

USE OF *CURSUS* IN THE WORKS OF THOMAS AQUINAS*

CHIARA CECCARELLI
SCUOLA SUPERIORE MERIDIONALE (SSM), NAPOLI

Abstract

This paper is intended to prove that Thomas Aquinas used the rhetorical device of *cursus* in specific sections of texts. In those chapters where he wanted to enhance the rhetorical style – like prologues and dedications – *cursus* is frequently found. On the contrary, it is absent or at least not used intentionally in the philosophical prose, which is full of argumentation vocabulary.

Key Words

Thomas Aquinas, *Cursus*, Prose Rhythm, Literary Prologues.



One of the most recurrent rhetorical devices in Medieval works from XI–XII century onwards was *cursus*, i.e. the terminating of sentences and clauses with a rhythmic closing.¹ Especially employed in epistolography, it was concerned with the rhetorical form of the letters and used in order to enhance the prose.² *Cursus* was often accompanied by other rhetorical devices with similar aims, such as parallelism and anaphora, together with the insertion of authorial quotations. After the advent of universities, towards the end of the XII century, the new

* I would like to thank professor Andrea Aldo Robiglio, who encouraged me to undertake this research. My sincere thanks go to professor Marco Petoletti for his enlightening suggestions during various stages of this work. I also express my gratitude to two anonymous reviewers for their detailed comments.

¹ PIER VINCENZO MENGALDO, « *Cursus* », in *Enciclopedia Dantesca*, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, Roma 1970, vol. II, p. 290–295.

² The latest and most comprehensive study on Medieval rhetoric is BENOÎT GRÉVIN, *Rhétorique du pouvoir médiéval: les Lettres de Pierre de la Vigne et la formation du langage politique européen (XIIIe–XVe siècles)*, Publications de l'École française de Rome, Roma 2013 (Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 339). See also ANNE-MARIE TURCAN-VERKERK, « La théorisation progressive du *cursus* et sa terminologie entre le XIe et la fin du XIVe siècle », *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi*, 73 (2015), p. 179–259; MARTIN CAMARGO, *Ars dictaminis – Ars dictandi*, Turnhout, Brepols 1991 (Typologie des sources du Moyen Age occidental, 60).

treatises of medicine, theology and philosophy – written for academic teaching – adopted a less elaborate style, characterised by simpler syntax and more technical language.³

In this context, it is interesting to examine the case of the most prominent philosopher of the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas. At the basis of my reflection there is a fundamental question: did Thomas know and use the rhetorical device of *cursus*? Even before starting a proper analysis, one could answer at least the first part of the question. Thomas lived in the XIII century, when the *ars dictaminis* was part of the literary culture: it is certain, therefore, that he had the chance to learn it during his earlier studies. But now another question arises: did Thomas use it in his work, which almost entirely has philosophical content? In order to verify the presence of *cursus* in Aquinas' production, I started my search from the prologues, since these are the most remarkable and elevated parts of his work: both their style and their rhetorical construction are complex and refined.⁴

The purpose of this contribution is to show that Thomas made use of *cursus* in specific sections of texts. Even though I provide some evidence as to the frequency of the various types of *cursus*, my approach will not be quantitative; on the contrary, I will try to show where the presence of this rhetorical technique is intentional and where it is not. Indeed, sometimes it happens that a text presents a fair amount of rhythmical *clausulae*, but this is due more to the use of fixed formulas or recurrent terms than to a specific authorial will. In order to make a comprehensive study upon this issue, a complete analysis – also with the help of statistical methods – of the immense Thomistic *corpus* would be required. Since this is not the purpose of this article, I consider inappropriate to apply a statistical approach to a small and selected portion of Aquinas' opuses. For this reason, I will not adopt the method of internal comparison developed by Tore Janson in his fundamental contribution *Prose Rhythm in Medieval Latin from the 9th to 13th Century*,⁵ but I will proceed with a 'traditional' analysis of some case studies. It is important to note that the texts which will be presented here do not

³ TERENCE O. TUNBERG, « Prose styles and *cursus* », in FRANK A. C. MANTELLO, ARTHUR G. RIGG (eds.), *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, The Catholic University of American Press, Washington 1996, p. 111–121: 113: « The leading teachers in the newer disciplines of medicine, theology, and canon and civil law developed a much less elaborate prose, of which the most salient feature are a technical vocabulary and a simple sentence structure that could easily conform to the requirements of dialectic. This sort of latinity became the hallmark of scientific and philosophical works in the later Middle Ages ».

⁴ For the features of the prologue in the Middle Ages cf. JACQUELINE HAMESSE (eds.), *Les prologues médiévaux*, Brepols, Turnhout 2000 (Textes et études du Moyen Age, 15); JEAN-DANIEL DUBOIS, BERNARD ROUSSEL (eds.), *Entrer en matière: les prologues*, Cerf, Paris 1998 (Patrimoines. Religions du Livres); TORE JANSON, *Latin Prose Prefaces. Studies in Literary Conventions*, Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm 1964 (Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, 13).

⁵ TORE JANSON, *Prose Rhythm in Medieval Latin from the 9th to 13th Century*, Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm 1975 (Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, 20).

belong to a particular time span but have been composed in various periods of the author's life. This implies that Aquinas' rhetorical custom was not subject to variations and, despite the passage of time, he maintained the same attitude towards the prose style.

In order to verify the presence of *cursus* in the works of Aquinas I have started my analysis by examining the opening chapters to all his works.⁶ After a broad reading of all his prologues, it is possible to recognise at least two classes of beginnings, which differ from one another in the author's intent: some of them reflect a 'literary' intent while others are involved in philosophical matters. The first group consists of prologues and dedications which often explain the work's structure and the author's intent, with a particular attention to the elevated style. The sentences are longer, the syntax more complex and the rhetorical embellishment very refined. However, the majority of his beginnings are not 'literary' prologues, where the author shows his rhetorical skills: in most of the cases the *prooemium* introduces a philosophical topic, sometimes with the help of quotations taken from the Bible or from Aristotle.

A complete analysis of Thomas' *prooemia* has revealed that in the first type of prologue the author makes use of *cursus*, while in the second one it is almost entirely absent – or at least not used intentionally.⁷ The *Summa theologiae* prologue, for instance, well represents the first 'category' of beginnings; here the author recounts the reason why he resolved to write his work: since those who approach theology for the first time risk to get lost in the matter *propter multiplicationem inutilium quaestionum*, he decided to collect *quae ad sacram*

⁶ I refer to *Sancti Thomae de Aquino Opera Omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, Editori di San Tommaso, Roma, for *Summa Theologiae, prima pars*, vol. IV (1888); *Expositio libri Peryermenias*, vol. I (1882); *Compendium theologiae (seu Brevis compilatio theologiae ad fratrem Raynaldum)*, vol. XLII (1979); *Contra errores Graecorum*, vol. XL (1969); *Epistola ad Bernardum abbatem Casinensem*, vol. XLII (1979). For those works which are not included in the Leonine edition, I refer to THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Catena aurea in quatuor Evangelia*, ed. ANGELO GUARIENTI O.P., Marietti, Torino – Roma 1953, vol. I; ADRIANO OLIVA, *Les débuts de l'enseignement de Thomas d'Aquin et sa conception de la sacra doctrina, avec l'édition du prologue de son Commentaire des Sentences*, Vrin, Paris 2006 (Bibliothèque thomiste, 58); THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Super librum de causis expositio*, ed. HENRI D. SAFFREY, Société Philosophique, Fribourg 1954 (Textus philosophici Friburgenses, 4–5). I also adopt the corresponding handwritings.

