

APPENDIX 1

THE LITERARY DEBATE OF 1395 INVOLVING CLAMANGES,
MONTREUIL, PIETRAMALA, AND PREMIERFAIT

A. The Petrarchan Background

The earliest literary debate involving the circle of French humanists (among whom were the defenders of the Roman) represents a defense of French national culture by Nicolas de Clamanges and Jean de Montreuil against Cardinal Galeotto di Pietramala and Laurent de Premierfait. The first two, doubtless in consultation with other Parisian humanists, wrote from Paris; the last two from Avignon. The quarrel dates from 1395.¹

Because of the part played in the Quarrel by Nicolas de Clamanges' references to Petrarch, the

¹This quarrel has been studied in Ornato, "La prima fortuna del Petrarca in Francia," Studi Francesi, 5 (1961), 201-17; Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col, pp. 167-71; Franco Simone, Il Rinascimento francese. Studi e ricerche, 2nd ed. (Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1961; repr. 1965); pp. 48-49; Ornato, Jean Muret, pp. 28 ff.; 233 ff.; Cecchetti, "L'elogio delle arti liberali"; Dario Cecchetti, "Sulla fortuna del Petrarca in Francia: un testo dimenticato di Nicolas de Clamanges," Studi Francesi, 11 (1967), 201-22.

"Petrarchan" background of the debate over French culture should first be outlined. In essence this debate is really a continuation of an earlier "humanist" literary debate (or at least there is every reason to believe that Clamanges and Jean de Montreuil thought of their part in the debate as a continuation of the earlier). This was the altercation (which took place in the late 1360s) between Petrarch and Jean de Hesdin over the relative merits of Italy and France.

This earlier debate was the reflection of a political situation. Petrarch was attempting to resolve the "Babylonian" banishment of the Papacy to Avignon by attempting to induce the Pope, Urban V, to return the Holy See to Rome. He did this by praising Italy. In fact, Urban V did return to Rome shortly after Petrarch's letter of 1366, arriving in October 1367. Before leaving Avignon, Urban V gave an audience to an embassy of representatives of King Charles V of France, who was intent upon convincing the Pope to remain on French soil. Urban heard an oration to this effect delivered by one Ancel (Anselm) Choquart on behalf of the King. By the spring of 1368, Petrarch had been informed of this speech, and in Seniles IX.1 directed again to Urban V the Italian humanist openly challenged Choquart and defended Italy against France. In this

letter Petrarch let drop the vexed phrase "oratores et poetae extra Italiam non quaerantur," expressing in the heat of battle the opinion which Nicolas de Clamanges was to try to refute over twenty-five years later, in the debate at hand.

Choquart having died in the interim, Jean de Hesdin took up the challenge for France, composed a long and somewhat detailed refutation of Petrarch's views including a nationalistic defense of French culture. This document dates from 1369-70. However, Petrarch did not see it until early in 1373. But this time, the original cause of the debate--the move of the Papacy to Rome--had been removed, since Urban V had again abandoned Rome in April 1370 for Avignon. Petrarch then replied to Hesdin with his Invectiva contra eum qui maledixit Italie (so called in the Petrarch canon, but called "Apologia contra cuiusdam Galli calumnias" in the Coccia edition).²

This debate with the first man of letters in Europe

² Enrico Cocchia ed., "Magistri Iohannis de Hysdinio Invectiva Contra Fr. Petrarcham et Fr. Petrarchae Contra Cuiusdam Galli Calumnias Apologia," Atti della Reale Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere, e Belle Arti, VII (1920), 92-139.

clearly aroused much interest in the royal party. For one thing, it was an obvious example of how members of the royal chancery (the predecessors of Clamanges, Col, Montreuil, et al.) saw their interests as defenders of French culture as coinciding with their royal employer's political interests. For the dispute as to the relative merits of France and Italy, which had begun as a comparison of landscape and even of the merits of wines, became in essence a debate over culture, thanks to Petrarch's vexed phrase. Jean de Hesdin leapt at the chance to set forth a list of noted French writers of the middle ages.

Petrarch had in fact not originally denied that there were French writers of note. He had merely said that, of the four Doctors of the Church, none had been educated in France, "nullus doctus in Gallia." That Jean de Hesdin realized this phrase did not mean in fact what he invidiously read it to mean--"there are not and have not been any learned men in France"--he admits later in the same section of his essay. Again, Petrarch said (in Sen. IX.1) "orates et poete extra italiam non querantur de latinis loquor vel hinc orti omnes vel hinc docti," clearly referring to the Roman period. Jean quotes this sentence, omitting the last seven words, so that he may cite Statius and Claudian as examples of French writers (while not having to show that

they were also taught in France, that is). The similarity of this portion of Hesdin's essay to Ep. V of Nicolas de Clamanges, where the treasurer of Langres also lists French writers, suggests that Clamanges had read Hesdin's work. Perhaps even more suggestive, in fact, is the high umbrage which Clamanges takes at Pietramala's words in "Sepe alias," where the Cardinal is clearly using Petrarch's famous remark in order to construct a compliment to Clamanges. Nicolas is quick to use any opportunity to refute Petrarch's attack on French culture at length. As Cecchetti shows³ Clamanges considered himself the founder of classical "humanist" culture in France, a kind of French Petrarch, and was in addition no admirer of Petrarch, unlike for example Jean de Montreuil who frequently expressed admiration of the Italian humanist.

It is clear from the interest shown in this debate that Clamanges, Montreuil, and probably the whole royal chancery had studied it. Even at the time the debate had extended beyond Choquart and Hesdin, though how far we do not know. An anonymous and poorly-Latined Frenchman replied to Petrarch's final essay sometime after it reached Paris. It may have been written in 1373-74, as Enrico

³Cecchetti, "Sulla fortuna del Petrarca."

Coccia (who edited the document) and Pier Giorgio Ricci hold. However we should not exclude the possibility that a nationalistic defense of French culture might have been composed at almost any time, even after Petrarch's death, as a literary exercise. It is in any case clear from the poverty of the Latin style that this last reply was not intended as a formal part of the debate.⁴

B. The French Debate

As the documents in this quarrel have never been listed fully or in chronological order before, I think it best to begin with such a list:

Document #1--Pietramala's letter to Clamanges, "Sepe alias," of 2 December 1394 (edited in Martène et Durand, Amplissima Collectio, I, 1545-46).

Document #2--Clamanges to Pietrama, ed. Lydius, Ep. IV.

Document #3--Clamanges to Pietrama, ed. Lydius, Ep. V.

⁴For this "last quarrel" of Petrarch's, see Pier Giorgio Ricci, "La cronologia dell'ultimo 'certamen' Petrarchesco," Studi Petrarqueschi, IV (1951), 47-59; Ernest Hatch Wilkins, Petrarch's Later Years (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1959), pp. 161; 233-40.

Doc. #4--Jean de Montreuil to Pietramala, "Non dici," ed. Ornato, No. 96.

