

## Zenon Kałuża and Dragos Calma

French National Centre for Scientific Research

### THE PHILOSOPHICAL READING OF MASTER VINCENT

#### Abstract

Educated most probably in Paris, Wincenty, or Master Vincentius, called Kadłubek (d. 1223), was a lawyer, advisor to Duke Casimir II the Just (Kazimierz Sprawiedliwy) and, subsequently, bishop of Cracow. His chronicle, compiled on Casimir's commission before 1207–8, is a decent representative of the twelfth-century renaissance. Firstly, we established the algorithm for the numerical comparison of the *Chronicle* and his supposed source; secondly, we took into account some of the writings of the Greek and Roman philosophers taught in the schools of 12th century and known by writers of the same period. The essay seeks to identify crypto-quotes in Wincenty's chronicle, where a considerable number of unlabeled opinions by other authors – philosophers, poets, and so on – are potentially traceable. We furthermore aimed at reconstructing the list of books used by the chronicler as a source or reference material. We have assumed, as a principle, that a single citation from one work would not legitimize the statement that the chronicler knew directly that source. With two or three quotations from one work, we seek to establish the reasons why these quotations are in the *Chronicle*. The results obtained have significantly enlarged the number of (hitherto-known) quotes from Plato's *Timaeus* (in Calcidius's translation), *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Seneca's *Moral Letters*, and Boethius's *De consolatione philosophiae*. In this context, we have taken into account, for the first time, the logical texts by Aristotle and Boethius, discovering in Vincentius's chronicle traces of the reading of the *Topics* and *On Sophistical Refutations* (by the former author) and of *De topicis differentiis* (by the latter). After a thorough comparison with all the works of Cicero and a critical analysis of the quotations accepted by our predecessors, we retained only one source: the *De senectute*. We have also excluded the possible evidence of Kadłubek's knowledge of Macrobius. Our contribution is of philological nature as it seeks to determine the relation and dependencies between *Historia Polonica* and its philosophical sources. We discuss the nature of these relationships and their philosophical character in other studies. The present essay forms, we believe, a convenient point of departure for further research on philosophical aspects of Wincenty's output and on the reception of philosophy in Poland in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century.

**Keywords:** *florilegia*, crypto-quotes, *logica nova*, rhetoric, Platonism, stoicism

## I INTRODUCTION

The present contribution to studies on *The Polish Chronicle* [*Chronica seu originale regum et principum Poloniae* (*Chronicles of the Kings and Princes of Poland*)] by Vincent Kadłubek, also known as Master Vincentius, offers a systematic account of research into the philosophical sources of the work, utilising digital resources. The procedure calls for some initial explanation. We began our work with searching for sentences or phrases common to both the *Chronicle* and the writings of Aristotle in their Latin translations. A positive outcome of the first attempts encouraged us to follow up. Thus, this essay comes about as a result of the effort of two medievalists, of whom one is better versed in information technology and the other, in the *Chronicle* itself.

The software used is called Dramon. It has been developed by a team of two medievalists and two mathematicians, with the aim of identifying the tacit sources (crypto-quotes) of Latin texts. While not available to the broader public, the software has already been taken advantage of by a small group of Parisian scholars. It was first tested on Vincent's *Chronicle* – seemingly, with success.<sup>1</sup> The software is devised to automatically compare the roots of the words in two related texts subject to analysis and to demonstrate the sentences or phrases comprising words of the same lexical family. In order to produce a trustworthy result, the developers have created a database that is compiled from diverse classical and medieval Latin texts.

<sup>1</sup> The first redaction of this study was presented in June 2014 at the colloquium organised by Instytut Badań Literackich PAN from Warsaw, later published in the Proceedings of the Colloquium: Andrzej Dąbrówka and Witold Wojtowicz (eds.), *Onus Athlanteum. Studia nad Kroniką biskupa Wincentego* (Warszawa, 2009), 231–77. The study, slightly modified, was later published in Zenon Kałuza, *Lektury filozoficzne Mistrza Wincentego* (Warszawa, 2014), 219–81. Chapters 4 to 6 of this volume are signed by both authors. The volume is quoted hereinafter as Kałuza, *Lektury filozoficzne*. We cite the Latin text of the *Chronicle* after Magister Vincentius dictus Kadłubek, *Chronica Polonorum*, ed. Marian Plezia (Monumenta Poloniae Historica [hereinafter: MPH], N.S., 11, Kraków, 1994 [hereinafter: Vincent, *Chronica*]); the Polish text and the commentary is quoted after Mistrz Wincenty Kadłubek, *Kronika polska*, trans. and ed. Brygida Kürbis (Wrocław, 2003 [hereafter Mistrz Wincenty, *Kronika polska*]). We wish to express our gratitude to Professor Marek Gensler, and above all Ms. Maryna Mews and Professor Constant Mews for their patient revision of the English translation.

The database has become the basis for a relatively complex 'Latin glossary' encompassing several dozen thousand words and their varieties. Another software was created subsequently, which on the basis of the morphology of the Latin language for IT use has only memorised the roots of the words in our 'Latin glossary'. We have checked each stage of the software in order to produce a correct result, particularly for words the declension and conjugation of which was irregular. The outcome has served as the basis for analysis of the parallel passages in the texts.

The software analyses all the words shared by the two Latin texts, regardless of their content. It was our choice to study the relationship between Master Vincent and a certain number of ancient philosophers, but we are aware that similar research is possible with respect to the Bible, literary texts, juridic texts, and so on.

Dramon interprets a sentence (phrase, clause) as a series of consecutive words included between two major punctuation forms: full-stop, exclamation mark, question mark.<sup>2</sup> The user selects a number of such shared words which the software shows by juxtaposing two fragments of the text in order to compare the common terms, beginning with three or four, or ten (or whatever number) of them. Attempts made so far, make us deem particularly important those results for which the software recognises sentences comprising at least four common words. However, to satisfy our curiosity, we also compared (many times) sentences with three shared terms. We never took into account the sentences with two common words, because this would render the analysis fastidious: making us search, be it hastily, thousands of sentences or phrases with just two words in common juxtaposed fortuitously in most of the cases.

But even when it came to three common terms, we observed the necessary cautiousness and, contrary to what Dramon suggested, we did not accept, for example, Seneca's *De vita beata*, II, 3, as a source for the *Chronicle*, II, 28, 19<sup>3</sup>:

---

<sup>2</sup> This algorithm places a limit on our research; if the algorithm is modified, other results may emerge.

<sup>3</sup> The actual source being Justin's *Epitome* (Iustinus, *Trogi Pompei historiarum philippicarum epitoma*, IX:VIII, 8–9), so well known to Vincent – as remarked by Marian Plezia in his edition of the *Chronica* (re. II, 28, 19, p. 77).

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 28, 19:

*Gratiam finge in odio, non odium in gratia, quia tuta frequensque uia est per amici fallere nomen.*

Seneca, *De vita beata*, II, 3:

*Cum multis inimicitias gessi et in gratiam ex odio, si modo ulla inter malos gratia est, redii: mihi ipsi nondum amicus sum.*

On the contrary, the following text of the *Chronicle* is a genuine crypto-quote, with the appearance of six rare words<sup>4</sup>:

*Chronica Polonorum*, I, 9, 7:

*Litargirea enim argentea, felle vero tincta videntur aurea, easque ex opposito solis, quo magis resplendeant, in celso montis erigit cacumine.*

Aristotle, *De sophisticis elenchis*

(*Soph. el.*), 1(AL, VI, 1–3, p. 5, 11–14):

*Et in inanimatis quoque similiter; nam et horum haec quidem argentum illa vero aurum est vere, alia autem non sunt quidem, videntur autem secundum sensum, ut litargirea quidem et stagnea argentea, felle vero tincta aurea.*

In analysing the results received through Dramon, we notice the existence of common roots. Such cases call for a more detailed investigation to seek whether the juxtaposition of the words is fortuitous or, on the contrary, indicates the presence of a relevant source. Based on our experience, the bigger the number of shared words, the greater the probability that there is a relationship between the texts under investigation – and vice versa: the smaller the number of common words, the lesser such certainty. Taking these simple rules into account, we have found that there are no common sentences or roots between the *Chronicle* and a certain number of analysed texts (and thus, no actual direct influence of the latter on the former). Indeed, when choosing to compare the *Chronicle* against a possible source on the basis of at least four common words, Dramon determined similarities. However, it found nothing worthy of interest when compared against Cicero (for this author, we chose to compare texts on the basis of at least three shared words). Neither did we find it in Seneca's *Dialogues* I, II, and XII, nor in his *De clementia*, *De consolatione ad Helviam*, and *De consolatione ad Polybium*, *De vita beata*, *Apocolocyntosis*, and in Books 4–7, 9–11, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22 of *Moral Letters to Lucilius*. The only

<sup>4</sup> Boethius's translations of the *Topics* and *On Sophistical Refutations* are here quoted from: Aristoteles Latinus, *Topica. Translatio Boethii*, ed. Lorenzo Minio-Paluello and Bernard G. Dod (AL, V, 1–3, Bruxelles and Paris, 1969); and, Aristoteles Latinus, *De sophisticis elenchis. Translatio Boethii*, ed. Bernard G. Dod (AL, VI, 1–3, Leiden and Bruxelles, 1975).

crypto-quote from *De providentia* comes, in reality, from *Proverbia Senecae*, which was broadly known in the Middle Ages. The list of medieval authors in whom we have sought some points of contact with the *Chronicle* is even longer. These include (with at least three shared words): Boethius as the commentator of Aristotle (except for *De topicis differentiis* and *In Categorias*), Petrus Alphonsi (*Disciplina clericalis*), Anselm (*Proslogion*, *Monologion*, *Cur Deus homo*), Eriugena (*Glossae super De hebdomadibus*); and (with at least four shared words): Peter Abelard (*Ethica*, *Dialectica*, *Super Porphyrium*, *Sermones*, *Theologia Christiana*, *Theologia Sclarium*, *Sic et non*), Abbo of Fleury (*Passio Sancti Edmundi*), John of Salisbury (*Metalogicon*), William of Conches (*Glosae super Platonem*), and Pseudo-William of Conches (*Moralium dogma philosophorum*), Hugh of St Victor (*Soliloquium*, *Didascalicon*), and Bernard of Cluny (*De contemptu mundi*). This list has been enriched by adding two juridical works: a *Summa*, published under the name of *Paucapalea*, and *In Summam Institutionum* by Placentinus – the author who was the first in medieval Europe to have combined the Aristotelian tradition of pragmatic philosophy and Justinian's legal tradition.<sup>5</sup> All the similarities that have been found between the above-enumerated authors and the *Chronicle* are based upon their shared biblical and poetic citations as well as on commonly recognised and frequently quoted opinions, such as maxims and definitions. They confirm that some of the formulae whose origin could have faded from memory have proved permanent in scholarly or spiritual literature.

Our list of the works being read may seem chaotic. We have obviously not searched through the philosophical and scientific literary output of Antiquity and the Middle Ages systematically. The considerations we took into account were the following. Among the ancient authors, we have selected the most representative and best known authors and works forming a part of the educational canon and commented upon at schools observing high academic standards. This has led us to include Plato's *Timaeus* in Calcidius's translation, Aristotle's *Organon* as translated by Boethius, along with Boethian commentaries and philosophical writings; the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* by an anonymous author; works by Boethius and Macrobius. We looked for medieval authors, taking into account their importance in the history of

---

<sup>5</sup> Ennio Cortese, *Il diritto nella storia medievale*, ii: *Il basso medioevo* (Roma, 1995<sup>5</sup>), 141.

thought (as in the case of Anselm, Abelard, William of Conches, John of Salisbury), and their place in religious literature (Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugh of St Victor, the latter being poorly represented), their unique position in the ‘academic Middle Ages’ (Alain de Lille). Since experts on Vincent’s *Chronicle* admitted the work’s closer relationship with Placentinus and religious authors, we have done some survey research to this end – however, with none of the expected results.<sup>6</sup>

The successive operations that preceded the acceptance or rejection of a direct relationship between a sentence in the *Chronicle* and a sentence in the source (whenever Dramon showed a considerable number of shared words) were the following: (i) search for words common to the two texts, the *Chronicle* and its source (selected a priori); (ii) analysis of the context and the usage frequency of relevant words within the source; (iii) analogous analysis of the context of these same expressions or locutions in the *Chronicle*. These analyses are best observable in the chapter on Cicero, which is, perforce, limited to a critique of previous ‘findings’, as Dramon has neither confirmed nor extended the list of Ciceronian inspirations. However, comparison of contexts has its limits, set by a purely ‘literary’ approach to the borrowings – which to a remarkable extent became a mannerism in Vincent’s writing. The few noteworthy deviations from this rule will be touched upon in the Conclusions.

This study does not exhaustively or absolutely determine a list of the works read by Vincent Kadłubek, nor does it make up a list of all the borrowings from the writings of philosophers. Dramon, which has enabled us to embark on the present topic, remarkably facilitates and accelerates the investigation of the sources behind a given text, while it would not replace a historical or philological analysis which could only be carried out by a historian or philologist.

Firstly, the point is not to limit a software that could disclose any number of common elements but to determine the ‘lower limit’ for the researcher’s beneficial cooperation with the software. Disclosure of all the sentences containing two shared terms assumes, for the *Chronicle*, that several thousand cases be analysed. Suffice it to mention that the comparison of the *Chronicle* against *Tusculan Disputations* has returned a total of 5,703 sentences with two shared terms each. Comparing

---

<sup>6</sup> For the results of research into medieval authors, see Kałuża, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 283–5.

them all would be excessive. In counting shared words from three upwards, we admit that it is not really plausible that the software might have neglected the similarities based on a common root. This is where its major advantage (as aforementioned) lies: Dramon radically accelerates research on the sources of the text under analysis.

Secondly, our software only entirely disregards synonyms. Thus, Dramon has enabled us to identify as a source for *Chronicle* sentences comprising synonyms, only if other shared words appear therein – as evidenced in the selected examples:

*Chronica Polonorum*, I, 14, 1:

O magnae *vigilantiae* principem, cui-  
 us oculus somnum in principatu *non*  
*vidit.*

Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, II, 3, 6:

*Vigilantem* habemus consulem Can-  
 inium, qui in consulatu suo *somnum*  
*non vidit.*

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 5, 5:

Quia difficile est eum revereri virtutes,  
 qui semper *prospera* usus est fortuna.

*Ad Herennium*, IV, 24:

Difficile est primum virtutes revereri,  
 qui semper *secunda* fortuna sit usus.

There are probably numerous other places in the *Chronicle*, as these are easily recognisable in the examples analysed below, where synonyms are sometimes obstacles for the identification of the source.<sup>7</sup> One of the major limitations of the software is that it cannot indicate the shared sentences if the analysed text introduces synonyms with respect to its source. Nonetheless, Dramon leaves the way open for further search, with use of different methods. This restriction is one of the main reasons why, as has already been said, the outcomes achieved along these lines are not definitive. It can be inferred that weak similarities (based on two/three words) call for further analysis, in this particular respect; this would be true particularly for the texts whose importance for the *Chronicle* is evident. The following example is probably worth of such re-analysis.

<sup>7</sup> Katarzyna Chmielewska, 'Wincenty Kadłubek a dziedzictwo antycznej teorii literatury', *Prace Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Częstochowie. Zeszyty Historyczne*, vi (2000), 79–101; on p. 85 this scholar points to the substitution of *pulvis* into *cinis* (*Chronicle*, I, 16, 2). Due to the number of 'operations on the synonym' in the *Chronicle*, we consider this substitution to be such a deliberate case; Chmielewska reduces it to 'quoting from memory'. While we willingly admit that we are not aware of who is responsible for these linguistic alterations but, owing to their individual character, we have assumed that most probably it was Master Vincentius.

Our research into the *Chronicle's* relation with Seneca's *Moral Letters* has found the following three word similarities between the texts:

*Chronica Polonorum*, III, 26, 17:

Et animus generosior res etiam impossibiles ad possibilem reducit facultatem.

*Ad Lucilium*, 102, 21:

Magna et generosa res est humanus animus.

This juxtaposition is rather awkward to explain as *Letters to Lucilius* circulated in the Middle Ages in two collections, 1–88 and 89–124<sup>8</sup>, and often in abridged versions. All the similarities taken into consideration so far attest to the presence in the *Chronicle* of only the first collection. This ordered view seems to have been destroyed once we can prove that Vincent knew the *Moral Letters* in their entirety, or knew more fragments of the second series. In any case, similarities based on three words could not seem certain once a praise of human mind is to correspond with a description of its might, as clearly shown by the function of the noun *res*. The result of our further research is the following:<sup>9</sup>

*Chronica Polonorum*, III, 26, 17:

Et animus generosior res etiam impossibiles ad possibilem reducit facultatem. Unde nihil timens ...

*Osio suo Calcidus*, p. 5, 1–5:

Isocrates in exhortationibus suis virtutem laudans, cum omnium bonorum totiusque prosperitatis consistere causam penes eam diceret, addidit solam esse quae *res impossibiles* redigeret ad possibilem facilitatem. Praeclare; quid enim *generosam* magnanimitatem vel agredi pigeat vel coeptum fatiget ...

<sup>8</sup> See the introduction to Lucius Annaeus Seneca, *Ad Lucilium epistolae morales*, ed. Leighton D. Reynolds, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1972). The division into volumes corresponds with the manuscript tradition. Birger Munk Olsen, *I classici nel canone scolastico altomedievale* (Quaderni Di Cultura Mediolatina, Spoleto, 1991), on p. 121, offers a table specifying fifty six codices preserved from the 12th century (plus mentions those missing) containing series 1 of the *Letters* and, merely, seven with series 2; the corresponding figure for 9th to 12th centuries is 66/10. Edmé R. Smits, 'Aspects of Medieval Literary History', in Andries Welkenhuysen, Herman Braet, and Werner Verbeke (eds.), *Medieval Antiquity* (Medievalia Lovaniensia, S. I: Studia, 24, Leuven, 1995), 1–20, notes on p. 6 that the Senecan legacy was divided into six groups of writings circulating within six separate groups of manuscripts.

<sup>9</sup> Jan H. Waszink (ed.), *Timaeus a Calcidio translatus Commentarioque instructus* (Plato latinus, 4, London and Leiden, 1975 [hereinafter: Waszink]), 5, 1–6. The letter was commented upon in Chartres.