⁷ In my analysis I have considered only the three canonical types of *cursus*, i.e. *planus*, *velox* and *tardus*: the *c. planus* is defined as the union of a paroxytone polysyllable and a paroxytone trisyllable (ex. *retributiònem merètur*); the *c. velox* as the union of a proparoxytone polysyllable and a paroxytone quadrisyllable (ex. *iudicium ultiónis*); the *c. tardus* as the union of a paroxytone polysyllable and a proparoxytone quadrisyllable (ex. *felicitàtis percipient*). MENGALDO, « *Cursus* », p. 291. On the contrary, I have not considered the *c. trispondaicus* (paroxytone polysyllable + paroxytone quadrisyllable, ex. *ésse videátur*), which was not universally recognised since its use could easily be accidental. Cf. TURCAN-VERKERK, « La théorisation progressive du *cursus* », p. 181. The presence of *cursus* has been verified at the end of the clauses (*colon*) and of the sentences (*clausula*).

doctrinam pertinent in a brief and logical manner. He is not dealing with philosophical issues, but he is only presenting the circumstances of the composition of the *Summa*. In order to endow his work with a worthy beginning, Thomas not only makes use of *cursus*, but flaunts a relentless sequence of *velox*, besides some *clausulae* in *tardus* and one in *planus*. They are placed at the end of both the sentences (*clausula*) and the single clauses; nevertheless, the use of *cursus* is not perfectly regular, since not every clause-end presents a rhythmical conclusion.⁸

Quia catholicae veritatis doctor non solum provectos **debet instruere** (T), sed ad eum pertinet etiam incipientes erudire secundum illud Apostoli I *ad Corinth.* 3, 1: *tanquam parvulis in Christo, lac vobis potum dedi, non escam*, propositum nostrae intentionis in hoc opere est, ea quae ad Christianam religionem pertinent, eo modo tradere, secundum quod congruit ad eruditionem incipientium. Consideravimus namque huius **doctrinae novitios** (T), in his quae a diversis conscripta sunt, **plurimum impediri** (V), partim quidem propter multiplicationem **inutilium quaestionum** (V), articulorum et argumentorum; partim etiam quia ea quae sunt necessaria **talibus ad sciendum** (V*), non traduntur secundum **ordinem disciplinae** (V), sed secundum quod requirebat librorum expositio, vel secundum quod se praebebat **ocasio disputandi** (V); partim quidem quia eorundem frequens repetitio et fastidium et confusionem generabat in **animis auditorum** (V). Haec igitur et alia huiusmodi **evitare studentes, tentabimus** (P + T), cum confidentia **divini auxilii** (T), ea quae ad sacram doctrinam pertinent, breviter ac dilucide prosequi, secundum quod **materia patietur** (V).⁹

It is clear that Thomas aims at embellishing the beginning of his works; besides the use of *cursus*, other rhetorical devices cooperate to elevate the style: the biblical quotation, placed in the first lines of the work; the *iterationes* (« partim quidem... partim etiam quia... partim quidem quia... »); « secundum... sed secundum quod... vel secundum quod... »); the *accumulatio* (« inutilium quaestionum, articulorum et argumentorum »); « [...] et fastidium et confusionem »). *Cursus* is here only the crowning element of a refined passage.

Aquinas employs *cursus* not only in certain prologues, but also in some of his dedications. The purpose is always the same: adorning the prose in order to elevate the style. The commentary on Aristotle's *Peri hermeneias* is dedicated to the provost of Leuven Willem Berthout: the *epistula nuncupatoria* which precedes the work is enriched by *cursus*, particularly the *velox*. The content is similar to the

⁸ *Summa Theologiae*, Prologus, p. 5.

⁹ Since I do not follow the statistical method developed by Tore Janson (which indicates the *clausulae* on the basis of the number of the syllables and the position of the accent), I have adopted a simpler reference system: P = planus; T = tardus; V = velox; * = presence of *consillabatio* (I considered *cursus* only *consillabatio* with monosyllables + polysyllables).

prologue of the *Summa*: since the matter – in this case the philosophical matter – is complex and convoluted, Thomas comes to the aid of the inexpert scholars by commenting on Aristotle’s work. Even though the passage is brief, the syntax is ample and articulate, with a preference for the hypotaxis.¹⁰

Dilecto sibi praeposito Lovaniensi frater Thomas de Aquino salutem et verae **sapientiae incrementa** (V). Diligentiae tuae, qua in iuvenili aetate non vanitati sed sapientiae intendis, **studio provocatus** (V), et desiderio satisfacere cupiens, libro Aristotelis, qui *Peri hermeneias* dicitur, multis **obscuritatibus involuto** (V), inter multiplices occupationum mearum sollicitudines expositionem **adhibere curavi** (P), hoc **gerens in animo** (T*) sic altiora pro posse **perfectioribus exhibere** (V), ut tamen iunioribus proficiendi auxilia **tradere non recusem** (V*). Suscipiat ergo studiositas tua praesentis expositionis **munus exiguum** (T), ex quo si profeceris, provocare me **poteris ad maiora** (V*).

In other occasions Aquinas uses the dedication as a ‘literary space’ where he shows his rhetorical skills; this happens, for example, in the dedicatory letters of the *Expositiones in Matthaem* and *in Marcum*, part of the *Catena aurea in quatuor Evangelia*. Both letters are addressed to prominent people, respectively pope Urban IV and Annibaldo degli Annibaldi, cardinal priest of Basilica dei Santi Dodici Apostoli;¹¹ both writings are very refined, and the presence of *cursus* is constant and purposeful. The dedication to Annibaldo, after a subtle introduction, shows Thomas’ important cultural project: in order to comment on the Gospel through the *auctoritates*’ words, he desires to have access also to the Greek Fathers; for this purpose, he commissioned Latin translations of some of the Greek patristic works (« [...] quasdam expositiones Doctorum Graecorum in latinum feci transferri »). The entire letter is scattered with *cursus*, with the preference of the *velox* in the last sentences.¹²

Reverendo in Christo Patri Domino Hannibaldo, Basilicae duodecim Apostolorum venerabili Presbytero Cardinali, Frater Thomas de Aquino Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum se totum.

Rerum opifex Deus solo suae bonitatis intuitu cuncta in **esse producens** (P), naturalem boni amorem omnibus **indidit creaturis** (V), ut dum unaqueque res

¹⁰ *Expositio Libri Peryermeneias*, Epistola nuncupatoria, p. 5.

