Le *poetriae* del medioevo latino
Modelli, fortuna, commenti

a cura di Gian Carlo Alessio e Domenico Losappio

The *Ars versificaria* of Gervase of Melkley
Structure, Hierarchy, Borrowings

Alan M. Rosiene
(Florida Institute of Technology, USA)

Abstract   Gervase of Melkley, a younger contemporary of Geoffrey of Vinsauf, writes his *De arte versificatoria et modo dictandi* at the peak of a revisionary movement that places the discussions of figures and tropes inherited from classical and medieval grammatical and rhetorical traditions in new contexts, creating what we now call the Arts of Poetry and Prose. Gervase's art draws upon the works of Matthew of Vendome, Geoffrey of Vinsauf, and Bernardus Silvestris for its doctrine and its examples. But how often does Gervase refer to these writers? How does he use their arts in his art? When does he borrow from them? What doctrine and which examples does he borrow? Does he cite his references and, if so, what are his citation practices? This chapter surveys Gervase's borrowings from the works of Matthew, Geoffrey, and Bernardus by way of a review of the *Index nominum* and *Index scriptorium* of Hans Jurgen Graebener's modern edition of the *De arte versificatoria*. The review locates Gervase's borrowings of doctrine and examples with greater precision, and corrects errors in the indices as needed. Charting the precise citation practices of Gervase clarifies the meaning of his hierarchy of the three writers, places his long supposed use of the *Poetria nova* in serious doubt, and reopens the question of his art's date.

Summary   1 Introduction. – 2 The Structure of the *Ars Versificaria*. – 3 The Hierarchy of Matthew, Geoffrey and Bernardus. – 4 Borrowing and Citation Practices in the *Ars versificaria*. – 5 Conclusions of the Investigation. – 6 The Hierarchy of Matthew, Geoffrey and Bernardus Reconsidered. – 7 The Structure of the *Ars versificaria* at its Highest Levels.

Keywords   Medieval poetics. Gervase of Melkley. Geoffrey of Vinsauf. Matthew of Vendome. Bernardus Silvestris.

1   Introduction

In the early 13th century, the Englishman Gervase of Melkley composed a lengthy art of poetry and prose known as the *Ars versificaria*[1] – written in prose with examples in verse and prose, organising rules both common and specific to verse and prose – to answer the request of one Johannes Albus for an art to instruct the *rudes* in polished speech by way of the rhetorical colours and arguments.[2]

---

1   Gervase's work also is known as the *Ars versificatoria* or *Ars poetica*.

2   See Ward, J.O. *Ciceronian Rhetoric in Treatise, Scholion, and Commentary*. Turnhout, 1995, 155, for the juxtaposition of the colours and arguments found in Gervase's work:

205

Gervase's art first appears in the manuscript Glasgow, Hunterian V.8.14 (511), fols. 103*v*-133*r*. The Glasgow manuscript also includes Matthew of Vendome's *Ars versificatoria*, Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Summa de coloribus rhetoricis*, *Documentum de modo et arte dictandi et versificandi*, and *Poetria nova*, and a wide variety of poems associated with the treatises. Gervase's art appears after all the others – prefaced by a short treatise on letter writing, a poem to the Blessed Virgin, and a sample letter – and his art is followed by nineteen poems, of which the first five may have been written by Gervase himself.[3]

Gervase's art of poetry and prose fits Douglas Kelly's description of how the genre was taught: "the literary exemplars, written *ex arte*, were evaluated by a master in the context of *de arte*".[4] Just so, Gervase presents examples of the figures and tropes defined by his art, and he provides explanations to connect the literary practices with the figurative theory they exemplify. In this way, Gervase integrates figurative theory and literary practice within his *Ars versificaria*.

Gervase's art loosely fits the class of treatise described by John Ward as category (A)(1)(b): the art is restricted in its scope (A), to explanations of figures of speech and thought taken from *Rhetorica ad Herennium* Book IV (1), and illustrated from and addressed to the composition of poetry (b).[5] Because Gervase explains the figures of speech also by way of Donatus, has nothing to say about figures of thought, and addresses the composition of prose and poetry, his art is more narrow in its scope, less strictly Ciceronian, and more broad in its application than the class of treatise Ward describes.

2 The Structure of the *Ars Versificaria*

Gervase's theory and practice are set within a structure Edmond Faral calls interesting and systematic, a complex arrangement Hans-Jurgen Gräbener outlines at some length in his commentary upon the art's modern edition.[6]

"by the beginning of the thirteenth century [...] *inventio* (pursued hitherto in a dialectical context) was married to the *colores* (pursued hitherto in a largely grammatical and literary context)".

3 See Harbert, B. (ed.). *A Thirteenth-Century Anthology of Rhetorical Poems. Glasgow MS Hunterian V.8.14*. Toronto, 1975, for the structure of the manuscript, 5, and for some speculations on the authorship of the poems, 4.

4 Kelly, D. *The Arts of Poetry and Prose*. Turnhout, 1991, 59.

5 Ward, *Ciceronian rhetoric*, 74-5.

6 Faral, E. *Les arts poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe siècle. Recherches et documents sur la technique littéraire du moyen age*. Paris, 1924, 328; Gervais von Melkley. *Ars poetica*,

Catherine Yodice Giles, in the preface to her translation of the art, affirms that Gervase's "organization is neither arbitrary nor idiosyncratic", and suggests Gervase "was trying to treat the stylistic devices philosophically".[7] William Purcell, the latest to investigate the structure of Gervase's art, recognises that the three loci of *identitas*, *similitude*, and *contrarietas* "amount to three progressively sophisticated levels of expression and meaning".[8]

Unfortunately the systematic, philosophical and progressively sophisticated whole of Gervase's taxonomy of figures and tropes is very large and difficult to comprehend, and from Faral to Kelly to Purcell, the investigator's frustration with the task is clear. If Faral finds the originality of the art to lie in its interesting system, he nonetheless tires of describing the system before he finishes detailing its first component.[9] If Kelly recognises Gervase's art as "the only really deliberate innovation in the classification of tropes and figures", he considers this innovative classification at only its highest level, *identitas*, *similitudo* and *contrarietas*.[10] And, if Purcell makes some progress addressing the sophistication of Gervase's *similitudo*, his primary focus on *transumptio* leads him to gloss *identitas* and to misplace some tropes.[11] Thus Faral, Kelly, and Purcell all recognise that the interest of Gervase's art lies in the structural whole that organises it, but all dismiss the *Ars versificaria* before exploring its complexity fully.

We need some means to grasp the whole of Gervase's art and discover its essential structure without losing ourselves in the details. Without a grasp of the whole art, the arrangement of the *Ars versificaria* cannot be

kritische Ausgabe von H.-J. Gräbener. Münster, 1965, XXIX-CX. See also Gräbener's overview of the structure, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 286-7.

7 Giles, C.Y. *Gervais of Melkley's Treatise on the Art of Versifying and the Method of Composing in Prose*. Rutgers, 1973, LIX, LXII.

8 Purcell, W.M. "*Identitas, Similitudo*, and *Contrarietas* in Gervasius of Melkley's *Ars Poetica*. A *Stasis* of Style". *Rhetorica*, 9, 1991, 67-91 (75).