Such evident lexical and phraseological similarity is supported by the fact that Kadłubek knew the *Timaeus* and made use of it. Additionally, the *Chronicle's* manuscript tradition, albeit late, is not unanimous or unambiguous with respect to the choice between *reducere* and *redigere*.<sup>10</sup>

Medievalists are perfectly aware of the role the works of Cicero and Seneca, the two Roman stoic philosophers, played in the spiritual life of medieval Europe. Collections of their beautiful, explicit and expressive *dicta* were first compiled during their lifetimes; Cicero is said to have been engaged in this. These original *florilegia*, *floscula*, or *auctoritates*, handed down from generation to generation, became with time a shared asset which was enriched by new apophthegms of more or less well known authors, forming, at some occasions, a collection of thoughts worth memorising from an earnestly studied book – or, some other time, a set of maxims or adages that are seen or ought to be quoted, converted, or adapted. In effect, Cicero and Seneca, and even their respective imitators (Pseudo-Cicero, Pseudo-Seneca), moving from one book to another, were excellently represented in the literature and thought of the Middle Ages. This ‘itinerary’ of both stoic thinkers was shared by all the great writers of Latin Antiquity. We have endeavoured to pursue a prudent path and wherever possible, at points of convergence, determine the origin of ‘take-overs’, or, at least, indicate their certain or dubious origin. We also utilised a group of other electronic (numerical) and printed instruments: modern collections of maxims, concordances, older or newer editions of *florilegia*, which are mentioned in the appropriate places herein. We need to bear in mind the studies, quite numerous today, on the reception of Roman literature in the Middle Ages, including Birger Munk Olsen’s monumental *L’Étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XIe et XIIe siècles*,

---

<sup>10</sup> In his edition of the *Chronicle* (p. 118), Plezia notes down two variants for the *reducit*: ‘redigit F’ (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Ms. 3416, so-called Faber Manuscript, ca. 1480) and ‘redigit NI’ (Biblioteka Jagiellońska [the Jagiellonian Library] in Cracow, Ms. 3002, dated 1434, the so-called Jan of Dąbrówka Code). See Jan z Dąbrówki, *Komentarz do Kroniki polskiej Mistrza Wincentego zwanego Kadłubkiem*, ed. Marian Zwiercian, Anna Zofia Kozłowska, and Michał Rzepiela (MPH, N.S., 14, Kraków, 2008), 172: “... generosus animus etiam res impossibiles redigit ad possibilem facultatem”. The possibility that the rendering of *facilitatem* with *facultatem* is considerable; such error is noted in Paul E. Dutton, *The Glosae super Platonem of Bernard of Chartres* (Toronto, 1991), 142, up to line 20.

and other books by this author. We must also acknowledge the several dozen years of persistent effort of our colleagues from the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes (CNRS) in Paris who have amassed an extraordinary collection of information on sources of classic literature in the Middle Ages, studying the manuscript tradition and researching in this respect the resources of medieval libraries. We were able to use the rich collection of texts, monographs and studies forming specialised IRHT libraries at leisure.<sup>11</sup> Even though this study does not refer to them all, we admit that we owe to these studies our interest in the presence of ancient philosophers in Kadłubek's *Chronicle*.

As for the Polish reference literature, there is Katarzyna Chmielewska's doctoral dissertation on the role of antique threads and motifs in Vincent's work, and discusses the presence of ancient philosophers. Due to the quantity and quality of the information she has collected, her thesis forms an important work tool, useful to anyone studying the *Chronicle*. And this is how we approached it; our present contribution has taken the said dissertation as the point of departure, confronting its data against the apparatus of the sources for the critical edition and the findings of Brygida Kürbis in her Polish translation of the *Chronicle*. The information on the philosophical sources behind the Kadłubek work, amassed in these three books, does not completely correspond with the data obtained by Dramon; hence, their mutual comparison is useful.<sup>12</sup>

The area we explore is basically the same as Chmielewska's, adding to it the Latin *Timaeus*, Latin translations of Aristotle, and the philosophical works of Boethius. In doing this, we were primarily led by the thought that Vincent had been through a complete cycle of studies

<sup>11</sup> Three volumes of the study and the first part of the fourth have been edited by Éditions du Centre national de la Recherche scientifique of Paris in 1982–9, as part of the series 'Documents, Études, et Répertoires'. The series has also included an edition: Élisabeth Pellegrin *et al.* (eds.), *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1975–82); also, the studies by Birger Munk Olsen, *I classici*, and 'La diffusion et l'étude des historiens antiques au XIIe siècle', in Welkenhuysen, Braet, and Verbeke (eds.), *Medieval Antiquity*, and the collection of his studies entitled *La réception de la littérature classique au Moyen Âge (IXe–XIIe siècle)*. *Choix d'articles publiés par des collègues à l'occasion de son soixantième anniversaire* (Copenhagen, 1995).

<sup>12</sup> Katarzyna Chmielewska, *Rola wątków i motywów antycznych w Kronice Polskiej Mistrza Wincentego zwanego Kadłubkiem* (Częstochowa, 2003), 15. The author has gathered information on the findings of scholars from the last two centuries.

in the *trivium*, extending to grammar, rhetoric and logic; he probably was himself a *master* – that is, a teacher – at a school (perhaps first while in Paris and subsequently, in Cracow, Wiślica, or Sandomierz). In the twelfth century, Aristotle's logical treatises were included in the canonical reading assignments for the medium educational level, as was the case with the dialogue by Plato. It seemed to us that if Vincent knew and cited all the poets he had read at school<sup>13</sup>, he should also have known the other scholarly writings and made some reference to them, even if in an implied or underlying manner. The discovery of the chronicler's school 'reading list' thus seemed to be the most reliable way to reach for the sources of his intellectual culture. For this reason, we have paid attention to the relevant Greek–Latin translations, and certain commentaries that were also known in the twelfth century.

There was one more purpose behind our interest in the texts we chose to compare, a purpose that was at least of equal importance and, in a sense, moral. We sought namely to leave the area where Kadłubek the writer and erudite is admired – so willingly frequented and populated by some historians – and to make a step *from* peeping at Vincent the student/master/reader *to* learning about the resources of his library, or of other Polish libraries. We sought to determine what the chronicler has read – in order to establish what he had at hand in his own, or the church's, library. We hope that this contribution will facilitate better cognition of the *Chronicle* and its author.

## II

### THE LATIN VERSION OF PLATO'S *TIMAEUS*

It has been established in recent years that Vincent's *Chronica Polonorum* contains a considerable portion of borrowings from Plato's *Timaeus*, as translated by Calcidius.<sup>14</sup> We offer a table of these borrowings:<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Krzysztof Pawłowski, *Retoryka starożytna w kronice Wincentego Kadłubka. Sztuka narracji* (Kraków, 2003), 75.

<sup>14</sup> See Jerzy Mańkowski, 'Kraak, uczeń Sokratesa (glosa do Kadłubka *Chronica Polonorum*, I, 5, 3)', in Alina Nowicka-Jeżowa and Paweł Stępień (eds.), *Inspiracje platońskie literatury staropolskiej. Materiały z konferencji zorganizowanej przez Zespół Badań Literackich nad Historią Kultury Epok Dawnych Instytutu Literatury Polskiej Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 14–15 października 1998 r.* (Warszawa, 2000), 147–50; Witold Wojtowicz, 'Niektóre aspekty retoryczne prologu *Kroniki Mistrza Wincentego*',

1. *Chronica Polonorum*, I, 1, 3 = *Timaeus*, 22b; Waszink, p. 14, 5
2. *Chronica Polonorum*, I, 2, 2 = *Timaeus*, 21a; Waszink, p. 12, 14
3. *Chronica Polonorum*, I, 2, 2 = *Timaeus*, 24e; Waszink, p. 16, 20–17, 2
4. *Chronica Polonorum*, I, 5, 1 = *Timaeus*, 19e; Waszink, p. 11, 4–5
5. *Chronica Polonorum*, I, 9, 7 = *Timaeus*, 25c; Waszink, p. 17, 17–18
6. *Chronica Polonorum*, I, 10, 1 = *Timaeus*, 20d; Waszink, p. 12, 8
7. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 7, 7 = *Timaeus*, 28a; Waszink, p. 20, 21
8. *Chronica Polonorum*, III, 26, 17 = *Osio suo Calcidus*, Waszink, p. 5, 3

It is also known that the introductory (dialogical) section of *Timaeus* played a significant part in the choice of the *Chronicle*'s dialogical structure, the selection of the interlocutors due to their age, the 'description' of certain facts (the attack on Denmark); circuitously, through *Accessus ad Timaeum* by William of Conches, Plato's work influenced the way the character of Prince Krakus, legislator and sophist, was shaped. Elsewhere (no. 5), in preparing the description of Lestek I's struggles with Alexander the Great, Vincent says, "For, once all have doubted about salvage ...", thus referring to Plato's passage: "... pro communi omnium salute ac libertate desperantibus ...". This crypto-citation is not a literary embellishment: it functions here as a concise presentation of the situation in the Polish camp, paralysed with anxiousness at the approaching forces of Alexander. The greatness of Lestek's deed becomes apparent against this background: it is, in our opinion, the comical greatness of a prudential sly old fox (*astutus Lestek*) who orders that wooden mock-ups be painted. The topic and the words used have been borrowed from Aristotle – as shown elsewhere (and as will be reminded once again).

The moment Mateusz ends his story about the victory of the Poles, Jan shouts out, with Plato's words: "An odd thing, but pretty credible it is!" (no. 6), and moves on to the famous apocryphal letters of Aristotle. Thus, Lestek's victory is shown in a 'layered cake' form: Plato–Aristotle–Plato–Pseudo-Aristotle. The reader is left to admire the noble sources from which the fable of Lestek I is made. This is

---

in Jolanta Sztachelska, Janusz Maciejewski, and Elżbieta Dąbrowska (eds.), *Teatr wymowy. Formy i przemiany retoryki użytkowej* (Białystok, 2004), 41–51; and Kałuża, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 99–148.

<sup>15</sup> Here, and further on, in column 1, the reader is referred to the Plezia edition. For column 2, the reference is to the translation of *Timaeus* in Waszink's edition, quoting page and verses. Calcidius's letter is quoted for the first time in connection with the *Chronicle*.

what can be said about the ‘facts’ behind the *Chronicle*’s Book 1. We did not study the philosophical aspect of the *Chronicle*’s Book 1, since the method and the purpose we assumed in this article are not productive for this kind of research.

In sum, the borrowings from Plato could be grouped as follows:

- nos. 1–3 reflect the *Chronicle*’s literary model – i.e., the legendary conversation (held in Egypt) on the history of Athens and the war Athens waged against the Atlantes.
- no. 4 shows the oratorical gift of Grakus-Krakus, who could speak fluently and solemnly (*sententioso agmine beatus*). Depth is added to the legendary ruler’s portrait through a discrete evocation of William of Conches’s *Accessus ad Timaeum*. The selection of sources, which belong to the same philosophical family, testifies to the chronicler’s conscious effort. Having accepted this, we ought to recognise that he deliberately combined within the figure of Krakus two basic Ciceronian virtues – the skill of public speaking (according to *Timaeus*) and philosophical prowess (according to *Accessus*).
- nos. 5 and 6 belong to the story of Alexander the Great and Lestek.

As thus can be seen, the first six parallel passages serve the literary structuring of the *Chronicle*, outlining the figures to be discussed, moving the plot forward, and even seeking to employ extraordinary solutions.

The case of the last borrowing, belonging to Book 2, is different from the others and calls for a broader discussion.

- no. 7 is based upon the maxim by Plato that ranks among those most cited and commented, beginning with St Augustine, through the Italian Renaissance, and further on. *Timaeus* (28a) differentiates between two types of objects: eternal and unchangeable, and those incessantly emerging. The former are cognizable by the human intellect, the latter, through sensual perceptions. Knowledge of inalterable objects is necessary, whereas knowledge about the objects of sensuous cognition is but an opinion. Having stated this, Calcidius’s Plato adds: “Omne autem quod gignitur ex causa aliqua necessario gignitur; nihil enim fit, cuius ortum non legitima causa et ratio praecedat.”<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Waszink, p. 20, 21–2. Calcidius enriches Plato’s text with his addenda: “... nihil enim fit, cuius ortum non legitima causa et ratio praecedat”.

Subsequently, Plato describes how the Demiurge, the *Opifex*, creates the world of unnecessary objects, looking at their ideal model. Putting it more precisely, we simplify here Plato's theory of ideas, his epistemology and his theory of creation or birth of the World.

Yet, Vincent does not care about any of the Platonic dogmas. In reference to the ritual haircutting of Siemowit (II, 3, 4), Kadłubek expresses a legal issue (through the mouth of Jan):

if the hair-cutting celebration is superstitious, as may be inferred from the very pagan ritual, then, why has it been described by this awkward occurrence? Why is it not only not forbidden to the faithful but celebrated very solemnly and reverentially?<sup>17</sup>

The explanation of a pagan origin of the custom is based on the discernment of two legal forms of child adoption, founded upon Roman law and its terminology, as has been shown by Janusz Sondel.<sup>18</sup> Nearing the end of his argument, Jan asks: “Non erit ergo celebre hoc adoptionis genus quod tam legitima et causa precedit et ratio?” (II, 7, 7). Having completely lost its ontological sense, the *legitima causa et ratio* of the Calcidian *Timaeus* gains the meaning of a ‘legal cause’ – identical with the one that justifies, in a Christian society, the continuation of other legal and social institutions of paganism (*gentilitas*) – for instance, the ones of “purchase, leasehold, recognition of slaves, and other agreements” (II, 7, 8). The cause consists in the reverence paid to the works of reason that were respected by the ancestors: “Irreligiosum enim est ea non venerari quae ratio instituit, quae devota maiorum veneratur religio” (I, 7, 9). The role ascribed to reason as the force creating the laws and traditions that are worshiped owing to their origin, concordant with the reason, is worthy of note.

Vincent refers to Calcidius's initial letter and subsequently, to *Timaeus* – beginning with 19e, where talented sophists are mentioned,

<sup>17</sup> Mistrz Wincenty, *Kronika polska*, 45; Vincent, *Chronica*, II, 6, 1–2.

<sup>18</sup> In Book 2 (II, 7), Vincentius refers to the *Digesta*, *Institutiones*, and the *Code*. Janusz Sondel, *Ze studiów nad prawem rzymskim w Polsce piastowskiej* (Prace Prawnicze, 82, Kraków, 1978), 45–6, 52–5 (on adoption and ceremonial haircutting); subsequently, the article ‘Wincenty zw. Kadłubkiem jako apologeta prawa rzymskiego’, in Dąbrowska and Wojtowicz (eds.), *Onus Athlanteum*, 91–109, esp. 103 ff.).

up to 28a, with the exposition of the genesis of the World. However, it is rather apparent that his contacts with Plato ended in an escape from philosophy to fabulous history, the law, and writing.

### III THE LATIN ARISTOTLE

#### Topics

Aristotle's name is mentioned only once in the *Chronicle*, in connection with his imaginary correspondence exchanged with Alexander the Great, following the fictitious defeat of the monarch (I, 10, 1), whereas the work's relationship with the *Topics* is based on two quotes. The first, a beautiful maxim on the placidity of human nature (*homo est animal mansuetum natura*), has been used in Prince Zbigniew's defence oration (II, 28, 33), where it was supposed to underpin the opinion of the Prince as a man incapable of committing the crimes he was charged with. Obviously, Aristotle admits this characteristic (*proprium*) of man, and even offers it several times as an example of a constant characteristic feature. It is part of the repertoire of examples that illustrate the types of properties in *On Interpretation*, Chapter 11, and in *Topics*, I and II.<sup>19</sup> This particular example, taken out of its context, has been promoted to the role of a general philosophical principle in Zbigniew's address. This suavity, apparently innate in humans, is contrary to, and contrasted with (II, 28, 25), the accusation, inspired by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV, 12), of the Prince's deficient sense of humaneness: *ab humanitate derelictus homo*. It is quite apparent that Pseudo-Cicero had a hand in Zbigniew's accusation, with Aristotle being engaged by Vincent to defend him.

Yet, recognising that the beautiful maxim came from Aristotle and stating that Vincent found it in *On Interpretation* and *Topics* is two different things. The adage claiming the placidity of human nature

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. *supra*, n. 4. Aristotle, *Topics*, V, 128b 14–17, trans. William A. Pickard-Cambridge, in *The Complete Works of Aristotle. The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. Jonathan Barnes (Princeton, 1984), on p. 483: "The question whether the attribute stated is or is not a property, should be examined by the following methods. A property is given either in its own right and for always or relative to something else and for a time: e.g. it is property in its own right of man to be by nature a civilized animal [*to dzoon hémeron phúsei*]." Aristotle, *De interpretatione*, 11, 20b, 15–18.

could be known to the chronicler via some other sources, such as Boethius's or Abelard's commentaries to the *De interpretatione*, or, as an anonymous maxim passing from one work to another, as can be seen in Alan of Lille.<sup>20</sup> The example formulated by Aristotle has gained a life of its own, its significance and role being re-determined by the new contexts in which it appears. In logical commentaries, the Aristotelian maxim normally functions as an example of permanent property; in Alan, the placidity or suavity is superior to the innate moral dispositions. Thus, in order to obtain an auspicious decision from the court of law, Zbigniew's defence speech should have correlated this property with human nature on a permanent basis. And this is what happens indeed: Zbigniew gave his example of constant property a function of a general philosophical principle.

A slightly similar case occurs with another crypto-quote from *Topics* (I, 3), which was at times pointed to as a passage taken over from John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*. It is well known that this twelfth-century humanist knew Aristotle's work directly, and discussed it in his *Metalogicon*. It also seems that Vincent knew the *Topics* and made discreet and accurate use of them. To verify this hypothesis, let us now carry out a concise analysis of Jan's utterance, assessing the behaviour of Zbigniew and the value of the court's procedure (II, 29, 3–5). As Jan says,

It is easy, though, to pass the final verdict pursuant to the evidence presented from both sides, if no circumstance has been neglected on either side (*ex contingentibus*).