Doc. #5--Letter or document of Laurent de Premierfait, now lost (referred to in the following letter of J. de Montreuil, No. 97, l. 18, as rescriptum tuum).

Doc. #6--Jean de Montreuil, to Laurent de Premierfait, "Si Thersitem," ed. Ornato, No. 97.

Doc. #7--Pietramala's letter, now lost, to Jean de Montreuil (referred to in J. de Montreuil, No. 149, ll. 9-22; see also Ornato, Jean Muret, p. 31 and n. 131).

Doc. #8--Jean de Montreuil, to Laurent de Premierfait, "Quem pleraque," ed. Ornato, No. 148.

Doc. #9--Jean de Montreuil, to Laurent de Premierfait, "Venit ad," ed. Ornato, No. 149.

As with most of all the debates we will study we must assume that the persons involved in the actual 'debate' were much more numerous than the authors of those documents which have survived, or even than the others whose participation we can surmise. For example we learn from a letter of Clamanges' that Gontier Col saw Petramala's letter "Sepe alias," (Doc. #1) and liked it so much that Pietramala gave him a copy.⁵ In addition, Jean Muret no doubt

⁵Ornato, Jean Muret, p. 31, n. 132.

wrote Clamanges a letter (now lost) in much the same laudatory vein as that of "Sepe alias," to which Clamanges' Ep. VII is a reply.⁶ We may assume that in addition to these men Giovanni Moccia⁷ at least was also consulted or involved in conversation. The subject matter of the debate--the defense of French culture--was one which can be expected to have elicited the widest interest in Paris at least, as had the earlier and related debates with Petrarch in their day.

The purpose of the following analysis is to isolate the most important aspects of the literary debate in order to point out certain similarities with the Quarrel of the Roman. I cannot attempt a detailed study of all the ramifications of the debate. This will cause little difficulty, however, since the main concern of our humanists' debate is also that which is significant for our study of the Quarrel of the Roman--the defense of French culture. Closely related to this main aim is the strong emphasis by the Parisian writers upon constantly relating eloquentia to sapientia, subordinating the first to the second.

The following analysis is divided into two main

⁶Ibid., pp. 12-13, 33-34.

⁷Ibid.

sections, dealing first with the defense of French culture, and second with the question of the relationship of eloquence to wisdom.

1. Defense of French Culture

The defense of French culture includes five major arguments. First, Nicolas and Jean refute the implication in Pietramala's letter that French Latin style is poor by providing examples of "excellent" (for its time and place) Latin prose. Second, they defend French education (specifically, the University of Paris). Third, they introduce the notion of translatio studii. Fourth, Clamanges subtly changes a defense and praise of oratory (by which must be understood written, rather than oral, eloquence--see below) into a praise of the liberal arts. Fifth, he presents a list of French masters of eloquence and wisdom.

These arguments are not at all entirely separated from one another, as will become clear.

a. Defense of French Latin Style.

Pietramala had remarked with surprise upon the excellence of the style of N. de Clamanges' letters:

Vidi ego . . . quasdam universitatis Parisiensis
litteras . . . que . . . me in tui amorem et tanti
eloquii admirationem adduxerunt consideransque mecum
ipse tanto cum stili splendore tantam sententiarum

maiestatem admixtum stomachari cepi atque compatriote meo Petrarche tacitus irasci, apud quem legeram extra Italiam oratores et poetas non querendos. Dicebam ergo michi:--Iam falsa est Petrarche tui sententia; iam apud Gallos orationis venustas, sententiarum gravitas, poetarum dulcedines, facundia exuberans et stilus mellifluus venerantur; iam Gallia in hac arte nostre non cede Ausonie, . . .⁸

As Cecchetti notes, " . . . il barocchismo degli umanisti francesi verso la fine del secolo XIV e ormai un fatto accertato."⁹ " . . . le Università fornivano una preparazione stilistica inadeguata, che alla ricerca della chiarezza aveva sostituito, con l'aiuto della goffaggine di ciascuno e del giovanile desiderio di strafare, quella dell'oscurità."¹⁰

⁸ Cardinal Galeotto di Pietramala, "Sepe alias," in Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum Historicorum, Dogmaticorum, Moralium; Amplissima Collectio, ed. Dom Edmond Martène and Dom Ursin Durand, I (Paris, 1724-33; repr. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), col. 1545-46. Further references will be to Ampl. Coll.

⁹Cecchetti, "Sulla fortuna del Petrarca," p. 217, quoting from Ornato, "L'umanista Jean Muret," p. 286, n. 130.

¹⁰Ornato, "L'umanista Jean Muret," p. 286. Ornato points out (pp. 286-87) that the search for claritas in style, and the recognition of their own inadequacy in this respect, are echoed in certain of those very humanists. Pietramala was touching a sore spot in the self-esteem of the French humanists. As Giovanni Moccia remarked in a poem, ". . . quisque suum vix carpit amicum" (p. 287). See p. 287 and nn. 133 and 137 for several other passages from Moccia and Jean de Montreuil concerning the problem of obscurity of style.

Chancery Latin learned from imitation of documents drawn up for the purpose was undoubtedly responsible for the clumsiness of style, the poor and confusing constructions, the use of foreign and Greek words, which still pose difficulties for the student of these writers. Although Nicolas de Clamanges pretends some indignation at Pietramala's surprise, therefore, he is no doubt aware of his own status as an 'exception to the rule' among contemporary French writers.

Clamanges' most obvious response to this criticism is stylistic. The first lines of his first response to Pietramala, "Perpulchras pater," consist of a long, very intricate, orate period, interwoven with a complex image of a rebirth of culture which is anything but lucid:

Perpulchras pater Reverendissime litteras tuas,
 multa dicendi copia, nec minori suavitate, mentem
 pariter auremque mulcentes, laetus accepi, nec sum
 magis gaudens admiratione, lacteum eloquentiae fontem
 nectareos quacumque cursum suum egent riuulos parien-
 tem, ex incluto & tam diu arenti, in tam facundum
 repente flumen, nouis scaturiginibus erupisse, hortum-
 que oratorum olim amoenissimum, aspera diuturnae
 hyemis inclementia gelidique Aquilonis histili vredine,
 iamdudum decussis floribus, squalientem, nunc Zephiri
 tepentis afflatu, rursus in pristinam redolent iam,
 vernanti caelorum varietate reflorescere iamque;
 adeo suae refragarantiae odorem spargere, ut flori-
 gelae ad illum apes, tanta captae dulcedine, passim
 conuolent; roscidi inde mellis haustus merito sugere
 cupientes.¹¹

¹¹Ed. Lydius II, p. 20, col. 1.

