

GÁBOR KECSKEMÉTI

LATIN RHETORIC OF IMRE PÉCSELI KIRÁLY  
AND THE EARLY 17<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY EUROPEAN RHETORIC THEORY

Rector of the school in Komárom, Imre Pécseli Király (ca. 1590–ca. 1641) set off for peregrination to Heidelberg in May, 1609.<sup>1</sup> After finishing his university studies proper, he remained in Germany and joined scientific and literary activities of Hungarians staying in the country.<sup>2</sup> The mentor of students of Calvinist denomination, Albert Szenci Molnár, who had been living there for decades, took notice of the youngster and drew on his help in preparing his own Oppenheim edition of the Bible. In its songbook appendix, it contains a morning praise by Pécseli Király.<sup>3</sup> In the year when this Bible was printed, 1612, the same print shop in Oppenheim published a rhetoric manual by Pécseli Király.<sup>4</sup> This included, among others, a salutatory poem in Latin by Szenci Molnár.<sup>5</sup> As Tibor Klaniczay has formulated it: “Molnár, a writer of dictionaries and grammar might have seen a follower of his own ideas in Pécseli Király, a writer of rhetoric.”<sup>6</sup> They stayed in contact later. When, in August 1612, Szenci Molnár went for a brief visit to Hungary, he travelled together with his younger colleague, who was on his way home to take up his position as rector of the Komárom school again.<sup>7</sup> Undoubtedly, they were in contact in

<sup>1</sup> The most comprehensive biography of Pécseli Király to this day comes from Tibor Klaniczay: *Régi magyar költők tára: XVII. század, 2, Pécseli Király Imre, Miskolczi Csulyak István és Nyéki Vörös Mátvás versei* (Poems of Imre Pécseli Király, István Miskolczi Csulyak, Mátvás Nyéki Vörös), eds. JENEI FERENC, KLANICZAY TIBOR, KOVÁCS JÓZSEF, STOLL BÉLA, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1962 (hereafter: JENEI–KLANICZAY–KOVÁCS–STOLL 1962), 250–256. There is one single point on which a revision was needed since: János Heltai refuted that Pécseli Király visited his homeland in the spring of 1610. Cf. HELTAI JÁNOS, *Alvinczi Péter és a heidelbergi peregrinusok* (Péter Alvinczi and the Hungarian students at Heidelberg), Budapest, Balassi Kiadó, 1994 (Humanizmus és Reformáció, 21) (hereafter: HELTAI J. 1994), 75. See also HELTAI JÁNOS, *Adattár a heidelbergi egyetemen 1595–1621 között tanult magyarországi diákokról és pártfogóikról* (Repertory of Hungarian students at Heidelberg University and of their patrons, 1595–1621), OSZK Évkönyve, 1980 (1982), 243–347 (hereafter: HELTAI J. 1982), 310–311.

<sup>2</sup> JENEI–KLANICZAY–KOVÁCS–STOLL 1962, *op. cit.*, 252.

<sup>3</sup> JENEI–KLANICZAY–KOVÁCS–STOLL 1962, *op. cit.*, no. 3; *Régi magyar költők tára: XVII. század, 6, SZENCI MOLNÁR ALBERT KÖLTŐI MŰVEI* (Poems of Albert Szenci Molnár), ed. STOLL BÉLA, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1971 (hereafter: SZENCI MOLNÁR 1971), 436, 439.

<sup>4</sup> SZABÓ KÁROLY, HELLEBRANT ÁRPÁD, *Régi magyar könyvtár* (Old Hungarian library), III (Bibliography of prints by Hungarian authors printed abroad in foreign languages), Budapest, MTA, 1896–1898 (hereafter: RMK III), no. 1112.

<sup>5</sup> Edition of Szenci Molnár’s poem: JENEI–KLANICZAY–KOVÁCS–STOLL 1962, *op. cit.*, 252; SZENCI MOLNÁR 1971, *op. cit.*, 449.

<sup>6</sup> JENEI–KLANICZAY–KOVÁCS–STOLL 1962, *op. cit.*, 252.

<sup>7</sup> JENEI–KLANICZAY–KOVÁCS–STOLL 1962, *op. cit.*, 253.

