

is only when it tries to express ideas, that its deficiency becomes apparent¹. This is only natural. From poetry to descriptive prose, from descriptive prose to logical prose, is the normal course of development for every language².

The reign of Charles V. forms an interlude of rest between two terrible epochs of war and misgovernment. The temporary return to prosperity which France enjoyed under his wise and beneficent rule was not without its effect on literature. For although during his reign at least there was no visible progress, the seeds were sown of future improvement. It is from his reign that we must date the appearance in France of that preliminary classical revival, which, with reference to Italy, has, as I have said, been called by Mr Bryce 'the Roman Renaissance.' The king himself was a fair Latin scholar, and under his auspices several Latin works were translated into French. It was not however till the beginning of the fifteenth century that this revived interest in Latin classical literature began to have any effect upon the style of French prose.

The fifteenth century, as a period in French literature, is generally treated as a whole; but it is better to divide it. The accession of Louis XI.

¹ See on this point some good remarks by Mr Saintsbury, *Hist. of French Lit.* p. 153.

² There is a good sketch of the 14th cent. literature, by J. V. Leclerc, in the *Hist. Litt.* xxiv. 439—455.

(1461), whose reign like that of his prototype Philip the Fair marks the beginning of a new political epoch, is a good landmark also from the literary point of view. Taking then this date as the point of division we shall have two sub-periods of about equal length, the first beginning at 1404, the date of the appearance of Christine de Pisan's *Livre des Fais et bonnes Meurs du sage roi Charles V.*, the first prose work of any note written under the influence of Latin models¹, and ending at 1461; the other beginning at 1461 and ending at 1515.

The two periods, though they share some features in common, are sufficiently contrasted to justify their separation. The first is by far the more interesting of the two, for it is illustrated by several great or at least celebrated names, while the second period, if we except Philippe de Comines, whose memoirs were not published till after its close, in 1523, can shew nothing but third-rate writers, whose common characteristic is mediocrity. The first period represents the last expiring effort of mediæval literature, the second is a period of repose, or, to use an untranslatable French term, *recueillement*, during which France was silently preparing and strengthening herself for the Renaissance.

¹ On the 1st of January, 1404, Christine presented her poem of the *Mutation de Fortune*, as a new year's gift (*étrennes*) to the Duke of Burgundy, who then commissioned her to write a life of Charles V.

The fifteenth-century literature opens thus with Christine de Pisan, who, though in her poetry she is content to follow in the traces of her master Deschamps, as a prose writer makes an entirely new departure. This admirable woman, the prototype of so many of her sex, who, left widows at a comparatively early age¹, have painfully won a subsistence for themselves and their children by a life of literary toil, was by no means a woman of genius. But she was industrious, clever, and for her time exceedingly learned. There were few branches of literature or knowledge in which she did not turn her pen to account. It is only however with her influence on French prose that I am now concerned. This is what M. Aubertin has to say of her style. *It is full of big words, heavily translated from the Latin, which make it at once odd and obscure; she combines, in her outpourings of undigested learning, the nonsense of future Renaissance pedants with the subtleties of scholastic divisions and subdivisions. To all the defects of her own age she adds by anticipation those of the age following*². This is severe, and, I think, unjust. In favour of Christine it may fairly be said, first that whenever she is moved to eloquence her style not only shews considerable force and dignity, but becomes more lucid and

¹ Her husband, Thomas de Pisan, died in 1402, when she was eight or nine and thirty.

² Aubertin II. 273.

simple, and secondly that in her later prose writings a decided improvement may be traced. Thus it is rather by the *Lamentation sur les Maux de la guerre civile* (1410) and the *Livre de la Paix* (1412—1414) than by the history of Charles V. that we must judge of her capabilities as a writer. But even granted that what M. Aubertin says be true, French literature still owes to Christine de Pisan a large debt of gratitude, for it was she who first pointed out the true source of the regeneration of French prose, and the models after which it was to be refashioned in order to fit it for its great task of becoming the interpreter of Europe, of presenting in a language of crystal lucidity and logical precision the ideas of each European nation. Christine de Pisan was thus a worthy predecessor of Rabelais and Calvin and Amyot and Montaigne, and all those who carried on the work of fashioning French prose as a medium of thought as well as of narrative¹.

Her immediate successor was Alain Chartier, who in his patriotism, his pedantry, and his literary activity bears a strong resemblance to her. It is a well-known story how Margaret of Scotland, wife of the Dauphin, afterwards Louis XI., finding him

¹ For Christine de Pisan see R. Thomassy, *Essai sur les écrits politiques de C. de Pisan*, 1838. There is a good and appreciative notice of her in Mr Blades' *Caxton*, p. 195 and pp. 337—338 (2nd ed.).

one day asleep in a room through which she was passing, did honour to the lips 'from which so many golden words had issued,' by stooping to kiss them¹. And though now it is chiefly by this royal kiss that he is known, his fame by no means ended with his life. In the sixteenth century he was called the 'Father of French eloquence,' and the title well expresses the nature of his services to French prose literature. It was eloquence as well as logical precision which was wanting to French prose. It prattled charmingly, but it could not draw the long breath of a continuous discourse: it was vivid and picturesque in a remarkable degree, but it was wholly deficient in style, in the power of expressing noble and dignified thoughts in noble and dignified language. Now these qualities Alain Chartier, in spite of his pedantry and stilted cumbrousness, undoubtedly possessed: he had the power of sustained utterance and the feeling for style; in other words he had eloquence. There are many pages in his masterpiece, the *Quadriloge invectif*, which are not unworthy to stand beside the great speech of the Sieur d'Aubray in the *Satire Menippée*. We are

¹ The story is told by, among others, Estienne Pasquier, *Recherches de la France*, vi. c. 16, a chapter entitled '*Des mots douz et belles sentences de maistre Alain Chartier*'. For Chartier's life and writings see Delaunay, *Etude sur A. Chartier* (1876), and Gérusez, *Hist. de la Litt. f.* i. 230—242. The latest edition of his works (1 vol. 4to.) is of 1617. Caxton translated his *Curial* or *Courtier*.

told that his favourite author was Seneca, and it is to Seneca that Estienne Pasquier compares him. The connexion is noteworthy. The influence of Seneca in French literature has been considerable; on French tragedy it was in a great measure a harmful influence, but it was not so with regard to French prose. Seneca's faults are those of every artist of a silver age, of an age in which style is cultivated not for the sake of the thoughts of which it should be the setting, but for its own sake. But if Seneca had, so to speak, too much style, French prose had too little. Thus Chartier by taking him as a model shewed his appreciation of what was the great want of French prose—style; and though from not having the genius requisite for his task he failed himself in this work of regeneration, he at any rate pointed out to his mightier successors, to Rabelais and Montaigne and Pascal, the source from which that regeneration was to come. In the history then of French literature Alain Chartier has a right to an honourable place, not indeed as a great writer, but as one of those who have contributed to the forging of that keen and mighty weapon, French prose.

By the side of the latinised prose of Chartier and his followers the old picturesque narrative prose continued to flourish. At the close of this period we have three works of considerable reputation, the *Quinze Joyes du Mariage*, *Petit Jehan de*

Saintré, and the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, which competent judges seem to be agreed in assigning to one author, Antoine de la Sale, and in praising as among the best specimens of French mediæval prose¹. The numerous prose versions of the old poetical romances, which down to nearly the middle of the sixteenth century were the favourite reading of the whole of Europe, also belong to this period².

The other branch of French literature, besides narrative prose, which had shewn an upward tendency during the fourteenth century—the drama—still continued to progress during the fifteenth. The establishment by letters patent in 1402 of the *Confrérie de la Passion* as a recognised society

¹ Antoine de la Sale was born in Burgundy 1398, and served successively Louis III., Count of Provence, his successor René, and Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy. He wrote *Jehan de Saintré* in 1459. The *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* were told between 1456 and 1461 at the castle of Genappe in Flanders by Louis XI., then Dauphin, the Comte de Charolais, and their suite. The 50th story was told by A. de la Sale, who is supposed to have edited the collection, which was first printed in 1486 by A. Vérard. The *Quinze Joyes du Mariage*, also attributed to La Sale, is mentioned in the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* and must therefore be of earlier date. The oldest manuscript of it bears the date of 1464. See the introduction to the edition of the *Cent Nouv. Nouv.* by Bibliophile Jacob. The literary value of all these works is, I think, often exaggerated. I agree with Michelet that *Petit Jehan de Saintré* is an *œuvre ennuyeuse et pédantesque*. The *Quinze Joyes* is painfully cynical and the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* revoltingly coarse.

² Aubertin i. 266, 267.

for the performance of religious dramas, and the consequent erection of a stage in a huge hall of the hospital of the Trinity, gave France her first regular theatre; and the two forms of the mediæval religious drama, the mysteries and the miracle plays¹, displayed throughout this period a considerable accession of vitality. It was not till the second half of the century that the enormous length to which they, especially the mysteries, attained, shewed that they too had reached their period of decadence. The profane drama, in its three forms of the farce, the *sotie*, and the morality, was no less active. Of the hundred and fifty comedies or thereabouts of the French mediæval theatre that have been brought to light, the great majority belong to the fifteenth century, nor, as in the case of the religious drama, can we make any distinction between the earlier and later half of the century. The most celebrated piece of all, the immortal farce of *Patelin*, which, in spite of attempts to father it with the distinguished names of Villon and Antoine de la Sale, still remains anonymous, is assigned to various dates between 1460 and 1473². The flourishing period of mediæval comedy in fact lasted till the

¹ Originally the name *Mystère* was confined to pieces of which the subject was taken from the Bible, while the *Miracle* was a legend from the lives of the Saints; but in the fifteenth century this distinction was not always adhered to.

² Aubertin i. 541, 542. *Patelin* was printed at Rouen before 1486, at Paris in 1490.

close of the reign of Louis XII. (1515), when after a final outburst of activity during that reign it gradually passed away in company with its more decrepit religious sister.

The more persistent vitality of the secular as compared with the religious mediæval drama is one more example of the change which mediæval society and literature were undergoing, the decay of their religious and aristocratic elements, and the growth of their popular and secular elements. It is these more or less antagonistic forces that are represented by the two poets, who are the best known of all the writers of this period, and who, both ending their work almost exactly at its close, seem to sum up all the traditions of mediæval literature during the two preceding centuries¹.

Charles d'Orleans, the poet-prince, is the representative of the element of chivalry, of the courtly and graceful strains of lyric song, of the perfumed allegory of the first part of the *Roman de la Rose*. His poetry is the sweet swan's note of expiring feudalism. François Villon, the poet-vagabond, inherits, on the other hand, the traditions of the *fabliaux* and the *Roman du Renart*, of Rutebœuf and Jean de Meun. His poetry is the rude, but resolute, utterance of a voice that has played no

¹ C. d'Orleans died in 1465. Villon's last known work, the *Grand Testament*, was written in 1461. Nothing is known of him after this date.

small part in French history and literature, the voice of the French people. While the prince is wholly of the past, the vagabond is partly also of the future, and while the prince is merely the most graceful and polished representative of a class, the vagabond has that stamp of individuality which is the unfailing accompaniment of genius. It is this which has earned for Villon the title of France's first modern poet; but, in spite of that modern air which his strong individuality gives him, in his thought hardly less than in his method he belongs to the mediæval world.