The point of this incredible image seems to be that Nicolas is also glad that French letters are coming to life again (if the lacteum eloquentiae fontem is France; the concrete meaning of the image is lost to me otherwise). If so, Nicolas is attempting to illustrate the truth of that fact in a stylistic tour de force of his own. The self-consciousness of the passage becomes more obvious when one reads the rest of the letter, for the elaborate image is never resumed again nor is there any other period in the letter remotely as ornate and obscure as this first one.

Nicolas can only intend this first period to be evidence of stylistic excellence. In fact, of course, he is really showing that what Pietramala had implied was in fact true: French Latinists were not noted for their excellence of style. For the rest of this letter, and for Ep. V, Clamanges reverts to his familiar epistolary style, similar in clarity to that of Pietramala (in the only two letters of his we have) or of Salutati, and utterly unlike the labored, pedantic and difficult lucubrations of Jean de Montreuil.¹²

¹²Another important difference between the two is the frequency of direct classical citations, and the difference in the way these citations are used by Clamanges and Montreuil. In the two long letters Ep. IV and Ep. V Clamanges cites classical authors much less frequently

b. Defense of French Education.

Pietramala had been told that Clamanges had studied in the University of Bologna. This appeared to Pietramala to make sense, and to explain Petrarch's otherwise incorrect remark; one had only to understand that Petrarch meant, not that French intellectuals were incapable of poetry or eloquence, but that they had not studied them, being intent upon other matters.¹³ Obviously no adequate defense of French culture could overlook this slight to the principal institution of learning in the country. But again the response of Clamanges and Jean de Montreuil is such that it invites us to suspect that Pietramala's surprise was, in all probability, not at all unfounded.¹⁴

than does Montreuil in two much shorter letters (ed. Ornato, Nos. 96 and 97). But--more significantly--Clamanges uses these citations as evidence in some argument, or in order to discuss them. Montreuil, in contrast, uses classical citations to elevate the style of his own letters by incorporating them directly into his own text.

¹³Recall that Petrarch had originally said that, of the four Doctors of the Church, "nullus doctus in Gallia," meaning that none of the four had been taught in France. Jean de Hesdin had tacitly admitted this by taking it to mean something like "[there is] no learned man in France"--a straw man which was easy to demolish.

¹⁴Unfortunately we know next to nothing concerning the classical education, rhetorical training, etc., which was available at Paris at this time. See Ornato, "L'umanista Jean Muret," p. 286.

First, Clamanges develops a philosophy of study in which the role of a teacher is of secondary importance only. In Ep. IV, Clamanges uses the example of St. Bernard to show the pre-eminent importance of "studium usum, exercitium assiduum attentamque lectionem auctorum eloquentium, cum aliqua forte ingenii aptitudine" (p. 21A). That is, reading the authors themselves and practice are much more important than studying rules from rhetoricians. Clamanges quotes from Augustine, de doctrina Christiana IV, to this effect, and concludes that eloquence should come from nature rather than from curious skill (although Clamanges clearly doesn't always practice what he preaches, as we have seen from the first sentence of this letter):

quia curiosius elaborata, magis solent artem & curiositatem ostentare, quam rem sensibus audientium imprimere. (p. 21B)

Clamanges holds that one ought not to be ignorant of rhetorical precepts. In fact he says he has studied them directly in Cicero and Quintilian. But one will learn more of eloquence through reading Cicero's orations than from reading his Rhetoric.

Clamanges does not go so far as to say that one can learn eloquence by himself (despite the example of St. Bernard). He says he has human praeceptores, with whom he has read and conferred, whom he clearly distinguishes from

magistros (p. 21B). Here Clamanges is clearly referring to the group of similar-minded Parisian "humanists" with whom he studies, but of whom he is clearly the acknowledged master. So according to Clamanges magistri (experts of the kind one would expect in a university professor) are not necessary in the pursuit of eloquence. Since no such experts are in fact mentioned, we can conclude fairly safely that there were in fact none (or none whom Clamanges regarded as such) at the University of Paris. That is, Pietramala's guess was correct!

Second, Clamanges reveals that he has never studied in Bologna nor gone anywhere near it: "Crede mihi Bononiam vestram, quam matrem studiorum vocas, numquam omnino vidi . . . ne nihil extra Italiam posse disci aut scire aestimes . . ." (21--really 22A). Third, both Clamanges and Jean de Montreuil defend the University of Paris directly, but yet without being very specific as to the nature of classical studies there. Clamanges is the more specific. He insists that classical rhetoric is studied at Paris:

Equidem in studio Parisiaco saepe Tullianam publice legi Rhetoricam, saepe item priuatim: Nonnunquam etiam Aristotelicam. Poetae vero summi & optimi Virgilius atque Terentius illic etiam saepe leguntur. (p. 28A)

Jean de Montreuil merely declares in his first letter to Laurent de Premierfait in Avignon that he writes "zelo

patrie et tot venerabilium universitatum accensus amore [hec dixi]" (no. 96, ll. 43-44). However, he has said nothing of substance which would defend the University at all. Parenthetically, it would seem unlikely that either Jean or Clamanges were in fact aware of any extensive or serious instruction in classical literature at Paris, since neither cites it (or any teachers) specifically in this case, an obviously golden opportunity to do so.¹⁵

c. Translatio studii.

The notion of translatio studii is raised by Nicolas, though with scant evidence to support his claims. In Ep. IV he feigns surprise that Pietramala, an Italian, has achieved much in literature, since Italians are so avid in business that they might be supposed to have scarce time for study!

Si autem me Gallicis editum, alitum atque eruditum
littoribus, aliquid in illis otiosum profecisse miraris
studiis multo iustius mirari possum, te licet Itala
gente creatum, quem tanta vrget moles negotiorum,
tantaque rerum sarcina detinet occupatum, in hanc
styli elegantiam, disertequae scribendi facultatem

¹⁵Cecchetti, "Sulla fortuna del Petrarca," p. 217 and n. 6, remarks that little is known of what these first French humanists used for grammars, glosaries, artes dic-tandi, etc., at the University, and that little or nothing is known concerning Clamanges' own education at the Collège de Navarre. There seems to be no reason to think that there was any particular concentration on classical literature or rhetoric above and beyond what might be covered in the normal courses in the Trivium.

(qua pene caeteros huius aevi quos nosce contigit,
exuperas) aliqua potuisse diligentia evadere.
(p. 21A--really 22A)

The implication is that one ought not to be any more surprised to find an eloquent Frenchman as to find an eloquent Italian, and so that Pietramala's surprise is uncalled for. This is naturally a pretense on Clamanges' part. Elsewhere he recognizes that he is atypical of French men of letters, just as Pietramala has said. In Ep. XLVI, "Cum omnibus," to Gontier Col, Clamanges credits himself for working for a renaissance in France.

ipsam eloquentiam diu sepultam in Gallis quodammodo
renasci novisque iterum floribus, licet priscis longe
imparibus, repullulare laboravi.¹⁶

Hence, the assertion made here to Pietramala is clearly for the sake of national pride, not from conviction.