9 Faral, *Les arts poétiques*, 329. Faral does investigate sections of the art further in "Le Manuscrit 511 du Hunterian Museum de Glasgow". *Studi medievali*, 9, 1936, 62-107, but he refers the reader (63) to his earlier discussion of its structure in *Les arts poétiques*, downplays the importance of Gervase's system given the developments of modern linguistics, and suggests Gervase was, in any case, more interested in practice than in theory (93-4).

10 Kelly, *The Arts*, 80.

11 Purcell misreads Gervase's criticism of Donatus ("nec enim hanc vicinitatem appello similitudinem, ut Donatus", Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica,* 65) to claim that the four tropes of *digressio* "are more appropriately classed under *similitudo*" (Purcell, "*Identitas*", 82; Purcell, *Ars poetriae. Rhetorical and Grammatical Invention at the Margin of Literacy*. Columbia, 1996, 106). See also Purcell, W. "*Transsumptio*. A Rhetorical Doctrine of the Thirteenth Century". *Rhetorica*, 5, 1987, 369-410 (389-90), and Purcell, *Ars poetriae*, 112, where Purcell claims that the three tropes antonomasia, synecdoche, and metonymy are "subsumed by *transumptio*" in the *Ars versificaria*. In fact, Gervase discusses these tropes (and hyperbaton and hyperbole) under *identitas-mutatio-diversio*, not *similitudo-transumptio*.

compared with the arrangements of other arts, including the works by Matthew of Vendôme and Geoffrey of Vinsauf to which Gervase refers.

3   The Hierarchy of Matthew, Geoffrey and Bernardus

In the dedicatory epistle prefacing his art, Gervase refers to Matthew of Vendôme, Geoffrey of Vinsauf and Bernardus Silvestris as writing the art of versifying fully, more fully and most fully: "Scripserunt autem hanc artem Matheus Vindocinensis plene, Gaufroi Vinesauf plenius, plenissime vero Bernardus Silvestris".[12] On this basis, Douglas Kelly constructs four levels of treatises: the masterpiece (Bernardus' *Cosmographia*), the rhetorical treatise (Geoffrey's *Documentum* and *Poetria nova*), the grammatical treatise (Matthew's *Ars versificatoria*), and the elementary treatise (Geoffrey's *Summa de coloribus* and Gervase's *Ars versificaria*).[13]

Perhaps the "hierarchy of treatises" Kelly extracts from Gervase can provide the means to relate the whole of the *Ars versificaria* to other arts. But we must proceed with caution and remain aware of the additions Kelly makes to Gervase's list. Gervase does not consider Matthew's treatise grammatical and Geoffrey's treatises rhetorical or elementary. Gervase does not name Matthew's art or Geoffrey's treatises or separate Geoffrey's *Summa* from his *Documentum* and *Poetria*. Gervase proposes no elementary level below the three degrees of fullness he states.[14]

Kelly seems to base the elementary level, in part, upon Gervase's claim that he fears taking up a task already accomplished by such authoritative men as Matthew, Geoffrey and Bernardus.[15] If Gervase's fear is warranted, he can write only a less authoritative art.

But Gervase's self-effacing introduction is better understood as the *topos* Ernst Robert Curtius calls "affected modesty", exemplified by a logic that informs the opening of Cicero's *Orator*:

---

12   Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 1.

13   Kelly presents the full hierarchy in Kelly, *The Arts*, 63, and uses it to classify the later arts of John of Garland, Eberhard the German, and Mathias of Linköping as well. References to Kelly's hierarchy appear in Woods, M.C. *Classroom Commentaries. Teaching the "Poetria nova" across Medieval and Renaissance Europe*. Columbus, 2010, 16 and especially 47-9; and in Camargo, M. "From *Liber versuum* to *Poetria nova*. The Evolution of Geoffrey of Vinsauf's Masterpiece". *Journal of Medieval Latin*, 21, 2011, 1-16 (1).

14   Kelly's hierarchy of treatises is useful as a broad classification of the poetic arts in terms of their scope and intended student audience. For the full definition of the levels see Kelly, *The Arts*, 62-4. The focus here is upon precisely how Gervase defines the hierarchy of artists in the *Ars versificaria*.

15   "Timendum est igitur laborem presumere qui viros tam autenticos detinebat", Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 1.

1. This task is beyond the powers of this writer to accomplish, and thus I fear the criticism of the learned; and
2. since I have little hope of successfully completing this task, I am open to the charge of indiscretion for even trying, but
3. I will do the task nonetheless to fulfil the request of my friend.[16]

Gervase's reasoning is nearly identical:
1. To write an art is so great a work, so difficult an undertaking, already done by authorities like Matthew, Geoffrey and Bernardus, that
2. it would have been more prudent for me to remain silent than to pursue or to have rashly promised fulfillment of the task, but
3. faith and obedience to the request of my friend overrule my fear and discretion.

In fact, Giles correctly recognises this "protestation of inadequacy" as "an established convention", while Kelly takes it to mean "Gervase states that his treatise is more elementary than the three he extols by Bernardus, Geoffrey, and Matthew".[17]

The primary source of Kelly's elementary level is most likely Gervase's claim that his art is for the *rudes*, whom Kelly calls "as yet unformed pupils".[18] But *rudes* has a precise meaning in Gervase's art: the *rudes* appear to be grammatically informed students who lack rhetorical polish.[19] When Gervase writes that *elementares pueri* are to be directed to the four distinct parts of *diversio,* the elementary *pueri* would seem to be a subset of all the *rudes*.[20] And when Gervase states that the figure *emphasis* is best for instructing *pueris*, the third person reference implies he addresses his

---

[16] Curtius, E.R. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Princeton, 1953, 83-5. Engl. tr. of *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. Bern, 1948. My paraphrase and reorganisation of the translator's paraphrase of Cic. *Orat.*, 1-2.

[17] Giles, *Gervais*, XXXIII; Kelly, *The Arts*, 62. Kelly also reverses the order in which Gervase presents the authors, placing Bernardus first and Matthew last to open up a space for a less than full elementary art below the level of Matthew's.

[18] Kelly, *The Arts*, 62 referring to "Opusculum hoc rudium est", Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica,* 2.

[19] Compare the following hierarchy of discourse to level of student: "Rudium idemptitatum alia rudis, alia rudior, alia rudissima, where rudis idemptitas in solis grammatice preceptis consistit et caret tam figura quam vitio quam colore", Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 6. Elementary grammar students would be *rudior* if not *rudissima*.