Jan subsequently proceeds to enumerating the arguments of the party's plea: St Augustine's principle whereby it is forbidden to convict somebody based upon suspicion alone is in force;<sup>21</sup> one ought not to bear responsibility for an unforeseen accident; finally, he says that his imprisonment by his father and the reprimand from him have not defamed Zbigniew. The court has only one argument: a soldier, even if the most courageous, should be punished for having fought

<sup>20</sup> See Kałuza, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 82 (and n. 45), 168. The maxim was also known to Benedykt Hesse of Cracow, *Lectura super Evangelium Matthaei*, super 5, 1–5, ed. Waclaw Bucichowski (Textus et Studia historiam theologiae in Polonia excoltae spectantia, 16, Warszawa, 1983), 34, 41–2, and 37, 31–3.

<sup>21</sup> On this principle of Augustine and Gratian see Kałuza, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 96; also, 163, 414, 434.



without permission from his commander. Thus, nothing of what should have been said (*ex contingentibus*) has been omitted.<sup>22</sup> This is how Jan concludes his appraisal of the hearing:

May no one wonder that Zbigniew's voluble eloquence has crumbled, to whom appears the menace of rueful punishment. Because not always may a physician cure, or an orator persuade. Should he, however, not have omitted any of the circumstances, he shall [at least] be said to have had a well-concocted subject of his oration (*sufficiens dicetur habere propositum*).

The Latin translation of the *Topics* offers a clearer text: *sufficienter eum habere disciplinam dicemus*: "we shall say that he has displayed a satisfactory command of his area."

The context created for the crypto-quote is appropriate, namely rhetoric and the art of persuasion – the subject Aristotle discusses. The replacement of *disciplina* by *propositum* is suggested by Chapter 2 of the same book (i.e., Book 1) of the *Topics*, where the term appears in a few meanings and functions, including a domain of knowledge mastered by somebody – 'the given discipline' (*proposita disciplina*). What the character named Jan claims is that Zbigniew did not limit himself to having worked out well the subject of his speech: an educated man, he appears to have been well-versed in heuristic. The *propositum*, borrowed from Aristotle (whilst absent in John of Salisbury), shows that Kadłubek knew the *Topics* better than the crypto-citation itself might suggest; he knew the original context of the interpolation, and this awareness enabled him to unrestrainedly use Aristotle's text and adapt it to his own literary purposes without deforming the line of thought of the model he copied. This is why we can believe that Vincent knew the *Topics* first hand.<sup>23</sup> Finally, we notice that he has taken advantage of his knowledge of the work in the construction and assessment of Zbigniew's trial. This opinion is based on three unquestionable borrowings:

<sup>22</sup> The expression *ex contingentibus* in *Top.*, I, 3 is not indicative of 'circumstances' but rather, the means with which to achieve the things one is willing to achieve (*quae appetimus*), that is, the purpose one wants to reach through arguing and reasoning or treating their patients. A master in his discipline would never omit them.

<sup>23</sup> See Kałuża, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 21; Zenon Kałuża, 'Kadłubka historia mówiona i historia pisana (*Kronika*, I 1–2, I 9 and II 1–2)', *Przegląd Tomistyczny*, xii (2006), 61–120, here 115–16.

1. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 28, 33 = *Topica*, V, 1 (AL V, p. 86, 6); V, 2 (p. 90, 20–1)
2. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 29, 3 = *Topica*, I, 3 (AL V, p. 8, 1–2)
3. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 29, 5 = *Topica*, I, 3 (AL V, p. 7, 25–8, 3)

### On Sophistical Refutations

As for the last treatise in the *Organon*, there is actually nothing more to add. There is the single allusion to Lycophron (*Soph. el.*, 15, 174b, 37), as identified by the *Chronicle's* editor,<sup>24</sup> and two crypto-quotes, of which the first (quoted at the beginning), found in Book 1 (I, 9, 7), was used by Vincent in his description of the disintegration of Alexander's army in the story of Lestek's combat against the Macedonian ruler, whilst the second (*Soph. el.*, 12) was put into the mouth of Pompilius II's wife, who was a poisoner (I, 19, 4). There is also one distinct quotation: albeit not identifying the author. It is announced as *verba vere sapientis*. This makes up a total of four quotations:<sup>25</sup>

1. *Chronica Polonorum*, I, 9, 7 = *Soph. el.*, 1 (AL VI, p. 5, 13–14)
2. *Chronica Polonorum*, I, 19, 4 = *Soph. el.*, 12 (AL VI, p. 29, 2–6)
3. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 28, 37 = *Soph. el.*, 15 (AL VI, p. 34, 13: Lycophron)
4. *Chronica Polonorum*, III, 5, 1 = *Soph. el.*, 15 (AL VI, p. 33, 17–19)

The first two crypto-citations have an important part in constructing the fables in Book 1. In the first case, Aristotle's words serve as an idea to plot resistance and to win, thus adding meaning to Lestek's existence. What would have remained of this fictitious ruler, had he lost to Alexander? Does the fable not have a philosophical subtext to it, teaching us that the word of a philosopher conclusively prevails in a clash with a mighty army? The other crypto-quote shows Pompilius's wife as a brute and hypocrite. The allusion to Lycophron in Zbigniew's oration makes us think of scepticism, which must have interested, or at least puzzled, the chronicler, as he will resume this school of thought, once again, in Book 3. In the same book, Vincent

<sup>24</sup> Marian Plezia, *Okruchy ze stołu Arystotelesa i Cyncerona. Studia i szkice*, ed. Barbara Brzuska (Warszawa and Kraków, 2000), 98–100; Kałuza, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 68–70, 79–80.

<sup>25</sup> Nos 1 and 2 are discussed in Kałuza, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 137 and 139; Nos 3 and 4, *ibidem*, 70 and 79–80.

refers to an *ex comparatione* argument, opposing Gniewomir's treason against true friendship modelled after two students of Pythagoras and, in the period closer to Vincent, the friendship of Coloman I, the Hungarian king, and Boleslaw III, the ruler of Poland.<sup>26</sup>

Allusions to relatively unknown figures, carefully selected (and even more carefully transferred) imports, quotations taken from several mutually distant chapters and, primarily, the fact that lawyers – Kadłubek being one of them – well knew the last two treatises of the *Organon*: all this seems to reinforce our thesis that the chronicler directly knew the *De sophisticis elenchis*.

#### IV

#### CICERO'S 'NEW RHETORIC': *RHETORICA AD HERENNIVM*

The most recent editor of Vincent's *Chronicle* offers, in his edition's erudite apparatus and in the index of sources, merely two endnotes pointing to the *Rhetorica*, the work once ascribed to Cicero. The first reference appears at the very beginning of the account of Zbigniew's trial (II, 28, 13); the second is with regard to one term, *Plagioxiippus*, which only appears in *Ad Herennium* (IV, 42) and in *Chronica Polonorum* (III, 2, 4).<sup>27</sup> Its presence attests, if need be, the familiar (hitherto rarely noticed and mostly underestimated) relationship of Vincent with this pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetoric*. The findings of Chmielewska and Plezia have not encouraged further research in this direction, and yet what came out of the recent research surpassed our expectations. To highlight them, we will juxtapose the similarities, thus shedding a new light on their interrelation.

Between Jan's argument demonstrating that indigent man, if talented and merited, may become a ruler of a country or an army commander (II, 5, 1–4), and Mateusz's declaration concerning 'genuine nobility' based on virtue (II, 6, 1), the chronicler inserts

<sup>26</sup> Vincent, *Chronica*, III, 4, 1–5, 1; the *ex comparatione* argument is taken over from *De sophisticis elenchis*. See, in particular, Kałuża, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 446, n. 24.

<sup>27</sup> Chmielewska mentions these two fragments – cf. *eadem*, *Rola wątków*, 103, 108–9, 230, 243. A few years ago, it was found, based on an analysis of terms, that Vincentius drew on Cicero's prescriptions and technical vocabulary from the *De inventione* – rather than the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. In fact, there are so many points of encounter between the two rhetoric treatises that it is easy to get trapped in this area. See Kałuża, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 72–3.

an interesting mosaic composed of three take-overs, among which there is the first citation from *Ad Herennium* (which we have already come across):<sup>28</sup>

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 5, 5:

Imo tales esse debere principes, qui *cum paupertate* noverint *habere commercium*, quia *difficile est eum revereri virtutes*, qui *semper prospera usus est fortuna*. Unde cuidam a sapiente dictum est: *semper te puta miserum, quia numquam fuisti miser*.

Seneca, *Epist.*, 18, 12:

... incipe *cum paupertate habere commercium* ...

*Ad Herennium*, IV, 24:

*Difficile est primum virtutes revereri, qui semper secunda fortuna sit usus*.

Seneca, *De provid.*, 4, 3:

... *miserum te iudico, quod numquam fuisti miser*.

As it appears, paragraph 5 in Book 2, Chapter 5 is in its entirety a fascinating composition of two authors of authority, Seneca and Pseudo-Cicero, and three sources, of which the last is not the dialogue *De providentia*, contrary to what is believed by scholars<sup>29</sup>, but *Proverbia Senecae* – of which more will be said in the chapter on Seneca.

We will now pass on to Book 2's long Chapter 28, where the two orations, the accusation and the defence of Zbigniew, provided the opportunity to quote beautiful sentences, recalling the rules of judicial practice and cite *Rhetorica ad Herennium* in such juridical context. It is for these reasons, judicial or procedural, that the prosecutor vociferates before the judges: "With this [i.e., Zbigniew's deed] having been presented, there is not even a slightest doubt that could delay the condemnation." The *ratio (defensionis)* according to Pseudo-Cicero, which was determined before the trial, is the first attempt of the accused to defend himself, and it also specifies the matter of the trial (*causa*). The basis for a lawsuit appears in 28, 11: "I will not dispute the fact that I encroached [into the camp] together with the enemies ... ." Thus, having established the 'bare' facts, and drawn their avowal from Zbigniew, the prosecutor states that he has no doubts about the verdict the court ought to pass.<sup>30</sup> But this is just

<sup>28</sup> *Rhétorique à Herennius*, ed. and trans. Guy Achard (Paris, 2003).

<sup>29</sup> Plezia, in the apparatus of the sources for his edition (p. 34); Mistrz Wincenty, *Kronika polska*, 45, n. 28; Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 102, fn. 178.

<sup>30</sup> *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (hereinafter: *Ad Heren.*), I, 26, goes on as follows: "Inventa ratione, firmamentum quaerendum est, id est quod continet accusationem, quod adfertur contra rationem defensionis de qua ante dictum est."

the very beginning of the trial, about which Vincent wrote with a copy of pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetoric* at hand, and at which the prosecutor peeped over his shoulder – as becomes apparent when we compare the following passages:

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 28, 13:

His enim digestis *nec parva quidem dubitatio remorari potest condemnationem.*

*Ad Herennium*, IV, 24:

Ergo, ut ostendi, ratio ea est quae continet defensionem, sine qua *ne parva quidem dubitatio potest remorari damnationem.*

The prosecutor's speech nears its end, and the orator should now appeal to the imagination and the listeners' hearts, and win them over for his own opinion. This goal is served by amplification (*amplificatio*)<sup>31</sup>, being a rhetorical measure adding to the elocutionary floridity of the oration (*exornatio*, II, 46). The orator has ten ways at his disposal, called *loci communes*, with which to stimulate his listeners' imagination. The orator portrayed in the *Chronicle* has chosen the sixth:

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 28, 25:

Nam si *ab humanitate derelictus homo* letam, quod absit, referat sententiam, nulla res unquam aut huic mederi poterit incommodo, aut erratum corrigere. Nec enim post incendii favillam succurritur incendio, nec post naufragium naufragio consulitur, praesertim cum *voluntario* ac deliberato *facinori nulla sit* uspiam expectatio veniae. *Imprudentiae* vero seu necessitudini etiam *iustam deprecationem esse paratam*; lex enim iubet: remissionem veniae crimina nisi semel commissa non habere ...

*Ad Herennium*:

IV, 12: O feros animos! o crudeles cogitationes! o *derelictos homines ab humanitate!*

II, 49: Sextus est locus quom ostendimus et consulto factum et dicimus *voluntario facinori nullam esse excusationem, imprudentiae et iustam deprecationem paratam.*

This accusatory speech, marked with solemnity and sarcastic irony, deprives Zbigniew of human nature and makes of him a monster permeated with ill will that leads to premeditated crime. In order to reject the imputation, Zbigniew borrows, in his response, from Aristotle's *Topics* the idea that clemency is part of human nature. The opposition between the two theses takes shape based upon two images of man:

<sup>31</sup> *Ad Heren.*, II, 47: "Amplificatio est res quae per locum communem instigationis auditorium causa sumitur." For *loci communes*, see II, 48–50.

man-the-monster and man-the-angel. Were we take a formal glance, however, at this particular fragment of the accusatory oration, we could notice the chronicler's remarkable care about rhetorical coherence of the two orations. The exclamation *O derelictos homines ab humanitate*, taken over and modified by Kadłubek, is in *Ad Herennium*, Book 4. It is an example of an oration that is meant to illustrate a high register (*figura gravis*), characteristic of which is elegant selection of the vocabulary and beautiful thoughts, necessary in amplifications.<sup>32</sup> This is how Vincent has structured both orations delivered at the court.

Let us pay attention to the second section of Paragraph 25: inspired by *Ad Herennium*, II, 49, it corresponds there to the sixth method of evoking vivid response among the audience (*instigationis auditorium*). Following the path of his model, Kadłubek tells us that, having listened to the prosecutor's speech, "almost the entire assembly raised their spearheads against Zbigniew. They are shouting that not only should he be pierced through but torn into pieces with no mercy at all."<sup>33</sup> Vincent describes the trial of Zbigniew quoting not the files of the action but the *Ad Herennium* instead.

There is one more fragment in this same Chapter 28 – namely, paragraph 33: a new incrustation formed of three borrowings quoted in a series of sections:

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 28, 33:

*Si ergo pollicitus sum me ostensurum non intervenisse rationem, qua inducti rei publicae machinaremur exitium et si ambitionem, quam illi praecipuam in nos causam conferunt, sed et ipsam rerum et humanitatis naturam animum malignandi pati non potuisse docui, non est dubium quin confiteantur maleficio locum non fuisse.*

*Ad Herennium*:

II, 30: *Si ergo pollicitus sum me daturum causam, qua inductus Ulixes accesserit ad maleficio ...*

(II, 28: *iniuria quavis inimico exitium machinari*) *et si inimicitiarum acerrimam rationem et periculi metum intercessisse demonstravi ...*

(I, 16: *ne refelli possit aut temporis parum fuisse aut causam nullam aut locum idoneum non fuisse aut homines ipsos facere aut pati non potuisse*) *non est dubium quin confiteatur causa maleficio fuisse.*

<sup>32</sup> *Ad Heren.*, IV, 11: "Sunt igitur tria genera, quae genera nos figuras appellamus, in quibus omnis oratio non vitiosa consumitur: Unam gravem, alteram mediocrem, tertiam extenuatam vocamus."

<sup>33</sup> Vincent, *Chronica*, II, 28, 26–7; Mistrz Wincenty, *Kronika polska*, 105.

The basic text of the *Rhetoric* is borrowed from the conclusion (*complexio*) of an exemplary discourse delivered to prove that Ulysses killed Ajax.<sup>34</sup> Vincent modified the model's conclusion of the accusation in the end of Zbigniew's speech, in which he refutes four charges: (i) scheming against the Republic and seeking its ruin; (ii) striving for power; (iii) the wrongdoing of the case and (iv) of the human nature.

The take-overs in II, 28 and II, 30 come from the same exemplary oration against Ulysses. The last fragment (I, 16) concludes the exposition on the *narratio*, reminding that a narration is plausible (*veri similis*) when the opponent is not able to reply that the time was too short to commit the crime; or that the place was unsuitable for the action he is charged of; or that there was no motive; or that he could not have acted or been treated so. Weaving quotations of *Ad Herennium* into this passage strictly relates with the *trivium* arts – rhetoric, specifically. It shows the way, in which Vincent compiled and edited his text, and to what extent *Rhetorica ad Herennium* supplied him with knowledge on the course of lawsuits and court proceedings and addresses delivered at the tribunal, as well as models to follow, as far as oratorical displays were concerned. This example also shows the extent to which the chronicler remains free with respect to the models and the material gathered in *Ad Herennium*: he follows the advice and prescriptions of the manual since he knows them so well that he can transform them unrestrainedly, whilst using the models to take over a handful of words, from time to time, for his own purpose.

In Book 3 of the *Chronicle* (III, 20, 6–9), we find once again an oration of importance, delivered at the ducal council by Piotr Włostowic.<sup>35</sup> Having resolved to abduct the Prince of Przemyśl, Piotr thus concludes his speech (making a discreet reference to Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 25, 2): “I should prefer lack of success to attempts at gallantry” – and adds, immediately, after the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*

---

<sup>34</sup> *Ad Heren.*, II, 27, announces a lecture on how to compose an elevated and a complete oration: *ornate et absolute tractare*; II, 28: five-part arrangement of speech at court; II, 28–9: example of excellent oration charging Ulysses, similes likening to wild animals; II, 30: *complexio* – the fifth part of oration. The example was exercised at school – and probably this is the part it is meant to play in Kadłubek's work. We checked the following English translation: *Ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium)*, ed. and trans. Harry Caplan (London and Cambridge, MA, 1964).

<sup>35</sup> Kałuża, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 190ff., omits the dependence of III, 20, 9 (as indicated for the first time) on Seneca and the *Ad Herennium*.

