ethical actions in the classroom. If all teachers within departments coordinated their pedagogical practices with ethical frameworks, then the combination of all of those classes would reflect the corporate belief that education promoted ethical practices.

John suggested that teachers should establish clear links between lesson content and ethical ground from which students could inform their practices. John claimed that people of different ages could benefit from developing virtuous practices. As John noted, “Just as virtue which is out of proportion to tender youth is acknowledged, so that virtue which does not desert those who are becoming feeble with age is also acceptable” (143). If virtues were tied to wisdom and wisdom were connected to eloquence, then John implied that medieval rhetorical educators promoted a commitment to develop a life-long pursuit of wisdom among students.

Connie Titone posited that sympathy, an essential component for developing virtue, was a feeling that denoted a relationship between one person and another (94).
Educators may use sympathy to teach students that they should understand themselves as members of larger communities outside the classroom. Titone argued that students should open themselves to alterity and difference. John embraced similar presuppositions by asserting that Catholicism bestowed a necessary ethical framework. Medieval Catholics could reveal their innate virtue by completing their roles to serve their communities.

John articulated his beliefs about the relationship between virtue and education throughout The Metalogicon. John comprehended virtue as the public demonstration of one’s ethics. John assumed that teaching could foster virtue. While performing assigned roles in society, people could demonstrate their virtue by contributing to the common good. John argued that praxis represented the telos of effective medieval rhetorical education.

John’s Call for Rhetorical Educational Praxis

John concluded that praxis represented the telos of medieval rhetorical education. The term “praxis” means “theory-informed action.” The English edition of The Metalogicon, however, lacks the word “praxis” in the index. “Praxis” did not enter the European lexicon until the sixteenth century (Oxford Dictionaries). Although the word “praxis” did not occur in the English translation, “practice” appeared multiple times. John used the term “practice” during certain circumstances to achieve the same results as if he were to use “praxis.”

The modern English word “praxis” has etymological roots in both Latin and Greek. “Praxis” derives from the Greek verb “prattein,” meaning “to do.” Prattein, which is the infinitive πραττειν, is an expression of prasso (πράσσω), the first-person
singular active indicative verb. When consulting A Greek-English Lexicon: A New Edition, Revised and Augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones D. Litt. in Two Volumes, one encounters approximately one and one-half columns of possible definitions across pages 1460 and 1461. Definitions that might provide texture for Latin derivatives could include: “to pass through or over,” “to experience certain fortune,” “to achieve, effect, or accomplish,” “to be successful,” “of sexual intercourse,” “to manage affairs or business,” “to do something to one,” “to study,” “to practice” (1461). The multiplicity of these definitions suggests an intimate relationship between contemplation and action.

The Greek prattein led to the emergence of three Latin verbs: colo, exerceo, and meditor. Practice, the modern English word, derives from three Latin words that John could have written in The Metalogicon: colo, exerceo, and meditor. Colo means “To cultivate a farm,” “To inhabit,” “To cherish/protect,” “to court/honor,” “to worship,” “to practice qualities or pursuits,” and “to adorn/embellish” (Betts and Franklin 92). Exerceo means “to train,” “to occupy,” “to harass,” “to use tools,” “to perform,” “to practice” (174). Meditor means “To contemplate,” “to devise,” “to plan,” “to practice,” and “to rehearse” (289). These Latin verbs, like their Greek counterpart, combine action and contemplation. Since colo, exerceo, and meditor involve action tied to thought, the word “practice” functions as an accurate English translation.

Throughout The Metalogicon, John often associated “practice” with “study.” The word “study” appeared in the following pages: 34, 35, 149-150, 199-200. By juxtaposing the English edition of The Metalogicon with the Latin version, an analysis of the word “study” reveals that John often chose “practice” to achieve the same meaning as “praxis.” John mentioned “study” for the first time to discuss habits. As John commented,
“Nature, the first fundamental, begets the habit and practice of study, which proceeds to provide an art, and the latter, in turn, finally furnishes the faculty whereof we speak” (34). The phrase exercitium studii indicated that John used the verb exerceo to signify “practice.” John aligned habits with practices, defining practices as repeated actions that occurred over time.

John associated effective study methods with practice as a counter to the Cornificians. The shortcuts offered by the Cornificians failed to assist students in their pursuit of wisdom to inform their actions. As Gillian R Evans observed, “He does not like to see technical skill regarded as an end in itself, or applied to the resolution of frivolous difficulties” (167). Study appeared for a second time when John alluded to Cicero. As John recalled, “‘Study’ (according to Cicero) ‘is the diligent and vigorous application of one’s mind to the determined accomplishment of something’” (35). John referenced Cicero to indicate that study involved contemplation and mental exertion.