[20] Woods offers some evidence to support an elementary student audience on the basis of sexual references in the *Ars versificaria*, Woods, *Classroom*, 60-1, but the seven instances she offers are few and far between in the treatise, and Gervase treats them all rather clinically.

art to teachers as well as students.[21] In any case, Gervase assumes the *rudes* have mastered the grammatical prohibitions and permissions found in Donatus. The *Ars versificaria* teaches grammar by way of Priscian's precepts, and rhetoric by way of Cicero's counsels.[22]

Gervase's direction to the dialecticians – "we send the dialecticians to those mentioned above" – might mean that both the dialecticians and the works of Matthew, Geoffrey and Bernardus are "more advanced" than the *rudes* and the *Ars versificaria* Gervase writes for them.[23] But here we must be careful not to confuse a level of teaching – elementary, intermediate, and advanced – with the level of the subject taught – grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic. Grammar is the first of the liberal arts, but grammar is taught at a variety of levels, from elementary to advanced. When Gervase advises the dialecticians "that they not despise either the *Barbarismus* of Donatus, the *Ars Poetica* of Horace, or the *Rhetorics* of Cicero", he reminds them of the importance of all levels of language study.[24] The attitude of Gervase toward the dialecticians is complex; he respects their place in the trivium, but he suggests that they respect grammar, poetics and rhetoric as well.[25]

In the *Ars versificaria,* the place of dialectic in the trivium appears to be, in accordance with the traditional hierarchy of Martianus Capella, between grammar and rhetoric.[26] For instance, in his discussion of *determinatio*, Gervase associates grammar with correct phrasings (*congrua*) and dialec-

---

21   Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 59, 71. Although Woods follows Giles' reading of the *rudes* as "those who are in the early stages of language study", Giles, *Gervais*, IX; Woods, *Classroom*, 51 fn. 4, she also notes that a writer's reference to the *rudes* in the third person is a sign the commentator is writing for other teachers, Woods, *Classroom*, 51.

22   Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 2. Gräbener notes "*die Beherrschung der Grammatik ist Voraussetzung zum Studium der Poetik*", Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, XXXV.

23   "Dialecticos ad supradictos transmittimus", Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 2; Kelly, *The Arts*, 62. Kelly thus agrees with Gräbener, who calls the *rudes* "*die weniger Fortge-schrittenen*", Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, XXX.

24   "Consilium tamen est ne contempnant vel Barbarismum Donati vel Poetriam Oracii vel Rethoricas Ciceronis", Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 2; Giles, *Gervais*, 2. Kelly reads the sentence as advice to the *rudes* rather than to the dialecticians, Kelly, *The Arts*, 62. Giles reads the sentence as advice to the dialecticians and calls them "more sophisticated students", Giles, *Gervais*, XXXIV. R. Copeland and I. Sluiter, in their selection from the *Ars versificaria* in *Medieval Grammar & Rhetoric. Language Arts and Literary Theory, AD 300-1475*. Oxford, 2009, 609, translate *dialecticos* as "advanced students", but without comment.

25   Notwithstanding his reading of Gervase's directive as advice to the *rudes*, Kelly gets Gervase's point exactly right: the dialecticians should "know traditional grammar and rhetoric despite their presumed eagerness to learn logic", Kelly, *The Arts*, 63.

26   See Fredborg, K.M. "The Unity of the Trivium". *Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, 3 Bd., *Geschichte der Sprachtheorie*. Hrsg. von S. Ebbesen. Tübingen, 1995, 325-38 (328-30), for Capella's order, and for the rise of dialectic to and fall of rhetoric from the top position of the trivium in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

---

tic with true phrasings (*vera*); he then shows how dialectical truth grounds the appropriate and ornate phrasings (*competens et ornata*) of rhetoric.[27] Grammar can explore rhetorically useless areas: certain peculiarities of epithet "may be left to the grammarians".[28] But some of the intricacies of dialectic are rhetorically useless, too. The *transumptio* or transformation of conjunctions, prepositions, and interjections belongs to the "subtlety of dialectic rather than to the usefulness or beauty of rhetoric".[29] Moreover, it is clear from some of his phrasings that Gervase does not consider himself to be a grammarian or a logician. Some forms of apposition are "inappropriate for the grammarian, more inappropriate for us".[30] Some of the details pertaining to the consignification of verbs belong "to the logicians rather than to us".[31] It appears Gervase considers himself to be a rhetorician, one who desires the equivocation that the logician disdains.[32]

If Gervase's humility is feigned, his audience of *rudes* more intermediate than elementary, and his treatise more rhetorical than dialectical or grammatical, there is little ground for Kelly to construct an elementary level below the three Gervase explicitly states. Certainly it is illogical to place the *Ars versificaria* at an elementary level when the treatise borrows copiously from and comments incisively upon the writings of Matthew, Geoffrey and Bernardus supposed to be more advanced than it.

Still, the hierarchy of authorities Gervase presents might provide the means to relate the whole of the *Ars versificaria* to the three of them in some other way.

4 Borrowing and Citation Practices in the *Ars versificaria*

This investigation surveys Gervase's borrowings from the works of Matthew, Geoffrey, and Bernardus by way of a review of Gräbener's *Index*

---

27 Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 42-3. Fredborg cites Ebbesen for the association of grammar with congruity and dialectic with truth, Fredborg, *The Unity*, 333; Ebbesen, S. "The Present King of France Wears Hypothetical Shoes with Categorical Laces. Twelfth-Century Writers on Well-formedness". *Medioevo,* 7, 1981, 91-114 (91). The reference in Ebbesen is to the Pseudo-Kilwardby, *Commentary on Priscian Maior* written in the mid-thirteenth century.

28 Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 46; Giles, *Gervais*, 36.

29 Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 123; Giles, *Gervais*, 118.

30 Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 49; Giles, *Gervais*, 39.

31 Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 52; Giles, *Gervais*, 42.

32 "Quippe equivocationem sic desiderat rethorica, sicut logica dedignatur", Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 138.

---

nominum and *Index scriptorum*.[33] How often does Gervase refer to the three writers? How does he use their arts in his art? When does Gervase borrow from them? Does he borrow doctrine, examples, or explanations? How does Gervase cite his references? The review seeks to clarify Gervase's borrowings of doctrine, examples and a few explanations, and to correct errors in Gräbener's indices as needed.

The two charts collect borrowings of names and doctrine (d), examples (x), and explanations (X) from *identitas* (Chart 1) and from *similitudo*, *contrarietas* and the remaining sections of the *Ars versificaria* (Chart 2).[34]

Inspection of the charts reveals the following three main points:

Point (1): Gervase never cites by name of author or work his borrowing of doctrine from the arts of Matthew and Geoffrey.[35]

d. Because Matthew borrows doctrine heavily from Donatus and Isidore, but he mentions Isidore only three times and the *Barbarismus* just once, Gervase's explicit borrowings from the *Ars versificatoria* might be difficult to pin down.[36] Fortunately, when Gervase borrows from Donatus, he cites him or his work by name in 21 of 24 instances. For example, Matthew borrows from Donatus in 32 instances, but Gervase shares only two of these, and he labels both clearly *a Donato*.[37] Matthew also borrows from Isidore in 35 instances, and Gervase shares three of these, but only the discussion of *paronomoeon*, one of the three times Matthew mentions Isidore, clearly is borrowed from Matthew's *Ars versificatoria*.[38] In short, whether or not Matthew borrows doctrine from Donatus or Isidore, Gervase

---

[33] *Index nominum*, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 250-7; *Index scriptorum*, 279-85.