(III, 9): “for it is a beautiful thing, going as far as beyond death, owing to courage.” Of the list of praises of prowess in *Ad Herennium*, Piotr selects just one for his proud declaration:<sup>36</sup>

*Chronica Polonorum*, III, 20, 9:

*Malo igitur successum nobis deesse quam experimenta virtutis, etenim virtute vel etiam ultra in mortem proficisci praeclarum.*

*Ad Herennium*, III, 9:

(Seneca, *Ad Lucil.* 25, 2: An profecturus sim nescio: *malo successum. mihi quam fidem deesse.*)

... *virtute vel ultra mortem proficisci esse praeclarum.*

Contrary to the earlier borrowings, whose connection with the law, forensic practice and *pro utraque parte* orations was direct, the last quoted crypto-citation opens with the system of chivalric values, as represented by Piotr Włostowic. The paramount value of a knight is bravery, supported by the hope for successfully overcoming perils. Once, however, we get to know the source of Piotr’s view on courage, honour, and even death, we realise that the chivalric axiology he displays is well anchored in the praxis of Roman attorneys and the ethics of Roman lawyers and rhetors. The manuals they produced imposed an invariable moral standard over the long centuries of the Middle Ages. When compared to the *Ad Herennium*, it becomes apparent that the course of Zbigniew’s trial was written according to the principles of judicial procedure, laid down in the pseudo-Ciceronian manual. Furthermore, both court speeches – the accusation of the Prince and his own defence – were based upon the provisions established there. Vincent took over a number of utterances in a literal form, but independently of the *Rhetoric*’s author set against his accusatory exclamations Aristotle’s tranquil opinion and the arguments based on the Justinianian law or the Decree. One has to admire the extremely careful ‘literary’ elaboration of Prince Zbigniew’s case. To end with, the influence of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* upon the structure of Vincent’s *Chronicle* as such, particularly the construction and description of Zbigniew’s court trial, is worth emphasising – especially that a fictitious character of this description and its literary model is thus revealed.

<sup>36</sup> *Ad Heren.*, III, 9: “Qui tutae rei praeponet rationem honestam his locis utetur: Virtutem nullo tempore relinquendam ...” See the same juxtaposition of the two texts in the column *Moral Letters to Lucilius*.



V  
CICERO'S WRITINGS

Save for a single case, Cicero has been deleted from our list of authors and works. This is because in the sets of sources used by Kadłubek, even if the most critical and 'frugal' scholars (Plezia, Kürbis, Chmielewska), do include certain writings of the Roman orator and philosopher. Plezia and Chmielewska accept three crypto-quotes taken from *De senectute* and *De amicitia*, and one each from *In Catilinam I*, *De oratore*, and *De finibus*. Chmielewska has enriched the list by three borrowings from the *Tusculanae disputationes*, two from the *Paradoxa stoicorum*, and one each from the *De republica* and *Epistulae ad familiares*.<sup>37</sup> This, in sum, gives a total of nine writings by Cicero, but they are varied and non certain.

Our analysis starts with the weakest proposed elements, namely from the *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, which they suggest Kadłubek apparently took over from this treatise, namely (in II, 28, 9) the saying that 'custom is second nature', and it is not easy to break or lose it. But the adage, of Greek origin, is also quoted by Macrobius, who was most probably known to Vincent, and was plausibly more broadly known in the twelfth century.<sup>38</sup> Since Vincent's work bears no other trace of *De finibus*, it would be hard to deem this treatise to have been one of the sources for the *Chronicle*. Another text shared by Cicero and Macrobius will be covered in the chapter on Macrobius.

Comparison of the *First Oration Against Catiline* (I, 1, 3: *Fuit, fuit ista quondam in hac re publica virtus*) with the first sentence in the *Chronicle's* Book 1: "*Fuit, fuit quondam in hac re publica virtus*" reveals a no less negative outcome. But it was Plezia who first called into question Vincent's knowledge of the *Catilinarian Orations*, naming Priscian of Caesarea (5th/6th cc.) as the possible intermediate agent. His *Institutio de arte grammatica* was a commonly known textbook in the Middle Ages, becoming obligatory for universities in the thirteenth

<sup>37</sup> We have used the indices following the Plezia edition and the book by Chmielewska.

<sup>38</sup> Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, VII, 9, 7 (ed. James Willis [Leipzig, 1970], p. 429, 28–30); Vincent, *Chronica*, II, 28, 9, the source apparatus; Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 106 and 112, n. 220, is hesitant about whom of the two philosophers to consider as the actual source for the *Chronicle*. For more on the proverb, see Kaluża, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 83–6. Whenever referring to traces of knowledge of a work, we consider the clear, unambiguous instances of borrowings.

century.<sup>39</sup> On our part, we can only add one remark. Cicero wrote his oration under the strictly determined political conditions of the Roman republic; the virtue he refers to – the will to defend the homeland and its institutions – is indicated by the pronoun *ista*. Vincent would not tell us which virtue, in specific, he is willing to talk about, and what was the virtue Polish senators of his time valued. The sentence he uses is but a generalised maxim, known to other authors of his time and, for instance, repeated by Otto of Freising.<sup>40</sup> Nothing is known of any other relations between the *Catilinarian Orations* and the *Chronicle* whatsoever.

The same thing ought to be said about the connections with *De re publica*, as critically discussed by Chmielewska. Still, the only instance of use of *De re publica*, which has been accepted as such by this scholar, is the following:

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 10, 7:

Quid plura? *Nihil illi defuit quod naturae amicum, quod virtuti consonum, quod honestati fuisset consentaneum.*

*De re publica*, I, 17, 28:

Quis vero divitiorem quemquam putet, quam eum, cui *nihil desit, quod quidem natura desiderat ... ?*

has now to be rejected – not just because it is the only such case, and because this work by Cicero was not overly known in the Middle Ages, but also because the formulae *nihil deesse* and *natura desiderat* are commonplace in Latin. Of the whole similarity, only the words *naturae amicum* remain, which has no counterpart in Cicero.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Vincent, *Chronica*, I, 1, 1, the source apparatus; Cicero, *In L. Catilinam*, I, 3, in *Discours*, vol. X, ed. Henri Bornecoupe, trans. into French Édouard Bailly (Paris, 1974), 6. Priscian quotes Cicero without omitting the pronoun *ista*. Professor Juliusz Domański has drawn our attention to the difference between the two formulae (the precise one: *fuit ista quondam virtus*, vs. the general one: *fuit quondam virtus*).

<sup>40</sup> Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I, imperatoris*, II, 21, ed. Georg Waitz (MGH, *Scriptores in usum scholarum*, 45, Hannover and Leipzig, 1912, rpt. 1997), 135.

<sup>41</sup> Chmielewska, *Rola wqtków*, 106–7. Cicero, *De re publica librorum sex quae supersunt*, ed. Per Krarup (Milano, 1967), p. 46, 4–5. Known to the Middle Ages were primarily those passages of *De re publica* which had been commented upon by Macrobius; see Leighton D. Reynolds, 'Cicero, *De re publica*', in *idem* (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983), 131–2.

Both Plezia, in his edition of the *Chronicle*, and Chmielewska in her dissertation have noticed some similarity between Chapter II, 25 of the *Chronicle* and *De oratore*, II, 249. Let us investigate them:

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 25, 2:

Quod illum vere virum non latuit, qui multis in proelio fuis ab hoste tandem gressu subnervatur, a consociis deplangitur. Quorum ille planctum ridiculo excipit, iocundum sibi gratulans accessisse hac in re commercium, ut singuli passus virtutum sint monumenta, non claudicandi opprobrium.

*De oratore*, II, 249:

Nam quod Sp. Carvilio graviter claudicanti ex vulnere ob rem publicam accepto et ob eam causam verecundanti in publicum prodire mater dixit 'quin prodis, mi Spuri? quotienscumque gradum facies, totiens tibi tuarum virtutum veniat in mentem', praeclarum et grave est? ...

The anecdote has many a shared characteristic, such as the subject matter and the consequent moral message. But the story told by Kadłubek bears all the traits of a secondary text, repeated after a book that has been read or a story heard. It is, thus, a recast of a seemingly distant Ciceronian model. We would not accept it in the general list of philosophical sources of the *Chronicle* as this is a clear case of a short tale contingent on *De oratore*, with an unknown intermediary in between.

There remains a group of writings that were the best known in the Middle Ages and most frequently used: these include the *Paradoxa*, *De amicitia*, *De senectute*, and *Tusculanae disputationes*. Let us begin with *Paradoxa*, whose fragments are cited by Vincent twice, according to Chmielewska.<sup>42</sup> While this identification is important, it is not certain yet whether Kadłubek had to do with the work directly or with some excerpts through *florilegia*. For our reply to be plausible, we should set together three texts: the *Chronicle*, the *Paradoxes*, and several collections of *dicta*.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 106. Following Heinrich Zeissberg, Chmielewska accepts (p. 106, n. 194 and 195) that the phrase *Male ... didicit* (column 1) is the first citation, and the rest belongs to the second. Brygida Kürbis only accepts the first quote, rejecting the second; Marian Plezia recognises none as such.

<sup>43</sup> We use here the edition: Cicero, *Paradoxa stoicorum*, ed. and trans. into French by Jean Molager (Paris, 2002). The *dictum* quoted is from a *florilegia* collection edited by Gilles G. Meersseman, 'Seneca maestro di spiritualità nei suoi opuscoli apocrifi dal XII al XV secolo', *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica*, 16 (1973), 61, no. 25 (Pseudo-Balbo); 63, no. 16 (collection of adages by famous philosophers; our maxim is ascribed to Socrates); 65, no. 23.

<i>Chron. Pol.</i> , I, 9, 4: Male aliis imperat, qui sibi met imperare non dicit. Neque enim gloria dignus est triumphali, de quo pompa cupiditatum triumphat. Tuae siquidem nullum est refrigerium, nullum temperamentum ...	Cicero, <i>Paradoxa</i> , V, 1, 33: Imperator quo modo, aut cui tandem hic libere imperabit, qui non potest cupiditatibus suis imperare?  I, 1, 6: Neque enim umquam expletur nec satiatur cupiditatis sitis.	<i>Florilegium</i> : Stultum est ut velit quis imperare, cum sibi ipse imperare non possit.
---	--	--

The first sentence in the *Chronicle* may be an answer to Cicero's question 'Quo modo?'; the reply is, 'male'. The sentence, however, is shaped as an aphorism, and there is no doubt that it followed a model from a *florilegium*, similar to the one we quote on an exemplary basis in column 3. This being the case, we are not even certain whether Vincent knew who of the sages had originally produced the *dictum*. We could recognise the second sentence as a distant echo of the reading of *Paradoxes*, provided that we could be certain that Vincent had ever read it.

Putting aside the conjectured quotation from *Ad familiares* (discussed in the chapter on Macrobius), we now pass on to the opusculum *Laelius de amicitia*. Plezia and Chmielewska have recorded three crypto-quotes from this work in Vincent's *Chronicle*, to be found in I, 4, 1; II, 24, 3; and IV, 1, 4, respectively. The relationship between the *Chronicle* and the writings of Cicero, as perceived by historians and philosophers, is so fragile though, that it calls for being reinforced by reliable and indubitable arguments; or confirm our doubts about the previous judgements about the Vincent–Cicero relationship. *Laelius* provides a good opportunity to support the opinions of those who have not ceased to search for the 'intermediary link' between Cicero and Vincent. There indeed was a 'go-between' – Boethius was his name, rather than John of Salisbury.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Cicero, *Laelius de amicitia*, ed. Paolo Fedeli (Milano, 1971), par. 78, 11–13. The editor has neglected Boethius's dependence on the works of Cicero. Dimitrios Z. Nikitas (ed.), *Boethius' 'De topicis differentiis' und die byzantinische Rezeption dieses Werkes: Anhang, eine Pachymeres-Weiterbearbeitung der Holobolos-Übersetzung* (Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi Philosophi Byzantini, 5, Athens, Paris, and Bruxelles, 1990), par. 23, 17–18; PL 64 1184B; Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 104.

<p><i>Chron. Pol.</i>, II, 24, 2: Quod quantum apud prudentes gloriae tantum illi [Boleslao] apud mores improbos peperit invidiae, quia <i>virtus sese diligit aspernaturque contraria</i>.</p>	<p>Boethius, <i>De top. differ.</i>, II: Mali quippe notitia deesse non potest bono, <i>virtus enim sese diligit aspernaturque contraria</i> nec vitare vitium nisi cognitum queat.</p>	<p>Cicero, <i>Laelius</i>, 13, 47: Quod si curam fugimus, <i>virtus fugienda est</i>, quae necesse est cum aliqua cura res <i>sibi contrarias aspernetur</i> atque oderit, ut bonitas malitiam, temperantia lubidinem, ignaviam fortitudo.</p>
---	---	--

In other cases, the similarity between the two texts – even if delusively close – is not certain. Some of the beautiful phrases, nobly structured sentences, originally conceived by Cicero have with time become the common good of authors, also becoming subject to transformations depending on the period's taste. This is revealed in another example of the presence of *De amicitia* in Vincent's *Chronicle*:

<p><i>Chronica Polonorum</i>, I, 4, 1: <i>Nihil hic fictum nihil simulatum, sed quidquid asseris, uerum</i> asseri ex antiqua praesumitur historia. Galli enim, ut ait Trogus, cum eos patria ...</p>	<p>Cicero, <i>Laelius</i>, 8, 26: Nam utilitates quidem etiam ab iis percipiuntur saepe, qui simulatione amicitiae coluntur et observantur temporis causa; in amicitia autem <i>nihil fictum est, nihil simulatum</i> et, <i>quidquid est, id est verum</i> et voluntarium.</p>
---	---

The same words written on both sides of this table qualify things that are various, or even contradictory. Cicero states that friendship is grounded upon truth rather than falsehood or simulation; Vincent's utterance has been put into mouth of Jan, the moraliser, and it refers to Mateusz's story about the bedevilment of the Poles somewhere in Carinthia, on the borderland of Roman domains. Thus, while Cicero speaks of situations from the 'real' system, his *verum quidquid est* seeming to reinforce the definition of friendship, Jan's *verum quidquid asseris* agrees with Mateusz's historical discourse and validates it for the reader. Kadłubek's utterance was once referred<sup>45</sup> to the cry let out by Socrates after he heard the young Critias's narrative in the Platonic dialogue *Timaeus* (26e; Waszink, p. 19, 11–12): "non fictam commenticiamque fabulam, sed veram historiam ...". Such a brief direct juxtaposition of *Timaeus* and *Laelius* could also be explained by the fact that Cicero was a diligent reader of the

<sup>45</sup> See Kałuża, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 113.

Greek *Timaios* and, possibly, the author of the dialogue's first Latin translation.

However, setting the truth against falseness and imitation is not typically Ciceronian, as is shown below (and the following table is incomplete):<sup>46</sup>

<i>Chron. Pol.</i> , I, 4, 1:	Cicero, <i>Laelius</i> , 8, 26:	Aelredus Riev- al., <i>De spirit.</i> <i>amicitia</i> , II, 38, 134–236:	Thiofridus Epternacensis, <i>Flores epyt. sanc-</i> <i>torum</i> , Prooemium	Ambrosius, <i>De</i> <i>officiis</i> , II, XXII, 112; PL 16, 141C:
<i>Nihil hic fictum nihil simulatum, sed quidquid asseris, verum asseri ex antiqua praesumitur historia.</i>	<i>... in amicitia autem nihil fictum est, nihil simulatum et, quidquid est, id est verum et voluntarium.</i>	<i>In amicitia quippe nihil inhonestum est, nihil fictum, nihil simulatum, et quidquid est, id sanctum et voluntarium et verum est.</i>	<i>Et Iesum testor et sanctos eius et regnum eius in amicitia mea nihil fictum, nihil simulatum est, sed quidquid est, id totum uerum, totum uoluntarium est ...</i>	<i>Plerique enim remissores malunt esse ut uideantur boni esse, sed nihil simulatum et fictum seuerae uirtutis esse certum est...</i>

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, *Laelius* (*On friendship*) was present in texts written by the monks: Thiofrid (Theofrey, Théofrède) of Echternach (d. 1110), a Benedictine, author of *Flores epytaphii sanctorum*, and Aelred of Rievaulx (d. 1167), a Cistercian, author of *Spiritual Friendship*. Both these authors repeat, very minutely, using the same words, the Ciceronian praise of friendship, with Thiofrid giving this moral maxim a more personal flavour, thus expressing his own attitude towards the books and the brethren who have requested him to compile the *florilegium* for them. Centuries before the Frisian and

<sup>46</sup> Aelredus Rievallensis, *Opera omnia*, i: *Opera ascetica*, ed. Anselm Hoste and Charles H. Talbot (Turnhout, 1971); Elred z Rievaulx, *Przyjaźń duchowa*, trans. and ed. Mirosław Wylegała (Kęty, 2004), 37; Philippe Delhay, 'Deux adaptations du *De amicitia* de Cicéron au XIIe siècle', *Recherche de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 15 (1948), 304–31. Thiofridus Epternacensis, *Flores epytaphii sanctorum*, ed. Michele C. Ferrari (Turnhout, 1996). The abbot of Echternach and his book are much less known compared to Aelred of Rievaulx and his writings. For a concise discussion of friendship as the topic of letters and treatises authored by monks, see Jean Leclercq, *Initiation aux auteurs monastiques du moyen âge. L'amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu* (Paris, 1963), 174–5.

Scottish friars, Ambrose of Milan had also used the Ciceronian formula, in an abridged and much more concise form. The Polish chronicler, in whose time *Laelius* was frequently read in an educated and learned milieu, proceeded similarly. It is not surprising, then, that this particular book by Cicero was an inspiration for many authors, and that several people repeated the memorised sentences. As regards Vincent Kadłubek, we have found that he ‘quotes’ the treatise on friendship once according to Boethius, and we are not certain whether he was aware of this. For I, 4, 1 of the *Chronicle*, we can see that he repeats a broadly known maxim, which also appeared in the *florilegium* – without the need to directly refer to its source. Such are the reasons for which we would not list *De amicitia* as a work that has directly inspired Vincent the writer.

In his dialogue *Laelius* (24, 89), Cicero uses the beautiful citation from Terence’s *Andria* (68): “Sed nescio quo modo verum est quod in Andria familiaris meus dicit: / Obsequium amicos, veritas odium parit.” The verse is only partly identifiable in Book 4, 1, 4 of the *Chronicle*, where we can read *veritas odium parit*. Hence the question: who is it that the Polish author quotes – is it Cicero (quoting Terence, in turn), or Terence, or, perhaps, just a saying known at the time to the educated? We cannot resolve the question. Terence, whose *Andria* was known in the twelfth century, is mentioned by a number of authors.<sup>47</sup> Chmielewska takes into account the numerical relations: while Terence’s *Andria* is only cited once, Cicero’s *Laelius* scores three.<sup>48</sup> This argument is weak, as the citations from Cicero are uncertain and the origin of the third quote under discussion has not been decisive, even though it should have been. Thus the two remaining crypto-quotes do not confirm that Vincent uses the *De amicitia* directly.