May, 1613,<sup>8</sup> and Szenci Molnár attended the wedding of Pécseli Király in Tardoskedd (today Tvrdošovce in Slovakia) in November of the same year.<sup>9</sup> Between July and October, 1614, when Szenci Molnár worked as a pastor in Komárom, they must have had daily contact.<sup>10</sup>

Pécseli Király became a pastor in Komárom in 1615. He offered his work written in an irenic spirit and published in Kassa (today Košice in Slovakia) in 1621 to lawyer Georg Rem of Nuremberg, a friend of Szenci Molnár, and to Szenci Molnár himself.<sup>11</sup> He was elected preacher in Érsekújvár (today Nové Zámky in Slovakia) in 1622. Only his catechism and spelling book are known beyond his poems from these years. His efforts in the church are still significant: “he attempted to foster both Presbyterian and Unionist aspirations.”<sup>12</sup> János Heltai demonstrated in convincing manner that his catechism is not a trite dogmatic piece but a unique, irenic attempt of reconciliation between Protestant catechism literature in Hungary and the Heidelberg Catechism. It followed the structure of Luther’s Lesser Catechism and had some influence on Lutheran catechism literature.<sup>13</sup>

The rhetoric manual of Imre Pécseli Király, *Isagoges Rhetoricae Libri Duo* was published in several editions. The second edition that followed the one from Oppenheim is not known today, no copy has been found up till today. However, an edition from 1639, Nuremberg, stated on the front cover that it was the third.<sup>14</sup>

Even though Imre Bán, in his brief overview, has already discussed rhetoric of Imre Pécseli Király,<sup>15</sup> and an extensive selection of the work, translated into Hungarian, has been published not long ago,<sup>16</sup> his sources and models haven’t really been reviewed yet.

<sup>8</sup> SZENCZI MOLNÁR Albert *Naplója, levelezése és irományai* (Journal-book, correspondence, and documents), ed. DÉZSI Lajos, Budapest, 1898, 385.

<sup>9</sup> SZENCZI MOLNÁR Albert *Naplója* (Journal-book), ed. SZABÓ András, Budapest, Universitas Könyvkiadó, 2003 (Historia Litteraria, 13) (hereafter: SZENCZI MOLNÁR 2003), 89, 167.

<sup>10</sup> SZENCZI MOLNÁR 2003, *op. cit.*, 91–92, 170–171.

<sup>11</sup> HELTAI János, *Irenikus eszmék és vonások Pécseli Király Imre műveiben* (Irenic ideas and features in the works by Imre Pécseli Király) (hereafter: HELTAI J. 1987a), in: *Irodalom és ideológia a 16–17. században* (Literature and ideology in 16–17<sup>th</sup> centuries), ed. VARJAS Béla, Budapest, Akadémiai, 1987 (Memoria Saeculorum Hungariae, 5) (hereafter: VARJAS 1987), 209–230, 212–216; HELTAI J. 1994, *op. cit.*, 59, 161–163.

<sup>12</sup> JENEI-KLANICZAY-KOVÁCS-STOLL 1962, *op. cit.*, 254.

<sup>13</sup> HELTAI J. 1987a, *op. cit.*, in: VARJAS 1987, *op. cit.*, 216–227.

<sup>14</sup> PÉCSELI KIRÁLY Imre, *Isagoges Rhetoricae Libri Duo*, Nürnberg, 1639<sup>3</sup> (RMK III, 1551) (hereafter: PÉCSELI KIRÁLY 1612/1639).

<sup>15</sup> BÁN Imre, *Irodalomelméleti kézikönyvek Magyarországon a XVI–XVIII. században* (Poetic and rhetoric handbooks in Hungary in 16–18<sup>th</sup> centuries), Budapest, Akadémiai, 1971 (Irodalomtörténeti Füzetek, 72) (hereafter: BÁN 1971a), 14–22.

<sup>16</sup> Publication of the Latin text of the offering and the preface, based on the first edition: JENEI-KLANICZAY-KOVÁCS-STOLL 1962, *op. cit.*, 261–265. Selected passages from the third edition in Hungarian translation: *Retorikák a reformáció korából* (Rhetoric handbooks from the age of Reformation), ed. IMRE Mihály, Debrecen, Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 2000 (Csokonai Universitas Könyvtár: Források – Régi Kortársaink, 5) (hereafter: IMRE 2000), 265–334; cf. IMRE Mihály, *Melanchthon retorikájától Buzinkai Mihályig* (From the rhetoric by Melanchthon to Mihály Buzinkai), in: IMRE 2000, *op. cit.*, 399–452, 445–448.