¹¹ Pope Urban IV had commissioned the composition of the *Catena aurea*, an accurate commentary upon the Gospels, but he died (on October 2nd 1264) before seeing the work completed. The *Expositio in Matthaem*, in fact, is dedicated to the pope. The *Expositiones in Lucas* and *in Johannem* don’t have a dedicatory letter instead, but only a prologue which is involved in the work’s content. Cf. CARMELO G. CONTICELLO, « San Tommaso e i Padri: la *Catena Aurea super Ioannem* », *Archives d’Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge*, 65 (1990), p. 31–92, especially p. 39–42.

¹² *Catena aurea in quatuor Evangelia*, *Expositio in Marcum*, Ad Hannibaldum, Epistola dedicatoria, p. 429.

bonum sibi conveniens naturaliter **amat et appetit** (T*), quadam conversione mirabili in suum recurrere **demonstretur auctorem** (P). Sed in hoc praefertur ceteris **rationalis natura** (P), quod ipsum universalem bonitatis fontem per sapientiam intueri potest, et per caritatis amorem **suaviter degustare** (V): unde fit ut sapientiae bonum, quo ad ipsum fontem **bonitatis accedimus** (T), omnibus humanis bonis secundum rectae rationis **iudicium praeferatur** (V). Haec est enim quae fastidium nescit: ita ut qui eam edit, adhuc esuriat, et qui eam bibit, **sitire non cesset** (P*). Haec est quae intantum **peccato repugnat** (P), ut qui secundum ipsam **operantur, non peccent** (P*). Haec est quae indeficientem fructum suis **ministri largitur** (P), ut qui eam elucidant, vitam **possideant sempiternam** (V). Praecellit itaque **voluptates dulcedine** (T), securitate **sedes et regna** (P*), utilitateque **divitias universas** (V). Huiusmodi igitur **delectatus muneribus** (T), evangelicae sapientiae a saeculis in mysterio absconditae, quam in lucem produxit Dei **Sapientia incarnata** (V), ministerium **expositionis adhibui** (T), sacrorum Doctorum **sententias compilando** (V); ad quod me induxit primitus felicis recordationis Urbani Papae **quarti mandatum** (P). Verum quia, eo summo Pontifice ex hac **vita subtracto** (P), tria Evangelia, Marci, Lucae et Ioannis **exponenda restabant** (P), ne opus quod obedientia inceperat, negligentia **imperfectum relinqueret** (T), cum multo labore diligens adhibui studium, ut quatuor Evangeliorum **expositionem complerem** (P), eadem in omnibus forma servata in ponendis sanctorum auctoritatibus et eorum **nominibus praescribendis** (V). Et ut magis integra et continua praedicta sanctorum **expositio redderetur** (V), quasdam expositiones Doctorum graecorum in latinum **feci transferri** (P), ex quibus plura expositionibus latinorum Doctorum interserui, auctorum **nominibus praenotatis** (V). Verum quia congruit ut de laborum fructibus oblationes **sacerdotibus offerantur** (V), Expositionis evangelicae opus, laboris mei fructum, Apostolorum Presbytero **censui offerendum** (V): in quo vestra suscipiat auctoritas debitum, ut scientis industria iudicii **censuram exerceat** (T); et antiqua dilectio, amoris affectum in offerentis **munere comprehendat** (V).

As it is clear from the texts presented up until now, Aquinas reserves the use of *cursus* to those introductory passages where he presents his work and clarifies the reason and the purpose of its composition. Furthermore, the intensive use of *cursus* is marked by the greater presence of *velox*, which occurs much more frequently than *tardus* and *planus*. By the way, the upper register is often pursued through other expedients, as the articulated syntax and the presence of quotations. Even if the percentage of *cursus*, and particularly of the *cursus velox*, is lower than the previous examples, the *incipit* of the *Compendium theologiae* represents an effort to elevate the rhetorical tone, despite its theological content. The first part constitutes an introduction to the work's content, where the author illustrates three ingredients to reach the eternal salvation: knowledge of the truth, search for the just cause and respect for divine justice. The second one, with the dedication to his friend Rainaldo, explains the author's purpose, i.e. to

write a compendium of Christian theology and to elaborate on the work's structure.¹³

Eterni Patris Verbum sua immensitate uniuersa comprehendens, ut hominem per peccata minoratum in celsitudinem diuine **glorie reuocaret** (V), breue fieri uoluit nostra **breuitate assumpta** (P), non sua **deposita maiestate** (V). Et ut a celestis uerbi capessenda doctrina nullus **excusabilis redderetur** (V), quod propter studiosos diffuse et dilucide per diuersa Sacre Scripture uolumina tradiderat, propter occupatos sub breui summa humane salutis **doctrinam conclusit** (P). Consistit enim humana salus in **ueritatis cognitione** (V), ne per diuersos errores intellectus **obscuretur humanus** (P); in debiti finis intentione, ne indebitos **finis sectando** (P) a uera **felicitate deficiat** (T); in iustitie obseruatione, ne per uitia **diuersa sordescat** (P). Cognitionem autem ueritatis humane salutis necessariam in breuibus et paucis fidei **articulis comprehendit** (V); hinc est quod Apostolus ad Romanos 9, 28, dicit: *Verbum abbreviatum faciet Dominus super terram, et hoc quidem est uerbum fidei, quod predicamus*. Intentionem humanam breui **oratione rectificauit** (V), in quo dum **orare nos docuit** (T*), quo nostra intentio et spes tendere debeat ostendit. Humanam iustitiam que in legis **obseruatione consistit** (P), uno precepto caritatis consummavit; *plenitudo enim legis est dilectio*. Vnde Apostolus, ad Corinthios 13, 13, in fide, spe et caritate, quasi in quibusdam salutis nostre **compendiosis capitulis** (T), totam presentis uite perfectionem consistere docuit, dicens: *nunc autem manent fides, spes, caritas*. Vnde hec tria sunt, ut beatus Augustinus dicit, quibus colitur Deus. Vt igitur tibi, fili carissime Raynalde, compendiosam doctrinam de christiana religione tradam, quam semper pre oculis **possis habere** (P), circa hec tria in presenti opere tota nostra **uersatur intentio** (T). Ac primum de fide, secundo de spe, tertio uero de **caritate agemus** (P); hoc enim et apostolicus ordo habet, et ratio **recta requirit** (P). Non enim amor rectus esse potest nisi primo debitus finis spei statuatur, nec hoc esse potest si ueritatis cognitio desit. Primo igitur necessaria est fides, per quam **ueritatem cognoscas** (P); secundo spes, per quam in debito fine tua **intentio collocetur** (V); tertio necessaria est caritas, per quam tuus affectus **totaliter ordinetur** (V).

In spite of the complex matter, this *incipit* aims at embellishing the prose. If it is clear that *cursus* is not used as frequently as in other prologues, it is also true that it is actually present – while it is almost totally absent (or at least not deployed intentionally) in the following chapters. Moreover, the quotations are inserted in order to embellish the prose, since they confirm what Thomas says with his own words.¹⁴

¹³ *Compendium theologiae*, cap. 1, p. 83.