In Ep. V., written shortly after the first in order to expand on some of the ideas Clamanges did not have time to deal with there, Nicolas sets forth the idea that the cultivation of eloquence proceeded better in France after the time of St. Bernard than anywhere else, including Italy.

1. He admits that in the recent past there were not many poets and orators in France, but insists that there

¹⁶Ed. Lydius II, p. 141; quoted in Cecchetti, "Sulla fortuna del Petrarca," p. 216, n. 4.

were also not many in Italy save for Petrarch himself.

2. He notes a resurgence of Latin style, along with religion, in France in the time of St. Bernard while there were still very few or no eloquent men in Italy.

3. He rapidly takes the offensive against Petrarch. In saying there were no poets or orators outside of Italy in his own day, while recognizing that there were practically none besides himself in Italy itself, Petrarch is in effect boasting that he is the only one in the world!

4. He intimates that in the past and for a long time (after the time of Gregory) France had more eloquent men than the rest of the world, Italy included.

Clamanges concludes that: (1) in Petrarch's day there had been practically no eloquent men anywhere, besides Petrarch himself; and that (2) France had in effect been preeminent from the time of Gregory to Bede, and at the time of St. Bernard again. Thus Clamanges makes his case that France has in fact been historically preeminent in eloquence. He turns Petrarch's words back upon their author, for Petrarch is shown to have been slandering France only to praise himself!

d. Praise of the Liberal Arts.

Clamanges sets forth in Ep. IV a lengthy paean of

praise of the liberal arts. Enumerating their advantages public and private, he asserts that they are greater than the study of law (p. 21--really 22A-B). However, what appears to be a paean of the 'liberal arts,' in more or less traditional terms, is in fact a praise of eloquence.¹⁷ The benefits to be derived from literary study, then are: (1) personal--honor, fame, glory, the eternal memory of your name; and (2) the glory of your genus (family), country, and dignitas (i.e. of his position as Cardinal); a prop for the Church, a defense for good men, vengeance upon and confusion to the bad (p. 21--really 22B). That is, Clamanges divides the benefits of eloquence into public and private, while holding that the public are superior.¹⁸

¹⁷Cecchetti, "L'elogio delle arte liberali," p. 6, calls this a eulogy of liberal arts. However, it is significant that the "Haec . . . libero & ingenio homine digna studia, & propterea merito a maioribus ingenua ac liberalia appellata" (p. 21--really 22B) which Clamanges refers to here are not just the traditional "Seven Liberal Arts," but eloquence. The "haec" in the sentence above refers to the sentence previous to it, "studiorum horum . . . cultu," which in turn refers to the preceding sentence, where we read "Hanc styli elegantiam, disertequae scribendi facultatem." Thus, significantly, Clamanges is investing the study of eloquence with all the virtues usually ascribed to the liberal arts in general.

¹⁸As did Pietramala; see his discussion of the officia media in "Sepe alias," Ampl. Coll. I, 1545 D. See also note 22 below.

By thus associating the study of letters and eloquence with the values of the liberal arts, Clamanges is able to place them in a position of superiority to legal studies, since the latter are pursued for profit, especially by the wealthy, who are slaves to cupidity.

This argument is clearly also connected with Clamanges' defense of the University of Paris. As we have seen, Pietramala intimated that letters are little studied in France. Bologna, however, was most famous as the cradle of legal studies in Europe. By dispraising legal studies Clamanges tacitly upholds the dignity of the studies at Paris over those at Bologna. And, of course, France was famous for its poets and writers, a point upon which, as we have seen, Clamanges dwells in Ep. V.

e. French Masters of Eloquence.

Finally, both Clamanges and (to a far lesser extent) Jean de Montreuil list French writers. Jean de Hesdin had mentioned eleven French writers; Clamanges expands the number to eighteen. It is probably this list to which Jean de Montreuil refers in No. 96, l. 27. In addition, Clamanges gives an account of the kind of literary education he himself had obtained, and thus indirectly gives another defense of French culture. Jean

de Montreuil, in his letter No. 96, "Non dici," to Pietramala, seconds these opinions. He reiterates that Petrarch must have been ignorant of the absentium tante multitudini (l. 27) of orators and poets of France, and asserts that he was moved to write by his love of country and "for such a venerated university"--most likely, again, a reference to Clamanges' letters, since Pietramala's letter hadn't challenged the University of Paris directly. Despite his classical citations, however, Jean is not able to give much of an example of French culture himself. When, in his response to Laurent de Premierfait, he is faced with defending Nicolas de Clamanges' literary and poetic skills, Jean contents himself with complaining merely that Laurent should have been restrained from criticism by the laws of friendship. In doing this, Jean seems to tacitly admit that he is in fact incapable of answering Laurent's charges on the grounds of their literary merit (Clamanges did answer them as Cecchetti shows).¹⁹

¹⁹The rest of the debate reveals that Jean never seriously considered abandoning his defense of French culture. Jean's letter "Venit ad," (ed. Ornato No. 149) to Pietramala is largely concerned with other matters. It is clearly a response to a reply by Pietramala which is now lost (scriptionibus meis tua gravis et alta responsio, p. 215, l. 3). Whatever Pietramala had said in this letter, Jean here declares himself vanquished, convinced by Pietramala, and back in agreement with Petrarch (ll. 7-13). But he declares that he has been vanquished by the fact that

In the list of French writers of eloquence given by Clamanges, Christian writers far outweigh the classical. This fact, I believe, implies several things. First, of course, it involves a shift of the grounds of the argument away from what Pietramala (and before him, Petrarch) had established. For both Italians seem to have clearly meant that France was deficient in poets and orators who attempted to write in a classical style. Or perhaps they also intended to include writers who had constant recourse to

he is not eloquent enough to reply to the Cardinal's eloquence, not by the Cardinal's arguments. So Montreuil never yields his point.

Of course, it is possible that Pietramala had merely explained to Jean what Petrarch had really meant to say. But these lines could easily be interpreted to mean that Jean agreed at last with the denigration of French culture proffered by Petrarch and the Cardinal.

A closer look shows that this is not the case. In the first place, Montreuil's letter "Quem pleraque," (ed. Ornato, No. 148) to Laurent de Premierfait has been misread by Ornato. In "La prima fortuna del Petrarca," p. 217, Ornato says that this letter implies Montreuil has given in to Laurent's criticisms of Clamanges' poem (the one discussed in "Si Thersitem," No. 97). In fact the opposite is true. Jean clearly takes the lack of response on the part of Laurent to mean a tacit admission of defeat. In fact, the letter is clearly designed to stimulate an overdue reply from Laurent.

In the second place, "Nichil profecto" (ed. Ornato, No. 138), written up to a year after the quarrel, contains a passage which makes it clear that Jean never abandoned his views: "Cuius occasione contra Petrarcham spiritum exclamandi nequivi continere, insolenter, pace sua, dicentem extra Italiam oratores non esse querendos et poetas, . . ." (ll. 42-45).