Both the overview and the translation are based on the edition from the year 1639, thus relations between existing editions haven't been systematically investigated.

The latter can be dealt with quickly. As opposed to what has been stated in the literature,<sup>17</sup> we can believe the cover page which says that the 1639 edition is not only a revised but an expanded one with respect to the previous one (“prioribus longe auctior et emendatior”). In the review below, I myself follow the later edition and note the parts that had not been included in the first edition. There is no positive evidence that the additions come from Pécseli Király himself, and there is no argument against it either. The question of attribution of these revisions is related to another question: what assumption may we have about the function and audience of these editions?

It is already a well-known fact that whereas the 1612 edition is offered to civilian, military, and church dignitaries of Komárom, and the preface is addressed to pupils of the Komárom school already mentioned on the front cover, the third edition from 1639 is offered not to Komárom students but “in usum scholarum Hungariae” on its front page, and the preface is addressed to “Studiosis Hungariae”. According to István Bartók “this is a good example of how community consciousness changes: publishers have the good of the whole nation in their minds not just certain towns.”<sup>18</sup> Bartók presumes that “Hungarians urging its publication did not print Pécseli’s work for the Komárom school but for some other school, perhaps several ones.” He remarks: “It is not difficult to find analogies for books published abroad, intended for domestic use.”<sup>19</sup> We may add that bookseller Wolfgang Endter of Nuremberg also contributed significantly in this respect: it was he, who published, in 1638, the Latin speech exercises of Sebald Heyden supplemented with Hungarian and German interpretations, revised and expanded versions of texts published a century before. He covered the costs of the fourth edition of Szenci Molnár’s dictionary in Frankfurt in 1645. János Heltai’s opinion differs from that of Bartók to some extent. He says Pécseli Király, “during his stay abroad, wrote a textbook of rhetoric of such a high standard” for the Komárom school “that other countries considered it worthy of putting it into use.”<sup>20</sup> According to him a local, German demand could also explain the new Nuremberg edition. The question of relevance of this audience can be raised regarding the above publications of the Endter Company. Numerous calendars of David Frölich published there offer an even more telling analogy—these were obviously produced for a German market. So both notions can be supported by analogies; however, we lack data on actual usage. What suggests a wider use is that according to the records of István Szilágyi Benjámín, Pécseli Király’s textbook was taught in Sárospatak together with the Melanchthon-excerpts of Lossius and Keckermann’s

<sup>17</sup> According to Klaniczay, the third edition came out with “unchanged text”: JENEI-KLANICZAY-KOVÁCS-STOLL 1962, *op. cit.*, 261.

<sup>18</sup> BARTÓK István, „Sokkal magyarabbul szólhatnánk és írhatnánk”: *Irodalmi gondolkodás Magyarországon 1630–1700 között* (Literary thinking in Hungary 1630–1700), Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó–Universitas Kiadó, 1998 (Irodalomtudomány és Kritika) (hereafter: BARTÓK 1998), 302.

<sup>19</sup> BARTÓK 1998, *op. cit.*, 122.

<sup>20</sup> HELTAI J. 1994, *op. cit.*, 39–40.

rhetoric<sup>21</sup>—presumably between the two in time. Moreover, the Sárospatak council prescribed this rhetoric for schools teaching a complete rhetorical system in Zemplén, Gömör, Abaúj, and Borsod counties (Miskolc, Rimaszombat [today Rimavská Sobota in Slovakia], Szikszó, Tállya, Abaújszántó, and Ungvár [today Uzhhorod in Ukraine]) in 1648.<sup>22</sup>