John mentioned study for the third time when addressing the issue of talent. As John avowed, “For progress, two things are necessary: studious practice and a supporting vein of good talent. A good intellect readily assents to what is true, and rejects what is false” (199). John linked the word “study” with exercitii, expressing a cooperative relationship between theory and practice. If study could improve the faculties of reason,

---

54 “Et haec quidem est omnium origo artium, ut cum natura praecacens usum et exercitium studii pepererit, <pariant> usus et exercitation artem, ares autem eam de qua nunc agitur facultatem” (30).

55 “Est autem ut Ciceroni placet studium assidua et uhehens animi applicatio ad aliquid agendum magna cum voluptate” (30).

56 “Ceterum ut quis ueniat ad profectum, sicut studium exercitii, ita et uenam laudibilis necesse est subesse ingenii. Ingenium uero bonum est, quod uero facile adquiescit, et falsum aspernatur” (137).
which increases the intellect, then John suggested that practice and study could help people acknowledge truth and reject falsity much faster.

John emphasized study when discussing the value of practices. As John articulated, “‘Practice makes perfect,’ and begets a skill in proving and investigating the truth” (200)\(^57\). If one were to develop one’s practices, one could easily discern truthful actions. John argued that practices could improve as students gained additional knowledge and wisdom. Students could then use their experiences to inform their practices.

John offered a philosophical texture for study. As John asserted, “Although one may sometimes profitably exercise [his reason] alone, just as he does with a partner, still [mutual] discussion is evidently more profitable than [solitary] meditation” (200)\(^58\). John described developing one’s reasoning abilities as a communal activity. Informed practices better served society. John presupposed that society benefitted from communal action. John’s discussion about learning in a group setting anticipated the contemporary educational metaphor of cooperative learning. The term “cooperative theory” replaced the term “group work” among educators. Hephzibah Roskelly professed the values of group work because students benefitted through communal learning. During moments of discussion, students could exchange ideas and expand their horizons of learning (53). John grounded his assumptions about cooperative learning within Aristotelian thought. John presupposed that human beings experienced a natural inclination to form

\(^{57}\) “Vius quidem exercitium roborat patrique facultatem probandi et examinandi ueri, facilius tamen et expeditius, si artis praeceptorumque compendio solidetur” (138).

\(^{58}\) “Sed licet nunc ad alterum contingat utiliter exerceri, collatio meditatione uidetur utilior” (138).
communities. John expressed a direct link between human language acquisition and the creation of human societies.

Ultimately, John presented a reciprocal relationship between praxis and the Church. While demonstrating praxis in society, one could benefit the Church. Educators within the Church could draw from praxis-oriented experiences to frame the lessons for their students. Medieval rhetorical education granted students theoretical and cultural frameworks to inform their actions. The Church as an institution offered ethical guidance. John presupposed a cooperative relationship among teachers, students, and the Church. As a cleric and bishop, John demonstrated praxis in service of the Church. While John recognized that not all students would embark on careers within the Church, he assumed that praxis could be demonstrated by all members of society to make positive contributions in God’s world.

John provided a theory of medieval rhetorical education. First, John drew upon the wisdom he acquired from his own experiences of medieval rhetorical education. Second, John framed teachers as rhetoricians who persuaded students to follow them along a path of wisdom grounded in the liberal arts. Third, John situated medieval rhetorical education within an ethical framework. Fourth, John suggested that medieval rhetorical education promoted virtue among students. Fifth, John argued that medieval rhetorical education concluded in praxis that benefitted all members of society.

The Implications of John’s Medieval Rhetorical Theory

John’s medieval rhetorical theory contained theoretical implications for the communication discipline and contemporary educators. In The Metalogicon, John contributed to the development of medieval rhetorical theory by synthesizing Ciceronian
rhetoric and Aristotelian dialectics. The *Metalogicon* offers an additional artifact of medieval epideictic rhetoric for communication scholars to study. While The *Metalogicon* may broaden the scope of communication research, John’s writings provide theoretical coordinates for the pedagogical practices of contemporary educators.