¹⁴ In other cases, as for example the *incipit* of the *Scriptum super Sententiis* (which will be presented later), the quotations are part of the structure of the prologue, since the author's argumentation is totally based upon the *auctoritates'* words.

However, when he delves into theological or philosophical matters, *cursus* normally becomes rarer or totally disappears. In this regard, the *incipit* of *Contra errores Graecorum*, commissioned by pope Urban IV, shows the different use of *cursus* in the three parts of the prologue. In the first and last parts of the text, where the prose is more ‘narrative’ and rich, *cursus* is widely present;¹⁵ in the central part, where the author explains the reasons why contemporaries are doubtful as to the message of the Greek Fathers, the sentences are less elaborate and *cursus* becomes rarer: not every *clausula* in fact is provided with a rhythmical closing. Moreover, besides some *clausulae* in *velox*, there are also many *planus*, which is the ‘simplest’ way to close a sentence.¹⁶

Libellum ab Excellentia vestra **mihi exhibitum** (T), Sanctissime Pater Urbane Papa, **diligenter perlegi** (P), in quo inveni quam plurima ad nostrae fidei assertionem **utilia et expressa** (V*). Consideravi autem quod eius fructus posset apud **plurimos impediri** (V) propter quaedam in auctoritatibus sanctorum **patrum contenta** (P) quae dubia **esse videntur** (P) et unde possent **materiam ministrare** (V) et contentiosis dare **occasionem calumniae** (T); et ideo, ut remota omni ambiguitate ex auctoritatibus in praedicto libello contentis verae fidei fructus **purissimus capiatur** (V), proposui primo ea quae dubia in auctoritatibus praedictis esse **videntur exponere** (T) et postmodum ostendere quomodo ex eis veritas Catholicae fidei et **doceatur et defendatur** (V*).

Quod autem aliqua in dictis antiquorum sanctorum inveniuntur quae modernis dubia **esse videntur** (P), ex duobus **aestimo provenire** (V): primo quidem quia errores circa fidem exorti occasionem dederunt sanctis Ecclesiae doctoribus ut ea quae sunt fidei maiori circumspectione traderent ad eliminandos **errores exortos** (P), sicut patet quod sancti doctores qui fuerunt ante errorem Arrii non ita expresse locuti sunt de unitate **divinae essentiae** (T) sicut **doctores sequentes** (P); et simile de aliis **contingit erroribus** (T). Quod non solum in **diversis doctoribus** (T) sed etiam in uno egregio doctore Augustino expresse apparet; nam in suis libris quos post exortam Pelagianorum haeresim edidit cautius locutus est de potestate liberi arbitrii quam in libris quos edidit ante praedictae haeresis ortum, in quibus libertatem arbitrii contra **Manichaeos defendens** (P) aliqua protulit quae in sui defensionem erroris assumpserunt Pelagiani, divinae **gratiae adversantes** (V). Et ideo non est mirum si moderni fidei doctores, post varios **errores exortos** (P), cautius et quasi elimatius loquuntur circa doctrinam fidei ad omnem haeresim evitandam. Unde si qua in dictis antiquorum doctorum inveniuntur quae cum

¹⁵ In the last lines of this prologue Aquinas gives a relevant declaration of philological method: since « multa quae bene sonant in lingua Graeca, in Latina fortassis bene non sonant », the translation of Greek texts must not be strictly literal (« indecens erit expositio si semper verbum ex verbo sumatur ») (i.e. *translatio ad verbum*), but it must restore the sense of the passage (i.e. *translatio ad sensum*). If this does not happen, the translation may not be clear and ambiguities might remain (« non est mirum si aliqua dubietas relinquatur »).

¹⁶ *Contra errores Graecorum*, Pars prior, Prologus, p. 6.

tanta cautela non dicantur quanta a **modernis servatur** (P), non sunt contemnenda aut abiicienda; sed nec etiam ea extendere oportet, sed **exponere reverenter** (V). Secundo quia multa quae bene sonant in lingua Graeca, in Latina fortassis **bene non sonant** (P*), propter quod eandem fidei veritatem aliis verbis Latini **confitentur et Graeci** (P*). Dicitur enim apud Graecos **recte et catholice** (V*) quod Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus sunt tres hypostases; apud Latinos autem non recte sonat si quis dicat quod sunt tres substantiae, licet hypostasis idem sit apud Graecos quod substantia apud Latinos secundum **proprietaem vocabuli** (T), nam apud Latinos substantia usitatus pro essentia accipi solet, quam tam nos quam Graeci unam in divinis confitemur; propter quod sicut Graeci dicunt tres hypostases nos dicimus tres personas, ut etiam Augustinus docet in VII De Trinitate. Nec est dubium quin etiam simile sit in aliis multis.

Unde ad officium boni translatoris pertinet ut ea quae sunt catholicae fidei transferens **servet sententiam** (T), mutet autem modum loquendi secundum proprietatem linguae in quam transfert. Apparet enim quod si ea quae litteraliter in **Latino dicuntur** (P) **vulgariter exponantur** (V), indecens erit expositio si semper verbum ex **verbo sumatur** (P); multo igitur magis quando ea quae in una **lingua dicuntur** (P) **transferuntur in aliam** (T*) ita quod verbum **sumatur ex verbo** (P*), non est mirum si aliqua **dubietas relinquatur** (V).

As said before, most of Aquinas' prologues are involved in philosophical or theological matter. In this respect, there are at least three types of beginning as regards the structure: those with quotations from *auctoritates*, those without quotations and those without a proper prologue.

Sometimes Thomas elevates his beginnings and shows his erudition through a long sequence of quotations. This happens, for example, in the prologue of the *Scriptum super Sententiis*, where the author explains the content of the four books through a relentless sequence of biblical quotations. From the very beginning, therefore, he is concentrated on complex topics and does not focus on rhetoric. He does not aim at elevating the prose through *cursus*, but at clarifying the work's structure and the reasoning behind it. *Cursus* is not totally absent: in a few cases (compared to the total number) some *clausulae* are closed by a *tardus* or a *velox*. However, the number of the rhythmical *clausulae* is very low if compared to the total. Overall, the impression is that Aquinas here worries about the content, not about the rhetorical form, and wants to be clear in order to be understood. An excessive use of *cursus*, therefore, would have become an obstacle to the comprehension of the readers.¹⁷

Ego sapientia effudi flumina: ego quasi trames aque immense de fluio: ego quasi fluuius Dorix et sicut aqueductus exiui de paradiso. Dixi: rigabo ortum plantationum et inebriabo partus mei fructum. Eccli. 24, 40.

¹⁷ *Scriptum super primum librum Sententiarum*, Prologus, p. 303–309.