Distinct both from the formal court poetry, of which Charles d'Orleans was the chief exponent, and from the poetry of the streets of Paris represented by Villon are the numerous anonymous popular songs¹ of the fifteenth century. Some of them silly enough, many of them ignoble and sensual, not a few of considerable charm and beauty, all fresh and spontaneous, they are interesting as the genuine expression of the social life of provincial France. In form, like the songs of most nations, they are

¹ 143 of these songs, in various dialects, many of them dating from near the close of the 15th century, have been published under the title of *Chansons du xv^e siècle* by M. Gaston Paris, for the *Société des anciens textes français*, from a MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale. The finest perhaps of all is the war-song beginning *Il fait bon veoir ces hommes d'armes* (p. 129), of the time of Charles VIII. or Louis XII. It is given by Mr Saintsbury in his *French Lyrics*, p. 57.

characterised by a plentiful use of the refrain. It is a species of poetry which has always flourished on French soil, and which at the beginning of this century found a great literary exponent in the person of Béranger.

The first period of the fifteenth century is to be regarded, as I have said, as the last expiring effort of mediæval literature. What Sainte-Beuve says with reference to the mystery-plays is true of the whole literature, *When things are near their end, they often have a season of splendour: it is their autumn, their vintage, their last firework*¹. The remaining period, which comprises the fifty-four years which elapsed before the accession of Francis I, is the most uninteresting in the whole of French literature. With the exception of the farce of Patelin and the anonymous songs already mentioned, and the delightful little tale of Jehan de Paris², there is hardly a single work of this period which has any interest for the general reader; and except Pierre Gringore, the author of the famous *Jeu et Sotie du Prince des Sots*, played in 1511 on Shrove-Tuesday before all Paris, Jean le Maire de Belges,

¹ "Quand les choses sont près de finir elles ont souvent une dernière saison toute florissante: c'est leur automne et leur vendange, c'est leur bouquet." *Poésie française au xvi^{me} siècle* (nouv. éd.), p. 172.

² M. A. de Montaiglon assigns it with great probability to the year 1492. See the preface to his edition (Paris, 1867). It was first printed about 1530.

and possibly Guillaume Coquillart, who, though he lived till 1510, was born in 1421, ten years before Villon, there is not a single writer of even respectable merit. It is not that there was any dearth of writers, or any stint in their productions, but bad taste and mediocrity reigned supreme. It was a literature of decrepitude, a shadowy survival, which preserved only the faults of the old mediæval literature, and intensified these into grotesqueness. Poetry was chiefly represented by the so-called *grands rhétoriciens*, many of whom enjoyed an enormous contemporary reputation. They affected the latinised language of Christine de Pisan and Alain Chartier, dealt largely in allegory, revelled in the difficulties of the *chant royal* and other highly artificial forms of verse, and, in the words of Mr Saintsbury, *produced some of the most intolerable poetry ever written*¹.

The same affectation and pedantry, the same striving after ingenuity, the same futile efforts to force the French language into a Latin mould,

¹ *Hist. of French Lit.* p. 165, and cf. Darmesteter et Hatzfeld, *Le xvi^e siècle en France* (1878), p. 82. "Rimer lourdement des chroniques plus ou moins historiques : écrire de froides allégories rappelant de très-loin le Roman de la Rose, le modèle du genre ; composer pour la cour fleureton, ballades, rondeaux, quatrains, huitains, dizains, cartels, mascarades, complaints, &c., ou s'amuser à des tours de force de versification—alors l'idéal de l'art—aux rimes équivoquées, doublement équivoquées, brisées, couronnées, enchaînées, batelées &c....tel est l'art de ces maîtres révévés à l'égal des grands."

characterise the prose of the period, the lumbering chronicles of the historiographers of France and Burgundy. This is how Jean Molinet begins his *Chronicles* of the history of Burgundy:

La très-illustre et refulgente maison du seigneur et duc de Bourgogne est magnifiquement fondée sur les sommets des montagnes. Les gens terriens qui sont entendus les victorieux princes et regens et conducteurs du bien publique sont comme montaignes excelses où est assis le hault trosne d'honneur vers qui les nobles preux du siècle tournent la face et tendent bras et mains.

And Jean Molinet was much admired by his contemporaries¹.

A far simpler and better writer than Molinet, though not wholly free from the same affectation of using Latin words, is Claude de Seyssel² the author of *Les louenges du roy Louys xii^e* published in

¹ Jean Molinet (d. 1507) succeeded George Chastellain (1403—1475) as historiographer of the house of Burgundy. His chronicle extended from 1474 to 1504. He turned the *Roman de la Rose* into prose. He had also a great reputation as a poet, his poetry being chiefly composed of bad puns and other puerilities.

² C. de Seyssel, a native of Savoy (born about 1450), was professor of law at Turin when he was invited to France by Louis XII. He rose to high honour at the French court, being made a member of the state-council and a master of requests. He afterwards took orders and was made bishop of Marseilles, and finally archbishop of Turin, where he died in 1520. His translations of the Greek historians will be mentioned hereafter.

1508¹, though apart from its merits of style his work does not rise to a higher level than that of an uncritical panegyric. But about the year 1500 there was completed, though not published till 1523, an historical work of a very different quality from that of either Molinet or Seyssel, the *Memoirs of Philippe de Comines*².

Comines has been called the 'father of modern history', and the 'first really modern French writer.' But he deserves neither the one appellation nor the other. He is certainly not a modern writer, nor in the true sense of the word is he an historian. If it be said that he stands, as it were, on a bridge between the two worlds, mediæval and modern, it must be added that it is to the mediæval world that his face is turned. His *Memoirs*, truly says Arnold, *are striking from their perfect unconsciousness*:

¹ Republished in 1558 under the title of *L'histoire singulière du roy Loys, &c.*, and again in 1615 by Godefroy with other records of the reign of Louis XII.

² P. de Comines was born about 1447 and died in 1511. His *Memoirs* embrace the reign of Louis XI. from 1465—1483 (books I.—VI.), and the Italian wars of Charles VIII. from 1493—1498 (books VII., VIII.). Sainte Beuve has a good essay on him (*Causeries du Lundi*, I. 241 ff.). Mr Saintsbury's estimate of him (*Short history*, p. 161) is on the whole a just one, but the fact of Comines grasping 'the anti-feudal and therefore anti-mediæval conception of a central government' does not seem to be sufficient reason for classing him among the writers of the Renaissance period. See also Ranke's criticism from the historical point of view in *Zur Kritik neuerer Geschichtschreiber* (Werke, xxxiv.), pp. 134—139.

*the knell of the Middle Ages had been already sounded, yet Comines has no other notions than such as they had tended to foster; he describes their events, their characters, their relations, as if they were to continue for centuries*¹. His style too is purely mediæval: it has neither a foretaste of the logical precision and clearness of later French prose, nor does it shew any trace of classical influences. Comines indeed knew neither Latin nor Greek, a fact alone which marks him as a child of the mediæval world and not of the Renaissance. Yet along with these unmistakable signs of mediævalism there is to be found in him a vein of modern thought, a manner of looking at events, which, though it does not justify us in calling him the father of modern history, entitles him to be regarded as at least a forerunner of the modern historian. In the first place, unlike the older chroniclers, especially unlike Froissart, he cares neither for battles nor pageants nor other picturesque matters. What he cares for is not light and shade, but cause and effect; unravelling the web of tortuous statecraft; tracking the hidden springs of character. It is this inquiring spirit as well as his thoroughly anti-feudal attitude, his entire appreciation of the policy of his hero, which give him the air of a quasi-modern historian. But after all his book is not a history any more than it is a chronicle. It

¹ *Lectures on Modern History*, p. 118 (2nd ed.), and see pp. 110, 111.

is what he himself terms it—his Memoirs, the record of events of which he was an eye-witness. This is the real historical value of the book, that it is written by a man who was not only an eye-witness but a leading actor in most of the events which he relates, by a man who if not a profound statesman was at least a profound master of statecraft, who was skilled in reading the thoughts of those with whom in the conduct of affairs he came in contact, and who had thus learnt, not from books, but from men, the lessons in practical politics with which he points his narrative. But it is a history rather by accident than by design. It is as much a history as the Memoirs of Metternich, and no more. The great charm of Comines consists in his originality, in that mixture of *naïveté* and maliciousness which is the characteristic of the *esprit gaulois*, in his appreciation of the unheroic side of history, in his keen eye for character. But to call him ‘the father of modern history,’ or the French Machiavelli, or the French Tacitus, is to miss the peculiar flavour of this *bourgeois* minister of a *bourgeois* monarch.

Comines’ Memoirs are the single bright spot in the literary desert of the close of the Middle Ages. But dreary though the period is from the point of view of literary production, it is by no means unimportant from that of literary developement. I shall shew in a future chapter how the material prosperity which the country enjoyed during this period, the

strong central government and political unity established by Louis XI., and the contact with Italy caused by the invasions of Charles VIII. and Louis XII., were all powerful agencies in preparing the soil for the Renaissance. But there are two events that fall within this period which have a more immediate bearing upon literature, are indeed two of the most important landmarks in the whole history of French literature. One, I need hardly say, is the introduction of printing, the other is the revival of Greek. It is to the printing of books, and the study of the ancient masterpieces, not to its pretentious poems and histories, that the true literary value of the period is due. The work was not indeed carried on with such activity as it was during the reign of Francis I., but the ground was thoroughly broken up, the good seed was sown. Before the end of the period France had a distinguished Greek scholar of her own, Budé, and a distinguished printer, Jodocus Badius Ascensius, both of whom stood beyond dispute in the first rank of European humanists¹.

¹ Badius, though a Fleming by birth, had adopted France as his home.

CHAPTER IV.

MEDIÆVAL LEARNING.

§ 1. *The Paris University.*

Authorities. The chief authority is Bulæus (Du Boulay), *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis* (1673, 6 vols. fol.); Crévier, *Histoire de l'Université de Paris* (1761, 6 vols. 12mo.), is a good arrangement of Bulæus' matter with very complete index; Thurot, *De l'organisation de l'enseignement dans l'Université de Paris au moyen âge* (1850), is a thesis of much learning derived from the registers in the University archives and from other original documents, sometimes inaccurate in the citation of authorities; Jourdain, *Index chronologicus chartarum pertinentium ad historiam Univ. Parisiensis* (1862), is a useful collection of the original charters. See also Savigny, *Geschichte des Römischen Rechts*, III. XXI., useful for the constitution; Vallet de Viriville, *Histoire de l'instruction publique en Europe &c.* (1849—1852), especially ch. III.; and P. Lacroix (Bibliophile Jacob), *Sciences et lettres au moyen âge et à l'époque de la renaissance* (1877), pp. 1—45, both lively sketches, with illustrations, of the University in the middle ages, the former being better for the studies, the latter for the general life and manners; Meiners, *Geschichte der hohen Schulen* (Göttingen, 1802, 4 vols.), with much various and interesting information, which unfortunately is frequently inaccurate.