**Implications of John’s Medieval Rhetorical Theory for Communication**

John’s medieval rhetorical theory offered implications to the communication discipline. John synthesized Ciceronian rhetorical practices with Aristotelian dialectics. Ciceronian rhetoric, especially his use of “circumstances,” had resonance in medieval courts of law. Circumstances represented components of arguments that served to define particular attributes of cases (Copeland 67). John extended Cicero’s rhetorical approach beyond the court room and into many additional spaces within society. After reading The *Organon*, John articulated ways of placing Aristotelian dialectics within a framework of medieval rhetorical education.

John announced that both Cicero and Aristotle promoted pragmatic application of their respective theories. In “The Educational Theory in the Metalogicon of John of Salisbury,” McGarry noted John’s use of ideas from both sacred and profane sources (663). When coupling Greco-Roman philosophical sources with passages from Scripture and Patristic commentaries, John argued that the interaction of diverse ideas could lead to a rich education. In The *Metalogicon*, John indicated how the *trivium* could foster human wisdom. John claimed three ascending stages: opinion, science, and wisdom (McGarry 666). Opinion derived from a person’s reaction to their environment. Science could be understood as methods of investigation tied to reason. Lastly, wisdom could emerge through understanding.
John’s argument about the *trivium* could be viewed as a three-dimensional grid system. R.W. Southern described the *trivium* as literary subjects (66). Southern’s characterization of the *trivium* the complication relationship among human thought, human language, and human action. Placing grammar along the x-axis recognizes the role of opinion. Human beings may verbally express their reactions to their world through language. Science may be plotted along the y-axis in relation to dialectics as a means of testing knowledge and weighing the strengths of propositions through the faculties of reason. The z-axis, the area of rhetoric, signifies understanding through movement across space and time. Human beings comprehend their world through combining contemplation of their minds and bodily actions to meet their needs of existence.

The *Metalogicon* provides a glimpse of an expansive version of rhetoric that had been practiced during the Middle Ages. John’s articulation of medieval rhetorical education reflected the practice of integrating Classical, pagan, and Christian ideas to be put to use for the benefit of society (Cameron 20). Medieval teachers and students presumed that education concluded in praxis that contributed to the common good of the Christian community. John’s defense of logic reacted to the growing trend in scholasticism that favored specialized education over the liberal arts.

Throughout the *Metalogicon*, John expressed his preference for an integration of education, praxis, and rhetoric. The liberal arts could promote freedom from ignorance by expanding the worlds of students. John claimed that human beings must apply their minds for the quest of wisdom, which allowed people to formulate and exercise sound judgment (74). Students could enlarge their horizons of understanding by study a diverse
assortment of the arts. As they gained valuable insights, students could draw from this
cultural wisdom as a means of assisting them as they made decisions.

**Countering Murphy’s Dismissal of John as a Rhetorician**

John has remained a marginalized figure within the communication discipline following Murphy’s dismissal of The *Metalogicon* as a rhetorical text during the 1950s. In his “Review of the Metalogicon,” Murphy rejected John as a rhetorician because John focused on defending the teaching of logic (2). Murphy generated his critique through John’s term “logic.” John’s use of logic did not correlate with Murphy’s perception of John’s use of “logic.” *The Bremen and Frieburg Lectures* of Martin Heidegger might provide an explanation about why Murphy’s interpretation of “logic” greatly differed from John’s meaning of “logic.”

Heidegger posited that the transformation of “dialectics” into the term “logic” occurred as a result of the philosophical approach of G.W.F. Hegel. Heidegger argued that the theoretical-speculative development of dialectics changed into a separate domain of intellectual inquiry in Hegel’s *The Science of Logic* (78). Hegel transformed dialectics into a larger system addressing the rules of human thinking. In “Preface to the Second Edition” of *The Science of Logic*, Hegel explained that logic expressed a methodology of abstraction tied to consciousness, concerning “thoughts as thoughts” (Lewis 34). After Hegel became a dominant voice in philosophy, Western scholars could accept “dialectics” as a synonymous term with “logic.”

Murphy, having gained an education situated within Western philosophical presuppositions, interpreted John’s “logic” as “dialectics.” John, however, defined “logic” as “the science of verbal expression and [argumentative reasoning]” (32). He
explained that “logic” derived from the Greek *logos*, meaning “word” and “reason.” John noted that his use of “logic” represented, in a wide sense, all instruction relative to words. John’s mention of instruction referred to the *trivium*. No speculation about Murphy’s reason for disregarding John’s definition will be undertaken, especially since the quotation appeared in the very same English edition that Murphy read to construct his critique.