Both known editions of Pécseli Király’s book include poems saluting the author. The first one is the poem of “Rudolphus Goclenius senior, antecessor philosophiae primarius, et nunc rector Academiae Marpurgensis”, which “in Emerici sui gratiam faciebat Wormaliae, Anno 1611. 3. Octob.” This one is followed by Heidelberg professor of rhetoric and poetics Simon Stenius and then by the above-mentioned poem of Szenci Molnár dated 24 October 1611 in Oppenheim. Authors of further salutatory poems are, in order, János Filiczky, György Szepsi Korotz, “Petrus Trappius Heimersheimensis Palatinus, diaconus ecclesiae Oppenheimensis”, and Dániel Varsányi P. Salutations are ended by a poem of Pécseli Király himself “ad Librum”.<sup>23</sup> The Hungarian youngsters who wrote the poems were fellow students of Pécseli Király in Heidelberg,<sup>24</sup> where he might have met Stenius, but he obviously got to know Trapp only in Oppenheim. There is no indication, however, that he ever visited Marburg,<sup>25</sup> so it is reasonable to assume that he got to know Rudolf Goclenius the elder (1547–1628) through Szenci Molnár, who had moved to Oppenheim via Heidelberg just from Marburg and just for the time of printing the Bible.<sup>26</sup> Szenci Molnár dined with Goclenius at the Frankfurt autumn book fair already in 1601; the latter is the first person from Marburg with whom he had personal contact we know about.<sup>27</sup> Even though Szenci Molnár doesn’t mention Goclenius later in his diaries, clearly they had to stay in continual contact, especially between early summer of 1607 and July 1611, when Szenci Molnár lived in Marburg. He left the town for longer periods only twice: during the time of printing his first Bible-edition between April and October 1608, and during printing the second edition of his *Dictionarium* between September

<sup>21</sup> MOLNÁR Aladár, *A közoktatás története Magyarországon a XVIII. században, I* (History of public schooling in Hungary in the 18<sup>th</sup> century), Budapest, 1881 (hereafter: MOLNÁR A. 1881), 417; SZIMONIDESZ Lajos, *A sárospataki ref. főiskolában és Sárospatak környéke iskoláiban használt ismert és ismeretlen tankönyvek* (Known and unknown textbooks used at Sárospatak College and at schools in the neighbourhood of Sárospatak), Magyar Könyvszemle, 66(1942), 410–413 (hereafter: SZIMONIDESZ 1942), 410.

<sup>22</sup> MOLNÁR A. 1881, *op. cit.*, 321; SZIMONIDESZ 1942, *op. cit.*, 412; MÉSZÁROS István, *Az iskolaügy története Magyarországon 996–1777 között* (History of the schooling in Hungary), Budapest, Akadémiai, 1981, 380.

<sup>23</sup> Published: JENEI-KLANICZAY-KOVÁCS-STOLL 1962, *op. cit.*, 269.

<sup>24</sup> All three studied in Marburg before. Szepsi Korotz’s Hungarian translation of King James’ *Basilikon Doron* also came out with the help of Szenci Molnár in Oppenheim in 1612, and it contained salutatory poems by Szenci Molnár in Hungarian, Georg Rem and Peter Trapp in Latin. HELTAI J. 1982, *op. cit.*, 278–279, 328, 343.

<sup>25</sup> In the offering of the rhetoric, Marburgians are not mentioned either. Pécseli Király only mentions professors from Heidelberg: David Pareus, Quirinus Reuter, and Bartholomaeus Coppen.

<sup>26</sup> JENEI-KLANICZAY-KOVÁCS-STOLL 1962, *op. cit.*, 252.

<sup>27</sup> SZENCI MOLNÁR 2003, *op. cit.*, 76, 142.

1610 and April 1611, when he lived in Hanau.<sup>28</sup> We can reconstruct the schedule for the autumn of 1611 like this: Szenci Molnár might have invited Pécseli Király to Oppenheim during his visit in Heidelberg in August 1611 at the latest. On the 3<sup>rd</sup> of October Pécseli Király was already on his way, when he met Goclenius in Worms, which is halfway between Heidelberg and Oppenheim. Szenci Molnár might have introduced him to Goclenius some time before or he might have just written a letter of recommendation to him. Printing the Bible took place between the end of November and the beginning of April.<sup>29</sup> After that, Szenci Molnár returned to Marburg immediately. We have no data on whether Pécseli Király spent the winter in Oppenheim or in Heidelberg.