Latin authors, as did Jerome and Augustine, Petrarch's two favorite fathers.

Pietramala says explicitly (if not very specifically) what he is surprised to have found in Clamanges' letters,

. . . orationis venustas, sententiarum gravitas,
poetarum dulcedines, facundia exuberans, & stylus
mellifluus (Ampl. Coll. I, 1546 A)

It is dangerous to try to make anything too specific out of these general terms. But, in the context of praising a prose letter, poetarum dulcedines probably refers to references to, and quotations from, classical poetry.²⁰

A familiarity with classical style and grammar, and a freedom from the formulae of legal, or theological (technical) Latin, would in itself presuppose conscious cultivation of classical literature and literary principles. At the universities the study of the Trivium tended to be regarded as a mere preliminary for the continuation in study of theology, or law, or (in the case of secretaries and notaries, in all likelihood) of a technical political

²⁰ Unless it means vaguely "delights of poetic language," in which case all these florid terms are basically equivalent to one another, and we are left to mere speculation about what Pietramala was surprised to find. In any case he had expected a more crabbed Latin style.

style. What drew Pietramala's attention to Clamanges' letters was precisely the fact that, though written in a political context, they did not give evidence of the usual style. They stood out. All the more reason to conclude therefore that the author is engaged in studying and cultivating the sources of this style.

Now there is no question that Clamanges' style, both in the letters written in the name of the University of Paris (to which Pietramala refers) and elsewhere, certainly distinguishes itself from that of other political and legal writers of the day. Yet it is far from Ciceronian, or from that of classical authors of the pagan era. Nothing surprising about that, of course; and the same may be said of Pietramala's letter to Clamanges itself. None of the fourteenth-century humanists were able to free themselves from their medieval stylistic heritage so rapidly.

When we speak of a more "classical" style, therefore, we are speaking in approximations only. All of the fourteenth-century humanists in every country were intensely involved in study and imitation of models of excellence in style (1) in order to learn classical and eloquent grammar, vocabulary, spelling, syntax, etc.; but mainly (2) in order to struggle against the usage of their contemporaries, a Latin which surrounded them, which they

even had to write themselves. This is probably especially true of secretaries and notaries such as our Parisian humanists, working in environments not always sympathetic to the new 'classical' style. The influence of this everyday medieval Latin was constantly re-contaminating their own writing.

It is a problem which the student of Latin today may have trouble appreciating, since the language is no longer used or even much studied except in its classical form. Those few today who write Latin at all write classical Latin. There is little possibility that one will learn to write fluent and (relatively) clear Latin which is very far from classical rules. But for our early humanists it was a hard and pioneering struggle to free themselves from non-classical usage without the aid of good and easily accessible classical editions like those on which humanists of the fifteenth and later centuries could base their style, much less the encyclopedic classical dictionaries, reference works, etc., at the disposal of the modern student.

The point here is this: From the standpoint of the humanists of the fourteenth century, the styles of earlier writers such as the Fathers must have appeared much closer to that of classical Latin writers than they would today to, say, a classicist. The style of certain Church Fathers

reflected an education in monastery schools, based largely on the Bible and the study of religious works composed in the late days of the Roman empire, commingled with the study of, and commentary upon, Classical Latin works themselves. This was before the advent of Universities, the formal study of theology, or the influx of Aristotelian terminology, and before the existence of large clerical or secular chanceries with specialized technical language to suit their needs.²¹ Good, clear Latin of the high middle ages and earlier--of the period from Gregory to Bernard, as Clamanges says (Ep. V)--was, not surprisingly, considered very "classical."

2. Sapientia and Eloquentia

It is necessary to recognize this in order to discern the similarities and differences between Pietramala and Clamanges here. Let us consider first the similarities. Clearly there is no ultimate disagreement between them on the matter of submitting eloquentia to sapientia. A glance

²¹Little is known about the development of Chancery style. It is discussed briefly in the following works: Helene Wieruszowski, "Ars Dictaminis in the Time of Dante," Medievalia et Humanistica, I (1943), 95-108; repr. in Helene Wieruszowski, Politics and Culture in Medieval Spain and Italy (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1971), pp. 359-378. See also Hubertus Schulte Herbruegen, ed., Sir Thomas More: Neue Briefe. Mit einer Einfuehrung in die epistolographische Tradition (Muenster: Asschendorff, 1966), pp. xxii-xxxvi.

at the letter Pietramala includes with "Sepe alias," "Hortatur patriae" (Ampl. Coll. I, 1543-45) will reveal that it is very like those of Clamanges in style, while in content it is a pious exhortation to the Romans to recognize Benedict XIII and help end the schism. There are no classical, or even literary, citations at all. Pietramala puts his style to pious use, makes his "eloquence" subservient to "wisdom."

However, there is nothing in "Hortatur patriae" which separates it, in style or use of language, from much Patristic Latin either. As I remarked above, what could be considered eloquent (even 'classical') Latin in this period was still far from a formally classical style, and was in some ways bound to approach the language of the Fathers. All the more so since all our humanists (we know little of Pietramala, but also little to suspect that he would be an exception) read the Fathers, admired them, and were often concerned with similar issues, not to speak of the fact that it was from some of the Christian Fathers that they derived much of what they knew about certain Latin authors.

So much for the obvious similarities between Clamanges and Pietramala. The differences are more revealing, and, in a general way, typical of the differences between the French and Italian humanists of the period. The

main difference between them is the relative emphasis given to classical pagan authors and that paid to Christian authors, particularly certain of the Church Fathers.

Pietramala emphasizes the more purely classical elements much more than does Clamanges. Pietramala incorporates elements of classical values themselves. Clamanges thoroughly subjugates them to a Christian and traditional context.

This fact is reflected in "Sepe alias." In contrast to the response of Clamanges, Pietramala reveals a less explicitly Christian, more classical concept of virtus. In addition, the praise in the letter is primarily for Clamanges' style and rhetoric. Pietramala begins his letter with a praise of virtus, specifically that which he admires in Clamanges' letters. This is not the Stoic virtue, he continues, which is not to be found in this sinful age:

Señ de illa loquor, quae reipublicae parere jubet,
privatosque tuetur ac moderatur affectus, cujus officia antiqui media vocavere. (Ampl. Coll. I, 1545D)²²

This is a brief enough reference and Pietramala doesn't continue it. Clearly he understands this virtue to be a form of officia media, and to consist in a certain attitude towards one's duty, namely, to put one's own private

²²The term officia media appears to come from a passage in Cicero's de officiis l. 3.8: "medium officium id esse dicunt [graeci] quod cur factum sit, ratio progabilis reddi possit" (i.e. with less than true philosophical justification).

interests behind those of the State. Clamanges' eloquent anonymity in writing the letters from the University (Epp. II and III) which Pietramala had seen and admired prompted this brief compliment. It is, however, presented purely in secular terms as a civic virtue, one particularly appropriate to statesmen and servants of the State such as Clamanges.