The following word substitution exercise using three quotations from Murphy’s “Review of the Metalogicon” might reveal the strange character of Murphy’s interpretive choice. First, three significant quotations from Murphy’s review are included. Second, the word “logic” will be replaced by “*trivium*: grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric.” The phrase “*trivium*: grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric” represented John’s wide use of “logic” to include all instruction relative to words. The goal of this exercise is to demonstrate that Murphy dismissed John based on an interpretation of “logic” that John never promoted within *The Metalogicon*.

The following two quotations appeared in James J. Murphy’s “Review of The Metalogicon” from *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* in 1956. As Murphy expressed, “John’s title, then, means Defense of the Logos, in the ancient Greek sense of logos as the double science of reasoning-expression. His method is to defend Grammar and Logic, which he sees as two sciences which provide men with rules for speech” (2). As Murphy remarked, “It is evident that he cares little for rhetoric, since he mentions it no more than half a dozen times. On the other hand, he provides an extensive treatment of Logic” (2).
The previous quotes from Murphy have been altered to reflect John’s meaning of the term “logic.” The substituted words will be placed in italics within brackets for points of emphasis. As Murphy expressed, “John’s title, then, means Defense of the Logos, in the ancient Greek sense of logos as the double science of reasoning-expression. His method is to defend Grammar and [trivium: grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric], which he sees as two sciences which provide men with rules for speech” (2). As Murphy remarked, “It is evident that he cares little for rhetoric, since he mentions it no more than half a dozen times. On the other hand, he provides an extensive treatment of [trivium: grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric]” (2).

The process of word substitution indicated that Murphy’s rejection of John was constructed on faulty premises. Murphy argued that John ignored rhetoric in favor of logic. Yet, Murphy’s understanding of “logic” had been most likely formed from Hegel’s transformation of “dialectics” into “logic.” Throughout The Metalogicon, Murphy might have read the word “logic” as “dialectics,” regardless of John’s statements to the contrary. The word substitution exercise could produce an almost comedic effect if one were to perform the same actions with Murphy’s overall criticism of John. The Metalogicon should not be considered a rhetorical text because John defended [trivium: grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric] too much. John should not be labeled a rhetorician because he wrote too much about [trivium: grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric], while he barely mentioned rhetoric.

James J. Murphy’s dismissal of John as a rhetorician in 1956 created the dominant perspective among communication scholars that has lasted to the contemporary era. Although this dissertation has sought to provide the alternative view that John should be
considered a rhetorician, the challenge of reshaping a long-held assumption remains great. Publications and conference presentations describe some steps in opening additional conversations about the implications of John’s writings for medieval rhetorical theory. The work to reshape commonly held assumptions about theorists has been one of the vibrant characteristics of communication scholarship.

The scholarship of both Richard L. Lanigan and Calvin L. Troup signify alternative approaches to reading important theorists. Specifically, Lanigan articulated the implications of Maurice Merleau-Ponty for semiotic phenomenology. Troup proposed a non-Neoplatonic interpretation of St. Augustine within medieval rhetorical theory. These distinguishable explications of theorists extended conversations within the communication discipline.

In Speaking and Semiology: Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s Phenomenological Theory of Existential Communication, Richard L. Lanigan analyzed the implications of Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s existential phenomenology for communication theory. As Lanigan proposed, “The dialectical operation of perception and expression form an explanation for thought and action at the personal, interpersonal, and social levels of human involvement” (19). Lanigan described Merleau-Ponty’s communication theory as a combination of psychological and philosophical methodologies to explain human beings as the speaking man, homo loquens.

Speaking and Semiology functioned as a development of Lanigan’s earlier scholarship on Merleau-Ponty. In “Rhetorical Criticism: An Interpretation of Maurice Merleau-Ponty,” Lanigan interpreted Merleau-Ponty as an alternative view to the dichotomy of speaker and listener (69). By explicating the existential phenomenological
project of Merleau-Ponty, Lanigan reframed the bifurcation of either speaker or listener into a gestalt of both speaker and listener. By engaging the existential phenomenology of Merleau-Ponty, Lanigan directed scholars to follow the communication discipline’s less-taken paths of inquiry.

In Temporality, Eternity, and Wisdom: The Rhetoric of Augustine’s Confessions, Calvin L. Troup offered an interpretation of The Confessions as an important source for St. Augustine’s rhetorical assumptions. His choice of The Confessions represented a stark contrast to most communication scholars who selected On Christian Doctrine as the primary source for St. Augustine’s approach to rhetoric (Eidenmuller 178). Troup claimed that his ambition was to offer an analysis of The Confessions that might lead others to read St. Augustine’s text on its own terms (10). Troup’s work also posed as a departure from traditional scholarship by arguing against the traditional interpretation of St. Augustine as a Neoplatonist (Edenmuller 180). By focusing on The Confessions and distancing St. Augustine from Neoplatonism, Troup demonstrated that distinct exegesis of theorists may open conversations within the communication discipline.