[34] Citations introduced by name of the author or the work are highlighted. Passages in the *Ars versificaria* that Gräbener notes as similar to, rather than identical with passages in other works are italicised. Bolded entries mark points of interest mentioned in the following discussion.

[35] Gervase uses examples from Bernardus' works to make theoretical points, but he makes only one such point without providing an example. This occurs at the very end of the *De Arte versificatoria*, in the section *dictamen prosaicum*, where Gervase notes that Bernardus did not follow Isidore's advice in his prose and avoid eliding the letter 'm' with vowels, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 222.

[36] See Mathei Vindocinensis. *Opera*. Edidit F. Munari, III. *Ars versificatoria*, Roma, 1988, 28-29 for "il problema della dipendenza di Matteo da Donato e Isidoro". Munari lists Matthew's mentions of works and writers in his *Index nominum*, 245-52.

[37] Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 18 for *homoeoteleuton*, 149-50 for *enigma*. No connection with Matthew's text is apparent. Munari lists Matthew's borrowings from Donatus and Isidore in his *Index locorum*, Mathei Vindocinensis *Opera*, III, 235-43.

[38] Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 12 for *paronomoeon*; also 113 citing Virgil, 61 modifying Virgil, not charted.

---

never names Matthew or his art as the source of the doctrine he borrows from him or it.

e. Similarly, Gervase's borrowings of doctrine from the *Summa de coloribus rethoricis* and *Documentum de modo et arte dictandi et versificandi* never name Geoffrey or his works, and Gervase does not borrow doctrine from the *Poetria nova* at all.

Point (2): Gervase cites by name of the author only the examples he borrows from the poetic works of Matthew, Geoffrey, and Bernardus.

a. Gervase may introduce the classical examples he shares with Matthew by the name of the author (Ovid, Lucan, Statius), or he may not (Virgil, Juvenal), but whether or not he mentions an author, Gervase never names Matthew as the source of the quotation.[39] In fact, after the initial mention of Matthew in his hierarchy of authorities, Gervase names him just once in the *Ars versificaria*, as *Vindocinensis*, when he presents, as an example of *singula singulis*, the first lines of the poem that closes the *Ars versificatoria*, Matthew's *Christe, tibi sit honor.*[40]

b. Gervase's borrowings from Geoffrey of Vinsauf are easier to assess. In his *Summa,* Geoffrey borrows most of his examples from Marbod of Rennes' *De ornamentis verborum,* and he cites less than twenty classical examples from Ovid, Lucan, Statius, Virgil, and Juvenal in the entire *Documentum*.[41] Gervase does not appear to use Marbod directly. His three uncited borrowings of Marbod's verses for *ratiocinatio*, *occupatio*, and *articulus* (noted mx on Chart 1) reduce the examples in Geoffrey's treatises to no more than two lines, and treat all three figures in Geoffrey's terms.[42]

---

[39] The lack of overlap between the many examples Matthew and Gervase take from these five authors is quite remarkable. Of 197 total quotations in Matthew and 78 total in Gervase, only 15 are shared, and of these 15, only six serve the same purpose in Gervase's art. These six are Ovid for epithet, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 47; Statius for metaphor, 121; Virgil for *polysyndeton*, 34, metaphor, 112, and synecdoche, 73; and Juvenal for *conduplicatio*, 38. Of these six, the Virgilian example for *polysyndeton* also is found in Donatus, and similar doctrine makes it more likely Gervase borrows the example for *conduplicatio* from Geoffrey's *Documentum de modo et arte dictandi et versificandi,* ed. Faral, *Les arts poétiques*, II, 2, 26.

[40] Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 82. Gräbener incorrectly assigns the example to Geoffrey in the *Index nominum*, 252, but he cites Matthew correctly in his footnote, 82, and in the *Index scriptorum*, 284.

[41] Camargo notes "the crucial change from the *Summa* to the *Documentum* is Geoffrey's extensive and explicit use of his own poems to illustrate his precepts", Camargo, *From Liber versuum*, 8.

[42] *Ratiocinatio* and *articulus*, Geoffrey, *Summa de coloribus rhetoricis,* ed. Faral, *Les arts poétiques*, 322; *occupatio*, Geoffrey, *Documentum* II, 3, 167.

More interesting is Gervase's borrowing of the definition and example of *gradatio* from Geoffrey's *Summa*.[43] In this case, the lines are taken from Geoffrey's poem known as the *Causa magistri Gaufredi*, but Geoffrey does not cite the example as his own in the *Summa*, and Gervase does not name Geoffrey when he borrows it.

In total, Gervase names Geoffrey only four times in the body of his art: once for Geoffrey's prophetic eulogy to King Richard, twice for his lament for King Richard, and once for his epitaph for Henry II.[44]

  c. Given the consistency of Gervase's citation practice, it is not surprising to find that he introduces by name all but four of the 64 examples he borrows from the literary works of Bernardus Silvestris – the *Cosmographia* and the *Mathematicus* or *Parricidali*.[45]

Point (3): Since Gervase never borrows doctrine from the *Poetria nova*, and he cites Geoffrey by name only the four times he borrows from Geoffrey's occasional verses, the five additional examples Gräbener relates to the *Poetria nova* deserve a closer look.[46] Two of Gräbener's references pertain to examples Gervase provides for metaphor and three of his references pertain to two of Gervase's examples of allegory.

  a. Gräbener suggests that Gervase's example of metaphor – "ore Paris, fama Pelides, viribus Hector" – relates to Geoffrey's example in the *Poetria nova* – "*Tullius ore, Paris facie, Pirrusque vigore*", but Geoffrey's example in the *Documentum* – "Tullius ore, Paris facie, Cato

---

43 Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 20, Geoffrey, *Summa*, 323. Gräbener incorrectly assigns this example to the poem *Jean Grey* in his footnote, 20, and in the *Index scriptorum*, 279.

44 Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 22, *Poetria nova,* ed. Faral, *Les arts poétiques,* vv. 348-352; Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 76, *Poetria nova,* vv. 382-384; Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 130, *Poetria nova,* vv. 390-1; Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 171 epitaph. The epitaph alone does not appear in the *Poetria nova* although it has been placed in that column of chart 2 for convenience. Gervase does not attribute to Geoffrey an additional quote from the lament, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 25, *Poetria nova,* vv. 386-7, but this, the *exclamatio* "O dolor! O plus quam dolor!" was well-known to be Geoffrey's. See Camargo, *From Liber versuum*, 13.

45 Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 193, 194, 205, 220. All four uncited borrowings appear late in the *Ars versificaria* and all are from the *Cosmographia*. Four similarities to Bernardus' works (48, 72, 101, 120) and five references to the poetry attributed to Hildebert of Lavardin, marked H and placed in the *Mathematicus* column of the charts for convenience (23, 25, 35, 68, 194), have been excluded from the total number of examples. Gervase attributes none of these nine similarities and references to an author or work.

46 These five references pertain to only three lines: *Poetria nova*, v. 943 (in three instances), *Poetria nova*, v. 1776, and *Poetria nova*, v. 1777. Since these verses occur after Faral duplicates numbers 520-4, the verses are numbered higher by five in editions of the *Poetria nova* that correct his error.