Inter multas sententias que a diuersis de **sapientia prodierunt** (V), quid scilicet esset uera sapientia, unam singulariter ueram et firmam Apostolus protulit dicens *Christum Dei uirtutem et Dei sapientiam*, qui etiam *nobis a Deo factus est sapientia*, I Cor. 1, 24 et 30. Non autem hoc ita dictum est quasi solus Filius sit sapientia, cum Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus sint una sapientia sicut **una essentia** (T), set quia sapientia quodam speciali modo Filio appropriatur, eo quod sapientie opera cum propriis Filii plurimum **conuenire uidentur** (P): per sapientiam enim Dei manifestantur **diuinorum abscondita** (T), producuntur creaturarum opera, nec tantum producuntur, set etiam restaurantur et perficiuntur – illa dico perfectione qua unumquodque perfectum dicitur prout proprium **finem attingit** (P). Quod autem manifestatio diuinorum pertineat ad Dei sapientiam patet ex eo quod ipse Deus per suam sapientiam se ipsum plene et **perfecte cognoscit** (P). Vnde si quid de **ipso cognoscimus** (T), oportet quod ex eo deriuetur, quia omne imperfectum a perfecto **trahit originem** (T). Vnde dicitur Sap. 9, 17: *Sensum tuum quis sciet nisi tu dederis sapientiam*. Hec autem manifestatio specialiter per Filium facta inuenitur: ipse enim est Verbum Patris, secundum quod dicitur Io. 1. Vnde sibi manifestatio dicentis Patris conuenit et totius Trinitatis. Vnde dicitur Mat. 11, 27: *Nemo Patrem nouit nisi Filius et cui Filius uoluerit reuelare*. Et Io. 1, 18: *Deum nemo uidit unquam, unigenitus* etc. Recte ergo dicitur ex persona Filii: *Ego sapientia effudi flumina*. Flumina ista intelligo fluxus eterne processiois qua Filius a Patre et Spiritus Sanctus ab utroque ineffabili **modo procedit** (P). Ista flumina olim occulta et quodam modo infusa erant tum in similitudinibus creaturarum, tum etiam in **enigmatibus scripturarum** (V), ut uix aliqui sapientes Trinitatis misterium **fide tenerent** (P). Venit Filius Dei et infusa flumina quodam **modo effudit** (P), nomen Trinitatis publicando, Mat. ult. 19: *Docete omnes gentes, baptizantes* etc. Vnde Job 28, 2: *Profunda fluuiorum scrutatus est et abscondita produxit in lucem*. Et in hoc tangitur materia primi libri. Secundum quod pertinet ad Dei sapientiam est **creaturarum productio** (T). Ipse enim de rebus creatis non tantum speculatiuam, set etiam operatiuam sapientiam habet, sicut artifex de artificiatas. Vnde Ps. 103: *Omnia in sapientia fecisti*. Et ipsa sapientia loquitur, Prou. 8, 30: *Cum eo eram cuncta componens*. Hoc etiam specialiter Filio attributum inuenitur, in quantum est ymago Dei inuisibilis, ad cuius formam omnia formata sunt. Vnde Col. 1, 15: *Qui est ymago Dei inuisibilis, primogenitus omnis creature, quoniam in ipso condita sunt uniuersa*; et Io. 1, 3: *Omnia per ipsum facta sunt*. Recte ergo dicitur ex persona Filii: *Ego quasi trames aque immense de fluuio*; in quo notatur et ordo **creationis et modus** (P*). – Ordo, quia sicut trames a **fluuio deriuatur** (V), ita processus temporalis creaturarum ab eterno processu personarum. Vnde in Psalmo 148, 5, dicitur: *Dixit et facta sunt*, idest Verbum genuit in quo erat ut fieret, secundum Augustinum; semper enim id quod est primum est causa eorum que sunt post, **secundum Philosophum** (T). Vnde primus processus est causa et ratio omnis sequentis processiois. – Modus autem significatur quantum ad duo: scilicet ex **parte creantis** (P) qui, cum omnia impleat, nulli **tamen se committitur** (V*); quod notatur in hoc quod dicitur *immense*. Item ex parte creature, quia sicut trames procedit extra alueum fluminis, ita creatura procedit a Deo extra **unitatem essentie** (T), in qua sicut in alueo fluxus personarum

continetur. Et in hoc notatur materia secundi libri. Tertium quod pertinet ad Dei sapientiam est operum restauratio. Per idem enim debet res reparari per quod facta est. Vnde que per sapientiam condita sunt, decet ut per **sapientiam reparantur** (V). Vnde dicitur Sap. 9, 19: *Per sapientiam saluati sunt qui tibi placuerunt ab initio*. Hec autem reparatio specialiter per Filium facta est in quantum ipse homo factus est qui, reparato hominis statu, quodam modo **omnia reparauit** (V) que propter hominem facta sunt. Vnde Col. 1, 20: *Per eum reconcilians omnia, siue que in celis, siue que in terris sunt*. Recte ergo ex ipsius Filii persona dicitur: *Ego quasi fluuius Dorix et sicut aqueductus exiui de paradiso*. Paradisus iste gloria Patris de qua exiuit in uallem **nostre miserie** (T), non quod eam amitteret, sed quia occultauit. Vnde Io. 16, 28: *Exiui a patre et ueni in mundum*. Et circa hunc exitum duo notantur, scilicet **modus et fructus** (P*). – Dorix enim fluuius rapidissimus est, unde designat modum quo, quasi impetu quodam amoris, nostre reparationis Christus **compleuit misterium** (T). Vnde Ysa. 59, 19: *Cum uenerit quasi fluuius uiolentus, quem spiritus Domini cogit*. – Fructus autem designatur ex hoc quod dicitur: *sicut aqueductus*. Sicut enim aqueductus ex uno fonte producuntur diuisim ad fecundandam terram, ita de Christo profluxerunt diuersarum graciaram genera ad **plantandam Ecclesiam** (T), secundum quod dicitur Eph. 4, 11: *Ipse dedit quosdam quidem apostolos etc.* Et in hoc tangitur materia tertii libri, in cuius prima parte agitur de misteriis nostre reparationis, in secunda de gratiis nobis **collatis per Christum** (P*). Quartum quod ad Dei sapientiam pertinet est perfectio qua res conseruantur in suo fine. Subtracto enim fine, uanitas relinquitur quam sapientia non patitur secum. Vnde dicitur Sap. 8, 1, quod sapientia *attingit a fine usque ad finem fortiter et disponit omnia suauius*. Vnumquodque dispositum est quando in suo fine quem naturaliter desiderat collocatum est. Hoc etiam specialiter ad Filium pertinet, qui, cum sit uerus et naturalis Dei Filius, nos in gloriam paterne **hereditatis induxit** (P). Vnde Hebr. 2, 10: *Decebat eum propter quem et per quem facta sunt omnia, qui multos filios etc.* Vnde recte dicitur *Dixi: Rigabo ortum plantationum*. Ad consecutionem enim finis exigitur preparatio, per quam omne quod fini non **competit tollatur** (P). Ita Christus etiam ut nos in finem eterne glorie induceret, sacramentorum medicamenta preparauit, quibus a nobis peccati **uulnus abstergitur** (T). Vnde duo notantur in **uerbis predictis** (P), scilicet preparatio que est per sacramenta et inductio in gloriam. – Primum per hoc quod dicit *Rigabo ortum plantationum*. Ortus enim iste Ecclesia est, de qua Cant. 4, 12: *Ortus conclusus etc.*, in qua sunt plantationes diuerse, secundum diuersos sanctorum ordines, quos omnes manus **omnipotentis plantauit** (P). Iste ortus irrigatur a Christo sacramentorum riuus, que ex eius **latere profluxerunt** (V); unde in commendationem pulchritudinis Ecclesie dicitur Num. 24, 5: *Quam pulchra tabernacula etc.* et post sequitur, 6: *Ut horti iuxta fluuios irrigui*. Et ideo etiam **ministri Ecclesie** (T), qui **sacramenta dispensant** (P), **rigatores dicuntur** (P), 1 Corinth. 3, 6: *Ego plantaui, Apollo rigauit*. – Inductio autem in gloriam notatur in hoc quod sequitur: *Et inebriabo partus mei fructum*. Partus ipsius Christi **fideles Ecclesie** (T), quos suo labore quasi mater parturiuit: de quo partu Isa. ult., 9: *Numquid ego qui alios parere facio etc.* Fructus autem istius partus sunt sancti qui sunt in Gloria, de quo fructu Cant. 5, 1: *Veniet dilectus meus in hortum etc.* Istos inebriat habundantissima sui fruitione, de qua ebrietate Ps. 35,