John has not garnered serious attention among communication scholars since Murphy’s dismissal of The Metalogicon during the 1950s. A word substitution exercise revealed that Murphy attacked an argument that John never made. While countering a long-held assumption about a theorist might prove difficult to achieve, the work of Lanigan and Troup offer hopeful examples. Lanigan situated Merleau-Ponty’s existential phenomenology within communication theory. Troup focused on The Confessions as an alternative source of St. Augustine’s rhetorical theory and as St. Augustine’s rejection of
Neoplatonism. The next section examines the implications of John’s rhetorical theory to academia.

Implications of John’s Medieval Rhetorical Theory to Academia

John’s approach to medieval rhetorical education offers coordinates for contemporary educators within academia. The term “academia” derives from the word “academy,” meaning “Society of learned individuals organized to advance art, science, literature, music, or some other cultural or intellectual area of endeavor” (Merriam-Webster Dictionaries). “Academy” originated from Ancient Greece in reference to the location of Plato’s school of philosophy near an olive grove outside the city of Athens circa fourth century BCE. In a very broad sense, the term “academia” refers to collection of administrators, students, and teachers from kindergarten through 12th grade and higher education, including undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral levels in both public and private institutions. While acknowledging the diverse array of participants within the myriad of levels within academia, one common denominator remains: the essential cooperative relationship among instructors and students within the classroom.

John’s comments in The Metalogicon reflected his concerns about learning during a period of educational crisis. John described teaching as a process in which instructors should emphasize content of lessons and suggest practical applications for their students (86). Students, whether they were kindergartners or doctoral candidates, would benefit from learning how to put theory into practice. John anticipated the values of differentiated instruction, a pedagogical practice promoted by contemporary educators. John noted that positive rapport established among teachers and students enhanced
learning outcomes. The *Metalogicon* contained strategies to improve student writing and reading.

John composed *The Metalogicon* during a time of educational crisis. He experienced a shift between a focus on the liberal arts to a specialized scholastic education. America of 2013 had been confronted by an equally important crisis in public education from kindergarten to twelfth grade. Many promises of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 have yet to reach fruition. The NCLB Act had not closed the achievement gap among students from different social classes. As Ira Shor insisted, “Working-class students from under-funded, over-regulated schools develop lesser-valued cultural capital and little control of high-status linguistic practices” (9). From Shor’s perspective, the effective use of language could help students participate in social mobility. John recognized that eloquence could improve social mobility by allowing students to enter into meaningful careers.

Students from disadvantaged backgrounds could use their education to improve their socio-economic statuses. Jim Burke suggested that teachers have the power to help students understand that education could offer them a means to enter into a larger world. One important role of the teacher was to facilitate critical thinking among the students (413). John’s education granted his entrance into a career in the Church. John’s biography provides hope to a number of students in elementary schools from lower class backgrounds that education could prove to be a way for them to reach for better lives.

John argued that educators should use a multiplicity of teaching methods to best reach their students. Nederman and Forhan commented that *The Metalogicon* provided both a survey of education and a critique of pedagogy during the twelfth century (27).
Nederman and Forhan noted that John stressed that human beings could develop their natural talents through study and effort. John argued that students could cultivate their talents through education to best serve their communities.

John’s pedagogical commentaries included the act of interpretation. Specifically, John recalled the teaching style of Bernard of Chartres. Bernard preferred students learn gradual assimilation of texts by understanding the meanings of words and the relation of passages to other studies (67). Chang noted that higher-level processes include both meaning construction and comprehension, which drew from background knowledge. Students interpreted texts, made inferences about the content, and then evaluated the information within the texts (57). By referencing Bernard, John arrived at similar conclusions as Chang about the multifaceted process of interpretation.

John established his credibility to offer pedagogical commentary because he worked for a period of time as a teacher. Reginald L. Poole noted that John had to obtain a license so that he might be able to teach, a position John could use as a means to alleviate his poverty (322). In an admission that has relevance to contemporary teachers, John remarked that people did not truly understand the content until they had to teach the subject (98). John articulated the connection between the level of one’s comprehension of a subject and one’s ability to teach a subject.