From Goclenius' salutatory poem and the kind tone of the accompanying offering we might conclude that the rhetoric handbook of Pécseli Király is in complete agreement with the Marburg rector's views on rhetoric. But this is far from being the case. *Problemata Rhetorica* by Goclenius, published in 1596, represents decidedly Ramean points of view in certain issues of scholarly taxonomy. The 12<sup>th</sup> problem, for instance, raises the question, whether invention and disposition belong to rhetoric or not, and the answer is no—these are parts of dialectic. The essential part of rhetoric, as the answer for question 11 already states, is elocution. As a result of this statement, all other problems belong to the area of elocution. Still, the book is not a stylistic guide; it can be called, above all, a manual of dogmatic and exegetics: for the philosopher Goclenius questions regarding tropical expression are seen as bases for theological positions. The basic structure of questions recurs: do we have to understand a biblical formulation or a dogmatic principle as trope or literally. Thus, for example, a nearly sixty-page detailed theological explanation is given on the question, whether “Deus est homo” is to be understood as trope or not.<sup>30</sup> Similarly, question 63 discusses: “Tropicaene sint an propriae locutiones Christi: Ego sum vitis vera: Ego sum panis ille verus seu vero coelestis: et haec Joh. Baptistae: Christus est agnus ille seu verus Agnus Dei, qui tollit peccata mundi?”<sup>31</sup> Question 78 is: “An tropice dictum sit, Homo iustificatur fide?” In a tiny philosophical dispute in Marburg, lead by Goclenius, which consists of only eight pages and was printed in 1598, the conclusion is unequivocally Ramean: “Quod autem Cicero et Quintilianus Rhetoricam fecerunt quinque partitam, non artis ipsius naturam, sed oratorem usumque respexerunt. Nam Orator, non Oratoria, argumenta invenit, inventa disponit...” etc.<sup>32</sup>

There is no trace of Ramism in the rhetoric of Pécseli Király: Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian are listed on the cover page of his handbook, which follows a five-part Aristo-

<sup>28</sup> Overview of Szenci Molnár's connections with Marburg professors based on an album entry by him in Marburg from May 1611: BUJTÁS László Zsigmond, *Szenci Molnár Albert ismeretlen albumbefjegyzése 1611-ből* (An unknown album entry by Albert Szenci Molnár from 1611), Magyar Könyvszemle, 120(2004), 56–59.

<sup>29</sup> SZENCI MOLNÁR 2003, *op. cit.*, 84, 159.

<sup>30</sup> Rodolphi GOCLENII, philosophici professoris in Academia Marpurgensi *Problemata Rhetorica*, in Nundinis Francofurtensibus [Frankfurt am Main], 1596 (hereafter: GOCLENIUS 1596), 139–196.

<sup>31</sup> GOCLENIUS 1596, *op. cit.*, 220–223.

<sup>32</sup> *Disputatio Philosophica de Discrimine Dialectices et Rhetorices ... sub umbone excellentissimi philosophi, Dn. M. Rodolphi GOCLENII, Logices in inclyta Cattiadum Academia Professoris, Marpurgi Cattorum, 1598.*

telian–Ciceronian structure, and within that invention is preferred. In the 1639 edition, after six pages of “praecognita”, a chapter on invention begins that is 162 pages long and amounts to almost two thirds of the book. First, the six parts of speech are discussed in 32 pages, than genres of speech follow. The first is genus didascalicum. Both the thema simplex and conjunctum are touched upon, yet the argumentation is not too extensive, since this genre of speech occupies only ten pages of one chapter. On the other hand, each status of genus iudiciale is discussed in four chapters, in exactly 50 pages. Numerous handbooks from the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries use the Ciceronian grouping of four statuses, but Pécseli Király’s division and terminology of the statuses follow the *Ad Herennium* rhetoric precisely. 22 pages are devoted to genus deliberativum and 42 pages to demonstrativum. At the end of the invention part there are two short chapters: *De Locis Communibus* and *De Affectibus*. Disposition occupies only 7 pages. The subject of the second, 107-page book is elocution.