For the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries there are admirable notices in the *Histoire Littéraire*, vols. IX. XVI. and XXIV. by Dom Rivet, Daunou and I. V. Leclerc respectively, while Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, Part I. (1873), and *Munimenta Academica* (Rolls Series, ed. Anstey) are useful for purposes of comparison between Paris and our own Universities.

For the general characteristics of scholasticism I have con-

sulted A. Jourdain, *Recherches sur les anciennes traductions d'Aristote* (1843, new ed. by C. Jourdain). Hauréau, *De la philosophie scolastique* (1850). Cousin, *Hist. de la philosophie au XVIII^e siècle*, 9^{me} leçon. Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy* (English Translation, 1872), I. 355—467. Schwegler (Stirling's translation, 7th ed.), p. 144. Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik*, of which 4 vols. only are published (Leipsic, 1855—1870), and Mullinger as before. From the writings of Vives, especially *De causis corruptarum artium* in vol. VI. of the *Works* (Valentia, 1782—1790); and of Ramus, especially the *Scolae in literales artes* (Basle 1578); the letters of Erasmus, including a remarkable letter from Sir Thomas More to Martin Dorpius, in his *Works* (Leyden, 1703—6), III. pp. 1892—1916; the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum*, and the immortal work of Rabelais, much interesting and valuable contemporary information may be obtained on the whole question of mediæval learning.

Though the existence of the Paris University as an incorporated body with a recognised legal status only dates from the beginning of the thirteenth century, Paris had long before been famous as a great centre of education. At the end of the eleventh century the lectures of William of Champeaux in the school of Notre Dame attracted crowds of students. But his fame was soon eclipsed by that of his pupil and rival Abélard. The multitudes who thronged to hear him on the hill of Sainte Geneviève came from all parts of Europe¹. Among

¹ Nulla terrarum spatia, nulla montium cacumina, nulla concava vallium, nulla via, difficili licet obsita periculo et latrone, quominus ad te properarent, retinebant. Anglorum turbam juvenem mare interjacens et undarum procella terribilis non terrebat, sed omni periculo contempto, audito tuo nomine, ad te confluebat. (Foulques, prior of Deuil, to Abélard, quoted in Dom Bouquet XIV. 281.)

his hearers were Guido di Castello, afterwards Pope Celestine II.; Arnold of Brescia, who was protected by Pope Celestine II. and burnt by Adrian IV.; Peter the Lombard, afterwards bishop of Paris, who in his turn became famous as a teacher, and whose *Sentences* were throughout the middle ages one of the most approved text-books in the Paris schools¹, and our own countryman John of Salisbury². Throughout the twelfth century the great schools of Notre Dame, Sainte Geneviève, and St Victor, with others of less note, maintained their celebrity. *Paris*, in the words of Dom Rivet, *became a second Athens*. Nearly half the Popes of the century owed part of their education to her schools. Englishmen especially frequented them. To John of Salisbury, already mentioned, we must add Archbishop Thomas, Giraldus Cambrensis, Walter Map, Nicholas Breakspear, afterwards Pope Adrian IV., Stephen Langton, Edmund Rich, Alexander of Hales, Robert Grosseteste³, Matthew Paris, Michael Scott, and Roger Bacon, all of whom were students, many lecturers, at Paris, between 1230 and 1330⁴.

¹ See Hauréau, *La Philosophie Scolastique*. (Paris, 1850) I. 330.

² His *Metalogicus* (bk. II. c. 10) is the chief authority for the educational life of Paris at this time. It is largely quoted by Dom Rivet in his admirable account in the *Histoire Littéraire*, IX. See also Wright, *Biog. Lit.* II. 230.

³ Dr Luard in his preface to Grosseteste's letters (Rolls Series) points out that Bulæus is the only authority for his having been a student at Paris.

⁴ They all find a place by *droit d'aubaine* in the *Hist.*

By the middle of the twelfth century the number of students was so large that popular exaggeration could speak of them as outnumbering the rest of the citizens. Before long their great power and pretensions, and the consequent jealousy between them and the townspeople, which led to frequent scenes of uproar and bloodshed, ending, at least on one occasion, in a temporary secession of many of the students¹, rendered it necessary that their position should be determined by legislation. No positive act of incorporation has been preserved, but early in the thirteenth century we find the schools of Paris definitely incorporated into a University².

Littéraire. When Henry II. went to Paris in 1254, he was received with great splendour by the English students, of whom Matthew Paris says, 'erat numerus adventantium et obviantium infinitus' *Chron. Maj.* (Rolls Series, ed. Luard), v. 477.

¹ See Walter Map, *De nugis Curialium* (Camden Soc.), v. 217, and Matthew Paris's account of a riot between the citizens and the students in 1229 which resulted in the secession of a large body of students to Angers (*Chron. Maj.* III. 166-8).

² The earliest existing documents recognising the existence of the Paris University as a corporation are an ordinance of Philip Augustus of the year 1200 (Jourd. Index, no. 1), exempting the students from the jurisdiction of the provost of Paris, and a bull of Innocent III. of 1203 (Jourd. no. II.) authorising the students to be represented by an agent (*procuratorem ad agendum aut defendendum*). The term '*universitas*' first occurs in a bull of Innocent III. of 1211, which is inserted in the concordat made in 1213 between the University and the Chancellor of Notre-Dame through the mediation of the Bishop of Troyes (Jourd. no. xv.), but it is used with qualifying words—*universitas doctorum et scholarium*. It is not till 1262, in a bull of Urban IV., that we find *Universitas Parisiensis* used

In this transition from a loosely connected aggregate of schools to a single compact university, one important feature of which definite traces have been preserved is the emancipation from that jurisdiction, which every ecclesiastical corporation claimed to have over the schools within its limits, this jurisdiction in the case of the high schools being exercised by the Chancellor of the corporation¹. Thus the schools of Paris, out of which the University sprang, being situated for the most part within the limits of the Church of Notre-Dame or of the Abbey of Sainte Geneviève, were subject to the jurisdiction of the Chancellor of one or other of these corporations. But we hear most of the pretensions of the Chancellor of Notre Dame, who seems to have pushed his educational jurisdiction far beyond the actual territory of the Chapter which he represented. No one could open a school at Paris without his permission, and this permission or absolutely without any such qualifying words being either expressed or implied (Jourd. no. CLXXXIX.). In the Ordinance of Philip Augustus the title used is 'Schools of Paris,' a title which appears in various decrees of the thirteenth century. Another title was *studium generale*, i.e. a place of study open to all the world.

¹ The Chancellor was originally the Secretary to the Chapter. In the eleventh and earlier part of the twelfth century the superintendence of the episcopal school was in the hands, not of the *cancellarius*, but of the *scholasticus* or *magister scholarum*, an officer appointed by the bishop. See *Revue des questions historiques*, April 1, 1876, p. 573, an article entitled *La licence d'enseigner et le rôle de l'écolâtre au moyen âge*, by G. Bourbon.

licence, as it was called, was frequently either arbitrarily refused or only granted on payment of a fee¹. But in a Lateran council held in the year 1179 Pope Alexander III. decreed that no one should take money for a licence, or refuse to grant it to any fit person². This decree was by no means rigidly adhered to by the Chancellors, and there were frequent disputes between them and the nascent University. In 1215 however the Bishop and the Dean and Chapter of Paris passed a statute which restrained the power of their officer within due limits, and this statute was in the same year confirmed by the Papal Legate, Robert de Courçon, in a document which also contained various regulations concerning the teaching and discipline of the University³. An additional reason for the Chancellor's interference was the fact that the University, having no seal of its own, was obliged, when occasion required, to borrow that of the Chapter, which was kept by the Chancellor. But in 1225 the University established a seal of its own, the right to use which was, after a fierce dispute with the Chapter, confirmed by the Pope⁴. From this possession of a common seal the existence of the University as a legally constituted

¹ The *licence d'enseigner* is first heard of in the twelfth century, *ib.*

² *Pro licentiâ dicendi nullus omnino pretium exigat...nec docere quemquam expetitâ licentiâ, qui sit idoneus, interdicit*, Bul. II. 430.

³ Bul. III. 79—82.

⁴ Bul. III. 118, 119.

corporate body may be said to date, but, as we have seen, it virtually existed, even as a corporation, some years before. It is the glory of the Paris University that it was not called into being by the stroke of a royal pen, but that it grew of itself.

Nothing testifies more to the importance and universality of Paris as a place of learning in the middle ages than the division into nations. While at Oxford the two nations, the Northern and the Southern, had reference solely to English geography, the four nations at Paris, of France, England¹, Picardy and Normandy embraced the whole of civilised Europe. Though this division is mentioned for the first time in a public document in a bull of Innocent IV. of 1245, it existed, at any rate as a working arrangement, in the twelfth century².

For the next century and a half the fame of Paris as a place of education remained undiminished. The other leading Universities, Oxford, Bologna, Salerno, acknowledged her supremacy. But it was in spite of herself that she maintained it. For it was to sit at the feet of the great Schoolmen that

¹ In 1431 the name of Germany was substituted for that of England, but the latter name was used in official documents till 1455 (Thurot). The division into nations is still preserved, for the purpose of electing a Rector, in the Universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen.

² In 1169 Henry II. offered to submit his differences with Becket to the scholars of the various provinces of Paris (*scolaribus diversarum provinciarum*), Rad. de Diceto, i. p. 337. (Rolls Series, ed. Stubbs.)

foreigners now frequented her schools, and for many years she resisted to the utmost the admission of the mendicant orders, to which all the great Schoolmen belonged, within her body¹. But the mendicants, supported by Pope Alexander IV., gained the victory. On the same day in 1257 the Dominican, Thomas Aquinas, and the Franciscan, Bonaventura, received from the University the degree of doctor in theology. The fame of their teaching and that of their successors continued to attract students from all countries. Brunetto Latini, the master of Dante, spent seven years at Paris, and Dante himself heard lectures in that Rue de Fouarre—the Street of the Schools—which has found a place in his immortal poem². Some twenty years after Dante

¹ Matt. Par. mentions several dissensions between the University and the Dominicans during the years 1253—1259. On two of these occasions, in 1255 and 1257, there was a general secession from Paris on the part of the University (*Chron. Maj.* v. 416, 506, 528, 645, 743).

² Essa è la luce eterna di Sigieri
 Che, leggendo nel vico degli strami,
 Sillogizzò invidiosi veri. *Par.* ix.

Dante's sojourn at Paris as a student is related by all his biographers. See Scartazzini, *Dante's Zeit Leben und Werke*, p. 382, and Fraticelli, *Storia della vita di D.* p. 176. They give 1309 as the date of his coming to Paris.