Let us pass on to the *Tusculan Disputations*. Dramon specifies merely two verbal coincidences, possibly to be taken into consideration.

---

<sup>47</sup> Lactantius, *Div. Instit.*, V, 9, PL 6, 576B: “Utrumne veritas odium parit, ut ait poeta quasi divino spiritu instinctus?”; Hieronimus, *Commentaria in Epist. ad Gal.*, II, 15–16: “Similis est huic illa sententia nobilis apud Romanos poetae: Obsequium ...”; Cassiodorus, *De artibus ac disciplinis liberalium litterarum*, PL 70, 1165–6: “sententia est quod sententia generalis adicit ut apud Terentium: Obsequium...”; Isidorus Hispalensis, *Etym.*, I, 36, 3; Aelred of Rievaulx, *Spiritual Friendship*, III, 104; and, dozens of others. Paolo Fedeli, the editor of the edition we have used, refers the reader (editorial note, p. 103) to two collections of proverbs.

<sup>48</sup> Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 96, 104.

In the first case – *Chronicle*, II, 28, 39 (“*in carcerem coniectus es ... iussu ... legitimi iudicis*”) – Vincent quotes not *Tusc.*, I, 40, 26 (“*Qui cum coniectus in carcerem triginta iussu tyrannorum*”), but the Justinianian *Code* (2, 11, 1), as the *Chronicle*’s editor notes *ad locum*.<sup>49</sup> In the second case (*Chronicle*, IV, 5, 5 – *Tusc.*, V, 28, 80), only the names of political, that is, cardinal, virtues are identical, and nothing else.

Chmielewska points to three other paragraphs, of which one has been inspired, as she believes, by Cicero’s *Tusculanes*, the two others were inspired either by Cicero or by Macrobius. The similarities she refers to are based on analyses of a type different from the ones followed for this study by our software. What she shows, in an intriguing manner, is a reversed relation between the opening of *Chronicle*’s Prologue and *Tusculanae disputationes*, V, 3, 9. In response, as it were, to Cicero, who specifies three reasons why people go to the theatre, Vincent wrote of three reasons for which three outstanding figures (invented by the chronicler) do not attend the theatre. The scholar also observes that “The rhetoric used was identical in both works: first, the reasons for the procedure were simply outlined; further on, they were explained in detail, one by one.”<sup>50</sup> We will discuss the two remaining ‘quotations’ in the chapter on Macrobius.

With the *De senectute*, the most recent edition of the *Chronicle* and scholarly literature indicate three parallel passages, the last of which makes us compare the *Chronicle* with Cicero’s treatise and *Policraticus* by John of Salisbury. Let us then compare the Kadłubek text to Cicero’s *Cato*:<sup>51</sup>

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 18, 6:

Videns autem rex Ungariae Salomon tam sibi quam suis proelii imminere discrimen, proelium deprecatur, pacis offert conciliamina centum milia talentorum. Cui Boleslaus: Polonos, inquit,

Cicero, *Cato de senectute*, 16, 55:

Ergo in hac vita M'. Curius, cum de Samnitibus, de Sabinis, de Pyrrho triumphavisset, consumpsit extremum tempus aetatis; cuius quidem ego villem contemplans ... admirari satis non

<sup>49</sup> Vincent, *Chronica*, apparatus re. II, 28, 39 (p. 83). Sondel, *Ze studiów*, states that the addendum is rewritten literarily. Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Tusculanarum disputationum libri quinque*, ed. Hans Drexler (Milano, 1963), p. 66, 5–6.

<sup>50</sup> Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 105–6, text quoted from p. 105.

<sup>51</sup> Vincent, *Chronica*, 53; see Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 104–5, for further reading; in the last item, the author corrects the findings of her predecessors. Cicéron, *Caton l’Ancien (de la vieillesse)*, ed. Pierre Wuilleumier (Paris, 1969), 117.



*habere aurum non delectat, sed habentibus aurum imperare, turpiusque esse pretio vinci quam proelio succumbere ...* possum vel hominis ipsius continentiam vel temporum disciplinam. Curio ad focum sedenti magnum auri pondus Samnites cum attulissent, repudiati sunt; non enim *aurum habere* praeclarum sibi videri dixit, *sed iis qui haberent aurum imperare*.

Only the background of the plot is dissimilar in the two texts – with the hearth and home in Cicero, and the landscape after victorious battles fought in Hungary, in Vincent. Both texts share the conquering chief who receives the envoys of the losing party and rejects the gold, offering the elegant reply that he prefers to gold the reigning over those who possess the gold. This section is absent in John of Salisbury, who instead, reproducing aspects of various traditions, ‘cites’ Curius’s reply, ascribing it to Gaius Fabricius. We face various traditions there, of which we should be clearly aware. One comes from Cicero’s *Cato*, featuring Manius Curius uttering the known couplet about gold. The second, transmitted by Valerius Maximus (*Memor.*, IV, 3, 5), also sides with Curius but omits his sacramental words about gold, albeit the sense of the utterance is identical.<sup>52</sup> The third tradition we are aware of, represented by Aulus Gellius (*Noctes Atticae*, I, 14, 2), describes the meeting between Samnite ambassadors and Fabricius, who in an almost magical way shows his own rule over himself, most clearly putting both realms of his domination on the same footing. The domination of his own body and of the hostile peoples makes gold redundant for him. In Policraticus (V, 7), John of Salisbury recounts the story of Fabricius, keeping Gellius in front of his eyes; then he adds a brief comment on his own, ending the story with the famous Ciceronian formula on possession of gold and power.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>52</sup> Valère Maxime, *Faits et dits mémorables*, IV, III, 5, ii: *Livres IV–VI*, ed. Robert Combès (Paris, 1997), on p. 23 is Curius’s oration to the Samnites: “Supervacuae, inquit, ne dicam ineptae legationis ministri, narrate Samnitibus M’. Curium malle locupletibus imperare quam ipsum fieri locupletem atque istud ut pretiosum, ita malo hominum excogitatum munus refertote et mementote me nec acie vinci nec pecunia corrumpi posse.” These last words indicate that the author held Cicero’s *De re publica*, III, 6, in his memory (*op. cit.*, 114).

<sup>53</sup> Aulus Gellius, *Les nuits attiques*, *Livres I–VI*, ed. and trans. into French by René Marache (Paris, 1967), 52; the same tradition is followed by Iulius Frontinus, *Strategemata* [IV, 3, 2], ed. Robert I. Ireland (Leipzig, 1990), 99. John of Salisbury in his *Policraticus*, i, p. 311, 11–19 (*Ioannis Saresberiensis episcopi Carnotensis*

Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, I, 14, 2:

Tum Fabricius planas manus ab auribus ad oculos et infra deinceps ad nares et ad os et ad gulam atque inde porro ad ventrem imum deduxisse et legatis ita respondisse: dum illis omnibus membris quae attigisset obsistere atque imperare posset, numquam quicquam defuturum; propterea se pecuniam, qua nihil sibi esset usus, ab his quibus eam sciret usui esse, non accipere.

Ioh. Saresb., *Policraticus*, V, 7:

Fabricius vero planas manus ab auribus ad oculos et infra et deinceps ad nares et ad gulam et ad os et deinde ad ventrem et ima deduxit, et legatis in haec verba respondit: Dum omnibus his membris, quae attigi, resistere atque imperare potero, mihi nihil omnino deerit, ideoque vobis reservate pecuniam necessariam usibus vestris, nec eam quibus necessaria aut grata non est ingeratis; *Romani siquidem non curant habere aurum, sed imperare volunt habentibus aurum.*

Based on what has been said hitherto, the *Policraticus* anecdote combines at least two traditions: the third – the story of Fabricius, and the first, being the source of the maxim on gold. Neglecting the ancient history, Vincent only preserves the maxim. Extracted from *Cato*, the ‘useless gold’ adage lives its own life and the medieval authors take advantage of the ready-to-use formula, stylising and editing it as they need to, forgetting about its origin. John and Vincent could have used a similar *florilegium*.

There are two other fragments in the *Chronicle* that have been (and still are) indicated as inspired by Cicero’s *De senectute*; namely:<sup>54</sup>

1. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 22, 9 = *Cato de senectute*, 6, 17
2. *Chronica Polonorum*, IV, 25, 1 = *Cato de senectute*, 18, 66

But neither these two passages nor any of those discussed above seem to have been directly taken from Cicero’s work. Some of them have been repeated after a different author, some rewritten from collections of *dicta*, as may be guessed based on the varying form of the ‘words

---

*Policratici sive De nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum libri VIII*, ed. Clemens C.I. Webb, i [Oxford, 1909], 311, vv 11–19) recollects the *Strategemata*. Manius Curius Dentatus and Caius Fabricius Luscinus, the victorious commanders in the wars against the Samnites and Pyrrhus, are several times mentioned in Juvenal’s *Satires*. René Marache, editor of the *Attic Nights*, so writes on the anecdote under discussion: “The anecdotes on both characters often lead to mistakes. It is mostly believed that it was Curius Dentatus who received the delegation of the Samnites” (cf. Aule-Gelle, *Les nuits attiques*, i: *Livres I–IV*, ed. René Marache [Paris, 1967], I, 52, n. 2).

<sup>54</sup> Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 104–5.

of wisdom' – short and emphatic, as in the statement that Poles dislike gold, or, the announcement that the words quoted in IV, 25, 1: “Unde quidam sapientium ...” are taken from a collection of maxims. We have not come across in the *Chronicle* fragments that would suggest that Vincent worked with Cicero's texts. Similar issues are the case when it comes to Seneca – the author whose sententious, or aphorismatic, style oftentimes favoured the supposition that Kadłubek quotes a *florilegium*. And yet, we can clearly note that Vincent often revisited the *Moral Letters* and that he transposed in his *Chronicle* issues he came across in the *Letters*. But this reflection only becomes evident after analysing the Vincent–Seneca relationship.

## VI SENECA'S WRITINGS

### Moral Letters to Lucilius

The writings of Lucius Annaeus Seneca, especially his *Moral Letters to Lucilius*, rank among the works that were the most diligently studied in the Middle Ages; no doubt, this was a basic philosophical reading of Master Vincent as well. Plezia, the *Chronicle's* editor, and Chmielewska indicate a relatively high number of Senecan crypto-quotes, twelve and fourteen respectively, but only three of them are considered to be borrowed from other works than the *Letters*.<sup>55</sup> Below follow twelve shared source identifications, listed schematically, by the order of the *Chronicle's* books:

1. *Chronica Polonorum*, I, 8, 4 = *Ad Lucil.*, 9, 10
2. *Chronica Polonorum*, I, 9, 6 = *Ad Lucil.*, 13, 3
3. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 5, 5 = *Ad Lucil.*, 18, 12
4. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 11, 7 = *Ad Lucil.*, 2, 5
5. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 11, 7 = *Ad Lucil.*, 5, 6
6. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 18, 11 = *Ad Lucil.*, 74, 21
7. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 22, 9 = *Ad Lucil.*, 26, 2
8. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 28, 19 = *Ad Lucil.*, 7, 7

---

<sup>55</sup> Cf. the index of authors in Plezia's edition, and Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 98–100, 237, 244. The latter study offers (pp. 100–1) a critical discussion of a few erroneous findings. In reality, Chmielewska refers to seventeen analogies and citations from Seneca, and fourteen quotes from *Moral Letters*. Herein, the *Letters* are cited based on Reynolds's edition (see *supra*, n. 8).

9. *Chronica Polonorum*, III, 1, 1 = *Ad Lucil.*, 9, 22  
 10. *Chronica Polonorum*, III, 21, 1 = *Ad Lucil.*, 27, 8  
 11. *Chronica Polonorum*, III, 25, 1 = *Ad Lucil.*, 3, 4  
 12. *Chronica Polonorum*, IV, 24, 4 = *Ad Lucil.*, 9, 9

The two other fragments, proposed by Balzer and Chmielewska, include:

13. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 3, 3 = *Ad Lucil.*, 81, 6  
 14. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 6, 1 = *Ad Lucil.*, 44, 5.

The first comparison seems particularly interesting. Two visitors, repelled by Popiel-Pompilius, appear in front of Piast's and Rzepicha's hut; the hosts offer them a treat, 'begging them that they ponder not what they are being offered, or the quantity thereof, or whom it comes from, but in what a fashion and with what sentiment'.<sup>56</sup>

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 3, 3:

Orant ne quid, *ne quantum*, ne a quibus, *sed qualiter* et quo exhibeatur affectu considerent ...

Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 81, 6:

Eo animo quidquid debetur quo datur, *nec quantum sit, sed a quali* profectum voluntate perpenditur.

Both these utterances focus on making a donation or kind-hearted retribution for the good received. Neither of the two authors want the focus on such occasions to be on the quantity of what is being received; both evoke the donor's internal attitude, which is described as a certain quality of his will or disposition – as in Seneca, and sentiment or benevolence – as in Vicentius. Juxtaposed against each other, these texts make one recall the disposition of 'cheerful giver' (II Corinthians 9, 7): "hilarem datorem diligit Deus", and of the indigent widow who offered two obols to the Temple (Mark, 12, 42–4): owing to her disposition, the poor widow gave more than the rich contributors did. There is a degree of probability that by letting the miraculous guests into Piast's and Rzepicha's house, the chronicler inspired the hosts' hearts with a stoic and evangelical thought. To support such understanding of Kałużebek, inspired as it is by the

<sup>56</sup> Mistrz Wincenty, *Kronika polska*, 41–2. Oskar Balzer, *Studium o Kadłubku*, 2 vols. (Lwów, 1934–5), i, 379, n. 3, where '81, 5' is mistakenly quoted for Seneca; similarly, in Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 99–100. Not mentioned in Plezia's critical apparatus.

*Moral Letters* and the Bible, we should like to quote two reasons. Firstly, the chronicler has himself commented on the words of Piast and Rzepicha he quoted, using the authority of Romans 7, 18: “for the willing is present in me, but the doing of the good is not.” Thus, in Vincent’s concept, the episode has a deeper Christian sense to it. Secondly, this is not the only instance of merging the prestige of Seneca and the authority of the Bible in the *Chronicle*: a similar procedure is applied when it comes to describing the figure of Prince Boleslaw the Wrymouth, where I John 4, 1 and *Ad Lucil.*, 3, 4 are combined.<sup>57</sup> There is no reason to suppose that this specific reading of *Moral Letters* is founded upon the presumed correspondence between Seneca and Paul the Apostle.

Let us now take into consideration the second case indicated by Chmielewska who rather hastily compares the ‘inference’ of the two thoughts on the origin of *nobilitas*, rather than two similar texts, which she has not set against each other. A number of authorities assert that *nobilitas* originally comes from virtue and is not founded ‘upon the parental loins’ and blood. This is attested by a short verse quoted by Vincent, which was unknown to Seneca but known to medieval authors: “nobilis est, virtus quem sua nobilitat.” Therefore, we would not take the second mentioned proposition into consideration.<sup>58</sup> Vincent allowed Mateusz to follow a view similar to the stoic thinker.

Before we pass on to showing new imports, let us make a correction in number 7 of our previous table. Vincent’s statement concerning the age of Prince Władysław Herman, is composed (in the left column) of two sentences, of which the first has traditionally, and correctly, been compared (by Zeissberg, Plezia, and Chmielewska) with Seneca’s text; the second sentence comes to light only now. The entire utterance becomes clearer, and the relationship with Seneca’s letter more interesting, as with Vincent’s reversing the order of the sentences:<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> See Kałuża, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 208.

<sup>58</sup> Vincent, *Chronica*, II, 6, 1, at which Plezia refers us to Hans Walther, *Proverbia sententiaeque latininitatis medii aevi. Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sentenzen des Mittelalters in alphabetischer Anordnung*, 6 vols. (Göttingen, 1963-7), nos. 17003 and 16991. In her dissertation, Chmielewska refers to ‘inference’ in p. 99, n. 160, and to ‘notional [resp. reflective] analogy’ in n. 162.

<sup>59</sup> The erroneous entry in the source apparatus compiled by Plezia has been corrected by Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 99, n. 170.

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 22, 9:

*Animus mihi de senectute controversiam facit, hanc ait esse florem suum. Nam cum detrimenta sentiam in corpore, in animo non sentio.*

Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 26, 2:

Gratias tamen mihi apud te ago: *non sentio in animo aetatis iniuriam, cum sentiam in corpore.* Tantum vitia et vitiorum ministeria senuerunt: *viget animus et gaudet non multum sibi esse cum corpore; magnam partem oneris sui posuit. Exultat et mihi facit controversiam de senectute: hunc ait esse florem suum.*

At this point, we should discuss the borrowings identified with the help of Dramon. It is worth emphasising that the software added eight new Senecan borrowings and doubtless inspirations to the list of thirteen already admitted, bringing altogether twenty-one citations from Seneca.<sup>60</sup> The following hitherto unrecognised borrowings have now been found in Book 2 and 3 of the *Chronicle*:

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 11, 6:

*Aperitur illi omnia aliena esse praeter duo: animum et tempus, quorum possessionem natura nobis delegavit.*

Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 1, 3:

*Omnia, Lucili, aliena sunt, tempus tantum nostrum est; in huius rei unius fugacis ac lubricae possessionem natura nos misit, ex qua expellit quicumque vult.*

In Jan's anecdote on the philosopher, a motif appears of 'the one and only thing' that, in Seneca's view, man has received from nature – that is, time. This gift has doubled in the *Chronicle* and thus, "nature has given us, and made us the possessors of, time and soul". This is a philosophical-religious, and not necessarily Christian, feature in Vincent's *Chronicle*.

Further on, the chronicler takes over from Seneca the image of panic of the troops, caused by clouds of dust raised by the cattle's hooves:

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 12, 6:

*Quibus eminus ille [sc. Boleslaus] visis ait: Istos ipsos, o socii, pulvis pecorum calcibus excussus exiit a castris.*

Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 13, 8:

*Ita est, mi Lucili: cito accedimus opinioni; non coarguimus illa quae nos in metum adducunt nec excutimus, sed trepidamus et sic vertimus terga quemadmodum illi quos pulvis motus fuga pecorum exiit castris aut quos aliqua fabula sine auctore sparsa conterritur.*

<sup>60</sup> Let us briefly mention at this point that Dramon has not detected the following relationship: *Chronicle*, III, 1, 1 – *Ad Lucil.*, 9, 22. This is understandable since the *Chronicle* and the *Letters* do not share at least three common words.