John also indicated the qualities of what defined effective teachers. John described a good teacher as one who instructed in such a way that addressed the needs of the students at a particular time (148). This account of a good teacher announced the issue of differentiated instruction. Contemporary educators defined differentiated instruction as a pedagogical practice in which teachers formulate their lessons according
to the strengths and weaknesses of their students (Tricarico and Yendol-Hoppey 140). Differentiated instruction engaged students by using a variety of strategies to promote learning (Ernest et al 192). To ensure the highest possibility that students learn the material from the day’s lesson, teachers should use the best available means of instruction to teach any given student.

John’s version of differentiated instruction placed Aristotle’s rhetorical theory in the service of education. Aristotle defined rhetoric, the counterpart of dialectics, as the use of the best available means of persuasion in any given case (2152; 2155). Aristotle described rhetoric as a technical art because rhetoric could be used for persuasive purposes on any given subject. John lacked a copy of Aristotle’s Rhetoric because that text would not be available in Latin translation for almost an additional 100 years. By reading the texts of Cicero, John would have gained exposure to Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric.

John suggested that content should drive the lesson plans of teachers. First, teachers should focus on determining the content of each lesson. Second, educators should announce practical applications of the ideas. John claimed that fluency of speech should be informed by wisdom. Although the tongue was a small body part, the tongue propelled life (92). If students failed to comprehend the lessons of the teachers, then those teachers lacked effectiveness. The teachers, as rhetoricians, failed to persuade their class.

John emphasized that the primary role of educators should be to concentrate on teaching content to their students. John criticized masters who taught errors (118). They claimed to teach Aristotle, but taught the doctrine of Plato or a false opinion attributed to
other philosophers. Instructors who lacked sufficient grounding in content could not be expected to increase the wisdom among their students.

John anticipated the effectiveness of lesson plans. Stewart and Brendefur argued that many school districts initiated massive restructuring projects about their curricula, but administrators discovered little improvement in test scores and other forms of assessment because these reforms do not reach the classroom level (682). Stewart and Brendefur announced that these school districts focused on the macro-level of education, the overarching curricula. The schools, however, failed to assist teachers in developing innovative lesson plans that reflect the goals of the new curricula.

John suggested that teachers should create simple but effective lesson plans for their students. John noted that some teachers could not teach dialectics very well (88). Those teachers recalled an inordinate amount of quotations and facts, but they could not discriminate about what information should be used at any particular time. Consequently, they uttered nonsense. John posited that incredibly smart teachers could produce ineffective lessons if these teachers did not focus on specific content.

Susan Carlile observed that teachers noted improved learning outcomes when they shortened the number of goals for each lesson plan (32). By decreasing the level of complexity within the lesson plan, the students could focus their attention on learning specific content more effectively. John shared Carlile’s position that students could increase the success of their learning outcomes if they had to complete fewer goals. John experienced the unintended negative consequences from complex lesson plans.

According to John, disputations often exemplified ineffective lessons. John suggested that the disputation helped students exercise their minds. After students
ventured beyond their intellectual capacity, the disputation lacked utility. Disputations without clear goals impeded learning opportunities of students (90). John appreciated theoretical lessons that also contained practical application. Geddes noted that students benefitted from participating in lesson plans that were situated in real life scenarios (33). Geddes suggested that practical application of theory improved the learning outcomes of students because students presumed that the lessons could help them in real life situations.

The rise of dialectics led to John’s biggest critique of his educational experience. John rejected any attempt to elevate dialectics above grammar and rhetoric. When masters taught dialectics as an isolated art, dialectics lacked usefulness (94). John criticized dialecticians who scolded their students when students questioned the utility of dialectics. As John remarked, “These unadulterated philosophers, who despise everything save logic, and are ignorant of grammar, physics, and ethics alike grow furious. They accuse me of being a reprobate, a dullard, a blockhead, a stone” (86). The petty act of name-calling did not motivate John to improve his abilities as a student. Contemporary educators are likely to agree that students respond far better to public praise than ridicule.

John discussed the importance of the rapport among teachers and students. John asserted that teachers should treat students with respect. Taylor and Hoechsmann noted that multicultural approaches to education promote a sense of community among students because the lesson plans are grounded in respect for diversity (225). By increasing cultural awareness among the students, teachers helped students recognize the humanity of other people across both ethnic and cultural lines. John’s own reaction to verbal abuse
from his teachers indicated that students would be less likely to trust verbally abusive teachers.