---

moribus, Hector | viribus" – appears to be as close in thought if not in meter.[47]

b. Gräbener suggests that Gervase's example of metaphor *lilia faciei* relates to the *Poetria* nova's *lilia frontis*, but Gervase explicitly cites the *Anticlaudianus* for *frons lilia*, and he provides his own variation, *menti lilia*, too.[48]

c. Gräbener suggests that Gervase's examples of allegory *litus arat* and *laterem lavat* relate to the *Poetria nova*'s "*Litus arat, laterem lavat, auram verberat*", but both expressions are commonplaces that can be traced back to Ovid and Terence respectively.[49] *Litus arat* and *laterem lavat* also appear in logic manuals contemporary with Geoffrey and Gervase.[50]

5   Conclusions of the Investigation

Faral dates the *Ars versificaria* "aprés 1208 au plus tôt et peut-être aprés 1213" based upon Gervase's supposed knowledge of the *Poetria nova*.[51]

---

47   Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 111, *Poetria nova*, v. 1776, *Documentum*, II 3 51. See also Geoffrey, *Summa,* 326, "Tullius ore, Plato pectore, mente Cato". Matthew gives similar examples in his positive portrait of Ulysses, *Ars versificatoria*, I 52, and his negative portrait of Davus, *Ars versificatoria*, I 53. Similar examples also appear in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as allegory with metaphorical comparison and contrast, *Rhet. Her.*, IV 46.

48   Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 136, *Poetria nova*, v. 1777, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 83, 116. The lines containing *menti lilia* are from the *Piramus and Thisbe* commonly attributed to Gervase, ed. Faral, *Les arts poétiques*, 332, and ed. Harbert, *A Thirteenth-Century Anthology*, 55, vv. 39-40. In any case, the metaphorical use of lilies is common in Virgil and Ovid.

49   49 "Litus aratur", Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 108; "iste lavat laterem", 141; "iste arat litus vel iste lavat laterem", 147, *Poetria nova,* v. 943. *Arat litus* is found in Ovid and many others; see *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer,* gesammelt und eklärt von A. Otto, Leipzig, 1890, under *harena*, 159. *Laterem lavat* is found in Terence and many others; see *Die Sprichwörter*, 187.

50   *Litus aro* and *laterem lavo* appear together as examples of *amphiboloia preter constructionem* in the *Fallacie Parvipontane*, ed. L.M. De Rijk, *On the Twelfth Century Theories of Fallacy*. Vol. 1 of *Logica Modernorum. A Contribution to the History of Early Terminist Logic*. Assen, 1962, 572, 574. *Arat litus* is a fallacy *a transumptione in toto* in the *Dialectica Monacensis* and *Fallacie Londinenses*, ed. L.M. De Rijk. *The Origin and Early Development of the Theory of Supposition*. Vol. 2, t. 2 of *Logica Modernorum. A Contribution to the History of Early Terminist Logic.* Assen, 1967, 567; 656. *Pratum ridet* and *arat litus* appear to be opposed as *transumptio dictionis* and *orationis* in *Fallacie Londinenses*, ed. De Rijk, *Logica Modernorum*, vol. 2, t. 2, 649; 656, just as they are in the *Ars versificaria*, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 108. Ebbesen dates the *Fallacie Parvipontane* and *Fallacie Londinenses* 1190-1210, and the *Dialectica Monacensis* 1200-1220, Ebbesen, S. "Early Supposition Theory II". *Vivarium*, 51, 2013, 60-78 (74).

51   Faral, *Les arts poétiques*, 35.

Kelly assumes Gervase knows the *Poetria nova* and relies on Gräbener's indices to support his claim.[52] Glendinning also depends upon Gräbener's *index scriptorum* to assert "it is certain that Gervase of Melkley […] was a beneficiary of Geoffrey's *Poetria nova*".[53] Woods recently restates the critical consensus: when Gervase arranges the hierarchy of Matthew and Geoffrey and Bernardus, he "is referring here first to Matthew of Vendome's *Ars versificatoria* and then to Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria nova*".[54]

But a close review of Gräbener's indices reveals that Gervase – although he borrows doctrine from Matthew's *Ars*, Geoffrey's *Summa* and Geoffrey's *Documentum* – never borrows doctrine from Geoffrey's *Poetria nova*. Furthermore, the examples Gräbener claims Gervase borrows from the *Poetria nova* refer either to Geoffrey's independent occasional poetry or to literary commonplaces easily found elsewhere.[55] In short, the *Ars versificaria* shows no sign that Gervase borrows from the *Poetria nova* at all.[56]

The investigation also reveals that Gervase is remarkably consistent in his borrowing and citation practices, especially as they relate to Matthew, Geoffrey, and Bernardus. Gervase never names these authors as sources of doctrine or of examples not their own. He only credits them for examples of their poetry: for the opening lines of Matthew's *Christe, tibi sit honor*, for passages from Geoffrey's Richard poems and for his epitaph for Henry II, for excerpts from Bernardus' *Cosmographia* and *Mathematicus* or *Paricidali*. These practices are too consistent to be unintentional.[57]

---

52   Kelly, *The Arts*, 116, actually cites Woods, but both writers ultimately depend upon the accuracy of the indices in Gräbener (see Kelly, *The Arts*, 117 n. 275).

53   R. Glendinning, *Eros, Agape, and Rhetoric around 1200: Gervase of Melkley's* Ars poetica *and Gottfried von Strassburg's* Tristan, "Speculum", 67 (1992), 892-925 (905 and note 39).

54   Woods, *Classroom*, 47.

55   Camargo believes "the lament for King Richard […] definitely circulated on its own from an early date" (Camargo, M. "Geoffrey of Vinsauf's Memorial Verses". *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 56, 2012, 81-119 (98). Camargo also believes it likely that Geoffrey circulated "all of his occasional poems', Camargo, *From Liber versuum*, 13.

56   Which leads one to wonder why the critical consensus has remained so firm for so long. Perhaps the order of Glasgow, Hunter V.8.14 is somewhat to blame. Since the order of authors is likely to be chronological (Matthew, Geoffrey, Gervase), and the order of the works' composition arguably so (*Ars versificatoria*, *Summa*, *Documentum*, *Poetria nova*), and Gervase clearly borrows from the first three treatises, why not assume the *Ars versificaria*, assumed to be written after them all, borrows from the *Poetria nova* as well?

57   The references Gervase makes to John of Hanville's *Architrenius* follow a contrary, but equally consistent practice. Gervase refers to John by name twelve times, always when discussing doctrine. Gervase refers to the *Architrenius* by name fifteen times; in all but two instances he is discussing examples from John's poem.

---

6 The Hierarchy of Matthew, Geoffrey and Bernardus Reconsidered

That Gervase does not refer to the *Poetria nova* should come as a great relief to those who would like Gervase to recognise Geoffrey's treatise as a masterpiece. For if Gervase does view the *Poetria nova* as less than first-rate, either his judgment is faulty, or he sees a flaw in the treatise unseen by his contemporaries and successors.[58] But Gervase does not deny that the *Poetria nova* is a masterpiece; he simply does not include it in his assessment of Geoffrey's' work. Gervase does not place Geoffrey's poetic accomplishments at the level of Bernardus' *Cosmographia* because he bases his evaluation upon Geoffrey's *Summa*, *Documentum* and early occasional poems.