9: *Inebriabuntur ab ubertate domus tue*. Et dicitur ebrietas quia omnem mensuram rationis et desiderii excedit, unde Ysa. 64, 4: *Oculus non uidit* etc. Et in hoc tangitur materia quarti libri: in cuius prima parte agitur de sacramentis, in secunda de gloria resurrectionis. Et sic patet ex predictis uerbis intentio libri sententiarum.

Many other prologues are composed in the same way, as those of *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem*, of *Expositio libri Boetii De ebdomadibus* and of *Expositio in libros Aristotelis De caelo et mundo*. In all these cases Aquinas lists a long series of quotations in order to present the topic which he is going to develop; he does not make use of *cursus* – although some rhythmical *clausulae* are present –, because he means to be clear and does not aim at adorning the text with rhetorical devices.

In other prologues Thomas is involved in the work's content, but without the help of quotations; sometimes he refers to the *auctoritates*, especially Aristotle and the Bible, but without reporting their exact words. This happens, for example, in the prologues of the commentary to the *Liber de causis*, of the *Expositio super Iob*, of the *Sententia libri Metaphysicae* and *libri Politicorum*. Also in these cases Aquinas' purpose is not to highlight a rhetorical style, and for this reason – predictably – *cursus* is almost entirely absent. The prologue of the commentary to the *Liber de causis*, for example, is mostly focused upon the work's philosophical content. In the last lines Aquinas also introduces an interesting insight about the *Liber de causis*:¹⁸ since it is a translation from an Arabic work, and since most of the arguments are already present in Proclus' *Elementatio theologica*, he must conclude that the Arabic work was an extract from Proclus' one.¹⁹

Sicut Philosophus dicit in X *Ethicorum* (*Eth. Nic. X 7,1177 a 12–14*), ultima felicitas hominis consistit in optima hominis operatione quae est **supremae potentiae** (T), scilicet intellectus, respectu optimi intelligibilis. Quia vero effectus per **causam cognoscitur** (T), manifestum est quod causa secundum sui naturam est magis **intelligibilis quam effectus** (V*), etsi aliquando quoad nos effectus sint notiores causis propter hoc quod ex particularibus sub sensu cadentibus universalium et intelligibilium causarum **cognitionem accipimus** (T). Oportet igitur quod simpliciter loquendo primae rerum causae sint secundum se maxima et optima intelligibilia, eo quod sunt maxime entia et maxime vera cum sint aliis essentiae et veritatis causa, ut patet per Philosophum in II *Metaphysicae* (*Met. II 1, 993 b 26–31*), quamvis huiusmodi primae causae sint minus et posterius notae quoad nos: habet enim se ad ea intellectus noster sicut oculus noctuae ad lucem solis quam propter excedentem claritatem perfecte percipere non potest. Oportet igitur quod ultima

¹⁸ At the time of the composition of the *Scriptum super Sententiis*, Thomas was doubtful about the authorship of this work. When William of Moerbeke translated Proclus' *Elementatio theologica* (around 1268), Aquinas could confirm his hypothesis. Cf. CRISTINA D'ANCONA-COSTA, *Recherches sur le 'Liber de Causis'*, Vrin, Paris 1995 (Études de philosophie médiévale, 72), p. 229–258.

¹⁹ *Super librum De causis expositio*, Prooemium, p. 1–3.

felicitas hominis quae in hac vita haberi potest, consistat in consideratione **primarum causarum** (P), quia illud modicum quod de eis sciri potest, est magis amabile et nobilius omnibus his quae de rebus inferioribus cognosci possunt, ut patet per Philosophum in I *De partibus animalium* (*De part. an.* I 5, 644 b 32–34); secundum autem quod haec cognitio in nobis perficitur post hanc vitam, homo perfecte beatus constituitur secundum illud Evangelii: *haec est vita aeterna ut cognoscant te Deum verum unum*. Et inde est quod philosophorum intentio ad hoc principaliter erat ut, per omnia quae in rebus considerabant, ad cognitionem primarum causarum pervenirent. Unde scientiam de primis causis **ultimo ordinabant** (V), cuius considerationi ultimum tempus suae vitae deputarent: primo quidem incipientes a logica quae modum scientiarum tradit, secundo procedentes ad mathematicam cuius etiam pueri possunt **esse capaces** (P), tertio ad naturalem philosophiam quae propter experientiam tempore indiget, quarto autem ad moralem philosophiam cuius iuvenis esse conveniens **auditor non potest** (P*), ultimo autem scientiae divinae insistebant quae considerat primas entium causas. Inveniuntur igitur quaedam de primis principiis conscripta, per diversas **propositiones distincta** (P), quasi per modum sigillatim considerantium **aliquas veritates** (V). Et in graeco quidem invenitur sic traditus liber Procli Platonici, continens CCXI propositiones, qui intitulatur *Elementatio theologica*; in arabico vero invenitur hic liber qui apud Latinos *De causis* dicitur, quem constat de arabico esse translatum et in Graeco **penitus non haberi** (V*): unde videtur ab aliquo philosophorum arabum ex praedicto libro **Procli excerptus** (P), praesertim quia omnia quae in hoc libro continentur, multo plenius et diffusius **continentur in illo** (P*). Intentio igitur huius libri qui *De causis* dicitur, est determinare de primis causis rerum. Et, quia nomen causae ordinem quemdam importat et in causis ordo ad **invicem invenitur** (V), praemittit, quasi quoddam principium totius sequentis operis, quamdam propositionem ad ordinem causarum pertinentem, quae talis est.

