

It will be noticed that Latomus separates the Antecedent, Consequent, and Repugnant as a separate division of *affectae* under the heading *hypothetici* as opposed to the others, which he labels *puri*. Fortunately, these hypothetical affects did not appeal to the critics of the sixteenth century,<sup>3</sup> so that when we find Shakspeare using them, especially since he labels them as rhetoric, it is practically certain that he had them from *Topica*.

But to return to Cicero, he next defines each of these terms, illustrating rather briefly each time with some point of law, usually a knotty one.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, Erasmus, Melanchthon, and others justly complained of the difficulty of these illustrations for boys. When in 1524 Melanchthon published an edition of *Topica* with the commentaries of Boethius he pointed out that Cicero had drawn his illustrations from the law and so needed some explanation. In 1533, he added his own explanations, and these were frequently reprinted. So in spite of difficulties in the illustrations the schoolmasters hammered the definitions of *Topica* into the boys, and in some way the boys sometimes learned to understand.<sup>5</sup>

All these matters except the *affectae* center in a way upon definition, though *notatio* is a special form treated separately. It is "The designating the origin or power of a word; etymology."<sup>6</sup> We have seen that Shakspeare frequently plays upon the etymology or notation of a word, as Leonatus, Miranda, mulier, etc. The definition proper involves a preliminary distinction between the part and the whole, leading to the distinction between division and partition. That Shakspeare understood these distinctions is abundantly clear. After Cicero has defined the various *affectae* briefly, he then covers the whole system again in fuller form. For the whole, he begins with *definitio*.

*Definitio, est oratio, quae id, quod definitur, explicat, quid sit. Definitivum autem duo sunt genera prima. Vnum earum rerum, quae sunt: alterum earum, quae intelliguntur. Esse ea dico, quae cerni, tangi possunt, vt fundum, aedeis, parietem, stillicidium, mancipium, pecudem, supellectilem, penus, cetera, quo ex genere quaedam interdum nobis definienda sunt. Non esse rursus ea dico, quae tangi, demonstrariue non possunt, cerni tamen animo, atq; intelligi possunt: vt, si vsucapionem, si tutelam, si gentem, si agnationem definias, quarum rerum nullum subest quasi corpus: est*

<sup>3</sup> By omitting the hypothetical affects they could reduce *Topica* to the ten places of Aristotle. See the scheme of Latomus on the preceding page. <sup>4</sup> Cf. Fraunce, *Lawiers Logike*, ¶ 1 v-¶ 2r.

<sup>5</sup> Erasmus presents a variant of this system, broken down into details, with much simpler illustrations, in his *De Conscribendis* (Erasmus, *Opera* (1703), Vol. I, pp. 411 ff.).

<sup>6</sup> White and Riddle.