The investigation of citation practices demonstrates that the hierarchy of Matthew, Geoffrey and Bernardus is primarily a ranking of versifiers not theorists: that the three authorities "scripserunt autem hanc artem" more or less art-fully.[59] Of course we first consider the hierarchy of Matthew, Geoffrey and Bernardus to be an evaluation of their treatises not their verse, even if Bernardus appears to lack a treatise to evaluate.[60] But Gervase knows that rhetorical practices occur spontaneously to subtle spirits, even to those ignorant of theory, and such a spirit Bernardus might well have been.[61] If so, someone else would need to provide a fitting art (*de arte*) to explicate Bernardus' artful practices (*ex arte*), and who better than Gervase, who cites Bernardus more than any other author?[62] Gervase's subtle yet robust self-praise neatly balances the affected modesty of his introductory remarks.

Is it possible for us to follow Kelly's version of the hierarchy a bit further and describe Matthew's *Ars versificatoria* as grammatical and Geof-

---

[58]   Woods notes how uncommon it is for Gervase to place Geoffrey's text below the highest level, Woods, *Classroom*, 48. Woods generously suggests Gervase was an exceptionally gifted teacher.

[59]   Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 1. Faral, supplying "[*versificatoriam*]", emphasises the writing of an art of versifying over the art of writing verses, Faral, *Le manuscrit 511*, 80, but Gervase likely intends both meanings.

[60]   Gräbener reviews the literature that discusses Bernardus' supposedly missing art, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, XXV-XXVII. Kelly suggests Gervase's reference to Bernardus, "in prosaico psitacus, in metrico philomena", Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 1, pertains to just one work, the *Cosmographia*, a prosimetrum, Kelly, *The Arts*, 58-9. Kelly sees no reason to assume Bernardus also wrote an art, nor do I.

[61]   Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 4.

[62]   See Faral: "Il n'est pas une oeuvre qu'il cite plus volontiers que celle de Bernard", Faral, *Le manuscrit 511*, 72.

frey's *Poetria nova* as rhetorical? Yes, but only if we see the authorities themselves struggling to understand the distinction. Matthew, Geoffrey in his *Summa* and *Documentum*, and Gervase, all try to reconcile two disparate traditions of names, definitions, and examples for the figures and tropes. The *Barbarismus* of Donatus transmits a grammatical tradition that treats schemes and tropes with Greek names and Latin translations and excludes figures of thought as proper to the more advanced study of rhetoric. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* Book IV transmits a rhetorical tradition that treats all the *colores* by way of Latin names lacking explicit Greek equivalents including the figures of thought. In terms of the scope of their treatment of the figures, the *Ars versificatoria*, *Summa*, *Documentum* and *Ars versificaria* are all grammatical treatises. Only the *Poetria nova* is a rhetorical treatise because it alone includes the names, definitions and examples for figures of thought.

But the treatises prior to the *Poetria nova* are not simply grammatical. Matthew primarily draws upon the grammatical tradition, as his Greek names for, and numbers of, schemata (17) and tropes (13) make clear.[63] Still, Matthew is aware of the distinction between grammatical schemes and rhetorical colours, and he offers eight correspondences between the two.[64] Matthew goes on to list the Latin names for twenty-nine of the thirty rhetorical colours treated by Marbod.[65] In the *Summa*, Geoffrey borrows from Marbod to fill out Matthew's list of names. Although he does not suggest any correspondences with the grammatical figures, Geoffrey discusses twenty of Marbod's rhetorical colours.[66] When he turns to tropes, though, Geoffrey attempts to identify the colour *circuitio* with the figure *emphasis*, showing he is somewhat aware of the parallel grammatical tradition.[67] In the *Documentum*, Geoffrey repeats the identification of *circuitio* with *emphasis*, and he discusses at some length the relation between *synecdoche* (figure) and *intellectio* (colour), and *metonymy* (figure) and *denominatio* (colour).[68] Geoffrey's further identification of *zeugma a medio* with *conjunctum* and *zeugma a superiori/ab inferiori* with *adjunctum* con-

---

63   Matthew, *Ars*, III 3 for schemata, III, 18 for tropes. Matthew discusses only the schemes and tropes he considers most useful to the writer of verse.

64   Matthew, *Ars*, III 45.

65   Matthew, *Ars*, III 47. Marbod's figures are a subset of the thirty-five figures of speech treated in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* Book IV.

66   Geoffrey, *Summa*, 321-5.

67   Faral, *Les arts poétiques*, 325.

68   Geoffrey, *Documentum*, II 3 30, II 3 35, II 3 45-46. Geoffrey's discussion of synecdoche and metonymy is especially unfortunate as he seeks to create independent tropes of their species, and he uses the different grammatical and rhetorical names to make spurious distinctions.

nects the grammatical figures Matthew discusses at the beginning of his art with the proper rhetorical colours.[69]

Geoffrey's next step will be to leave the grammatical tradition behind and simply adopt the figures of speech and thought from the rhetorical tradition.[70] In the *Poetria nova*, Geoffrey will treat all the figures in the exact order of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* Book IV, deploying the figures of speech in a poem on the fall and redemption of man, naming and defining the figures of thought, and using the figures of thought in a long poem on papal duties and other matters.[71] Only the tropes will remain in a different order and place.[72]

7 The Structure of the *Ars versificaria* at its Highest Levels

We know Geoffrey's next step, but Gervase does not. Clearly, Gervase has a strong dialectical and theoretical interest in organising the *colores*.[73] The *Ars versificaria* is largely devoted to classifying them.[74] How, then, does Gervase handle the figures and colours he finds in the *Ars versificatoria*, *Summa*, and *Documentum*?

The early portions of the *Ars versificaria* neatly blend and coherently organise the two traditions of figures and colours. Not much of the doctrine is new, but the arrangement of the material deserves the attention of scholars interested in the history of semiotics.

The *Ars versificaria* builds upon the earlier attempts by Matthew and Geoffrey to relate the grammatical and rhetorical traditions. Gervase folalows the trajectory of Geoffrey away from grammar and toward rhetoric. He borrows names, doctrine and examples from both traditions, but he

---

69 Geoffrey, *Documentum*, II 3 60, Matthew, *Ars*, I 5.

70 In the *Poetria nova* Geoffrey uses the rhetorical term *color* (v. 872, v. 919, v. 944, v. 954, vv. 960-1, v. 986, v. 991, v. 993, vv. 1022-3, vv. 1036-7, v. 1046, v. 1094, v. 1097) much more often than the grammatical term *schema* (v. 937, v. 968, v. 1276, v. 1528). *Emphasis* also becomes a type of abbreviation, vv. 693-5, no longer associated with *circuitio*.

71 *Poetria nova*, vv. 1098-1217, vv. 1232-1279, vv. 1280-1527. Geoffrey proudly points to his completeness and consistency: "*nil perit ex numero nec omittitur ordo colorum*", v. 1220.