The Rue de Fouarre in which the schools of the faculty of Arts were situated is supposed to have been so called from the straw (*fouarre* or *feurre*) with which they were strewn for the students to sit on. (See *Hist. Littéraire*, xxi. Article on Siger by I. V. Leclerc.) It is mentioned by Rabelais, *Pant.* ii. c. 10. Petrarch calls it in one place the *strepidulus* and in another the *fragosus straminum vicus*.

came Petrarch. Boccaccio was born at Paris, but it is doubtful whether he ever studied there.

The first half of the fourteenth century was the epoch of the foundation of colleges. A natural result of the great influx of students to Paris was a scarcity of lodging accommodation. The high rents were a heavy tax on their slender purses, and the absence of all discipline was equally prejudicial to their morals¹. The first attempt to remedy this state of things was the foundation of *hospitia* or hostels, where first free lodging, and then free board were provided for poor scholars, who lived there under the superintendence of a master, and were taken by him to and from the lectures in the Rue de Fouarre. But in these hostels there was no teaching. The first regular college, that is to say, a place where students were taught as well as boarded, was the famous Sorbonne, founded in 1250 for poor students in theology by Robert de Sorbon, confessor to Louis IX. This was the only college founded in the thirteenth century. The next in date was that of Cardinal Le Moine founded in 1302. Then in 1304 came Navarre, destined to rival the Sorbonne in importance. Others quickly sprang up in the 'Latin Quarter' round the hill of Sainte Geneviève. By the middle of the fourteenth century at least five and twenty colleges had been founded. To

¹ See the frequently cited testimony of Cardinal de Vitry in his *Historia Occidentalis* (*Hist. Litt.* xviii. 234).

found a college had become a fashionable act of piety¹.

After this the work considerably slackened, for evil days had come on the University. Between Crécy (1346) and the peace of Brétigny (1360) France, smitten with the triple scourge of war, pestilence, and domestic sedition, was in no favourable condition for the pursuit of learning. Paris, which under its hero Etienne Marcel became the head-quarters of revolt, especially suffered. Petrarch visiting it in 1361 draws a melancholy picture of the change he found in its appearance². The reign of Charles V. (1363—1380) restored a large measure of order and prosperity to the country. Being himself a man of letters and a fair Latin scholar³, he shewed especial favour to the University, conferring on her, with other privileges, the title of the eldest daughter of the Kings of France⁴. To his reign may be traced an increase in the political importance of the University, due in a great measure to Nicolas Oresme, the principal of the college of Navarre and the most learned Frenchman of his

¹ Six Colleges were founded at Cambridge during the first half of the fourteenth century—Michael House, Clare Hall, King's Hall, Pembroke, Gonville Hall, Trinity Hall and Corpus Christi; and three at Oxford, Exeter, Oriel and Queen's.

² *Ep. de rebus senilibus* lib. x. (*Works*, Basle, 1554, p. 963.)

³ Christine de Pisan, *Hist. de Charles V.* Pt. II. c. 6.

⁴ Cf. *ib.* Pt. III. c. 13, where Charles calls the University his *très amée fille*.

day, who was high in Charles' favour. After Oresme three remarkable *alumni* of the same college of Navarre, who were at once courtiers, men of learning and reformers, Pierre d'Ailly, and Jean Gerson, successively chancellors of the University, and Nicolas Clamanges fully maintained the influence of the University in political matters¹. It was owing to them that in the councils of Pisa and Constance the University played so distinguished a part. In spite too of the disorder and frequent outbreaks of sedition which characterised the reign of Charles III, the University appears to have enjoyed a tolerable state of internal prosperity, though the foundation of Universities at Prague (1348), Vienna (1365), and Cologne (1388), must have drawn off a considerable number of students. On the outbreak of the civil war between the Burgundians and the Armagnacs in 1410 Paris became once more a scene of desolation. Then came the renewal of the war with England and the fatal day of Agincourt. In the year 1420, in which Henry V. entered Paris in triumph, the University was at her lowest ebb. Her schools were deserted, her colleges were falling to ruin.

With the decline of the English power after the death of Henry V. the University began again to hold up her head. We find her at once actively

¹ Crévier says that the period of the Papal schism (1378—1417) was that of the greatest influence of the University.

supporting the council of Basle abroad and making great efforts to re-establish peace at home, while at the assembly of the Gallican Church at Bourges her deputies were among the most ardent supporters of the Pragmatic Sanction. The return of peace restored in some measure her educational as well as her political credit. But neither Charles VII. nor his successor Louis XI. were favourably disposed to her, and they both encouraged the foundation of new Universities, which must have tended greatly to diminish the number of her students¹. Still in the reign of Louis XI. we find them variously estimated at ten and twelve thousand², and at the end of the century, though her splendour was somewhat diminished, she was once more recognised as the first University in Christendom³, a position which she maintained till the outbreak of the Civil Wars. But though some foreigners still found their way there, her students were drawn now almost entirely from France. She had become a national instead of a European institution.

¹ Poitiers, Caen, Valence, Nantes, Bourges, Bordeaux were all founded between 1431 and 1472. Several foreign Universities, Louvain, Freyburg, Basle, Ingolstadt, Tubingen, Mainz, were also founded during this period.

² For the numbers of the University see Appendix B. It will be as well however to say here that the numbers given above include much more than what we in our Universities understand by students. For this period the average annual number of bachelor's degrees in arts was under 300 (Thurot, p. 40 note).

³ *Academiæ omnium regina Lutetia* (Erasmus, III. 127).

Having thus given a brief sketch of the history of the University, I must say a few words about its constitution.

The government was entirely in the hands of the professors, not, as at Bologna, in the hands of the students. The technical term for the professors was, as it still is at Oxford, regents (*regentes*), the doctors who were not engaged in teaching being distinguished by the name of non-regents. The regents alone met in the ordinary assemblies or congregations, but on special occasions the non-regents were also summoned¹. They voted not individually, but through their nation or faculty, the voting units being the four nations and the three superior faculties of theology, canon law, or *decretorum*², and medicine.

At one time the only recognised division of the University had been that into nations, but, as a result of the quarrel with the mendicant orders, the three above-named faculties had separated themselves from the nations, and had come to be legally recognised as distinct bodies. Gradually the four nations, while retaining their four votes in the congregation and all the privileges of the original body,

¹ The assemblies in which only the regents took part were called *comitia generalia*, the others *comitia generalissima*. Bul. iii. 658. Till quite recently the Senate at Cambridge used to vote in two 'houses', that of the regents, and that of the non-regents.

² So called from the *Decretum* of Gratian published in 1151.

were regarded as a fourth faculty, which was usually called the faculty of arts, but not unfrequently the faculty of philosophy, and sometimes the faculty of grammar. The three faculties proper were then called in distinction the superior faculties, not from any superiority in power or status, but because they represented branches of study which were considered superior to that of arts¹. At the head of each of the superior faculties was a dean². The three deans with the rector and the four proctors (*procuratores*), who were still chosen exclusively from the nations, formed a tribunal which took cognisance of matters of discipline. There was also an older tribunal composed of the rector and proctors alone, which had a similar jurisdiction, but confined to the bachelors and undergraduates³. The rector was looked upon

¹ They are still called the superior faculties at Oxford and Cambridge. The origin of the faculties and whether they existed previous to the separation from the nations are questions which have never been thoroughly cleared up. But two points seem certain, one, that the term faculty originally meant, not the body of doctors in any branch of learning, but the branch of learning itself; the other, that some sort of association between the doctors of each of the four branches of learning must have existed before these associations took their places as distinct and recognised elements of the University constitution. Thus Matthew Paris says of John de Cella, who became Abbot of St Albans in 1195, that he *ad electorum consortium magistrorum meruit attingere* (*Gesta abbatum S. Albani*, ed. Riley i. 217). See the whole question discussed in Bul. ii. p. 562—569; Crévier, vii. 115—136; Thurot, pp. 13—18.

² There are deans of faculties in the Scotch Universities.

³ Crévier, vii. 75.

as the head of the University. From the year 1400 his term of office was for three months. The University in its corporate capacity for a long time claimed to be subject only to the jurisdiction of the king, but on an appeal being made to Charles VII. in support of this claim he formally vested the jurisdiction in the parliament of Paris, a body which the University had always looked upon with great jealousy. The two Chancellors of Notre-Dame and Sainte Geneviève, who in early times had, as we have seen, exercised supreme jurisdiction over the schools within their respective limits, had no longer any rights over the University but that of conferring the *licence* or degree of licentiate¹.

By the beginning of the sixteenth century the government of the University had passed almost entirely into the hands of the large colleges. It had

¹ The *licence* is the oldest university degree. Originally meant, as we have seen, a permission to teach, no one being allowed to open a school within the limits of a chapter without permission from the chancellor (see p. 80). The degree of *baccalaureus*, the name of which first appears in 1231, denoted that the possessor of it was in a state of training for the *licence*, during which he had to lecture under the eye of a master. It was obtained by an act called *determinatio*, from *determinare* (sc. *quæstionem*), to preside over a disputation. The degree of *master* was not properly a university degree. It signified the reception of the licentiate, or the licensed teacher, into the privileged body of masters. It was therefore conferred by the faculty itself. *Doctor*, which originally denoted a master actually engaged in teaching, became in time synonymous with *master*. (See Bul. v. 858, 859, ii. 681, 682. Crév. iv. 195, 196.)

come about in this way. Originally the colleges had confined their teaching to the students within their walls, all of whom were at once *boursiers* (*bursarii*), and on the foundation (*socii*)¹. There still remained a large number of students outside the colleges, who lived in what were called *pédagogies* under the charge of private tutors (*pédagogues*) and attended the lectures in the Rue de Fouarre or the schools of the superior faculties. But the advantages of the college discipline were so manifest that pensioners (*pensionnaires*) or paying students were in time introduced into the colleges. Navarre at the beginning of the fifteenth century was the first to make this change: at the same time its lectures were thrown open to the whole University². The *pédagogies* too seem to have become affiliated to the colleges, and sometimes a *pédagogue* rented part of the college buildings, and lived there with his pupils³. Thus at the time with which we are concerned all the students were either actually residing within the walls of the colleges or under their jurisdiction. The few unattached students were called *Martinets*⁴.

In the reign of Louis XI. we are told by Bulæus

¹ Launoy, *Regii Navarræ Gymnasii Historia* (1677), p. 104.

² Pasquier, *Recherches* ix. c. 17. See also the curious copy of a lease (*bail de pédagogie*) of 1506 between the college of La Marche and a professor of the college (Jourd. Index, no. MCLXVI.).

³ There are still 'bursaries' in the Scotch Universities.