Clamanges responds to this part of Pietramala's letter towards the end of Ep. IV, "Perpulchras pater":

Sed meam profecto amicitiam non aliqua spe vtilitatis adductus expetis, qui syncero amore, me, non mea quaeris, nec sordidi ritu vulgi, ex quaestu & commoditate amicitias metiris, quas ex honesto potius & virtute sicut tuae indicant litterae, & suscipiendas & colendas, & probandas, ponderandasque arbitraris. Quae cum ita sint, vide etiam atque etiam, ne fallaris: qui in meam (ut ais) ex virtute amicitiam traheris. Nam vt de illa virtute tecum taceam, quae per se sibi sufficiens, nullius externae opis indiget, sed cuncta secum bona complectitur: in qua vt tota clamat porticus Stoicorum, omnes sunt bene beateque viuendi locatae rationes, omnia instrumenta, & adiumenta, de qua dixisse puto Ciceronem, non cum perfectis viuitur hominibus, sed cum ijs, in quibus praeclare agitur, si sint simulachra virtutis. Et diuinum vatem Virgilium; cum arduam atque operosam paucorumque pedibus tritam illius igneae virtutis viam exprimeret.

Hoc opus hic labor est paucis, quos aequus amavit
Iupiter, aut ardens euexit ad aethera virtus.
Dijs geniti potuere.

Quibus verbis sub Iouis nomine, quem summum Deum putant, satis iuxta Catholicam veritatem insinuauit nonnisi divino amore nos praeueniente, atque ad se trahente, & ardenti virtute, quae nostrae litterae charitatem vocant, aequae igni comparant, ad caelestem nos beatitudinem posse conscendere. (pp. 23-24)

Clamanges makes it clear that the primary meaning of virtus, under which the others must be subsumed ("illa virtute . . . quae complectitur") is caritas. There is no sign of this in Pietramala. Pietramala puts his concept of virtus in a thoroughly classical context:

Nec nunc illam appello virtutem, quam Stoici definiere, . . . Sed de his hactenus, non enim mens est philosophorum scrutari sententias, aut inter Stoicos, Peripateticosque arbiter fieri. (Ampl. Coll. I, 1545D)

That is, he will not enter into a discussion of virtus; but if he were to do so, he would see it as a dispute between Stoic and Peripatetic concepts of the term.

Not, of course, that Pietramala would have disagreed at all with Clamanges' formulation of virtus, viz. that the most important, all-encompassing kind of virtus is caritas. But Pietramala clearly presupposed a certain kind of response, or certain kinds of interests, on the part of Clamanges. The opening of his letter "Sepe alias" (1545 C-E) contains several classical references: to Stoics, Peripatetics, virtus, the officia media. Pietramala expects to find in Clamanges to be a person ready and willing to discuss matters of classical literature and philosophy. (Since no other letters of Pietramala to Clamanges or our other humanists are extant, we must be careful of making too much of this one. But the tone of the first part of

the letter as here interpreted is consistent with the tone of the response Clamanges sends to him.)

Clamanges' stress upon Christian writers and upon the subordination of eloquence to wisdom--obviously part of his 'refutation' of Pietramala/Petrarch--all point to the fact that Clamanges felt, at least, that not enough attention had been paid by the Italians to the Christian eloquence of France. And this was probably because the Italians were treating the matter of eloquence in practice as something which could, in fact, be separated from wisdom.

Towards the end of "Sepe alias" Pietramala reveals why he has been drawn to seek out Clamanges and ask for his friendship:

Harum artium studium [this refers to the words 'ad illa studia . . . ad poeticas, oratoriasque disciplinas' in the preceding sentence], vir optime, me in tui quamquam invisi hominis traxit amorem, sic ut te colam, te diligam, te omni cultu benevolentiae prosequar, te jam ulnis caritatis amplectar . . . Vale felix propria virtute, propriisque studiis, & cum te diligam, me diligere non recuses. (Ampl. Coll. I, 1546, B-C, C-D)

It is true that, earlier in the letter, Pietramala had made it clear that he admired Clamanges not for his style and literary accomplishment alone, but also for his 'wisdom,' what he had to say:

Vidi ego, singularissime vir, quasdam universitatis Parisiensis litteras . . . quae . . . me in tui amorem & tanti eloquii admirationem adduxerunt, consideransque mecum ipse tanto cum style splendore tantam sententiarum majestatem admixtam, . . .

Dicebam ergo mihi: Jam falsa est Petrarchae tui sententia, jam apud Gallos orationis venustas, sententiarum gravitas, poetarum dulcedines, facundia exuberans, & stylus mellifluus vincerantur. (Ampl. Coll. I, 1545 D-E; 1546A)

(The important references here are to "tantam sententiarum majestatem" and "sententiarum gravitas.") Nevertheless, it was primarily the "study of these arts" of poetry and "oratory" (i.e. eloquence) which drew Pietramala's interest. And Pietramala's farewell addresses Clamanges as one happy in his virtue (that of being an excellent public servant) and in his studies.

Significantly, Clamanges distorts Pietramala's actual words by claiming that Pietramala had said he was drawn to desire Clamanges' friendship through his virtue:

Vt ergo illam taceam virtutem, quae paucorum nostrae aetatis hominum est, quos praeceps cupiditas, illi minime inimica virtuti, ad omnia potius maleficia rapit: ne illam quidem virtutem meis tenuibus ausim meritis arrogare; quam tu mediam vocas cuius officia (vt ais) sunt: rempublicam tueri, atque ei seruire, & priuatos sub imperio rationis ac moderamine continere affectus. Quomodo hanc mihi vendicem, cuius pauca & pertenuia sunt in Rempubli- can officia: nec affectus & passiones animi ad diuersa trahentes atque impellentes, pro arbitrio possum regere atque frenare. . . . Fal- leris itaque, Pater amantissime, si me vel hanc vir- tutem attigisse, aestimas, cuius necdum etiam plene ieci fundamenta. (Ep. IV, p. 24A)

As we have seen, it was really Clamanges' skill in writing rather than his "virtue" that had attracted the Cardinal's interest and friendship. In effect, both of Clamanges' replies to Pietramala constitute detailed reminders of the necessity of making eloquence subservient to the needs of wisdom. Clamanges' careful redefinition of virtus is only one example of this. The idea is present (in Pietramala's letter) in a formal way only. The Cardinal's principal interest is in eloquence, and specifically (from the first part of his letter) in its classical sources.

Ep. IV, "Perpulchras pater," it is true, begins with a complex period so gravid with rare words that the content is all but effaced entirely. In contrast to the beginning of "Sepe alias" however (which it was no doubt intended to answer specifically), the "classical" elements in Clamanges' letter are to be found in the recondite vocabulary rather than in any references to classical philosophy or its concepts. That is to say, Clamanges' opening sentence, in contrast to that of Pietramala, is "classical" only in a purely formal sense. And, at any rate, it is dropped.