However, Goclenius, who took a clearly Ramean stand regarding the connection of logic and rhetoric, would have had no reason to deny a cordial salutation even if he had happened to get to know Pécseli Király’s rhetoric more deeply. Even in the most fanatic Ramean context there was room for an orator’s handbook answering the practical needs of the orator instead of discussing theoretical aspects of the rhetor. They only called it oratoria, not rhetoric. Moreover, principles in the oratoria of Pécseli Király are in perfect harmony with those of Goclenius on many points. The first question of Goclenius’ *Problemmata* is: “An finis Rhetoricae sit bene dicere, an vero persuadere?”—and the answer is “Disputatur in utramque”.<sup>33</sup> Now, exactly the same thing is happening in the opening sentences of Pécseli Király’s rhetoric. His definition of rhetoric is based on reconciliation of the two aspects: “Rhetorica est ars bene dicendo persuadere potis”, where “bene dicere” means: “scienter et ornate loqui”, and “persuadere” means: “efficere, ut credat quis id, quod volumus”. He adds that “Non simpliciter persuadere, sed persuadere justa et bona est finis”. This way, persuasio is connected to the criterion of appropriate content, and is superior to form of expression: “Finis ergo est fides, oratio instrumentum”. The question in problem 10 of Goclenius says: “An Rhetoricae subiectum sit omnis oratio?” The answer is in the affirmative: since it is necessary to speak not only in civilian matters but in schools and the church, more recent theory writers (“recentiores”) supplement the traditional threefold system of genres of speech with a fourth genre, thus including speech of scientific clarity into rhetoric. Pécseli Király has a very similar approach. Defining genus didascalicum he says: this is “methodus Dialectica explicandi materias,

<sup>33</sup> Facing the problem was made necessary by Quintilian’s belletrist, “bene dicere” attitude for generations of Humanists. Distinction between inner (officium) and outer (finis) objectives of the ars has been customary since Marius Victorinus Afer’s commentary on Cicero’s *De inventione*, with reference to Varro. About the whole issue, see John MONFASANI, *Episodes of Anti-Quintilianism in the Italian Renaissance: Quarrels on the Orator as a vir bonus and Rhetoric as the scientia bene dicendi*, *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 10(1992), 119–138, 125–137; on Quintilian’s influence: Carl Joachim CLASSEN, *Quintilian and the Revival of Learning in Italy*, in: Carl Joachim CLASSEN, *Antike Rhetorik im Zeitalter des Humanismus*, München–Leipzig, K. G. Saur, 2003 (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 182), 153–175.

de quibus docendi sunt homines. Hoc Genus in Scholis potissimum vel inter doctos de rerum cognitione disceptantes versatur, et in explicatione, interpretatione, vel etiam disputatione quaestionum, quae ex aliqua doctrina sive contemplatione naturae rerum et rationis dependent, et ad cognoscendum tantum et docendum ventilantur. Complectitur itaque hoc genus praecipue infinitam quaestionem”, which, in classical perception, was the subject of dialectics. “Licet hanc rationem Orator accipiat a Dialectica methodo, copiam tamen et ornamenta sumit ex officina Rhetorum, unde, quoniam non ita concise et nude, ut in Dialecticis, apud auditores praesertim in concione tractandum est, sed copiosius, ornatus, liberius, et crassius, ideo hoc genus docendi jure bono locum in Rhetorico etiam agro sibi vindicat.” This leads to the interpretation of Goclenius’ answer for question 14: “An vitiosum sit docere tropis?” According to him, this is an error in giving definition indeed, but in description even a dialectician can resort to tropes. And a good orator, according to Pécseli Király, hardly ever uses a definition: “definitionem hic non semper accuratam, quam non facile capiunt auditores populares, sed descriptionem, quae constat ex accidentibus, eloquentiae studiosus saepius adhibere debet”.

Besides compatibility with the approach of Goclenius, it is clear that Pécseli Király’s direct inspiration and model does not come from the Marburg professor’s circle. However, closer kin and prototypes of this rhetoric can be found. And here we find a point of interest: two markedly different prototypes determine the essential division and the composition of example material in the work.

Division, structure, and proportions of the rhetoric of Pécseli Király correspond closely to the popular rhetoric textbook by Matthaeus Dresser. The latter also begins with a praecepta chapter that gives basic definitions, and then, just like in Pécseli Király, a separate part ponders issues related to “genera causarum”.<sup>34</sup> After this, he goes on to discuss “partes orationis” going through the same six parts of speech than the Hungarian youngster some decades later. Presentation of the rules for each genre also starts with genus didascalicum; iudiciale and deliberativum follow and demonstrativum is the last, just as in Pécseli Király. This, of course, corresponds by and large to the structure moulded by the paradigmatic example of Melanchthon’s rhetoric. However, details are telling. With Melanchthon, the doctrine of parts of speech is woven into the presentation of genus iudiciale, which means that, in this respect, instead of Melanchthon’s direct