Finally, the third type of beginning does not possess a prologue and directly begins with the dissertation. This is the case, for example, of the *Quaestiones disputatae* and of the *Opuscula philosophica*. Of course, also in these cases *cursus* is absent.

As already shown, Aquinas is able to use *cursus* and intentionally chooses when and where to make use of it. Prologues with a literary intent are obviously more suitable places for raising the style and showing his rhetorical skills. However, in most of his works he does not worry about rhetoric, but he intends to convey philosophical or theological concepts – also using the technical lexicon of argumentation. In these cases, *cursus* would be nothing but an obstacle to comprehension. The same attitude could be observed in the body of the works: *cursus* will be present only in those few texts which aim at a refined prose; on the contrary, it will be absent in the treatises or in the commentaries, which are the overwhelming majority.

Since most of the author's opuses lack *cursus*,²⁰ I will present one of the few cases where it is intentionally used, i.e. the letter to Bernardo, abbot of Montecassino. This epistle was composed in the very last weeks of Thomas' life, in February 1274. After having refused to visit the monks of Montecassino, where he was called in order to solve some doubts about a passage written by Gregory the Great, he sent a letter to the abbot Bernardo trying to answer their questions. Although the letter deals with a difficult matter – the compatibility between foreknowledge and free will –, it is evident that Thomas aims at a sublime style: the prose is enriched by several quotations and by the constant use of *cursus* (often *velox*). Together with the reply to the duchess of Flanders, which is fully provided with *cursus* too, this letter perfectly shows that the literary intent is always associated with the rhetorical style.²¹

Reverendo in Christo patri domino Bernardo, Dei gratia venerabili abbati Casinensi, frater Thomas de Aquino suus devotus filius se fatetur ubique ad obedientiam promptum.

Preoctaueram, pater venerande, quod conuocatis illis qui ex uerbis illustris doctoris Gregorii **scandalum patiuntur** (V), satisfacerem viva uoce, set hoc prolixitas diuini officii et ieiunii **obligatio impediuit** (V); et forte fructuosum erit ut quod **Scripture mandatur** (P) non solum presentibus prodesse ualeat set posteris. Nec absque diuina dispensatione hoc gestum credo ut, me **proficiscentem in Galliam** (T*), vestrae litterae comprehenderent Aquino, ubi sanctissimi patris Benedicti beatus Maurus eius discipulus, ab eo **transmissus in Galliam** (T*), recipere meruit licteras et sacra exenia tanti patris. Vt autem dubitantibus **plenius satisfiat** (V), inserenda sunt presentibus uerba beati Gregorii, que ignorantibus dubitationem **ingerunt et errorem** (V*). *Sciendum*, inquit, *quod benignitas Dei peccatoribus spatium penitentis largitur [...]* (*Mor. in Iob XVI c.10*). In quibus uerbis satis lucide doctor lucifluus duplicem uniuscuiusque hominis considerationem **habendam determinat** (T): unam quidem secundum se, aliam uero secundum quod ad diuinam **prescientiam comparatur** (V). Secundum se quidem homo consideratus, in his scilicet que circa eum accidunt, **necessitati non subiacet** (T*); set possibile est aliqua circa **ipsum contingere** (P) quae nullatenus **sortiuntur effectum** (P), quod expresse praemittit de peccatoribus, dicens: *quia accepta tempora non ad fructum penitentiae, ad usum uero iniquitatis conuertunt quod a diuina misericordia mereri poterant amictunt*. Si ergo mereri poterant non ex **necessitate amictunt** (P). Vnde ea quae contra hominem accidunt non ex **necessitate eueniunt** (T). Eadem enim ratio est de morte et de quibuscumque aliis que homo **agit aut patitur** (T*): omnia enim diuine **prouidentie supponuntur** (V). Si uero consideretur homo diuine **prescentie comparatus** (V), ea que agit uel patitur quamdam **necessitatem incurrunt** (P): non quidem absolutam, ut omnino secundum se considerata non possint, ut dictum est, **aliter euenire** (V), set condicionalem, quia

²⁰ This is what I could infer from a sample analysis of Aquinas' works.

²¹ *Epistola ad Bernardum abbatem Casinensem*, p. 413–415.

scilicet hec condicionalis est necessaria: si Deus aliquid praescit hoc erit. Non enim possunt ista duo simul stare, aliquid esse a Deo praescitum et **illud non esse** (P*), quia sic Dei **praescientia falleretur** (V). Est autem omnino impossibile ut falsitatem **veritas patiatur** (V). Et hoc signant uerba sequentia beati Gregorii cum subdit: *quamvis omnipotens Deus illud tempus vnus cuiusque ad mortem praesciat, quo uita eius terminatur; nec alio in tempore quisquam mori potuit, nisi ipso quo moritur*, scilicet quo a Deo praescitus est mori. Non enim possunt ista duo simul esse, quod Deus praesciat aliquem mori quodam tempore et ipse alio **tempore moriatur** (V), alioquin Dei **scientia falleretur** (V). Secundum se autem consideratus, homo potuit alio tempore mori: quis enim dubitat eum potuisse prius transfigi gladio, igne comburi, aut precipicio aut laqueo **vitam finire** (P)? Hanc et distinctionem sapiunt eius **uerba sequentia** (T); subdit enim: *nam si Ezechie anni additi ad uitam quindecim memorantur, tempus vite creuit ab illo tempore quo mori ipse merebatur*. Stultum autem est dicere quod aliquis mereatur id quod impossibile est euenire. Ipse ergo, secundum se consideratus, poterat tempore illo mori, set diuine **scientie comparatus** (V), non poterant hec simul esse, ut ipse uno **tempore moreretur** (V) et alio tempore Deus praesciret moriturum <...> doctoris exprimunt quasi oculata fide dubitantium **animis ingeramus** (V), considerare oportet differentiam diuine cognitionis et humane. Quia enim homo subiacet **mutacioni et tempori** (T*), in quo prius et posterius locum habent successiue, cognoscit res quedam prius et **quedam posterius** (T); et inde est quod **preterita memoramur** (V), **videmus presentia** (T), et **preuosticamur futura** (P). Set Deus, sicut liber est ab omni motu, secundum illud Malachie: *ego dominus et non mutor* (Mal. 3: 6), ita omnem temporis **successionem excedit** (P); nec in eo inueniuntur **preteritum nec futurum** (V*), sed presentialiter omnia futura et **preterita ei assunt** (V*), sicut ipse Moysi famulo suo dicit: *ego sum qui sum* (Exod. 3:14). Eo ergo modo ab eterno praesciuit hunc tali **tempore moriturum** (V) si modo nostro loquimur, cum tamen eius modo dicendum esset, videt eum mori quomodo ego video Petrum **sedere cum sedet** (P*). Manifestum est autem quod ex hoc quod video aliquem sedere, nulla ingeritur ei **necessitas sessionis** (V). Impossibile est hec duo simul esse vera, quod ego uideam aliquem sedentem et **ipse non sedeat** (T*); et similiter non est possibile quod Deus praesciat aliquid esse futurum et illud non sit: nec tamen propter hoc futura ex **necessitate eueniunt** (T). Hec sunt, pater karissime, que vestrae **petitioni obediens** (T), ad errantium **reductionem conscripsi** (P); que si eis non sufficiunt ista, **rescribere uobis obediens** (P + T) non desinam.