⁴ Pasquier, *Recherches* ix. c. 17.

that there were eighteen colleges *de plein exercice* (*collegia magna, famosa*) and eighty small ones (*parva, non famosa*)¹. In the former teaching was provided in at least all the branches of the faculty of arts: in the latter it was confined to the two primary studies of grammar and rhetoric. The teaching was now thrown completely into the hands of the colleges. The schools in the Rue de Fouarre were deserted or only used as examination rooms². The principals appointed whom they pleased as professors, sometimes being paid for the appointment, and the old custom that no one could be admitted to the professoriate without formally petitioning his faculty or, if he were a doctor in arts, his nation *pro regentiâ et scholis* gradually fell into neglect. But the college professors enjoyed the full privileges of regents, and as members of the governing body completely swamped the regents who had been appointed by the faculties or nations, but did not belong to the educational body of any college. Thus the whole power of the University had become vested in the large colleges, for the professors of grammar and rhetoric, who were the only professors in the small colleges, did not rank as regents³.

¹ There is a list of about 50 colleges in Vallet de Viriville, pp. 166, 167.

² Ramus in 1562 speaks of the last professor of the Rue de Fouarre having recently died. (*Sur la reformation de l'Univ. de Paris, Archives Curieuses* 1^o Série iv. 134).

³ They were not admitted to the rank of regents till 1535.

come about in this way. Originally the colleges had confined their teaching to the students within their walls, all of whom were at once *boursiers* (*bursarii*), and on the foundation (*socii*)¹. There still remained a large number of students outside the colleges, who lived in what were called *pédagogies* under the charge of private tutors (*pédagogues*) and attended the lectures in the Rue de Fouarre or the schools of the superior faculties. But the advantages of the college discipline were so manifest that pensioners (*pensionnaires*) or paying students were in time introduced into the colleges. Navarre at the beginning of the fifteenth century was the first to make this change: at the same time its lectures were thrown open to the whole University². The *pédagogies* too seem to have become affiliated to the colleges, and sometimes a *pédagogue* rented part of the college buildings, and lived there with his pupils³. Thus at the time with which we are concerned all the students were either actually residing within the walls of the colleges or under their jurisdiction. The few unattached students were called *Martinets*⁴.

In the reign of Louis XI. we are told by Bulæus

¹ Launoy, *Regii Navarræ Gymnasii Historia* (1677), p. 104.

² Pasquier, *Recherches* ix. c. 17. See also the curious copy of a lease (*bail de pédagogie*) of 1506 between the college of La Marche and a professor of the college (Jourd. Index, no. MCLXVI.).

³ There are still 'bursaries' in the Scotch Universities.

⁴ Pasquier, *Recherches* ix. c. 17.

that there were eighteen colleges *de plein exercice* (*collegia magna, famosa*) and eighty small ones (*parva, non famosa*)¹. In the former teaching was provided in at least all the branches of the faculty of arts: in the latter it was confined to the two primary studies of grammar and rhetoric. The teaching was now thrown completely into the hands of the colleges. The schools in the Rue de Fouarre were deserted or only used as examination rooms². The principals appointed whom they pleased as professors, sometimes being paid for the appointment, and the old custom that no one could be admitted to the professoriate without formally petitioning his faculty or, if he were a doctor in arts, his nation *pro regentiâ et scholis* gradually fell into neglect. But the college professors enjoyed the full privileges of regents, and as members of the governing body completely swamped the regents who had been appointed by the faculties or nations, but did not belong to the educational body of any college. Thus the whole power of the University had become vested in the large colleges, for the professors of grammar and rhetoric, who were the only professors in the small colleges, did not rank as regents³.

¹ There is a list of about 50 colleges in Vallet de Viriville, pp. 166, 167.

² Ramus in 1562 speaks of the last professor of the Rue de Fouarre having recently died. (*Sur la reformation de l'Univ. de Paris, Archives Curieuses* 1^o Série iv. 134).

³ They were not admitted to the rank of regents till 1535.

By far the most powerful of the colleges were the Sorbonne and Navarre. The Sorbonne is too well known to need any testimony to its importance here, and its name will often occur in these pages in connexion with the new learning. It may be as well however to caution my readers that it is a mistake to speak of the Sorbonne as if it were identical with the faculty of theology. It consisted indeed exclusively of theological doctors and students, and the students of all the other colleges, except Navarre, attended its theology lectures; but though the majority perhaps of the doctors of theology belonged to it they did not all belong to it, and it had students as well as doctors; it thus included both more and less than the faculty of theology.

The college of Navarre¹ had steadily kept to the course marked out for it by Nicolas Oresme and his successors. It had always been in high favour with the court, and had enjoyed almost exclusively the privilege of providing tutors for the royal princes. This courtly atmosphere, and, to its honour it must be added, the high standard of discipline which it always maintained² made it the Trinity of Paris, at once the most popular and the most fashionable college. Henry III, Henry IV, and Henry of Guise

¹ See Launoy, *Reg. Nav. Gym. Hist.*

² For the excellence of its discipline see a speech of the Rector of the University in 1484. (Launoy, Pt. i. p. 447.)

were fellow-students there¹. It is said to have had at one time seven hundred students, but probably this included the shoe-blacks. Other leading colleges were Le Moine, Harcourt, Lisieux, Du Plessis, Dormans, Beauvais, Sainte Barbe and Montaigu.

At the beginning of the reign of Francis I. the other Universities of France were far inferior in repute to that of Paris, though some of them soon became formidable rivals. They were twelve in number: Toulouse, Montpellier, Orleans, Cahors, Angers, Grenoble, Poitiers, Caen, Valence, Nantes, Bourges and Bordeaux. I have given the names in order of foundation. Montpellier was celebrated for its school of medicine; Toulouse and Orleans for their law schools. To these may be added five others which eventually belonged to France: Avignon, Orange, Perpignan, Aix and Dôle, afterwards transferred to Besançon².

Besides the Universities or high schools there were elementary or grammar schools, attached, as the high schools had originally been, to the cathedral, or abbey, or sometimes to the parish church, within the jurisdiction of which they were situated. But while the high schools had become independent

¹ Matthieu, after saying that Henry IV. was at the College of Navarre, adds, 'Il y eut pour compagnons le Duc d'Anjou qui fut son Roy et le Duc de Guise qui le voulut être'. *Hist. de France*, (1631), III. 113.

² See Rabelais' humorous account of these provincial Universities. (Pant. II. c. v.)

corporations, the grammar schools were still subject to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which in their case was exercised by the precentor (*cantor, chantre*) instead of the chancellor. Frequently however his authority was delegated to a person who was called the *grand maître* or head-master. In Paris all the grammar schools were under the precentor of Notre Dame. They were of two kinds, the *écoles petites* or *françaises* for both sexes, and the *écoles grandes* or *latines* for boys only¹. In the former were taught reading, writing and church singing. In the *écoles latines*, says Thurot, it appears that the boys were divided into three classes. The third or lowest class, besides reading and writing, learnt the elements of Latin grammar in Donatus *de octo partibus orationis*, and read in Cato's *Disticha de moribus*, a collection of moral precepts in hexameters which throughout the Middle Ages and down to the middle of the seventeenth century was regarded as indispensable to a polite education². Another writer hardly less popular as an instructor of youth, was the English-born Joannes de Garlandiâ, a Latin versifier and grammarian of the thirteenth century, whose *Facetus*, *Morale Scholarium* and *Distichium sive Cornutus* were of much the same nature as Cato's work but far below it in merit³. In the second class the Latin

¹ Vallet de Viriville, pp. 199—210.

² See Appendix C.

³ See App. C. Erasmus says, "Deum immortalem! quale

grammar in use was the *Doctrinale* of Alexander Gallus or De Villâ Dei, a Paris professor and monk of the thirteenth century. It was based on Priscian and written in Leonine verses¹. Another work by the same writer was also used in this class. It was entitled *Carmen de algorismo*, and was, as its name implies, a treatise in verse on the seven elementary operations of addition, subtraction, doubling, halving, multiplication, division and the extraction of roots, which were collectively known as algorism. In this class they also learnt the rules of Latin versification², and what was dignified by the name of rhetoric, namely the proper method of addressing letters to persons of title. In the first class they began logic in the famous *Summulæ*, or abridgement of the *Organon* of Petrus Hispanus. A great many boys it must be remembered did not go to a Latin school at all, but after a slight preparation either at home or in an *école petite* went straight to the University

sæculum erat hoc quum magno apparatu Disticha Ioannis Garlandini adolescentibus, operosis et prolixis commentariis enarrabantur." (De pueris instituendis. *Works* i. 514.)

¹ For Alexander Gallus see App. C. A catalogue of the library of Charles Duc de Berry, the younger brother of Louis XI., when eight years old, has been preserved. It comprises an A.B.C, Seven Penitential Psalms, a Donatus, an Accidence, a Cato, and a Doctrinal. (Vallet de V., p. 206.)

² Cardinal d'Estouteville in his statutes of 1452, by which the University was still governed at the opening of our period, prescribes that no one shall begin logic till he has learnt the art of versification. (Bul. v. 555 ff.)

at the age of eight or nine, some indeed as early as six¹. In many of the colleges there were bursaries, (seventy in all, says Thurot), set apart for the grammarians, as those who were not advanced enough to begin the regular academic course in arts were called. This course was generally begun at the age of twelve or thirteen. It lasted three years and a half. The first two years were devoted to logic, the first being spent chiefly in the study of the *Summulæ*, the second in that of the *Organon* itself with Porphyry's *Introduction* and Boëthius' *Topica*. The first-year students were called *summulistæ*, the second-year *logici*. At the end of the second year the baccalaureat was taken. The studies of the third-year students (*physici*) were physics, the Nicomachean Ethics, and a smattering of mathematics and astronomy. The latter was generally called *sphærica* or *la sphère*, the favourite text-book being the *Sphæricum opus* of Joannes de Sacro Bosco, an Englishman who in the thirteenth century was for several years a professor at Paris². The *licence* was taken at the end of the third year. Half a year later followed the master's degree (*maitrise*), involving two separate acts or ceremonies; first the *inceptio* or reception of the licentiate by the masters of his nation, and secondly the investiture of the

¹ Montaigne was only six when he went to the University of Bordeaux.

² For Joannes de Sacro Bosco see App. C.

inceptor with the *bonnet magistral* in the presence of the same body¹. The student who had hitherto borne the title of *dominus* was henceforth dignified with that of *magister*. The crowning honour remained, that of admission to the professorial body. Formerly it had been requisite that the newly-made master should present a formal request to the regents of his nation for admission, and for a school to be assigned to him to teach in. But, as we have seen, this custom had fallen into disuse, and the appointment to the professoriate now rested with the heads of the colleges.

But the arts course was only preparatory to the higher study of theology. It was theology that gave such lustre to the University of Paris. Her school of medicine was inferior to that of Montpellier; her school of law, which was confined to the canon law², ranked far below that of Bologna, below those of Toulouse and Orleans. But in theology she reigned supreme³. It was to the study of theology that her two most influential colleges, the Sorbonne and Navarre, '*the two porticos of orthodoxy*' (as Budé calls them), were, the Sorbonne exclusively, and Navarre to

¹ See a woodcut, representing this ceremony, in P. Lacroix.