The following text explains the origin of the inscription on a gold plaque (*aurea lamina*), which Boleslaw the Wrymouth was said to have hung on his breast, out of the love and respect for his father. While the inscription has basically been modified, the source of inspiration remains clear:<sup>61</sup>

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 24, 4:

*Sic loquere, tamquam pater semper a-*  
*diat, sic age, tamquam pater semper vid-*  
*eat.*

Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 10, 5:

Vide ergo ne hoc praecipi salubriter pos-  
sit: *sic vive cum hominibus tamquam*  
*deus videat, sic loquere cum deo tam-*  
*quam homines audiant.*

Vincent has imported from Seneca the last sentence in Boleslaw's letter to Zbigniew, who encroached upon the land of Silesia together with the Bohemians:

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 28, 6:

*Turpe enim est luctari cum onere, quod se-*  
*mel susceperis.*

Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 22, 7:

Expectas forsitan ut tibi haec dicant:  
*turpe est cadere oneri; luctare cum officio*  
*quod semel recepisti.*

In *Chronicle's* Book 3, the same *Letter 22* by Seneca inspires the Ślężanie tribe, who request Prince Boleslaw to declare a battle against the Emperor as they do not want to live in uncertainty any longer. And indeed, the battle of Psie Pole (Hundsfeld) occurs on the following day.

*Chronica Polonorum*, III, 18, 11:

Qui egre ferentes tantum hostem suae  
incubare provinciae, orant Boleslaum  
ne proelium differat, quia mora trahit in  
se periculum et satius esse *semel cadere*  
*quam semper pendere.*

Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 22, 3:

Nemo tam timidus est ut malit *semper*  
*pendere quam semel cadere.*

Also, Seneca has inspired the conclusion of Piotr Włostowic's magnificent oration at the council hosted by Prince Boleslaw III:

*Chronica Polonorum*, III, 20, 9:

*Malo igitur successum nobis deesse quam*  
*experimenta virtutis, etenim virtute*  
*vel etiam ultro in mortem proficisci prae-*  
*clarum.*

Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 25, 2:

An profecturus sim nescio: *malo succes-*  
*sum mihi quam fidem deesse ...*  
(*Ad Heren.*, III, 9: ... *virtute vel ultra mor-*  
*tem proficisci esse praeclarum).*

<sup>61</sup> See Kałuża, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 467–8.

Of Seneca's philosophical writings, the *Moral Letters* are the most frequently quoted in Vincent's work. Does this imply that Vincent's morality is a stoic one? Should a stoical morality consist in repeating Seneca's opinions or beautiful adages, the answer would be a resolute 'yes'. It is more appropriate to say that a few of the characters portrayed in the *Chronicle* 'play' the stoic, one example being the one who orders that the maxims be carved on the gold plaque. Is Prince Boleslaw, who always holds the stoical inscription with him, a genuine stoic – a Polish Marcus Aurelius? The question can be exhilarating. However, the example of Boleslaw, similarly to those of Włostowic and Prince Casimir the Just show that, rather than describing the Polish elite, Vincent portrays them as Roman leaders or statesmen. His sketches of outstanding figures fashion these persons, dressing them in virtue and wisdom as in a senator's toga; thus, Boleslaw is adorned with the Roman *pietas* with respect to his father; Piotr Włostowic wears a Socratic costume, keeping his dagger under the chlamys. Prince Casimir 'wears' the cardinal virtues, derived from the neoplatonic tradition and the book by Macrobius. The *Moral Letters* supplied the chronicler with an enormous resource, which he used by applying sublime polish to a story that otherwise offers scarcity of historical facts.

#### Other imports from Seneca

Medieval scholars and authors were much less versed in other writings of Seneca, the *De beneficiis* and *De clementia* being the best-known among them. However, as will be shown in a moment, traces of acquaintance with the former work in the *Chronicle* are pretty faint, if at all existent. This is basically true with *De providentia* as well. Our observations confirm Chmielewska's opinion rejecting the earlier, mainly the nineteenth-century, suggestions that Kadłubek could have used *De tranquillitate animae* and *De vita beata*. Chmielewska believes that the view that the dialogues have been processed in the *Chronicle* was based on 'approximations' and imprecise comparisons of Seneca's and Vincent's thoughts, with 'commonplace words' or 'typical phrases' being mistaken for meaningful ones, or taken as evidence of 'literary dependencies'. That such methods are deceptive, is obvious.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>62</sup> Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 101–2 and n. 173 (methodological in content). The basic principle, as strongly evidenced by Danuta Borawska (*eadem*, 'Mistrz



Nonetheless, with all her caution, Chmielewska has used the same method on another occasion. She traces the example of the recognised kinship between the *Chronicle's* thought (II, 16, 2) with that of Seneca's *De beneficiis* (II, 1, 1–4) regarding generosity.<sup>63</sup> There is no verbal affinity, whilst there are several similarities in depicting generosity, or munificence. Thus, the philosopher advises against delaying benefaction (*beneficium*) and showing hesitation. More grateful are the gifts that anticipate the wishes of the recipients, being offered as if spontaneously, indulging the recipient. "Nothing has been received free, should the donation have been consequent of a request." Vincent clearly sees the difference between generosity that anticipates a request and one that responds to it. He deems the former worthy of recommendation, as he is convinced that doing good in reply to a request is not giving out of generosity, or grace – that is, 'free-of-charge', or *gratis* – whilst such gesture of postponed grace could be indicative of the benefactor's avarice. Thus, certain similarities are traceable between the Senecan and Vincentian conception of generosity, doing, offering or rendering good (*beneficium*) and moral determinants of such an act. But Seneca's doctrine of *beneficium* is not reducible, in the given context, to such similarities: quite the contrary, the dozen or so centuries between the Roman philosopher's time and the Polish chronicler's days enabled the reflection on generosity to develop and grow, enriched in confrontation with Christian teaching. The topic of *beneficium* formed a shared area of consideration for theologians, philosophers, lawyers, and rhetors.

Seneca writes of the generosity of an affluent *private* person, whilst Kadłubek tells us about a *king* who is willing to display grace before he is ever asked to do so. And he does so because his fragile conscience is afraid of being suspected of parsimony. Instead, we should compare him with Strato, the ruler of Tyre

---

Wincenty w nowym wydaniu i opracowaniu. W stronę cystersów i św. Bernarda z Clairvaux', *Przegląd Historyczny*, 68 (1977), 341–66, esp. 348–9), that single citations from books by other authors should be approached with considerable reserve, is worth bearing in mind. For more on 12th-century copies of *De clementia* (17) and *De beneficiis* (15), see in Olsen, *I classici*, 121. The underlying information used in this section is based upon an earlier study by Birger Munk Olsen, *L'Étude des auteurs classiques latins au XIe e XIIe siècles*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1982–2009).

<sup>63</sup> Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 101.

(*Chronicle*, I, 15):<sup>64</sup> faithful to his mentality, Kadłubek ascribes to him prodigality (*prodigalitas*), anticipatory generosity, and detestation of penury. These two descriptions of royal generosity are quite similar to each other, as far as human characters are concerned; an identical standpoint on anticipating benignity and derogatory avarice was applied in both. Strato was aware of the natural limit of generosity, which was expressed in the rule “not any more than nature requires; not any less than honesty ordains”; primarily, though, he “endeavoured that he be pleasing because of the attributes of his spirit than flesh.”<sup>65</sup> Boleslaw II was free in dispensing things, and wanted to remain so; but he was also free of the ‘higher-tier’ concern. Both portraits are not directly dependent upon Seneca, and presuppose Vincent’s knowledge of other sources. In both descriptions of generosity, Vincent underlines the powerful trait of the Senecan concept of the virtue, as the act preceding the request: “Optimum est antecedere desiderium cuiusque.” Nevertheless, the knowledge to distinguish between when the request ought to be anticipated, and when the request should be gracefully replied to, does not have the trait of the Senecan thought; such differentiation is closer to a political and courtly thinking, rather than philosophical.

The third example of generosity that still needs being mentioned – somewhat ahead of our remarks on Boethius – appears in the portrait of Casimir the Just. As Vincent puts it:

In his fervour for munificence, [Casimir] completely crosses the limits of moderation. In the showing of which, he has been no moderate, ever since his childhood ... [whilst] he proceeds following the example of the River Tagus: the broader she flows, the more of gold sand does she throw off onto the coast. Why, profuse generosity is more valuable than gold.<sup>66</sup>

This fluvial metaphor refers to 10th metre of Book 3 of Boethius’s *De consolatio*ne; what it shows is that the source of Vincent’s thinking about *beneficium* could have had its root in a number of quite diverse writings, including hagiographical ones (considering the tone of the account on Prince Casimir).

---

<sup>64</sup> After Justin, *Epitoma*, XVIII, 3, 6–16. The portrait of the ruler of Tyre is not quite clear; his psychological profile is independent on Justin.

<sup>65</sup> Mistrz Wincenty, *Kronika polska*, 28.

<sup>66</sup> Vincent, *Chronica*, IV, 5, 8–9; Mistrz Wincenty, *Kronika polska*, 186.

Our negative attitude toward the relationship between *Chronica Polonorum* and *De beneficiis* can be confirmed by the second text quoted by Chmielewska in proof of her own opinion. Vincent namely states: “Saepe tamen invitis beneficia praestantur” (III 13, 3) – thus following Seneca’s opinion: “Non est dubium, quin beneficium sit etiam invito prodesse” (V, 20, 1).<sup>67</sup> The French editor and translator of *De officiis* informs the reader that Seneca rejects here the principle *Invito beneficium non datur*,<sup>68</sup> and he also indicates that the maxim is incorporated in Book 50, title 17, column 69 of the *Digesta*. Plezia, the *Chronicle*’s editor, gives the latter as Vincent’s source.<sup>69</sup> But if Seneca indeed contradicts this principle, it clearly means that it was already in use before him. And indeed, we can find it in a work by Lucius Annaeus Seneca the Elder (the Rhetorician), where we see it quoted by Hispo Romanus, a lawyer: “Invito tibi beneficium dedi. Non est quod mireris, nam et tu me non rogantem redemisti.”<sup>70</sup> Thus, it was already in the young years of Seneca the Elder (died ca. 39 AD) that the principle in question was known and discussed at the tribunal. Vincent had at his disposal more sources than just the *De beneficiis* of Seneca the philosopher, and drew from them, as testified by the numerous examples from *Digesta*. As for Plezia and ourselves, following this author, we identify the source (for *Saepe ... praestantur*) as St Augustine, quoted by Gratian: “Multa enim praestantur invitis bona.”<sup>71</sup>

Plezia and Chmielewska are of the opinion that Vincent once quoted (in II, 5, 5) a sentence that was believed to be taken from *De providentia*, 4, 3:<sup>72</sup>

<sup>67</sup> Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 101.

<sup>68</sup> Sènèque, *Des bienfaits*, ii, ed. and trans. into French by François Préchac (Paris, 1972), 27.

<sup>69</sup> Justinian, *Digesta*, ed. Theodor Mommsen, with adjustments by Paul Krüger, in *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, i: *Institutiones, Digesta* (Dublin and Zürich, 1973); the title ascribes the disposition to Paulus, a Roman lawyer and law theoretician (late 2nd/early 3rd c.).

<sup>70</sup> L. Annaeus Seneca Maior, *Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae, divisiones, colores* [IX, 1, 11], ed. Lennart Håkanson (Leipzig, 1989), 240. In IX, 1, the issue of *beneficium* is the subject of dispute.

<sup>71</sup> Vincent, *Chronica*, apparatus of the sources, re. III, 13, 3.

<sup>72</sup> As we could see in the section on *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Chapter 5, par. 5 of the *Chronicle*’s Book 2 is a mosaic composed of three pieces: *Ad Lucil.*, 18, 12, *Ad Heren.*, IV, 24, and *De provid.*, 4, 3. This particular import has been confirmed by Dramon.

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 5, 5:

Seneca, *De providentia*, 4, 3:

Unde cuidam a sapiente dictum est: *Miserum te iudico, quod numquam fuisti semper te puta miserum, quia numquam fuisti miser.*

Vincent announces that he will cite a sage, not specifying his name. Is it Seneca and his *De providentia* indeed? Should this be the case, we would have at least one undisputable crypto-quote taken from a work other than *Moral Letters*. But just because it would be the only quotation from *De providentia*, we deem it fair to accept that Seneca's words were transferred to the *Chronicle* via the collection of fine maxims, known as the *Proverbia Senecae secundum ordinem alphabeti*, where the *dictum* in question can be found under no. 52. These *Proverbs* have been edited by Gilles G. Meersseman, based on the Trier manuscript, of French origin. The editor dates this series of proverbs at the end of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century. The *proverbium* exactly repeats the quoted words from *De providentia*.<sup>73</sup> We have no evidence or certainty that would enable us to claim that Vincent Kadłubek ever used any other writings of Seneca the philosopher, apart from the *Moral Letters*.

## VII MACROBIUS

It seems initially legitimate to assume that there is a certain degree of correlation between Macrobius's *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis* and Master Vincent's *Chronica*, without going deeper into details and meanderings of the borrowings. It is on this particular work that the knowledge of the Latin Middle Ages and of Vincent on the fourfold distinction of virtues was based on. Some of them, such as justice and virtues of purified mind, are mentioned in the *Chronicle*, whereas the origin of other, minor virtues, or their dependence upon political, i.e., cardinal, virtues, has not been determined yet. Also, we do not know

<sup>73</sup> Chmielewska, *Rola wstków*, 102. Meersseman, 'Seneca maestro di spiritualità', 68–77; the proverb: "Miserum te iudico, quod numquam fuisti miser" appears on p. 74, no. 52, repeating the Seneca text word by word. All the sayings have been excerpted from the dialogues: *De providentia*, *De constantia*, and *De ira*. For manuscript 44 of the Seminary Library of Trier, see Meersseman, 'Seneca maestro di spiritualità', 46, 48.

whether Vincent learned the basics of philosophical ethics from the *Commentary* by Macrobius, or from another author. He had a nodding acquaintance with issues related to numerology, but what he talks about remains within the basics, thus preventing us from discussing the possible influence of Macrobius in this respect.<sup>74</sup>

### Saturnalia

Strictly speaking, we find in the *Chronicle* only one interesting trace of the *Saturnalia*, namely, the mention of Caninius, a one-day consul, whom Cicero mentions several times, particularly in the letters *Ad familiares*, VII, 30, 1. Following Cicero, and using similar irony, Macrobius refers to Caninius twice in his *Saturnalia* (II, 3, 6 and VII, 3, 10). While scholars clearly point to Cicero's letter as the ultimate source of the anecdote, their opinions regarding the intermediary link between this author and the Polish chronicler vary. Plezia hypothesises about two intermediaries: Cicero's collection of maxims entitled *Facete dicta Tulliana* and the *Saturnalia*; Kürbis believes that it was John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* (VII, 25); Chmielewska considers Vincent's use of Cicero and Macrobius "no less plausible", since Vincent knew both of them.<sup>75</sup> Hence, one should ask: Does Vincent cite Cicero's words based on this author's letter, or based on Macrobius, or some other intermediary?

*Chronica Polonorum*, I, 14, 1:

O magnae *vigilantiae* principem, cuius oculus *somnum* in principatu *non vidit!*

*Saturnalia*, II, 3, 6:

*Vigilantem* habemus consulem Caninium, qui in consulatu suo *somnum non vidit.*

Neither Macrobius text nor the relevant fragments of *Policraticus* and the *Chronicle* prove to be directly dependent on Cicero's letter.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>74</sup> Brygida Kürbis, 'Motywy makrobiańskie w *Kronice* Mistrza Wincentego a szkoła w Chartres', *Studia Źródloznawcze*, 17 (1972), 67–79; Borawska, 'Mistrz Wincenty'.

<sup>75</sup> Vincent, *Chronica*, I, 14, 1 – source apparatus; Mistrz Wincenty, *Kronika polska*, 27, n. 76; Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 108.

<sup>76</sup> Cicero, *Correspondence*, ix, ed. Jean Beaujeu (Paris, 1988), 31 (this edition observes a chronological arrangement of the letters. The letter under discussion is numbered DCCXIV; in other editions: *Fam.*, VII, 30, 1): "Ita Caninio consule scito neminem prandisse; nihil tamen eo consule mali factum est; fuit enim mirifica

The *Saturnalia* exactly reproduces its model, the *Facete dicta Tulliana*. John of Salisbury rewrites the text he had read in *Saturnalia*, preserving its second part unchanged. The text offered by Vincent is an even more distant alteration of the sentence from *Saturnalia*, based on synonyms and somewhat affected. The genealogy behind this text forms a chain: Cicero's *Letter DCCXIV* – *Facete dicta Tulliana* – *Saturnalia* – the *Chronicle*. Hence, we follow Plezia's suggestions: Macrobius had access to *Facete dicta*, the collection of Tullius's adages. Different series of such sayings had already been compiled in Cicero's lifetime – and Cicero was at times the author. Modified and altered, they survived till the Middle Ages. One of such collections, titled *Facete dicta Tulliana* was used by Macrobius, at several occasions, in his *Commentary* and his *Saturnalia*. While Vincent might have come across these *dicta*, he might equally well have used Macrobius's *prosimetrum*.<sup>77</sup>

As a few surviving medieval codices attest, it was not completely impossible to find Cicero's correspondence in the twelfth century. All the same, we do not (yet) know Vincent as a great discoverer of Cicero's works, comparable to men of learning of the Italian Renaissance. A single borrowing from the *Letters* would be astonishing. Conversely, an import from *Saturnalia*, even if one-and-only, would not be surprising.