72 *Poetria nova*, vv. 765-1060. The author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* treats the tropes as a separate subset of the figures of speech, a bridge between the *exornationes verborum* and *exornationes sententiarum*. Geoffrey discusses the tropes before he discusses the figures of speech and thought.

73 John Ward has noted "the dialectical and theoretical interests of the northern schools", Ward, *Ciceronian Rhetoric*, 159.

74 Discussion of the *colores* takes up 195 of the 217 pages in Gräbener's edition, or nearly ninety percent of the *Ars versificaria*. The slim remainder deals with the *argumenta* and special rules for verse and prose.

---

prefers the rhetorical terminology he borrows from Geoffrey's *Summa* and *Documentum*. Gervase usually restricts his references to Donatus to identifying the Greek names of grammatical figures with the Latin names of rhetorical colours.[75]

In the *Ars versificaria,* figures of speech (marked + on the charts) take up much of *identitas*, all of *conservantia* and a good deal of *mutatio*.[76] The arrangement of the figures is based on deviations from a degree zero of expression, *rudis identitas,* expression lacking any fault or figure or color. Gervase defines *conservantia* as decoration in itself, without *mutatio*, which involves subtraction from or addition to or disorder of the expression. The arrangement of figures in the *Ars versificaria* may be inspired by Geoffrey's distinction between figures of amplification and abbreviation in the *Documentum*, but Gervase places many of Geoffrey's figures differently.[77]

Clarifying the precise differences between the arrangements of Matthew, Geoffrey, and Gervase requires a closer reading than I can pursue here. Gervase so often borrows from Matthew, Geoffrey and Bernard throughout the *Ars versificaria* that the charts generated by the investigation map out the whole work. The charts provide a clear and comprehensive outline of the highest levels of the *Ars versificaria*. The outline is not fully detailed. Borrowings from the three authorities only begin to cover the lower levels of the work. The charts provide, at best, a solid overview of the major divisions of the *Ars versificaria*.[78]

The following remarks draw upon the view of higher levels the charts provide to suggest three areas worthy of more detailed investigations.
1. John Ward has written, in regard to Boncompagno's *Ars dictaminis*, that "the work is ostensibly designed […] to make up for the prac-

---

75 Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 11, *paronomasia/paronomeon* and *annominatio*; 16, *homeoptoton* and *similiter cadens*; 18, *homoeoteleuton* and *similiter desinens*; 20, *metalepsis* and *gradatio*; 37, *dialyton* and *å. Polysyndeton*, 34, is a rare case where no Latin rhetorical equivalent is given.

76 Some of the figures, including *contrarium* and *contentio* have to await treatment under *contrarietas*, a wide separation that shows Gervase's systematisation is not simply progressive.

77 Geoffrey, *Documentum*, II 2 1-II 2 44. For instance, Geoffrey and Gervase both place *conduplicatio* and *interpretatio* under amplification or addition, but Geoffrey also places *exclamatio*, *subjectio,* and *dubitatio* under addition, Gervase, *conservantia*. Geoffrey sees *dissolutum* as a type of abbreviation, Gervase, addition.

78 By comparison, the table of contents Gräbener provides, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, VI-XII, uses a complicated outline methodology and spreads over too many pages to grasp the whole. The three figures Purcell provides for *identitas*, *similitudo*, and *contrarietas*, Purcell, *Transsumptio*, 383-5, are in the wrong order (*contrarietas* is figure 2 and *similitudo* figure 3). His correctly reordered versions, Purcell, *Ars poetriae,* 103, 107, 115, remain outside the two enclosing structures of common and specific rules for verse and prose, and rhetorical *colores* and *argumenta*. Purcell's figure for *identitas* also is more unclear than need be, Purcell, *Ars poetriae,* 103.

---

tical deficiencies of classical rhetorical theory, particularly in the area of thirteenth-century legal applications".[79] The borrowing and citation practices of Gervase suggest the *Ars versificaria* is designed to supplement the traditional treatment of grammatical figures and rhetorical colours in the area of twelfth and thirteenth century verse and prose composition.

Twelfth century writings like the *Cosmographia* and *Architrenius* appear to require the creation of new theory. Gervase borrows examples from both the grammatical and rhetorical traditions to discuss figures of speech, but when he treats *determinatio*, he draws many examples from Bernardus.[80] Gervase cites Bernardus often in other non-traditional areas: in *equalitas* and *transmutatio*, in *assumptio*, in *munditia*.[81] Gervase cites John of Hanville in non-traditional areas, too: in *equalitas*, frequently in *assumptio*, in the special rules for verse and prose.[82] Further study of the placement and explication of twelfth and thirteenth century examples may help us understand why new areas of theory appear in the *Ars versificaria*.[83]

2. If the sequence of *identitas*, *similitudo*, and *contrarietas* represents progressively sophisticated levels of expression, Gervase, placing his tropes across the three *loci* in about the same order the tropes are presented in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* Book IV, shows that he understands the role the tropes play as a bridge between figures of speech and thought.

Under *identitas-mutatio-diversio*, Gervase begins to lay out the tropes: under *diversio-digressio*, (2) antonomasia, (3) metonomy, (4) circuitio, and (7) synecdoche; under *diversio-transcensus*, (5) hyperbaton and (6) hyperbole. Gervase continues to lay out the tropes under *similitudo*: under *assumptio*, (1) onomatopoeia and (8) cat-

---

79 Ward, *Ciceronian Rhetoric,* 126

80 Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 40-58.

81 One of the citations for *equalitas*, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 64, is especially interesting insofar as Gervase attributes the lines to Bernardus, but Geoffrey, *Documentum*, III, 3, 73, attributes them to the bishop of Le Mans, Hildebert of Lavardin. Since the lines are from the *Mathematicus*, vv. 21-2, Geoffrey probably considers Hildebert to be the author of the work Gervase calls the *Paricidali* and attributes to Bernardus seven times. Gervase refers to Hildebert as *egregius versificator*, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 15, and quotes from the *Versus de excidio Troiae* (vv. 3-4, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 194; vv. 13-14, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 23, 25, 35) and the *Versus de rota Fortunae* (vv. 13-14, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 68), poems commonly attributed to Hildebert, but Gervase does not name Hildebert as the author of the two poems.

82 *Equalitas*, Gervais von Melkley, *Ars poetica*, 64; *assumptio*, 91, 94, 97, 99, 106; special rules, 210, 211, 220, 221.

83 The new areas also appear to be where the contemporary logic manuals influence Gervase the most.

---

achresis; under *transumptio*, (9) metaphor and (10) allegory. Only synecdoche and onomatopoeia deviate from the order presented in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* Book IV: synecdoche most likely for its traditional connection with metonymy, and onomatopoeia for its traditional connection with catachresis.[84]

This presentation simplifies a much more complex situation. Areas that intervene in the sequence are excluded, and the division of allegory into species belonging to *similitudo* and *contrarietas* is neglected. Still, the movement from *vox* to *dictio* to *oratio* that spans the discussion of *similitudo* is intriguing, and further study of the arrangement of tropes in the *Ars versificaria* is warranted.