² The civil law was not admitted till the year 1679.

³ "Exspectabatur sententia Parisiensis Academiæ quæ semper in re Theologicâ non aliter principem tenuit locum quam Romana sedes Christianæ religionis principatum." (Erasmus, *Works* III. 600.) At this time however Louvain did not rank much below Paris as a theological school (see More to Dorpius, *ib.* III. 1896).

a great extent, devoted¹. The Paris degree of doctor in theology was the most coveted academical distinction of the day. But to obtain it a long and laborious training was necessary. The theological course extended over 14 years. For six years the student attended lectures on the Bible and the *Sentences*. Then he became a bachelor, for which degree he had to be at least 25 years of age, and served his apprenticeship as a lecturer. There were three grades of bachelors, the *biblici*, who lectured on the Bible, of whom some were *biblici ordinarii*, the rest *cursores* or extraordinary lecturers; the *sententiarii*, who lectured on the *Sentences*; and the *firmati*, who had to preach sermons and hold conferences, and occasionally to dispute. One of these disputations, which was known as the *Acte de Sorbonique*, lasted from six in the morning to six at night without even an interval for food². The length of the bachelor's stage altogether was eight years. The last year was occupied with the acts for the *licence* and the master's degree³.

The *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, which formed so prominent a feature of the theological teaching, were, as I have already said, a collection of theological propositions compiled from the fathers. But

¹ "Porticus duæ orthodoxiæ Sorbona et Navarra." Budé, *De studio litterarum recte et commode instituendo* (Basle, 1533), p. 16.

² Chevillier, *Origines de l'imprimerie de Paris*, p. 46.

³ This account of the theological course is taken from Thurot, pp. 133—136.

these were arranged and analysed and distinguished after a strict logical method, and conclusions derived from them by a strict logical process¹. The result was twofold. First, the concise form of the work made it a convenient theological handbook, while its dogmatism commended itself to an orthodox age. Secondly, an example was set of introducing subtle definition and rigid analysis into the field of religious belief. It was round the *Sentences* that much of the theology of the Schoolmen grew up. In the edition of the works of Scotus by Luke Wadding, his *Distinctions on the Sentences*, which was known as the *Scriptum Anglicanum* or *Scriptum Oxonicum*, occupies, with the notes and illustrations of his commentators, six out of twelve folio volumes. The labours of Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura and William of Occam in the same field were hardly less voluminous.

The contemporary portraits of the doctors in theology at Paris and the other theological Universities have been drawn by unfriendly hands. Their presumption, their sophistical and straw-splitting theology, their ignorance and bad Latin, have been frequently painted. They are represented as taking

¹ See *Hist. Litt.* XII. for an analysis of the work, or, for a briefer account, Maurice, *Mediæval Philosophy* (1857), pp. 150—156, and Mullinger, Pt. I. 59—63. For a complaint by Roger Bacon of its excessive use, to the exclusion of the text of the fathers, see his *Opus Minus* (Rolls Series), pp. 328—340.

a peculiar pride in their title of 'Magister.' 'They think,' says Erasmus, 'there is something implied in the title "Magister Noster" like what is implied in the Jewish tetragram. So they say it should be written in nothing but capital letters; and if any one transposes it and says "Noster Magister" there is an outcry that he has outraged the whole majesty of the theological title¹.' One famous Paris doctor however, the immortal Maître Janotus de Bragmardo of Rabelais, cannot at any rate be charged with pride. His aspirations in life are purely material, and he has no hesitation in saying so. When at the conclusion of his oration on behalf of the University, a mixture of bad French, bad Latin and bad logic, his hearers burst into an unextinguishable fit of laughter, he laughs with the best of them².

We have seen that logic was the basis of the whole education of Paris in the middle ages. The *Organon* ranked almost with the Bible as an inspired work. Aristotle was known as 'the philosopher,' as 'the master of those that know.' But down to the beginning of the thirteenth century it was only as a writer on logic that he was known to western Europe; and not even as a logician was it by any means the real Aristotle that they worshipped. The two principal interpreters under whose guidance they studied him,

¹ "Porrò theologos silentio transire fortasse præstiterit," &c. &c. *Moriæ Encomium*.

² Garg. I. XVII—XX.

Porphyry and Boëthius, were far from being pure Aristotelians; and both Porphyry in his *Introduction* and Boëthius in his translations and commentaries had fashioned him somewhat after their own manner¹. At the beginning of the thirteenth century the purity of the source was further polluted by the various Arabic translations and commentaries, not only of the *Organon*, but of several of the other works of Aristotle, translations of which again into Latin, made chiefly by order of Frederick II, were promulgated at Paris between 1210 and 1225². With a view to counteract this overgrowth of unorthodox interpretation upon the original text, St Thomas Aquinas in 1271, three years before his death, with the assistance of Pope Urban IV, procured new translations from the Greek of the physical, metaphysical, ethical, and political treatises³. This *Nova Translatio*, as it was called, was long regarded as the standard text, and, though, from its extreme literalness and especially from the practice of transcribing technical terms instead of translating them⁴, it often failed to give the true meaning of the original, it was at any rate far more faithful

¹ Hauréau i. 85—99.

² For these translations see Jourdain; Prantl, ii. 297—396; Hauréau i. 359—391.

³ Jourdain, pp. 40, 44, 393.

⁴ *ib.* p. 19. The translation of the *Politics* by William of Moerbeke (Bacon's William the Fleming) is printed by Susemihl in his edition of the *Politics*.

than the translations made from the Arabic versions which had in their turn been translated from the Syriac. Roger Bacon however had not a much higher opinion of the one than of the other. For his part he would have had them all burnt¹.

About the same time as the *Nova Translatio* appeared a work, which has already been mentioned as playing an important part in the Paris schools—the *Summulæ* of *Petrus Hispanus*. It is divided into seven treatises (*tractatus*). The first six are an abridgement of the *Organon*. The seventh, *De terminorum proprietatibus*, itself divided into six parts (which in some editions appear as separate treatises, thus making twelve instead of seven), was entitled the *parva logicalia*, and contained matter of which only hints are to be found in Aristotle². Whether this ‘logic of the moderns’ (*tractatus modernorum*), as it was called in contradistinction to the ‘ancient logic’ (*logica antiqua*) of Aristotle, was derived from Byzantine or western sources is a matter of considerable dispute, and seems to depend entirely upon whether the *Summulæ* was an original work or the translation of a Greek work by the

¹ *Opus Tertium*, p. 91 ; *Compendium Studii*, pp. 469, 471, 472 (Rolls Series).

² See Prantl, iv. 204, for the meaning of the term *parva logicalia*. More suggests that it was so called because it had little connexion with logic. (More to Dorpius in Erasmus’ *Works* III. 1897.)

Byzantine, Michael Psellus¹. For my purpose it is sufficient to point out the existence of this new element, having little in common with Aristotle, in a work which continued to be the chief text-book of logic in the schools of Paris far into the sixteenth century. Moreover it was round this new element in particular that from the beginning of the second half of the fourteenth century learning and controversy chiefly collected².

On the whole then there is little exaggeration in the remark of Giordano Bruno *that Aristotle owed more to the University than the University to Aristotle*³. For though the few may have been able to study him in fairly correct translations, it must be remembered that the great mass of students were wholly dependent on the oral lectures of their teachers, that the *Summulæ* was the text-book upon which the lectures were invariably based, and that in an age in which the extreme difficulty of consulting the sources and the absence of a critical spirit acted reciprocally, it was almost impossible to change the course of tra-

¹ The only advocate of the Byzantine origin of the *Summulæ* in modern times is Prantl. See *Gesch. der Logik* II. 264, III. 11 and 18, and *M. Psellus und P. Hispanus* (Leipsic 1867). The opposite theory is held by Mansel, *Artis Logicæ Rudimenta* (3rd ed. 1856), Introd. xxxiv. note; Sir W. Hamilton, *Discussions*, p. 126; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Phil.* I. 404 (note) and 459; Thurot, in *Revue Archéologique* x. (1864) 267—281, and *Revue Critique* for 1867, nos. 13 and 27; Val. Rose, in *Hermes* II. (1867) 146.

² See page 105.

³ Bartholmess, *Jord. Bruno*, I. 90.

dition. It was thus a traditional and not the true Aristotle who was worshipped in the schools of Paris¹. When we come to the subject of Roman law we shall see that exactly the same process took place then. The gloss had usurped the place of the text. It was the business of the new learning to restore the text.

Though from the earliest period of intellectual activity at Paris logic had been a distinguishing feature in her schools, and since the publication of the *Sentences* it had been called forth into increased prominence, it is apparently to the influence of Duns Scotus, the 'subtle doctor,' that the engrossing interest it attracted must be ascribed. The earlier schoolmen, Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, had, like Aristotle, regarded logic simply '*as a preparation for the study and knowledge of truth*'². It was only concerned with the form of thought: into the region of pure being it could not soar. But Duns Scotus recognised no limits to its range; according to him it could deal, not only with words, but with realities; instead of being merely preliminary to physics and metaphysics, it was their superior, nay, it superseded them³.

William of Occam, the 'invincible doctor,' the reviver of nominalism, the last of the great schoolmen,

¹ Cf. Vives, *De causis corruptarum artium* (*Works* vi. 61), "Detruncatus est Lutetiæ Aristoteles et traditus vix dimidiatus, ne sic quidem breviaria hæc lectores inveniunt: longum existimatur ea percurrere, sit satis indices aut rubricas inspexisse."

² Hauréau i. 33.

³ *ib.* ii. 308—317.

refused to logic the exalted station which his master Duns Scotus had claimed for it. But by excluding from the field of discussion the chief dogmas of theology, as beyond the province of reason, and thus, with the English prudence and common sense which marks him as a forerunner of Bacon and Locke, avoiding the aërial heights of metaphysics, he was enabled to study logic more thoroughly at the lower level to which he had brought it¹.

The effect of his teaching, combined with the increasing intellectual torpor of the age, was to turn aside speculation from the field of metaphysics, and to confine it to logic. During the remaining period of scholasticism the controversies which agitated the Paris schools, though affecting to be between nominalists and realists, were in fact between the 'terminists' or 'moderns' and the 'ancients' or advocates of formalism. The ban placed on the followers of William of Occam between 1473 and 1481 was, as Prantl shews, directed against them, not as nominalists, as it affected to be, but as 'terminists².' The large number of treatises on logic printed between the invention of printing and

¹ He wrote two treatises on logic, *Expositio aurea super artem veterem* and *Summa totius logicæ*.

² For an account of this proceeding see Bul. v. 708, 709, 711, and for Prantl's explanation of it see *Gesch. der Log.* iv. 186, 187. The conservative opponents of the 'terminists' were all Thomists or Scotists, but several Scotists, such as Bricot and Tartaretus, were 'terminists.'