St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Clamanges' first example of an eloquent man, is really only adduced as an example

of a man of undoubted eloquence who attained his skill without special teachers or formal study in eloquence. He is thus living proof of Clamanges' theory that eloquence should proceed from nature and, as such, is important in Clamanges' defense of French culture. In fact St. Bernard is evidence of the relative independence the eloquent man not only may have, but ought to have, from the formal study of classical rhetoric.

The first explicit example of the connection between eloquence and virtue (or wisdom), however, comes near the end of Ep. IV. Clamanges lists three kinds of benefits which the cultivation of poetry and oratory bring. First are the personal benefits of fame and benefit for the State and Church (see above). Second, these studies make man better for public affairs, and more apt to reject or put away his private ends and emotions. Therefore, Clamanges argues, these studies are more valuable than the study of law, which is undertaken for the sake of personal cupidity (Ep. IV, 21--really 22B).

Third, the study of poetry and oratory makes man a lover of all good, including the good of officia media or of public service:

[Haec praeterea studia] . . . hominem boni omnis
amantem faciunt, priuatisque reiectis affectibus,
publicis vtilitatibus aptant ac dedicant: quo quid

potest in homine melius aut praestabilius esse? Si autem hominem boni omnis amantem faciunt, utique bonum faciunt. Ex magna quippe bonitate est, magis zelo Reipublicae, quam privatae affici. Hinc est quod Cato ille superior, magnus vir ac doctissimus, Oratorem definiens ait: Orator est vir bonus, dicendi peritus. Vbi attende quod in definitione, non primum posuit dicendi peritiam, sed viri bonitatem quasi illa loco generis sit, quod solet in definitione, primum locum tenere, & cui tanquam fundamento totam superiectam structuram inniti oportet. Tolle a domo fundamentum, tota domus corrui, tolle ab Oratore virum bonum quaecumque illi alia concesseris, tam Oratoris non erunt, quam subducto fundamento domus esse desinit. (p. 21--really 22B to p. 24A)

Here we have the following sequence of ideas:

1. A praise of the Trivium, of the liberal arts, in fact becomes a praise of poetry and oratory (see n. 16 above).
2. These studies make man a lover of all that is good.
3. Therefore they make man a good practitioner of the virtus to which Pietramala refers, the virtue of putting one's private interests aside for the public interest.
4. And this is all (more or less) true by definition; for, Clamanges reminds Pietramala, no man may be an orator without being a follower of good, and, in fact, virtue (here Clamanges obviously means Christian virtue or caritas, though he has not yet spelled this out in so many words as he will do at the end of the letter) is the

very basis of oratory.

All this is in contrast to the way in which virtus and eloquence were discussed in Pietramala's letter. Clamanges makes it explicit, as though chiding Pietramala, that vir bonitatem precedes dicendi peritiam. Significantly, it is immediately after this discussion that Clamanges thanks Pietramala for having written him first. He is saying: "This--virtue--is what is really to be praised in the study of eloquence."

In Ep. V, "Quod in superiori," Clamanges again stresses the necessary relationship of eloquence to wisdom. Of course, he does not deny that writers of pagan antiquity also had good claim to eloquence. In the course of proving that Petrarch's statement "Non esse extra Italiam Oratores aut Poetas quaerendos" (this is the form of Petrarch's words Clamanges cites, p. 24B), Clamanges lists two kinds of writers. First he notes the many non-Italian orators and poets of classical times, and in so doing exhibits the extent of his classical reading and knowledge of literary history (pp. 25B-26B). In this first list he covers all non-Italian countries except France, reserving a separate list for her. Second, in this list he mentions the classical, pagan writers and early Church

Fathers, though few of them.²³ Even in this first list Clamanges implies that the 'eloquence' of the two kinds of writers, Catholics and pagans, have something in common. As we shall see, Clamanges later defines both the poet and the orator in essentially abstract and rhetorical terms, giving them definitions which could be filled as easily by a pagan as by a Christian.

The second list is that of French writers (pp. 26B-27B). Clamanges first cites several classical references to the eloquence of French writers in pagan times from Jerome and Juvenal. Among poets he mentions Statius, second only to Vergil. Then of orators, he mentions Hilary of Poitiers; of historians, Gregory, Severus Sulpitius, Martin. Finally, he divides the rest of the French authors into two groups; the antiquos--Irenaeus, Hilary of Arles, Gennadius, Radulphus Flaviacensis, Prosper and Cassinus; and the recentiores--St. Bernard, Hildebert, Ivo of Chartres, Odo, Hugo, and Peter of Cluny, Hugo and Richard of St. Victor, and Alanus de Insulis. Finally, he concludes by

²³The Church Fathers mentioned are: Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine for Africa (as well as 'Titonius,'--the Tyconius of Augustine, de doctrina christiana, III. xxx. 42 ff.); Africanus, Victorinus, Optatus (authors mentioned by Jerome or Augustine); for Spain, Orosius, Isidore, Prudentius; for Pannonia, Jerome; Lactantius for "Bechina" (Bithynia); Bede, and Rabanus.

saying (p. 27B) that there are many other orators and poets outside Italy, if one but look for them.

The similarity of this second list to the first is clear. Both lists, the French and the non-French, include pagan and Catholic authors in the same breath. The differences are equally apparent: Most of the writers of France are Catholic, while most of those of the first, non-French (and non-Italian) list are pagan.

Two things might be expected to follow logically from this. First, Clamanges must have a definition of eloquence (of what a poet, and what an orator, is) which can encompass pagan authors as well. That is, given the clear subservience of eloquence to wisdom, Clamanges does not exclude pagans from the ranks of the eloquent. In fact, Clamanges' discussion of poetry and oratory here is his most "humanistic." It is drawn principally from pagan authors. In contrast to his discussion in "Perpulchras pater" Clamanges here meets and, he hopes, defeats Petrarch (and, of course, Pietramala, who agrees with Petrarch) on his own grounds, by reference to classical sources only.

Thus Clamanges establishes that Petrarch is being arrogant by saying that there are no poets or orators outside of Italy in his own time (Clamanges having proven sufficiently by his historical discussion that the statement

is manifestly false for an earlier time). For Petrarch to assert this while there are not any poets or orators in Italy itself besides himself is, in fact, to assert that he himself is the only poet or orator in the world:

Vide quale fuerit propter vnum se, in Italia tanti saeculorum decursu, aliquatenus eloquentem, Oratores aut Poetas extra Italiam non esse quaerendos astruere. Magnum erat, imo nimium atque insulsum Oratorem se vel Poetam audere profiteri; quam insolentis ergo arrogantiae fuit, neminum in orbe vniuerso, praeter se, suis diebus Oratorem vel Poetam sententia vniuersali astruere? Quid autem aliud dixit, qui talem dixit extra Italiam non esse quaerendum, cum nullum talem sciret in Italia tunc alterum esse. ("Quod in superiori," p. 28A)

Further, Clamanges cites Horace and Cicero to show that even a great writer ought to be too modest to assert that he himself is a poet. Clamanges quotes from Cicero's pro Archia the famous passage about the natural genius and divine inspiration necessary to a poet, and then concludes that oratory is still more difficult (Ep. V, 28B). One ought not to arrogate to oneself the title of poet, but even to modestly refuse it when suggested by others, as did Vergil, whom Clamanges quotes to this effect.