John argued that the cooperative relationships among teachers and students could bolster the effectiveness of lesson plans. Good teachers placed the content of lessons within contexts that students could understand. As Shor professed, “For sure, good teaching is labor-intensive everywhere, but teaching and learning are always situated somewhere” (11). Shor explained that lessons must be situated within cultural frameworks for students to comprehend the material. Reaching students required the instructor to have an understanding of their culture. Kristen Seas posited that effectively persuasive arguments required the consensus of the audience (431).

If students and teachers shared certain cultural assumptions, then teaching could be enthymematic. Sharing similar values were important, but that trait did not fully express the power of the enthymeme. According to Seas, students were invited to actively participate in the construction of the enthymemes, facilitating the learning process (435). John grasped the potential of enthymemes to increase the power of arguments by reading Aristotle’s dialectical treatises. Teachers, as rhetoricians, could better persuade their students through enthymematic speeches. By sharing specific cultural assumptions, teachers gained additional trust from their students.

John addressed the critical step of reflection during the writing process. As John noted, “By disagreeing with others and committing my dissent to writing, I am, in fact, laying myself open to be criticized by many” (117). He acknowledged that his own writings would be open to interpretation and criticism. John also expressed that
committing his thoughts to paper provided an opportunity for people to read his argument long after his soul departed from his body.

John’s approach to writing articulates implications for contemporary students learning composition. As John confessed, “He who speaks is judged merely by one or a few persons; whereas he who writes thereby exposes himself to criticism by all, and appears before the tribunal of the whole world and every age” (117). John called for students to take ownership of their educations by performing self-critiques. First, students would demonstrate reflection by committing themselves to reaching educational goals (Amicucci 36). Second, the students should assess their progress during each step of their educational process.

John’s emphasis on reflection articulated the value of creating drafts during the writing process. The drafting process of the medieval era still has resonance for students of our contemporary age throughout a multiplicity of educational levels. Constance Weaver argued that teachers should promote a writing process grounded on drafting and editing to teach grammar (83). Students would be better served by generating their own texts and learning to correct their own errors to improve their writing. Weaver rejected the practice of asking students to complete worksheets requiring sentence correction or grammatical error hunts.

Tom Romano suggested that educators teach composition according to the demands of each department and school district (31). Romano expressed the need to situate general lessons within the cultural frameworks of specific schools. This movement from the general to the particular reflected John’s educational perspective.
John anticipated Weaver and Romano’s proposals that writing should be taught to fit the given circumstances and needs of the students.

Although Thomas Becket functioned as the primary readership of The Metalogicon, John also operated as his own audience. While writings about his own exploits, John gained additional insight about himself. Aimucci argued that writing promoted learning because students gain insight about themselves through reflection (37). Authors could learn about themselves throughout the writing process before their external reads could speculate about them.

John’s discussion about medieval rhetorical education also had implications for improving student reading abilities. John cautioned that students and teachers who did not grasp the meaning of texts should continue reading the material. They should read additional books to gain insight about previously baffling material (150).

Katia Ciampa argued that students with performance-avoidance inclinations would often blame their failure on a lack of ability, forming negative behaviors like disrupting classes or completing tasks with low persistence (5). John anticipated Ciampa’s argument that low-performing students were better served to focus their attention on the difficult reading instead of abandoning the activity. Teachers, as rhetoricians, should persuade their students to maintain their commitment to the practices of reading, especially while engaging the ideas of a complicated book.

The Metalogicon contained additional strategies for teaching students how to read. John linked student comprehension of texts with interpretive abilities. First, John recommended that teachers should read ancient texts, and then discuss the texts by including additional content from other books. Second, instructors should express
themselves in contemporary language so students could best understand the information (168).

Chauncey Monte-Sano claimed that students often searched for the literal meaning of the document. Many students were unlikely to notice source information within the text unless their teachers told them to do so (216). Monte-Sano praised interpretation as an important skill tied to literacy because students may read to gain information that can be applied in real life situations. Students could use interpretation to better inform their understanding of unfamiliar texts. John articulated Monte-Sano’s approach by emphasizing the need for students and teachers to develop encyclopedic wisdom, a significant value of medieval rhetorical education.