### *Commentarii in somnium Scipionis*

The *Commentary* was more frequently read in the Middle Ages than the *Saturnalia*. Plezia indicates four passages where Vincent meets Macrobius. Chmielewska, in her dissertation, discusses critically a considerable number of such influences, motifs and borrowings, and offers

vigilantia, qui suo toto consulatu somnum non viderit". John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, VII, 25 (Webb's edn.: ii, 224, vv 16–17): "Vigilantissimus est consul noster Canius [! – ZK, DC] qui in consulatu suo sompnum non vidit." The second part of this sentence exactly repeats its correspondent fragment in *Saturnalia*, the latter being well-known and openly cited in *Policraticus* (see Webb's edn.: ii, 223, v 19).

<sup>77</sup> Cicero, *Fragmenta ex libris philosophicis, ex aliis libris deperditis, ex scriptis incertis*, ed. Giovanna Garbarino (Milano, 1984), 145 (*Facete dicta Tulliana*, no. 63), and the introduction (pp. 35–6). Another reference, pointed out by Plezia and Chmielewska (*Rola wątków*, 112), is the frequently cited proverb "Similar seeks similar" (*Chronicle*, II, 1, 1; *Saturnalia*, VII, 7, 12); the proverb is, possibly, of medical origin. The second proverb, "Custom is second nature", was discussed earlier, in connection with Cicero's *De finibus*. We ascribe these proverbs to no specific author.

a global specification of the Vincent–Macrobius situation.<sup>78</sup> Most of the parallels discussed form good material for a comparative study on Vincent’s thought, but it has not much to do with the real take-overs, which may turn out to be an initial stage of a study in a doctrinal area. Hence, we resort to the findings of Plezia, in order to confine ourselves to what this publisher has considered to be the Macrobian heritage:

1. *Chronica Polonorum*, IV, 5, 5 = *Commentaria*, I, 8, 5–7
2. *Chronica Polonorum*, IV, 5, 25 = *Commentaria*, II, 10, 2
3. *Chronica Polonorum*, IV, 13, 6 = *Commentaria*, I, 5, 3
4. *Chronica Polonorum*, IV, 9, 4 = *Commentaria*, I, 5, 11; II, 2, 12

The first of the comparisons is somewhat ill-matched and not concordant with Macrobius: of the four ‘orders’ of the four cardinal virtues, Vincent only mentions the first two, i.e., the political and the purifying virtues. The latter are apparently Macrobian, because, according to our neoplatonic thinker, someone engaged in politics is incapable of attaining the level of purifying virtue. Consequently, Macrobius would not attribute those virtues to Casimir the Just, as Vincent did in his *Chronicle* (IV, 5, 5): therefore, we do not consider this fragment as a possible borrowing from Macrobius. Without further research, we would not know whether Kadłubek learned about the four kinds of virtue from Macrobius or from some other treatises which transmitted the same doctrine.<sup>79</sup>

Let us pass on to the second comparison:

*Chronica Polonorum*, IV, 5, 25:

Prudens enim virtutis fructum in conscientia metit, minus perfectus in ostentatione ...

Macrobius, *Comm.*, II, 10, 2:

Virtutis fructum sapiens in conscientia ponit, minus perfectus in gloria.

Vincent’s sentence is probably a fine example of how synonyms can be used, regardless of whether the model sentence be ascribed to Macrobius or to someone else. We are dealing here with a maxim

<sup>78</sup> Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 109–11. We omit here the rare terms, as they appear in other authors; this is also the reason why we have neglected the Damocles’s sword anecdote (V: I, 6, 4 = M.: I, 10, 16). Chmielewska’s critique mainly refers to Kürbis, ‘Motywy makrobiańskie’.

<sup>79</sup> Our reservation about Vincent’s knowledge of Macrobian philosophy is mentioned in Kałuża, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 398–401.

which was already known, and subject to contamination in the twelfth century. We come across it in such a function, in the *Moralium dogma philosophorum* (I.C.1): “Virtutis enim fructum sapiens in conscientia, stultus autem in gloria ponit.”<sup>80</sup> Unless proved otherwise, this undermines the statement that *Chronica Polonorum* is directly dependent upon Macrobius’s *Commentary*. We only admit that Vincent’s phrase is closer to Macrobius than the adage from *Moralium dogma philosophorum*; still, this is a single phrase taken out of context, and so it remains. The third parallel was, pertinently, rejected by Chmielewska as a banal conglomerate of commonplace words.<sup>81</sup>

The last parallel concerns the ‘symbolism of the number eight’.<sup>82</sup> Vincent writes:

Est autem octonarius primus solidorum numerorum inter pares et numerus beatitudinum, quod signat solidas esse debere constitutiones.

Vincent starts off from the number of eight saints – the ‘solid’ priests – and, by way of association, evokes the beatitudes (eight blessings) and the first even *numerus solidus*. Macrobius asserts that eight is the first ‘solid’ even number (solids, i.e. three-dimensional bodies, are

<sup>80</sup> John Holmberg (ed.), *Das Moraliū dogma philosophorum des Guillelmus de Conchis. Lateinisch, altfranzösisch und Mittelniederfränkisch* (Paris, Uppsala, and Leipzig, 1929), p. 31, 16–17, chapter ‘De magnanimitate’.

<sup>81</sup> Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 111, n. 216.

<sup>82</sup> Kürbis writes about the symbolic, but unclear, meaning of the number eight in her commentary to Mistrz Wincenty’s *Kronika polska*, 202, n. 124; *eadem*, in the article ‘Motywy makrobiańskie’, 69 (“This first ‘solid’ number among the even numbers raises the importance of the Łęczycza congress of 1180, for this corresponded with the number of Polish bishops attending.”); Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 109. Numbers in medieval literature are discussed by Ernst R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1953) – see Index of Subjects and Terms, s.v. ‘numbers’. Édouard Jeuneau, ‘L’usage de la notion d’*integumentum* à travers les gloses de Guillaume de Conches’, in “*Lectio philosophorum*”: recherches sur l’École de Chartres (Amsterdam, 1973), 161–4; *idem*, ‘Jean Scot et la Métaphysique des Nombres’, in Werner Beierwalter (ed.), *Begriff und Metapher. Sprachform des Denkens bei Eriugena. Vorträge des VII. Internationalen Eriugena-Colloquiums, Werner-Reimers-Stiftung Bad Homburg, 26.–29. Juli 1989* (Heidelberg, 1990), 126–41; presently, in this author’s collection of writings titled “*Tendenda vela*”. *Excursions littéraires et digressions philosophiques à travers le Moyen Âge* (Turnhout, 2007), 461–77; for Macrobius, 465–6. I omit herein the issue of numerology and arithmetic of 12th-century Cistercians, and their possible connections with Vincentius’s *Chronicle*: potentially, the subject of another research.



similarly stable), which implies that there are some solid odd numbers as well. William of Conches writes about it in his *Glosae super Timaeum Platonis* (LXIII, 11-13):

A number that has three identical words whilst multiplied is called a solid one; for instance, two times two times two is eight, and three times three times three is twenty-seven; both results of multiplication are called 'solid' due to their similarity to solids, being stable bodies. They have three identical words, as solids have three identical dimensions.<sup>83</sup>

These 'solids' are hexahedrons. Thus, being the product of threefold multiplication of the first even number (two), eight is the first solid even number ( $2 * 2 * 2 = 8$ ); correspondingly, twenty-seven is the first solid odd number within the odd-number line ( $3 * 3 * 3 = 27$ ), whereas solid numbers apparently can also mean solids. The issue is thus elementary vocabulary in the field of numerology and basic arithmetic, shared by mathematicians of various epochs: Boethius (*Institutio arithmetica*, II, 4, 6–8), Macrobius (*Comm.*, I, 5, 11; II, 2, 3 and 7; II, 2, 12), William of Conches, and others. There is not sufficient reason to link, on the basis of this argument, the *Chronicle* with Macrobius's *Commentary*. In the twelfth century, playthings of this sort were in vogue: suffice it to mention the enormous numbers of *quaternaria*, *septenaria*, *octonaria* (and so on), produced at that time. Similar schemes were used used to arrange the truths of the faith, Christian obligations, interdictions and injunctions, etc.

## VIII BOETHIUS

### *De consolatione philosophiae*

Although it has been known, since the nineteenth century, that Boethius was among the sources of *Chronica Polonorum*, the focus has been confined to the *De consolatione philosophiae*. Historians

---

<sup>83</sup> *Guillelmi de Conchis Glosae super Platonem*, ed. Édouard A. Jeauneau (Textes philosophiques du Moyen-Âge, 13, Paris, 1965), LXIII, 135; edn. in *Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 203 (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 110, 11–111, 13. The operation of multiplication mentioned by the authors, can alternatively be presented as the function of raising of a sequence of even/odd numbers to a power:  $2^3 = 8$ ;  $4^3 = 64$ , ...; and,  $3^3 = 27$ ;  $5^3 = 125$  ...; and so on.

have systematically neglected Boethius as translator and commentator of Aristotle's logical writings – and, doubtlessly the first teacher of logic in early medieval schools. This study endeavours to cover both types of Boethius's literary activity. It has also been assumed since the 19th century that there are four *Consolation* take-overs existing in the *Chronicle*. However, with time, as the criteria of historical research changed – with 'approximations' and 'reminders' replaced by critical elaboration of sources, the number of these alleged take-overs was reduced by half. Effectively, the two borrowings, recognised as such by Plezia, Chmielewska and the undersigned, are the following:

1. *Chronica Polonorum*, I, 19, 5 = Boethius, *De consolazione*, I, 4, 1
2. *Chronica Polonorum*, II, 14, 4 = Boethius, *De consolazione*, I, 2, 2

The first of the parallels calls for two remarks. First, it carries the words Philosophy uttered to Boethius when imprisoned: "Do you let it get into your spirit? Can it reach your consciousness?" Had Vincent known Greek, he could have replied spitefully, "Or, are you like a donkey at the lyre (*onos lyras*)?" But the phrase of donkey and lyre is written in Greek, and the chronicler has omitted it. Thus, the topos of donkey listening to a harp, or playing the harp, remained unknown to Polish twelfth-century men of letters.<sup>84</sup> Kadłubek also omits the immediately subsequent Greek citation from the *Iliad* (I, 363): "Pronounce it, and hide it not in your soul." Whereas we cannot pride ourselves on a twelfth-century quotation from Homer, however. Looking at this first set of fragments of the *Chronicle* and *Consolation*, we can watch a reversal in moral terms: in *De consolazione*, Philosophy desires to heal the philosopher's soul, whereas in the *Chronicle*, the wife of Pompilius II poisons the king's soul, persuading him to commit the crime of homicide. Second, strikingly enough, Kadłubek puts the words uttered by Philosophy into the mouth of a woman who is certainly beautiful (*illecebrae*),<sup>85</sup> but madly cruel. And it is she, in a fit of pique, who addresses Pompilius for the second time, using the Philosopher's words, thus concluding her 'point',

<sup>84</sup> For further information, see Édouard Jeuneau, *L'âge d'or des écoles de Chartres* (Chartres, 1995), 11–12.

<sup>85</sup> Pompilius the Younger was 'elated with the charms of a certain poisoner' (I, 19, 1: "cuiusdam venefice debriatus illecebris").

which is rewritten from Aristotle's *De sophisticis elenchis*! In effect, Boethius extends Aristotle's pronouncement in the disgraceful scene of the poisoner's talk with the king.

There are a number of as yet unrecognised crypto-quotes and allusions to Boethius's *De consolazione*. In one of them, Philosophy, meditating on the transitoriness of things and the lot that has affected Boethius, pronounces the opinion that the appraisal ought to come at the very end of all things: "the verge of things is assessed by prudence." Jan imports this opinion into the *Chronicle*, turning it into the instrument of his own thought: "It belongs to the prudent man to evaluate the matters in line with their outcome, since what has a good end, is good in itself." Uttered by Jan, this adage has manifold meanings: it gives grounds to the penalty that 'the entire kin of Boleslaw has suffered for Saint Stanislaus'; it confirms, as if experimentally, a deficient quality of the lineage, and warns against premature appraisal in general – and, with respect to the specific rule in particular. This leads to taking a relativistic view of any good the deceased ruler had ever done.<sup>86</sup> The *Chronicle* passage and its underlying model can be compared:

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 21, 1:

*Prudentis est rerum exitus metiri, quia cuius finis bonus ipsum quoque bonum.*

Boethius, *De consolazione*, II, 1, 15:

Neque enim quod ante oculos situm est suffererit intueri: *rerum exitus prudentia metitur* eademque in alterutro mutabilitas nec formidandas fortunae minas nec exoptandas facit esse blanditias.

The two subsequent fragments are inspired by the same sentence, in which Boethius asks the question: Who on earth is blissful or prosperous enough, so as not to be dissatisfied for any reason? This is, as it were, a continuation of the consideration of human lot and destiny: Vincent generalises Philosophy's query and makes it a part of Judith's and Władysław Herman's letter to the abbot of St Giles. To quote the relevant passage: "Although there may exist some human happiness, it may never be perfect. Nobody is to such extent happy, to avoid brawling with a part of his happiness."

<sup>86</sup> We use here the edition: Boethius, *De consolazione philosophiae, Opuscula theologica*, ed. Claudio Moreschini (München and Leipzig, 2000). Cf. Marian Plezia, *Dookoła sprawy świętego Stanisława. Studium źródłoznawcze* (Kraków, 2003), 116–17.

*Chronica Polonorum*, II, 22, 3:

Et si ulla esse possit, perfecta esse non potest humana *felicitas*. Nemo enim tam felix est, qui non cum aliqua suae *felicitatis parte rixetur*.

Boethius, *De consolazione*, II, 4, 12:

Quis est enim tam compositae *felicitatis* ut non aliqua ex parte cum status sui qualitate rixetur?

In Book IV, following the enumeration of all the successful marriages between the sons and daughters of Mieszko the Old (Mieszko Stary), the chronicler thus says of the Prince himself:

What should one wish moreover? It seemed to him that nothing failed at the *summum* of the human happiness, albeit nobody is to such extent happy, to avoid brawling with a part of his happiness.

*Chronica Polonorum*, IV, 2, 5:

Quid amplius? Nihil prorsus illi visum est humanae *felicitatis* ad cumulum defuisse, quamvis nemo tam sit felix, qui non cum aliqua suae *felicitatis parte rixetur*.

Boethius, *De consolazione*, II, 4, 12:

Quis est enim tam compositae *felicitatis* ut non aliqua ex parte cum status sui qualitate rixetur?

The gold thrown off by the waves of the Tagus has already been mentioned: the gold-bearing river is an image of generosity, the highly esteemed virtue of rulers.

*Chronica Polonorum*, IV, 5, 9:

... sed instar *Tagi* fluminis quo largius defluit, eo uberius *aureis harenis* inundat.

Boethius, *De consolazione*, III, m. X, 7:

Non quicquid *Tagus aureis harenis*/donat aut Hermus, rutilante ripa ...

The last crypto-quote in Vincent repeats exactly what Boethius had written: "Should you await assistance from a physician, what you have to do is discover the wound." It is Philosophy that utters these words in *De consolazione*, as she is willing to cure Boethius, her student. The *Chronicle* offers a different story: these same words come from a vixen in a fable of a gryphon with a broken wing; taking the vixen's advice, the gryphon gets his other wing broken and is eventually devoured by animals. While in Boethius the words in question are meant to initiate a rescue, they are to lead to death in Vincent's concept:

*Chronica Polonorum*, IV, 26, 8:

Tunc illa: Si *medicantis operam expectas*, necesse est ut *vulnus detegas*.

Boethius, *De consolazione*, I, 4, 1:

... si *operam medicantis exspectas*, oportet *vulnus detegas*.

So, we are back now where the Boethian peregrination started – and thus the circle of the *Chronicle*'s associations with *De consolacione* has been closed up. Vincent has smuggled Boethius into the *Chronica* seven times: once in Book 1, three times each in Book 2 and 4. The use of Boethius's work seems to have had a purely literary purpose; the only philosophical problem contributed to by the *Consolation* is the reflection on the fragility of human fate and transitory nature of happiness. The evocation of Boethius's authority in view of the appraisal of Boleslaw II's family and house, and of the death of Boleslaw's son Mieszko, is political in purpose – a deliberate act in support of the younger branch of the Piast dynasty.

### Boethius, the commentator of Aristotle

There are three citations from *De topicis differentiis* to be mentioned: more has been said previously about the crypto-citations from this particular work, the third having been discovered a few years ago.<sup>87</sup> Let us then limit ourselves to recalling the facts.

Firstly, writing of the advantages of the young Boleslaw, son of Władysław Herman, Vincent notices (II, 24, 2) that his qualities gave him much glory amongst the prudent, and no less envy amidst the wicked. And he adds: "Because virtue loves its own self, despising whatever is contrary thereto." As we recall, this Ciceronian opinion was beautifully adopted by Boethius – and repeated after the latter by the Polish author.<sup>88</sup>

Secondly, while praising (within the same chapter) the intellectual and character qualities and the virtues of Boleslaw, Vincent defines what he names virtue, describing it as "the habit of a well-formed mind" ("virtus est habitus mentis bene constitutae"; II, 24, 5). The same definition was given by Boethius in his *De topicis differentiis*.<sup>89</sup> Added to the definition, the explanation of the term *habitus*, which refers to a certain quality (*qualitas*) which one never loses, was

---

<sup>87</sup> The fourth quotation from the same work by Boethius is discussed in Kałuża, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 372–3, n. 7; there is a *locus a fine*: "cuius finis bonus est, ipsum quoque bonum est"; Nikitas (ed.), *Boethius' 'De topicis differentiis'*, p. 35, 20–1.

<sup>88</sup> See above, n. 44.

<sup>89</sup> *De topicis differentiis*, II, 7; Nikitas (ed.), *Boethius' 'De topicis differentiis'*, p. 33, 6–11; PL 64, 1188D.

compiled on the basis of Chapter 8 of Aristotle's *Categories*.<sup>90</sup> School education has propagated this particular definition of virtue, along with other definitions juxtaposed against it.