1520, a large proportion of which were the work of Paris professors¹, shews how firmly logic held its ground in her schools, and what a stubborn resistance it was capable of making to the attack of the humanists.

But logic was not regarded at Paris merely as a theoretical science². The student did not confine himself to acquiring the bare rules of the art. He put them into practice by constant exercises in disputation. *A boy, says Vives, is set down to dispute the first day he goes to school, and bidden to wrangle before he can speak. It is the same in grammar, in poetry, in history, in dialectics, in rhetoric, in short in every branch of study. Nor is it enough to dispute once or twice a day. They dispute till dinner, after dinner, till supper, after supper...They dispute at home, abroad, at the dinner table, in the bath, at church, in the town, in the country, in public, in private, in all places and at all hours*³.

Ramus, who was at the Paris University about

¹ See Panzer and Hain. Though between them they mention only about 24 treatises on logic printed at Paris before 1500, and half that number printed at Lyons, it must be remembered that neither of these bibliographers had access to French sources of information. After 1500 the number somewhat decreases, but from 1512 it begins to increase again.

² Dialectic and logic were generally used in the middle ages as synonymous terms, but strictly dialectic was considered to be the practice of the science, of which logic was the theory. Dialectic was applied logic. (Rémusat, *Abélard*, i. 300 and 302.)

³ Vives, *De causis corr. art.* (*Works*, vi. 50, 51). Vives studied at Paris from 1509 to 1512.

fifteen years after Vives, gives a somewhat similar account: *If I had to defend a thesis on a category, I thought it was my duty not to yield to an opponent, however right he might be, but by searching for some subtlety to embroil the whole discussion. If on the other hand I was the attacking party¹ my whole efforts were concentrated, not on enlightening my adversary, but on defeating him by some argument, whether good or bad it did not matter. That was how I had been trained. The categories were like a ball given to us to play with, which if we lost we had to recover by shouting, and if we held we had to resist its being taken from us however much we were shouted at. I was persuaded that the whole sum of logic consisted in disputing as bravely and as loudly as possible².*

Whatever advantage in the way of sharpening the intellect and giving facility of expression may have been derived from this practice of constant disputation, it was more than counterbalanced by the barren spirit of sophistry and quibbling, the striving for victory and not for truth, which it engendered. Rabelais makes the same complaint as Ramus: *Ils ne cherchent vérité mais contradiction et débat*, says Thaumaste, the Englishman who disputed by signs³. The account, which follows, of the dispute between

¹ The defender of the thesis was called the respondent, the attacker the opponent.

² *Scolæ in liberales artes* (Basle 1578) lib. iv. p. 424. Ramus became a student at Paris in 1527. See also Thurot, pp. 87—90.

³ Pant. II. ch. xviii.

him and Panurge is a fair caricature of the whole system. The process is hardly more absurd, the result not a whit more barren than many of the disputations which took place in the Paris schools¹.

These then were the general characteristics of the educational aspect of the Paris University at the close of the middle ages,—an almost exclusive devotion to theology, but to a theology which, based as it still was on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, had become stagnant and lifeless; an exaggerated reverence for the name of Aristotle, but for an Aristotle overlaid with interpretation and cut down by compendiums till he was barely recognisable; and lastly the penetration of logic and disputation of a most quibbling and sophistical type into every branch of study. These were the bulwarks of the old learning, the giants whom the humanists had to slay before they could enter upon their inheritance. They are generally known by the collective and convenient term of scholasticism.

Into the tortuous paths and thorny wilderness of the scholastic philosophy it is happily not necessary for me to enter; but before we turn our attention to the new intellectual movement which was to reign in its stead, it may be as well to clear ourselves of some of the prejudices which, as heirs of the Renaissance,

¹ Disputations or Acts formed part of the examination for the bachelor of arts degree at Cambridge down to 1839 (see Wordsworth, *Schol. Acad.* pp. 32—43), and still form the examination for the degree in the three faculties.

we have naturally conceived against it. From the increased attention which the so-called dark ages have received in the present century, and which tends to shew more and more that this darkness was merely comparative¹, the scholastic philosophy has, like the rest of the learning and literature of *those ages which knew nothing*, considerably profited.

From these investigations we may learn three things, first that 'scholastic' simply means 'taught in the schools,' and may be predicated as much of theology, or logic, or any other branch of learning as of philosophy²; secondly that the scholastic philosophy resembled all other philosophies, properly so called, whether ancient or modern, in directing its inquiries to things in their essence, in other words to metaphysical questions; thirdly that the distinguishing feature of the scholastic philosophy, the mark which differentiates it from modern philosophy, was its acceptance, not only of the general truths of the Christian religion, but of the whole doctrine of the Catholic Church, its endeavour to reconcile faith with reason, to prop up the edifice of faith with the buttress of syllogism. But when the Schoolmen began to withdraw from the field of enquiry, not the distinctively Christian mysteries, such as the Trinity and the Incarnation, for these had never been profaned by the handling of dialectic, but the chief

¹ See Maitland's *Dark Ages*, especially the introduction.

² Cousin, p. 224. Hauréau, i. 7.

metaphysical questions, such as the existence of God, their philosophy came to an end. Henceforth there was scholastic theology and scholastic logic in plenty, but no scholastic philosophy.

But because their philosophy failed as a system, we must not be blind to its merits. If it failed, it did not fail more than every philosophical system, as a complete system, as a solution of the great problem of existence, has failed up to the present day; and while it lasted, it did not contribute less than modern philosophies to the march of thought and the quickening of intellectual activity. But like other philosophies it had its day, and when it perished, there was no successor to take its place. What remained was an unsightly mass of dialectic, the bare poles and rafters of a once stately edifice. From these lifeless ruins the more enlightened minds like Pierre d'Ailly and Gerson and Nicolas de Clamanges turned aside either to humanistic studies or to public affairs, or to the consolations of a religion which satisfied their emotions if not their reason. The 'mystical theology,' with which from his treatise bearing that title Gerson's name is connected, and which found its supreme expression in the *Imitation*, was apparently nothing more than practical religion, based not on the unstable foundation of an ever-shifting philosophy, but on the far surer ground of human experience and emotions¹.

¹ See Cousin, pp. 253—257.

It is to the influence of the three men whom I have just named that such approach as the University made in the latter half of the fifteenth century to the new spirit of humanism must be ascribed. The appearance of the first Greek teacher at Paris in 1458, the establishment of the first printing-press in 1469 were both the work of the University. But the new studies were rather suffered with contempt, than hailed with enthusiasm. At the beginning of the reign of Francis I, when our period opens, the scholastic flag still waved bravely over the University of Paris; the rags of theology still fluttered on their poles of dialectic; the *Summulæ* and the *Sentences* still held their own in the schools; the controversies of Scotists and Thomists, of realists and nominalists, of terminists and formalists, still raged with fury¹. But it was all lifeless, withered, barren.

§ 2. *The Religious Orders.*

The other chief element of opposition, besides the University of Paris, with which the new learning had to contend in France, was, as I have said, the Religious Orders. The ignorance and immorality of the monks have been always a favourite topic

¹ "Parisiis clamatur verè sardonicè, et voce (quod dicitur) stentoreâ; fremunt aliquando ad spumam usque et dentium stridorem." Nicholas Darynton to Henry Gold, *Letters and Papers of reign of Henry VIII* (Rolls Series), iii. 880 (no. 2052).

with writers on the middle ages. The fidelity of the pictures drawn of them by contemporaries was taken for granted: it only remained to select from the mass of evidence the most piquant stories and the most telling denunciations. But it was forgotten that the evidence of bitter opponents is not the best evidence, and that these pictures of monastic corruption, which from the vividness of their colouring have made so deep an impression on our imaginations, have invariably been drawn by bitter opponents, not only by honest reformers, like Rabelais, Erasmus, or Luther, who rightly saw in monasticism a stronghold of the old and worn-out order of things, but by the worldling who found in the corruption of the monastery an excuse for his own vices, and by the spoiler who coveted its broad acres. Here again modern criticism has shewn that there are lights as well as shades in the picture.

In the words of a writer who was one of the first to dispel some of the mists of prejudice, which so long obscured the middle ages, *it appears to be the testimony of history, that the monks and clergy, whether bad or good in themselves, were in all times and places better than other people*¹.

With the morals of the monks I am not now concerned. But it would be impossible to present a faithful sketch of the state of learning and intelligence

¹ Maitland, *The Dark Ages*, p. xi. of preface; and cf. *Annales Monastici*, (Rolls Series), iv. pp. lvi, lvii. of preface (by Dr Luard).

at the close of the middle ages, without saying something of their intellectual life. In the first place we must be careful to distinguish between the monks and the friars. Called into being at two widely different epochs of civilisation, they did a widely different work. Western monasticism, the monasticism of St Benedict, arose in an age when religion and learning seemed in danger of being swept off the earth. The monasteries were places of refuge from the crime and barbarism of the outside world. They were the ark in which civilisation was preserved from the flood of anarchy which threatened to engulf it. The two products of civilisation, which are most necessary to man, agriculture for his physical, learning for his intellectual wants, had but for the monasteries come near to extinction. The monks were at once the agriculturists and the librarians of the dark ages.

The Mendicants on the other hand arose in an age in which civilisation was no longer in danger. Their work therefore was not to preserve civilisation but to spread it, a work no longer of defence, but of attack. They were to lead a life, not of peaceful contemplation, but of practical activity; they were to follow closely in the footsteps of their Divine Master, to be in the world, but not of the world, to heal the sick and to preach the Gospel. Thus the two systems were led into widely diverging paths of intellectual labour. The monks, living among their libraries in peaceful seclusion, copied manuscripts

and wrote uncritical chronicles. The friars, mixing in the busy throng of life, bent on influence and proselytism, threw themselves into all the studies of the age. They became masters of dialectic, they rekindled the waning interest in theology, they spun out the fine-drawn web of scholastic philosophy. The monks, in short, were the representatives of learning in the middle ages; the friars, of thought¹.

The colleges of the Paris University were preceded by and to a great extent formed on the model of the convents of the Religious Orders². The Mendicants led the way. In 1221, only five years after its confirmation by the Papal bull, The Order

¹ "Such is the history of Christian civilisation. It gave way before the barbarians of the North and the fanatics of the South; it fled into the wilderness with its own books and those of the old social system which it was succeeding. It obeyed the direction given it in the beginning,—when persecuted in one place, to flee away to another; and then at length the hour of retribution came, and it advanced into the territories from which it had retired. St Benedict is the historical emblem of its retreat and St Dominic of its return." Newman, *Hist. Sketches*, II. 434. Cardinal Newman in this and the preceding essay makes St Dominic the sole representative of the mendicant movement, but the services of the Franciscans to civilisation were surely not less than those of the Dominicans. For their physical studies, see *Mon. Franciscana* (Rolls Series, ed. Brewer) I. pref. p. xliii. If Thomas Aquinas was a Dominican, Roger Bacon was a Franciscan. As Cousin points out, the Dominicans were the conservative party, the Franciscans the innovators and bold speculators.