John’s approach to medieval rhetorical education has implications for contemporary educators within academia. The term “academia” corresponds to stakeholders: administrators, students, and teachers, throughout all levels of the educational system, from kindergarten to doctoral classes. John’s perspective about teaching developed during his years of studies as a student. He witnessed teachers deliver effective lessons by relating the content to students. Simple lessons allowed students to better comprehend the material. John noted that teachers who insulted their students lost credibility because the rapport among teachers and students was damaged. John grounded his teaching perspective within an ethical framework. John’s call for praxis articulated his belief that education benefitted society because educated citizens could make positive contributions to the common good through thoughtful, reflective, ethical actions.
Summary

In Chapter One, John of Salisbury (1115/1120-1180) was situated within the historical moment of the High Middle Ages (1050-1325). Significant events like the Second Crusade and the King Henry II-Thomas Becket Dispute affected John’s perspective about the relationship between Church and State and the role of education in negotiating a career that strode both the secular and non-secular realms. Although John was born into humble origins, he gained social mobility through his education. While learning from impressive masters such as Peter Abelard and William of Conches, John avoided becoming a disciple of any teacher by implementing theories he accepted and by discarding impractical ideas.

John represented one of the last rhetoricians to emphasize cooperation among the arts of the trivium before later scholastics elevated dialectics above grammar and rhetoric. He wrote the following rhetorical texts: The Entheticus (epideictic), The Policraticus (deliberative), The Metalogicon (epideictic), The Historia Pontificalis (forensic), The Life of St. Anselm (epideictic) and The Life of St. Thomas [Becket] (epideictic). He also practiced his rhetorical education as a teacher, as a diplomat in the Papal Curia, as a clerk for both Theobald the Archbishop of Canterbury and St. Thomas Becket the Archbishop of Canterbury (letter writing), and as Bishop of Chartres.

Chapter Two analyzed how the projects of Cicero and Aristotle informed medieval presuppositions about rhetorical education. Cicero remained the dominant scholarly voice among educators from the beginning of the Middle Ages until the 1100’s. Throughout The Metalogicon, John articulated how Ciceronian texts and Aristotelian
texts influenced his perspective about medieval rhetorical education. John learned from the writings of Cicero about an expansive form of rhetoric that concluded in action.

The Aristotelian texts taught John the importance of dialectics, which could benefit rhetorical practices. John attempted to place the newly translated Latin writings of Aristotle, The *Organon*, into the service of medieval rhetorical education. John followed Cicero’s translation of *logos* as *ratio et oratio* (reason and speech) to establish his fundamental assumption that “logic” represented grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric as separate arts of the *trivium* and the entire *trivium*.

In Chapter Three, The *Metalogicon* was framed within a period of the medieval era that offered a vibrant rhetorical tradition. Medieval rhetoricians used the writings of Cicero to foster an encyclopedic approach to rhetoric that concluded in praxis. John, like his contemporary rhetoricians, presupposed that rhetoric was practiced in multiple forms: preaching, letter writing, the composition of both poetry and prose, teaching, and oratory associated with courts of law, with courts of nobility, and ceremonial occasions.

The *Metalogicon* exemplified an artifact of medieval epideictic rhetoric. John praised teachers of the liberal arts who promoted integrated education that concluded in praxis. He censured the Cornificians because they not only boasted that they could guarantee shortcuts to success for their students, but they also refused to teach rhetoric. John celebrated the timeless values of a philosophical approach to education.

Chapter Four addressed John’s unique contribution to medieval rhetorical theory using a close-textual read of The *Metalogicon*. John noted that rhetoric, which seeks to sway the judgment of the audience, often uses prolonged oratory and induction, since orators generally solicit the assent of a large number of people. By using induction, John
separates himself from his contemporary scholastic educators who preferred deduction. John offered a synthetic approach to rhetoric by combining Ciceronian rhetoric with Aristotelian dialectics.

The Latin translation of Aristotle’s *The Organon* gave John ample dialectical theories that could be put into the service of rhetorical education. Students could put these intellectual coordinates to use as a means of developing their levels of eloquence. By articulating his agreement with Cicero, John argued that the level of one’s eloquence was in direct proportion to the level of one’s wisdom. As a humanist from the twelfth century, John emphasized the need of an integrated educational system for the benefit of society.

Chapter Five noted that John’s approach to medieval rhetorical education concluded in praxis. Although John did not encounter the Modern English word “praxis,” he recognized an equivalent idea in the form of practices that associated contemplation with action. As a former educator himself, John situated his pedagogical commentaries within a positive ethos. Many of the medieval instructional methods might prove beneficial to contemporary educators. First, effective teachers should deliver simple lessons in clear language that students could understand. Second, the lessons should be placed within ethical frameworks that students could use to inform their actions. John concluded that praxis offered a public revelation of the virtue of both students and teachers through their positive contributions to society.
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