Having thus (he hopes) defeated Petrarch on his own ground, Clamanges proceeds to give a rather secular definition of poetry and oratory:

Cum Oratoris [ut ait summus Orator] officium sit, non artis regulas aut praecepta nosse, sed de omni re aperte dicere ad persuasionem, Orationemque posse conficere abundantem sonantibus verbis, vberibusque

sententiis, quae videlicet & sensum grauitate, animum pascat, moueat, flectat, alliceat, & verborum elegancia, aptitudine & suauitate autem permulceat. Poete autem est, in carmine idem posse facere, & graue plenumque carmen caelesti [vt ait ille] instinctu fundere. . . .
(p. 29 A-B)

Once again Clamanges has met the Italian humanist on his own ground, that of a more purely secular understanding of eloquence based exclusively upon the study of the opinions of the classical pagan experts. In fact, this entire letter "Quod in superiori" has this character. It is not only a continued defense of French culture, but a defense phrased in terms which might be more acceptable to the Italian interlocutor, in more "literary" or classical terms.

Nevertheless Clamanges concludes his letter with a reminder that eloquence is part of, stems from, and is subordinate to, Divine Wisdom:

Cuius autem donum est eloquentia? nisi illius de quo Sapiens ait: mihi autem dedit Deus dicere ex sententia in cuius manu sumus & nos & sermones nostri? Excusat se Moyses apud Dominum, audit a Domino: Quis fecit os hominis, & mutum ac surdum? nonne ego? Quare Spiritus sanctus in libro Sapientiae: subtilis, disertus, mobilis acutus dicitur, nisi quia suo aduentu & illustratione tales efficit? Quid est ergo dicere, disertos extra Italiam non inueniri, nisi spiritum sanctum extra Italiam non adspirare. . . . Dictumne est, Spiritus Domini repleuit Italiam, & non potius: repleuit orbem terrarum?

In the final words of this passage there is a humorous yet still serious reminder to Pietramala. To discuss the

question of eloquence totally outside the Christian context may be fine for those who keep the context firmly in mind. But there is always the possibility that one will forget this. In that case, one will fall into the kinds of errors that Petrarch did. For Petrarch's error in saying "Extra Italiam, etc." is arrogance, or pride; but it is something more besides. Petrarch in fact allowed himself to overlook entirely the Christian eloquence for which France was famous in the Middle Ages. And to forget that wisdom is the essence of eloquence is to forget what the pursuit of eloquence is all about!²⁴

So far only the attitudes of Nicolas de Clamanges have been examined. In fact it is clear from Jean de Montreuil's letter "Non dici" (ed. Ornato, No. 96) that Jean is seconding Clamanges' ideas, and that in fact Jean's letter is explicitly prompted by Nicolas' having shown him Pietramala's (and no doubt his own) letter (No. 96, ll. 8-9). Not surprisingly, therefore, Jean's letter also stresses the unity of eloquence and wisdom:

²⁴Lest this seem "over-reading," or a somewhat harsh judgment of Petrarch to "read between the lines" of this letter, I refer the reader to Cecchetti, "Sulla fortuna del Petrarca," where the author gives overwhelming evidence that Clamanges disliked Petrarch throughout his life (unlike the other French humanists), and never participated in any show of enthusiasm for Petrarch's works.

. . . visus est michi sermo tuus ille mellifluo
Lactancii rore delibutus, qui in quodam cuiusdam
epistule tue ad Romanos rescripto cavetur, et, ut quod
me oblectat dicam, sentenciis ornatior quam verbis.
(No. 96, ll. 4-6)

Although beginning the letter by praising Pietramala's
letter to the Romans (the "Hortatur patriae" which he had
included in his letter to Clamanges) for its style and in
comparison with classical writers, Jean nevertheless
stresses that the pious message counted even more than the
style.

Jean continues to stress this point:

. . . qui a puero semper honoravi, semper amavi
rethores, et potissime bonitatis nomine insignitos.
(No. 96, ll. 12-13)

If it is the unity of wisdom and eloquence which the writer
keeps firmly in mind, then the glory and fame which is the
great author's prize is really a fitting reward, rather
than the danger and sin which desire for worldly acclaim
would otherwise be. As Jean continues:

Quod si me, pater optime, aule castrales neutiquam
habuissent, . . . vixque satis otium suppeditare
possemus, libenter huic, pre ceteris, intenderem
arti: quippe, an ulla putas alia esse rudimenta et
incunabula virtutis, quibus animi ad glorie cupidi-
tatem aluntur? quemadmodum Salustio, eloquentiam
obicienti, respondit Tullius. (ll. 13-18)

Jean modestly leaves final judgment over the matters he
has alluded to in this letter up to Pietramala:

De his tamen tua, dignissime pater, videat altissima discretio, quorum constituo correctricem, ut psalterium unisonum reddat ad citharam. . . . (ll. 40-42)

That is, Jean wishes that Pietramala's discretion "render the psalter consonant with the lyre." A psalter and lyre were, literally, ancient stringed instruments. However, the connotations of psalterium are ecclesiastical. The Psalms of David were specifically referred to as the Psalter. Cithara, on the other hand, was the instrument used by the bards of Greece, and here refers to classical poetry. This passage in Jean's letter occurs immediately after a section in which Jean praises Petrarch, but gently agrees with Clamanges that the Italian poet has wrongly neglected them many French men of eloquence. Now, these men of eloquence are largely Catholic, as we have seen from the list in Clamanges' Ep. V "Quod in superiori," to which Jean is clearly referring. Finally, in the rest of the same sentence Jean excuses his criticisms of Pietramala on the grounds that he was moved by: (1) zelo patriae (l. 43)-- love of country, and for the literary reputation of France, which Petrarch and Pietramala are attacking, and which is based primarily upon Catholic writers of eloquence; and (2) tot venerabilium universitatum . . . amore (ll. 43-44) which Clamanges had defended as a place where classical authors and rhetoric were indeed taught.

The connotations of the words psalterium and citharam, as well as the context in which this phrase occurs, make it clear that Jean here expresses a concern to make Christian and pagan eloquence (poetry) compatible. The basis for this compatibility, as shown best of all by Pietramala's own letter, is the recognition that wisdom is the basis of all eloquence. Were this kept firmly in mind by the Italians, Jean implies, there would be no question of undervaluing the French contribution to eloquence.