² For the Paris convents I have consulted Du Breul, *Théâtre des Antiquitez de Paris* (1639); *Paris sous Philippe de Bel* (Doc. inéd.); *Paris en 1380* (Hist. Générale de Paris); and Thurot.

of the Preachers¹ established a convent at Paris, in a hospital on the site of the present *mairie* of the 12th (the Pantheon) *arrondissement*. The hospital and its chapel were dedicated to St Jacques, and hence the Preachers were called in France Jacobins, and their convent at Paris Les Jacobins. The Minorites, in spite of their founder's prohibition of books and learning, followed their example in 1230. Their convent, known as Les Cordeliers from the popular name for their order, was in the Rue de l'École de Médecine. The Carmelite convent, Les Carmes, was at first on the right bank of the Seine², afterwards in the Rue de la Montagne de Sainte Gèneviève near the Place Maubert³. The Augustines, or, to call them by their official title, the Hermits of St Augustine, had their convent, first, like the Carmelites, on the right bank of the Seine, in a street off the Rue Montmartre, which now bears their name—Rue des vieux Augustins; then near the old

¹ The Friar Preachers, or, as they were called in England, Black Friars, were not called, after their founder, Dominicans till quite modern times. The same remark applies to the name Franciscan for the Friar Minors, or Grey Friars.

² On ground now occupied by the Caserne des Célestins, the name of which with that of the adjoining *Quai* perpetuates the memory of the religious order into whose hands the convent afterwards passed; while the neighbouring Rue des Barrés preserves the popular name of the Carmelites—*barrés* or *bigarrés*, from the striped dress of the order.

³ The name survives in the Rue des Carmes, and in the Marché des Carmes which occupies the site of the convent.

Porte St Victor, and finally near the Pont Neuf on the Quai des grands Augustins. Not only the Mendicants but the other Religious Orders followed the example of the Dominicans. The most flourishing college was the Cistercian one of Les Bernardins in a street near the Pont de l'Archevêché which still bears its name. Another Benedictine offshoot, the Cluniacs, had a college close to Les Jacobins.

Subordinate to these Paris colleges were the provincial ones. They were of two types, the *studia particularia*, of which there was one in each province of the order for the study of logic, physics, and the inevitable *Sentences*, and the *studia generalia* common to several provinces, which were devoted to the study of higher theology, and to the training of teachers for the *studia particularia*. The Paris colleges in their turn furnished professors for the *studia generalia*. The interesting features of this system are its centralisation and its training of teachers. As Thurot points out, the *studium generale* was a true *école normale*, while the Paris college was a sort of *école normale supérieure*¹. The creation of this system was originally due to the strong sense of organisation possessed by the Dominicans; but it was adopted by the other Religious Orders². Its success soon became visible. In 1253 out of twelve chairs of

¹ Thurot, p. 121, and see pp. 115—121 for the account of the system.

² For the Franciscans see Wadding, *Ann. Min.* II. 373—386.

theology at Paris nine were in the convents. Between 1373 and 1398 out of 192 bachelors of theology who were admitted to the licence 102 were Mendicant and 17 Cistercians¹. We have seen how jealously the University regarded this intrusion of the Mendicants into her special province, and how, after a long struggle, she had to admit them to her degrees. But they were not admitted on the same terms as her own students. They enjoyed some exemptions and were subject to some restrictions. Each order might only present to the faculty of theology one bachelor as a lecturer on the *Sentences*, except the Dominicans, who might present two. On the other hand they could take their baccalaureate at the end of five years instead of six, and it was not necessary that these five years should have been spent at Paris. These differences helped to foster the rivalry between them and the University; and down to the middle of the fifteenth century we find disputes from time to time arising between the two bodies, owing to the jealous spirit with which each clung to its privileges.

Whatever may have been the falling off in point of discipline and morality, the intellectual supremacy of the Mendicant Orders was fully maintained down to the middle of the fourteenth century. The Dominicans at Paris, as the Franciscans at Oxford, were the leaders of thought and education.

¹ Thurot, p. 112.

But the decline of the University which followed the outbreak of the Hundred Years War brought with it the decline of the Dominicans. From that time their influence steadily decreased. In the year 1400 the three leading men in the University, who were at the same time the three most distinguished men in the kingdom for learning and mental activity, were Pierre d'Ailly, Nicolas de Clamanges and Gerson, and not one of the three was either a mendicant or a monk.

The lighter literature of the whole fourteenth century abounds with satirical allusions to the mendicants, but towards the close of it the attacks on them begin to assume a more direct and serious shape. In 1384, the year of his death, Wiclif, their sworn enemy, wrote his *Fifty heresies and errors of Friars*, in which he denounces their 'hyprocrisie, pride and covetise' in unmeasured terms¹; and in 1401 appeared Clamanges' treatise *On the corrupt state of the Church*, in which the monks and more especially the mendicants are denounced with no less bitterness². By this time it was evident that the fresh sap of vitality which the Mendicants had instilled into the religious orders was dried up, and

¹ Wiclif's *Select English Works* (ed. by T. Arnold), III. 366 ff. The date is only conjectural, and Arnold thinks it possible that a follower of Wiclif was the author.

² *De corrupto ecclesiae statu* in *Appendix ad Fasciculum Rerum expet. ac fug.* II. 555—569.

it seemed as if the whole system was decayed to the core. One more effort, however, was made to revive it, and though this revival did not take place in France, yet as it had considerable influence on humanism north of the Alps some mention of it must be made¹.

In the year 1384, Gerard Groot, commonly called Gerardus Magnus, who in his youth had studied at Paris, established a community of clerks, living in common but bound by no vows, who came to be known as the Brethren of the Common Life². They were the successors of the Mendicants as promoters of education, their system being the result of a feeling of repulsion for the scholastic theology and dialectic of the Mendicants. The study of the Bible and that of the Latin classics were prominent features in it. Thus their schools, which spread first through the Netherlands and then through Germany and were throughout the fifteenth century crowded with scholars, became the nurseries of humanism. At Zwolle was educated Johann Wessel³, surnamed 'the light of the world.' At the mother school at Deventer,

¹ See *Real Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (Leipsic, 1878), II. 678—759; von Raumer, *Gesch. der Pädagogik* (2nd ed., Leipsic, 1846), I. 66—92.

² They were also called '*fratres bonae voluntatis*' and '*fratres devoti*.'

³ There seems to be no authority for the traditional statement that Rudolphus Agricola, who, like Wessel, was born in the neighbourhood of Groningen, was a pupil of Thomas a Kempis at Zwolle.

the celebrated Alexander Hegius was master for twenty-four years (1474-1498), and here it was that Erasmus studied from the age of nine to thirteen, and that Rudolphus Agricola spoke to him the prophetic words *Tu eris magnus*. Thus Deventer was connected with Paris both in its beginning and its end. Paris had educated Groot, the founder of Deventer, and now it was Deventer that educated Erasmus, the active ally of the new learning at Paris¹.

After the death of Hegius the schools of the Brethren of the Common Life began to decline. They could not keep pace with the age; their education lacked the freedom which was the keynote of the new era. They however lingered on till the last quarter of the sixteenth century, and then one society after another quickly dissolved².

It is to an ex-student of Deventer that the famous *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum* are supposed to be addressed, but Ortuinus Gratius, the schoolman in

¹ Jodocus Badius Ascensius, the printer and scholar, was educated at the Brethren's school at Ghent.

² It is asserted by several writers that one cause of the decline of the Brethren of the Common Life was the introduction of printing, which deprived them of their chief source of income, the copying of books. A fatal objection to this theory is that between 1476 and 1500 no less than 478 books were printed at Deventer by printers who, from the nature of the books printed by them (they are nearly all school-books) were evidently in the employment of the Brethren. (See Campbell, *Ann. de la typ. Néerlandaise*, The Hague, 1874.)

humanist's clothing, the *poetista asinus*, as Luther calls him, was a professor at Cologne, the head-centre of the Obscurantists, so that Deventer need not be held responsible for this exceptional product of her training¹. The *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum*, published as they were in the very year (1515)² from which I have chosen to date the commencement of the new era in France, may be looked on as the culminating expression of the attack of the humanists upon the ignorance of the monks. The picture is no doubt exaggerated, but the fact that for some time the monks complacently regarded this exquisitely absurd farrago of ignorance and imbecility and bad Latin as the genuine letters of their brethren speaks volumes³. If a man thinks his own portrait a faithful one, other people need hardly call it a caricature.

Monasticism, in short, as a potent instrument of education and civilisation, as an important factor in the government of the world, had come to an end. There was still much good in the monasteries and convents; still much learning, which in a later generation bore fruit in the noble enterprises of the

¹ Pope Adrian VI, a schoolman to the core, was also a pupil of Hegius at Deventer.

² The first part only in 1515, the second in 1516, the third in 1517.

³ This is told of the monks in England (Erasmus to Lipsius, *Works*, III. pt. 2, p. 1110; More to Erasmus, *ib.* p. 1575). For a good sketch of the contents of the letters see Strauss, *U. von Hutten* (Leipsic, 1858), pp. 231—254; also Michelet, *Hist. de France*, x. 38—42.

Benedictines of St Maur; still much vigour, which shewed itself in the activity of the Dominicans and Franciscans during the whole sixteenth century and in the foundation of new religious orders¹.

But the religious orders no longer ruled the world. They had often been revived and regenerated, and the sequel shewed that they were still capable of revival. The Reformation cut off their rotten members, and instilled fresh vigour into their system. They were restored to life—but not to empire. That was gone for ever. Like the scholastic philosophy, monasticism had done its work, and had to make room for a younger and more active successor. It had still an honourable and green old age before it, but it could no longer hold the reins of government. But as we look upon monasticism in this its hour of abdication, let us remember that it was put aside, not because it was worse than the rest of the world, but because it was no longer better, no longer able to lead it. Let us remember too that it left as a legacy to mankind the three men who most contributed to the downfall of the old order of things, and to the triumph of the new. Erasmus, Luther, Rabelais were all monks.

¹ The Minims were founded in 1473, the Capuchins in 1520, both of these being Franciscan offshoots, the Theatins in 1524, the Oratorians by Filippo Neri in 1558. The most important however of the religious orders founded in this century, that of the Jesuits, was virtually non-monastic.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE RENAISSANCE IN FRANCE.

CHAPTER V.

POLITICAL INFLUENCES.

I HAVE mentioned three events in French history which, though belonging to the political rather than to the literary world, had a considerable influence upon the developement of the Renaissance in France,—the consolidation of the French monarchy, the invasions of Italy, and the material prosperity of France during the reign of Lewis XII. I propose to consider these somewhat more in detail.

§ 1. *The consolidation of the French monarchy.*

In the year 1450 the territory practically subject to the French king was barely half the size of modern France. It was an island in a sea of more or less hostile kingdoms, Aquitaine on the southwest, Brittany and Anjou on the west, Picardy on