Thirdly, Vincent refers, in Book 2 (II, 28, 42), to the topical issues, which is of interest to logicians as well as lawyers-rhetoricians – specifically, to the argument known as *locus a maiori*: “Through the ‘argument *a maiore*’, it is brighter than the sun, that there was no cause, nor place, nor essence of things nor human nature could have admitted a felony.”<sup>91</sup>

There are two reasons why we have chosen *De topicis differentiis* as the source the chronicler bore in mind as he evoked an *a maiori* argument at the end of the defence oration. The first reason was that we already saw he used this text twice, since Boethius's treatise on *loci* was more frequently studied in the twelfth century than any other. The second reason was that the Boethian explanation of the *a maiori* argument shows that it is possible to use it in a trial for treason, and thus in the lawsuit against Zbigniew. We have not found this explanation in any other author of those indicated by Nikitas, the editor of Boethius's treatise – including Cicero, Martianus Capella, or Isidore. This is how Boethius foresees the way his argument may be used:

If the one who persecuted his homeland before the war has finally been granted forgiveness from the citizens, why should the one who stayed in exile, due to a rebellion he had raised (and thus, did not take part in the defence of his homeland), not deserve forgiveness?<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> Kałuża, *Lektury filozoficzne*, 165. It is about the first type of quality, comprising sciences and virtues, and their contra-distinctions; Aristoteles Latinus, ‘*Categoriae*’, 8, in *Categoriae vel Praedicamenta. Translatio Boethii, Editio Composita, Translatio Guillelmi de Moerbeka, Lemmata e Simplicii commentario decerpta, Pseudo-Augustini Paraphrasis Themistianiana*, ed. Lorenzo Minio-Paluello (Bruges and Paris, 1961), p. 23, 22–4, 13. This is, most probably, the only quote from the *Categories* in the entire *Chronicle*. Gilbert of Poitiers needs being added to the authors mentioned in the said study; in his commentary to Boethius's *De hebdomadibus*, Gilbert uses the second definition proposed by Boethius. Nikolaus M. Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers* (Toronto, 1966), 227, no. 182.

<sup>91</sup> Mistrz Wincenty, *Kronika polska*, 110; the rendering is based on a slightly modified translation by Brygida Kürbis. Vincent, *Chronica*, II, 27, 42: “Luce igitur clarius per locum a maiori liquet et causam et locum maleficii defuisse, nec ipsam rerum aut hominum naturam consentire maleficio potuisse.”

<sup>92</sup> Boethius, *De topicis differentiis*, III, 3, 32–3; Nikitas (ed.), *Boethius' 'De topicis differentiis'*, p. 56, 13–16: “Comparatio vero maioris est, quotiens id quod minus est

The rationale behind this argument was immediately clear to the educated reader (and witness to the trial). After all, we can well remember that Vincent did a similar thing, as he resorted, in the accusation of Zbigniew, to the model of homeland betrayal found in *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.

## IX CONCLUSIONS

In order to more clearly appreciate the presence in the *Chronica Polonorum*, of references to philosophical texts (save for Cicero) and to *Rhetorica ad Herennium* – the texts that were the most frequently used in the twelfth century – we have supplied this contributory essay with a global table of the authors and books cited. It is a list of some very specific sources for the *Chronicle*. They are specific because they are not subject to ordinary criticism of their reliability and, rather than determining historical facts, they are used as a means of commenting on what the author–chronicler deems to have been facts, words uttered, and opinions formulated. This being the case, the list of authors and books (below) is not a bibliographic inventory of ‘historical sources’ for Poland under the Piast dynasty. Because of the style in which this history is told, it would be more fitting to refer to literary sources behind the *Chronicle*. Yet, this is not what we have been seeking.

We have been interested in everything that was read in Poland in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century: which books were used by the Polish elite, which works and authors the political elite shaped its thinking and, presumably, actions. Possessing or non-possessing a book is also an important historical and cultural fact – so difficult to establish in Poland, so many centuries afterwards. The list of books read and quoted by Vincent is probably the first which is so comprehensive, which clearly shows the role of philosophical books in both the *Chronicle* and, generally, in Polish culture in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century.

---

maiori comparatur. Ab hoc loco ita sumitur argumentum: si is, qui patriam bello persecutus est, tandem a civibus veniam meruit, cur non is quoque mereatur, qui ob seditionem motam actus est in exilium? Quaestio de accidente, argumentum a comparatione maioris. Maxima propositio: quod in re maiore valet, valet in minore.”

Having this in mind, we should now carefully evaluate the amassed material. We specify below the authors selected with respect to their importance in the *Chronicle* and frequency of citations.

	I	II	III	IV	Total
Plato, <i>Timaeus</i>	6	1			7
Aristotle, <i>Topica</i>		3			3
Aristotle, <i>De sophisticis elenchis</i> , I	2	1	1		4
<i>Rhetorica ad Herennium</i>		8	2		10
Cicero, <i>Cato de senectute</i>		2		1	3
Seneca, <i>Ad Lucilium Epistolae morales</i>	2	11	5	1	19
Boethius, <i>De consolatione philosophiae</i>	1	3		3	7
Boethius, <i>De topicis differentiis</i>		4			4
Total	11	33	8	5	57

The *Moral Letters to Lucilius* is the most frequently cited philosophical book. This fact has been known for a very long time; this study will enrich the already-known effigy of Seneca found in Kadłubek. It is rather hard to define the specific role of these quotations, but we think that the observation of Chmielewska that only ‘respectable persons speak using Seneca’s words’ is correct.<sup>93</sup> Seneca frequently proved supportive in formulating moral principles and admonishments, all of which give the *Chronicle* the well known moralistic tone. If we were to point to one definite achievement of our effort for the history of books in Poland, it should consist in the finding that Vincent did not have or know the second part of the *Letters to Lucilius*. Whether Part one had a complete text of eighty-eight letters, or consisted merely of excerpts, is impossible to establish. We consider it quite plausible that, apart from the *Letters*, Vincent had copies of apocryphal *Proverbia Senecae* and some *florilegia*. He could have had access to collections of Cicero’s and Varro’s adages, as well as the *Proverbs* of Publilius Syrus.

Plato’s *Timaeus* and *Rhetorica ad Herennium* were the two books that had a decisive role in constructing and compiling the *Chronica Polonorum*. The introductory section of *Timaeus* provided a model of recounting the past, with which Vincent, following Plato, engaged those belonging to an earlier generation. He did not learn history from Jan or Mateusz: the age difference between them was too great; instead, Vincent learned his history of Poland from the anonymous

<sup>93</sup> Chmielewska, *Rola wątków*, 99.



author traditionally called Gallus, whilst Plato taught him how to adopt and adapt fable as history. The presence of Plato in the *Chronicle*, attested through citations and allusions, is reinforced by one borrowing, which bears traces of contamination through William of Conches's *Accessus ad Platonem*, and which served Vincent in building the character of Krakus, and by a short import from Calcidius's letter to Osius (*Osio suo Calcidius*), which preceded the Calcidian version of *Timaeus*. One can assume with a high degree of probability that there were three items forming Vincent Kadłubek's *Corpus Platonicum*: the *Accessus*, *Osio suo Calcidius* and *Timaeus* – whether owned by him or lent to him for his use.

In the light of our research, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* appears to be one of the major sources for the *Chronicle*. It was this particular book that played the primary part in constructing the fictitious litigation against Prince Zbigniew, Władysław Herman's son. The *Rhetorica* also provided ready to use models of court speeches and juridical argumentation; Vincent willingly took advantage of both. Finally, the *Ad Herennium* aroused in Vincent interest in the area called *exornatio*, and taught him how to use a high writing style. It is almost certain that we have not detected all the links between the *Chronica* and the *Rhetorica*, which is particularly true for Book 4 of the latter; yet, this has not really been our purpose. We are certain, in any case, that thorough and meticulous examination of these will once again provide interesting new results. The good practical utilization of the *Ad Herennium* in the *Chronicle* has enabled us to successfully guess the role of Aristotle's *Topics* and *On Sophistical Refutations* – two works which crowned the orator's education by teaching him the techniques of plausible argumentation, and false and erroneous arguments. This served as preparation for serious forensic and scientific discussions.

The complete list of citations shows that the *Chronicle*'s Book 4 functioned on a somewhat separate basis: the citations based on this section prove to be quite scarce. It looks as if this book had been written in a different, 'leaner and meaner' library. We can only see three authors there: Boethius, Seneca, and Cicero, and merely five 'philosophical' quotations. But we have to take into consideration the fact that the 'illustrious men', Jan and Mateusz, whose utterances were embellished with crypto-citations, are absent in it. In the other books, we come across 'blocks' of citations. We can see Plato dominating over the initial section of Book 1. This dominant position, reinforced

by *Accessus ad Platonem*, most clearly reflects the role of *Timaeus* as the model for recounting the mythical history of Poland. Vincent's contacts with *Accessus* and with Calcidius's letter of dedication letter testify that the chronicler's encounter with Plato was not coincidental.

In Book 2, the imports from *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and, partly, from Aristotelian treatises on erroneous reasoning, form an even more extensive block of citations. Save for one quote from Seneca, the only works of authority for the orations delivered at Zbigniew's trial (II, 28, 12–25 and 28–43) are *Ad Herennium*, *De sophisticis elenchis*, and *Topica* by Aristotle and Boethius. As for Aristotle, this author once again reappears in the 'judgement on the court' – that is, in Book 2, Chapter 29. Between the two orations (II, 28, 26–7), time and space at the tribunal is filled with 'agitation of the audience', as instructed by the *Rhetorica*. The court hearing makes evident to us the role the anonymous *Rhetorica* in Vincent's *Chronicle* and the former work's practical relationship with the aforesaid writings of Aristotle. While comparing the *Chronicle* to the *Rhetorica*, we can see that the latter complements the legal addenda – and that apart from acquaintance with the law, Vincent has also gained considerable knowledge of the procedure and course of trials, the skill to compile court orations and to use efficacious argumentation. In the *Rhetorica*, he had found numerous models of speeches, which he transferred to his *Chronica*. In this respect, Book 4 of the *Rhetorica* deserves particular attention. The knowledge of the law he had acquired dominates over Vincent's attitude toward the *Rhetorica*, which is obvious – as well as over philosophy, as we could see, based on the seventh fragment of *Timaeus*, which was quoted to explain the reasons for the ritual haircutting.

We may find, to our astonishment, that the murder of Bishop Stanislaus by Boleslaw II (II, 16–21) inspired no philosophical thought in Vincent. What we can see there instead is a brief take-over from Seneca, which is irrelevant, and – more important for the chronicler's historiosophical view of the history he describes – the finding (worded after Boethius) that the miserable end of Boleslaw's reign and the death of his son testify to how evil their entire family was.

\*\*\*

Was Vincent a philosopher? The answer to such a question is not our task or focal interest, here. His knowledge of philosophical issues was considerable; the works he read included texts from this field

of knowledge; the *Chronicle* bears unambiguous proof of its author's knowledge of Plato's *Timaeus*, and twice makes clear allusions to scepticism. His legal and moral stance seems to have been shaped by Roman Law, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, and (possibly, indirectly) Macrobius. The role of Seneca, who is, in a sense, 'omnipresent' in the *Chronicle*, is not as clearly apparent. What we can say now about citing the philosophers relates to the decorum of the *Chronicle*: to the characters, respectable figures adorned with titles from the period of the Late Empire, Kadłubek recites fine sayings of the harsh chiefs and leaders from the years of the Republic – as if he wanted to show us that *virtus* opens the first scene in the theatre of Polish history.

trans. Tristan Korecki

#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Mistrza Wincentego zwanego Kadłubkiem Kronika polska / Magistri Vincentii dicti Kadłubek Chronica Polonorum*, ed. Marian Plezia (Monumenta Poloniae Historica, N.S., 9, Kraków, 1994).
- Mistrz Wincenty Kadłubek, *Kronika polska*, trans. and ed. Brygida Kürbis (Wrocław, 2003).
- Die Chronik der Polen des Magisters Vincentius*, trans., foreword and ed. Eduard Mühle (Darmstadt, 2014).
- Banaszkiewicz Jacek, *Polskie dzieje bajeczne mistrza Wincentego Kadłubka* (Wrocław, 2002).
- Chmielewska Katarzyna, *Rola wątków i motywów antycznych w Kronice polskiej mistrza Wincentego zwanego Kadłubkiem* (Częstochowa, 2003).
- Dąbrówka Andrzej and Wojtowicz Witold, *Onus Athlanteum. Studia nad Kroniką Mistrza Wincentego* (Studia Staropolskie, S.N., 25 [81], Warszawa, 2009); pp. 476–527 – materials for a bibliography by Karol Kollinger.
- Kałuża Zenon, *Lektury filozoficzne Wincentego Kadłubka. Zbiór studiów* (Warszawa, 2014).
- Michałowska Teresa, *Literatura polskiego średniowiecza wobec poetyki europejskiej ("Ornatus difficilis")* (Warszawa, 2008).
- Pawłowski Krzysztof, *Retoryka starożytna w kronice Wincentego Kadłubka. Sztuka narracji* (Kraków, 2003).
- Plezia Marian, *Scripta minora. Łacina średniowieczna i Wincenty Kadłubek* (Kraków, 2001).
- Cistercium mater nostra*, ii, 2 (2008).
- Studia Źródłoznawcze*, xx (1976).

APPENDIX  
LIST OF PHILOSOPHICAL SOURCES USED IN  
MASTER VINCENT'S *CHRONICA POLONORUM*

*Prol.*, 4.4 = Publilius Syrus, *Sententiae*, litt. C(omes)

\* \* \*

- I, 1, 3 = Plato, *Timaeus*, 22b; Waszink, p. 14, 4–5  
 I, 2, 2 = Plato, *Timaeus*, 21a; Waszink, p. 12, 14  
 I, 2, 2 = Plato, *Timaeus*, 24e; Waszink, p. 16, 20–17, 2  
 I, 5, 1 = Plato, *Timaeus*, 19e; Waszink, p. 11, 4–5  
 I, 5, 3 = Guillelmus de Conchis, *Accessus ad Timaeum*, II (2006 ed., p. 6–7)  
 I, 8, 4 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 9, 10  
 I, 9, 6 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 13, 3  
 I, 9, 7 = Plato, *Timaeus*, 25c; Waszink, p. 17, 17–18  
 I, 9, 7 = Aristotle, *Soph. el.*, 1 (AL VI, p. 5, 13–14)  
 I, 10, 1 = Plato, *Timaeus*, 20d; Waszink, p. 12, 8  
 I, 14, 1 = Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, II, 3, 6; VII, 30, 1 (= *Facete dicta Tulliana?*)  
 I, 19, 4 = Aristotle, *Soph. el.*, 12 (AL VI, p. 29, 2–6)  
 I, 19, 5 = Boethius, *De consolazione*, I, 4, 1

\* \* \*

- II, 2, 1 = *Sententiae Varronis ad Papirianum*, no. 66  
 II, 3, 3 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 81, 6  
 II, 5, 5 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 18, 12  
 II, 5, 5 = *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, 24  
 II, 5, 5 = *Proverbia Senecae*, no. 52 (= *De providentia*, IV, 3)  
 II, 7, 7 = Plato, *Timaeus*, 28a; Waszink, p. 20, 21  
 II, 11, 6 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 1, 3  
 II, 11, 7 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 2, 5  
 II, 11, 7 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 5, 6  
 II, 12, 6 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 13, 8  
 II, 12, 8 = Publius Syrus, *Sententiae*, litt. E[tiam]  
 II, 14, 4 = Boethius, *De consolazione*, I, 2, 2  
 II, 18, 6 = Cicero, *De senectute*, 16, 55  
 II, 18, 11 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 74, 21  
 II, 21, 1 = Boethius, *De consolazione*, II, 1, 15  
 II, 21, 1 = Boethius, *De top. differ.*, II, 7, 25 (PL 64, 1189A, *locus a fine*)  
 II, 22, 3 = Boethius, *De consolazione*, II, 4, 12  
 II, 22, 9 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 26, 2  
 II, 22, 9 = Cicero, *De senectute*, 6, 17  
 II, 24, 2 = Boethius, *De top. differ.*, II, 2, 15 (PL 64, 1184B; *virtus sese dilligit ...*)

- II, 24, 4 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 10, 5  
 II, 24, 5 = Boethius, *De top. differ.*, II, 7, 10 (PL 64, 1188CD; *virtus est habitus ...*)  
 II, 28, 6 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 22, 7  
 II, 28, 13 = *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, I, 26  
 II, 28, 19 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 7, 7  
 II, 28, 25 = *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, 12  
 II, 28, 25 = *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, II, 49  
 II, 28, 33 = Aristotle, *Topica*, V, 1 (AL V, p. 86, 6); V, 2 (p. 90, 20–1)  
 II, 28, 33 = *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, II, 30  
 II, 28, 33 = *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, II, 28  
 II, 28, 33 = *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, I, 16  
 II, 28, 33 = *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, II, 30  
 II, 28, 37 = Aristotle, *Soph. el.*, 15 (AL VI, p. 34, 13; Lycophron)  
 II, 28, 42 = Boethius, *De top. differ.*, III, 3, 32–3 (PL 64, 1199B; *locus a maiore*)  
 II, 29, 3 = Aristotle, *Topica*, I, 3 (AL V, p. 8, 1–2)  
 II, 29, 5 = Aristotle, *Topica*, I, 3 (AL V, p. 7, 25–8, 3)

\* \* \*

- III, 1, 1 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 9, 22  
 III, 2, 4 = *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, 42 (*plagioxiippus*)  
 III, 5, 1 = Aristotle, *Soph. el.*, 15 (AL VI, p. 33, 17–19)  
 III, 18, 11 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 22, 3  
 III, 20, 9 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 25, 2  
 III, 20, 9 = *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, III, 9  
 III, 21, 1 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 27, 8  
 III, 25, 1 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 3, 4  
 III, 26, 17 = *Osio suo Calcidus* (Waszink, p. 5, 5)

\* \* \*

- IV, 2, 5 = Boethius, *De consolatione*, II, 4, 12  
 IV, 5, 9 = Boethius, *De consolatione*, III, m. X, 7  
 IV, 24, 4 = Seneca, *Ad Lucil.*, 9, 9  
 IV, 25, 1 = Cicero, *De senectute*, 18, 66  
 IV, 26, 8 = Boethius, *De consolatione*, I, 4, 1

**Zenon Kaluza** – medieval philosophy, research director at French National Centre for Scientific Research and editor-in-chief of *Przegląd Tomistyczny*;  
 e-mail: kaluza\_zenon@yahoo.fr

**Dragos Calma** – medieval philosophy; associate researcher at French National Centre for Scientific Research; e-mail: dragoscalma@gmail.com