Valeat paternitas vestra diu. Frater Raynaldus commendat se vobis.

This separation between literary genres and the consequent rhetorical choices is not new and can also be seen in further examples. When Dante in the second decade of the XIV century writes the famous epistle XIII to Cangrande della Scala, he implements the same division. The epistle, in fact, is composed of two parts: the first one is actually a real dedicatory letter directed to the lord of Verona; the second one represents an *accessus*, i.e. a thorough introduction, to the *Commedia* and particularly to the *incipit* of *Paradiso*. Since the two sections belong to two

different literary genres, style and rhetoric are also totally dissimilar: in the first one the author pays particular attention to the *ornatus* and bedecks all his *clausulae* with the use of *cursus*, which is almost absent – or at least very irregular – in the second one.²² The same attitude, as seen above, can be seen with Thomas. We can in fact appreciate how he perfectly fits his cultural environment when he adjusts his style according to the genre and thus to the content of his numerous works. He handles the difficult devices of rhetoric, but he intentionally chooses where and when to use them; the content, in short, must never be overwhelmed by the literary form.

Bibliography

Editions

Dante Alighieri, *Le opere - Nuova edizione commentata delle opere di Dante*, vol. V: *Epistole, Egloge, Questio de aqua et terra*, ed. Marco Baglio, Luca Azzetta, Marco Petoletti, Michele Rinaldi, Salerno, Roma 2016 (Pubblicazioni del Centro Pio Rajna).

Oliva, Adriano, *Les débuts de l'enseignement de Thomas d'Aquin et sa conception de la sacra doctrina, avec l'édition du prologue de son Commentaire des Sentences*, Vrin, Paris 2006 (Bibliothèque thomiste, 58).

Thomas De Aquino, *Catena aurea in quatuor Evangelia*, ed. Angelo Guarienti O.P., vol. I, Marietti, Torino – Roma 1953.

– *Super librum de causis expositio*, ed. Henri D. Saffrey, Société Philosophique, Fribourg 1954 (Textus philosophici Friburgenses, 4–5).

– in *Opera Omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*:

Commentaria in Aristotelis libros Peri hermeneias et Posteriorum analyticorum. Cum synopsis et annotationibus fr. Thomae Mariae Zigliara, vol. I, ex Typographia polyglotta S.C. De propaganda fide, Romae 1882.

Opuscula I. Contra errores Graecorum; De rationibus fidei; De forma absolutionis; De substantiis separatis; Super decretalem, cura et studio fratrum Praedicatorum, vol. XL, ad Sanctae Sabinae, Romae 1969.

²² DANTE ALIGHIERI, *Le opere - Nuova edizione commentata delle opere di Dante*, vol. V: *Epistole, Egloge, Questio de aqua et terra*, ed. MARCO BAGLIO, LUCA AZZETTA, MARCO PETOLETTI, MICHELE RINALDI, Salerno, Roma 2016 (Pubblicazioni del Centro Pio Rajna), p. 276 ff.

Opuscula III. Compendium theologiae; De articulis fidei et Ecclesiae sacramentis; Responsio de 108 articulis; Responsio de 43 articulis; Responsio de 36 articulis; Responsio de 6 articulis; Epistola ad ducissam Brabantiae; De emptione et venditione ad tempus; Epistola ad Bernardum abbatem Casinensem; De regno ad regem Cypri; De secreto, cura et studio fratrum Praedicatorum, vol. XLII, Editori di san Tommaso, Roma 1979.

Summa Theologiae. Cum commentariis Thomae De Vio Caietani, cura et studio fratrum eiusdem ordinis, vol. IV–XII, ex Typographia polyglotta S.C. De propaganda fide, Romae 1888–1906.

Studies

Camargo, Martin, *Ars dictaminis – Ars dictandi*, Turnhout, Brepols 1991 (Typologie des sources du Moyen Age occidental, 60).

Conticello, Carmelo G., «San Tommaso e i Padri: la Catena Aurea super Ioannem», *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge*, 65 (1990), p. 31–92.

D'ancona-Costa, Cristina, *Recherches sur le 'Liber de Causis'*, Vrin, Paris 1995 (Études de philosophie médiévale, 72).

Dubois, Jean-Daniel, Bernard Roussel (eds.), *Entrer en matière: les prologues*, Cerf, Paris 1998 (Patrimoines. Religions du Livres).

Grévin, Benoît, *Rhétorique du pouvoir médiéval: les Lettres de Pierre de la Vigne et la formation du langage politique européen (XIIIe–XVe siècles)*, Publications de l'École française de Rome, Roma 2013 (Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 339).

Hamesse, Jacqueline (eds.), *Les prologues médiévaux*, Brepols, Turnhout 2000 (Textes et études du Moyen Age, 15).

Janson, Tore, *Latin Prose Prefaces. Studies in Literary Conventions*, Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm 1964 (Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, 13).

— *Prose Rhythm in Medieval Latin from the 9th to 13th Century*, Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm 1975 (Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, 20).

Leonardi, Claudio, Enrico Menestò (eds.), *Retorica e poetica tra secoli XII e XIV. Atti del secondo Convegno internazionale di studi dell'Associazione per il Medioevo e l'Umanesimo latini (AMUL) in onore e memoria di Ezio Franceschini*, Trento e Rovereto 3–5 ottobre 1985, La Nuova Italia, Perugia – Firenze 1988 (Quaderni del Centro per il collegamento degli studi medievali e umanistici nell'Università di Perugia, 18).

Mengaldo, Pier Vincenzo, « *Cursus* », in *Enciclopedia Dantesca*, Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, Roma 1970, vol. II, p. 290–295.

Murphy, James J., *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages. A History of Rhetorical Theory from St. Augustine to the Renaissance*, University of California Press, Berkeley 1974.

Norden, Eduard, « Sulla storia della clausola ritmica », in Benedetta Heinemann Campana (eds.), *La prosa d'arte antica dal VI sec. a.C. all'età della rinascenza*, Salerno editrice, Roma 1986, p. 913–967.

Orlandi, Giovanni, « Metrical and Rhythmical Clausolae in Medieval Latin Prose: Some Aspects and Problems », in Tobias Reinhardt, Michael Lapidge, James N. Adams (eds.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2005 (Proceedings of the British Academy, 129), p. 395–412.

Tunberg, Terence O., « Prose styles and *cursus* », in Frank A. C. Mantello, Arthur G. Rigg (eds.), *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, The Catholic University of American Press, Washington 1996, p. 111–121.

Turcan-Verkerk, Anne-Marie, « La théorisation progressive du *cursus* et sa terminologie entre le XIe et la fin du XIVE siècle », *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi*, 73 (2015), p. 179–259.