3. Unlike Geoffrey's *Poetria nova*, which quickly became a fixture in the medieval classroom, the *Ars versificaria* seems to have had no immediate impact at all. In fact, Gervase's art does not appear to have generated much interest before the late 14th century Oxford renaissance of Anglo-Latin rhetoric described by Martin Camargo.[85] At that end of the 14th century, the *Ars versificaria* is copied in its entirety, and the *Tria sunt*, whose eighth chapter is "On the Functional Categories into Which All of the Colors Can Be Sorted and How the Figures Correspond to the Colors", quotes Gervase frequently.[86] Further investigation of how the *Ars versificaria* interacts with the *Tria sunt* must await a critical edition of the latter, but we are likely to learn much from a study of its borrowing and citation practices.

For now, we need to revise our understanding of the time and place of the *Ars versificaria*. The work does not refer to the *Poetria nova*, and its date does not depend on the date of the *Poetria nova*. But how can it be that Gervase borrows from Geoffrey's other works, and not from the *Poetria nova*? Perhaps it is that the two works are being composed simultaneously, but Gervase is one of the clerics with Stephen Langton in France, separated from Geoffrey during the interdict. But this, too, is a matter for further investigation.

[84] The relation of container and content (metonymy) is often confused with the relation of whole and part (synecdoche). Catachresis is traditionally understood as a metaphorical usage compelled by the failure of onomatopoeia to provide a proper term.

[85] Camargo, M. "The Late Fourteenth-Century Renaissance of Anglo-Latin Rhetoric". *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 45, 2012, 107-33. Camargo documents the appearance of the *Ars versificaria* in three manuscripts from the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, 124.

[86] Camargo, *The Late*, 129.

Gervase of Melkley
Ars versificaria

Chart 1. Borrowings and Citations, Part I

Vertical spine labels (left to right): REGULAE COMMUNIS · IDENTITAS · POLITA · MUTATIO · CONSERVANTIA

Category	Term	+/T	Donatus	Matt Av	G. Summa	G. Doc	G. "Pn"	B. Cos.	B. Math.
rudis									
rudissima	barbarism		7dx						
rudior	metaplasm		8dx						
simplex narratio	annominatio				11x			11x	
	paronomeon		**12dx (i)**	**12dx (i)**				12x	
	annominatio	+			*14x*				
	annominatio	+						16x (2)	
	omoptoton	+	16d						
	leonitas					17x (o)			
	homoteleuton	+	**18d**	**18d**					
	paronomasia			18dx					
	metalempsis		20d =	20d					
	gradatio	+		20x	**20x**				
	amphibolum			21dx			**22x RA**		
vehementi loquendi	correctio	+							**23x H**
	correctio	+			24x				**25x H**
	exclamatio	+					*25x RL 1*		
	dubitatio	+				26x			
questio et responsio	ratiocinatio	+			**27dmx**				
	subjectio	+			27x =	= 27x			
subtractio	praecisio	+				28dx			30x
additio	occupatio	+				**33dmx**			
	polysyndeton		**34x (v)**	= 34x					**35x H**
	articulus	+			**35mx**				
	disiunctum	+			36x				
	adiunctum	+						37x	
	dissolutum	+	37d					37x	37x
	dissolutum							38x	
	conduplicatio	+		38x (j)		38dx (j)			39x
	interpretatio	+			39dx	*39d*		39x	
	determinatio							43x (2)	
	determinatio							44x	
	epithet		45dx(v)					46x	
	epithet			**47dx (o)**					
	determinatio							*"48x"*	
	determinatio							54x (2)	
	determinatio							56x	
	determinatio							57x	
	app. simplex				57x				
diversio · equalitas	nec. metrice			59x (l)					
	nec. prosaice								
	equalitas							59x	
	equalitas							61x	
	equalitas					64x H =			**64x**
digressio	digressio a.m. (T)		65d						
	digressio a.s. (T)		68d		68dx	68dx			**68 H**
	metonymy (T)				69dx	69d			
	emphasis (T)			*70x*	69d	69d			*"72x"*
	synecdoche (T)		74d	**73x (v)**					
transversio	inversio		76dx (2)			75x (2)			
	metaplasms								
	transmutatio						**76x RL 2**	77x (2)	
	transmutatio							78x	
transcensus	hyperbaton (T)		80d						80x
	interpositio								81x
	parenthesis								
	sintesis		82-83d						
	singula singulis			**82x**					
	litotes							85x	
	hyperbole (T)		86dx (2)						

+ = figure
T = trope

\# = page in Gräbener (ed.), *Ars poetica*

d = doctrine   x = example

i = isidore

o = ovid   RA = Apostrophe Pn 348-352
m = marbod   RL 1 = Lament Pn 386-387
v = vergil   RL 2 = Lament Pn 382-384
j = juvenal
l = lucan   H = "Hildebert of Lavardin"

Chart 2. Borrowings and Citations, Part II

Gervase of Melkley *Ars versificaria*			Donatus	Matthew Matt Av	Geoffrey G. Summa	G. Doc	G. "Pn"	Bernard B. Cos.	B. Math.
SIMILITUDO	assumptio	vocis n.signif.						95x	
		assumptio						96x (2)	
		assumptio						98x (3)	
		assumptio						*"101x"*	
		assumptio						103x (2)	
	T	catachresis	107dx (2)						
	transumptio T	trans. dict.				*108xX*			
	T	trans. orat.					*"108x"*		
	T	metaphor	108d						
		metaphor				*111x*	*"111x"*		
		metaphor		112 x (v)				115x	
		metaphor						116x	
		metaphor	118d					118x (2)	
		metaphor						*"120x"*	
		metaphor		121x (s)				121x	
		metaphor						122x	
		metaphor						125x	
		metaphor					130x RL 3		
		metaphor				*136x*	*"136x"*		
		metaphor						137x	
	T	allegory					*"141x"*		
		asteismos	141dx (v)						
		asteismos						144x (2)	
		asteismos						145x	
		allegory					*"147x"*		
		allegory	148dxX (v)						
		enigma	**149-50dxX**	150x					
	omoiosis	icon	150dx						
		paradigma	151d						
		parabole	152d						
CONTRARIETAS	allegoria T	carientismos	156dxX						
	enthymema +	contrarium			158dx				
	+	contentio			162x				
	, T	*antithetum*					**[171x HE]**		
MUNDITIA		munditia		189x (2)					
		munditia						190 x	
		munditia						192x (2)	
		munditia		**193x =**				**193x**	
		munditia						**194x**	
		munditia						194x	**194 H**
		munditia						**195x**	
		munditia						196x	
ARGUMENTA		argumenta						203x	
reg. versibus speciales		reg. v. spec.						**205x**	
		reg. v. spec.						210x	210x
[reg.] dictamen prosaicum		reg. dict. p.						220x (2)	
		reg. dict. p.						**220x**	
		reg. dict. p.						221x (2)	
		reg. dict. p.						**222d**	

T = trope # = page in Gräbener (ed.), *Ars poetica*
+ = figure

d = doctrine   x = example   X = explanation

v = vergil   RL 3 = Lament Pn 390-391
s = statius   HE : Epitaph Henry II
   H = "Hildebert of Lavardin"