<sup>34</sup> “Etsi genus *didaskalikōn* ad Dialecticam maxime pertineat, utpote cuius proprium et munus docere methodice: ac materiae huius generis, quatenus rhetorice tractantur, satis commode partim ad genus Demonstrativum, partim etiam ad statum generis Iudicialis finitivum referri queant: nec etiam Aristoteles, Quintilianus et Cicero plura recenseant genera quam tria: tamen more scholarum retinebimus causarum quadripartitam divisionem, idque propter has duas causas. Primum, propter amplissimum usum, quem pariter in Ecclesia et in aliarum rerum explicatione hoc genus Didascalicum habet. Et enim satis constat, methodum, quam hoc genus tradit et sequitur, magnam lucem addere dogmatibus Ecclesiae et Philosophiae. Ac etiamsi haec methodus brevis videatur, et pressa: tamen potest dicendo mediocriter ornari, et amplificari. Secundo, quia loci generis didascalici multum conducunt ad cognitionem locorum aliorum generum, et sunt quasi praeparatio ad caetera causarum genera omnia. Sunt igitur quatuor genera causarum”. Matthaeus DRESSER, *Rhetorica Inventionis, Dispositionis et Elocutionis Illustrata et Locupletata Quam Plurimis Exemplis, Sacris et Philosophicis. In ludo illustri ad Albim*, Leipzig, 1580, 47–48.

influence, we are justified in saying that Pécseli Király follows Dresser's variation. Incidentally, this can be shown in other areas beside precepts. An example in the discussion of genus didascalicum, which presents a refutation of death being bad through the analysis of the arguments in a Ciceronian line of thought, is also taken from Dresser.<sup>35</sup>

But the major source of the rich example material included in the book is Johannes Schollius. It was Imre Bán, who remarked, in connection to a piece of example text referenced by name, that an author by this name, who remained otherwise unknown to Bán, might have something to do with Pécseli Király's rhetoric.<sup>36</sup> Yet in the rhetoric of the Hungarian youngster there is another reference to Schollius, and another half a dozen examples taken without name can also be traced back to Schollius.

Johann Scholl of Battenberg, Hessen, studied at the Marburg paedagogium since 1588. He was superior of grantees at the university from 1595, then, having earned a magister degree, became professor of Hebrew from 1600. At the same time he functioned as town pastor. He was dean of the theological faculty in 1604. His career was broken in 1605 by the so-called "Verbesserungspunkte", that is, a reorganisation of the university—which fell under Kassel rule—in a Calvinist spirit, to which he refused to submit. However, he did not join the teaching staff of the paedagogium in Giessen, where several of his Lutheran colleagues continued teaching, like Conradus Dietericus who was fairly popular both in Germany and in Hungary through his textbooks of rhetoric and oratory written during the Giessen years.<sup>37</sup> Scholl worked as a Lutheran priest from August 1605 in Friedberg, halfway between Giessen and Frankfurt. He died there at a young age on 10 August 1606.<sup>38</sup> His major rhetorical work was published posthumously: the textbook titled *Praxis Rhetorica sive Scholae et Exercitationes Eloquentiae* appeared first in Frankfurt in 1607, and then in Lübeck in 1612.<sup>39</sup> An offering, dated 1 April 1612 by

<sup>35</sup> Matthaues DRESSERUS *Retorikájának négy könyve (Rhetoricae Inventionis, Dispositionis et Elocutionis Libri Quatuor, 1606)* (Selection in Hungarian translation), in: IMRE 2000, *op. cit.*, 89–128, 97–98.

<sup>36</sup> BÁN 1971a, *op. cit.*, 15, 17.

<sup>37</sup> Dietericus, in his larger, nearly two-hundred-page oratoria—of which the offering is dated Giessen, 1613—often refers to Schollius as well as to Dresser and David Chytraeus: Cunradus DIETERICUS, *Institutiones Oratoriae, sive De Conscribendis Orationibus, e veterum et recentiorum oratorum praeceptis methodica introductio; in usum illustris Paedagogii Giesseni conscripta, variisque exemplis illustrata, a philosophiae moralis professore et paedagogiarcho*, Lipsiae, 1615. System of teaching rhetoric in Giessen in 1629: Joseph S. FREEDMAN, *Cicero in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-century Rhetoric Instruction*, *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 4(1986), 227–254, 253.

<sup>38</sup> Friedrich Wilhelm STRIEDER, *Grundlage zu einer hessischen Gelehrten- und Schriftsteller-Geschichte, I–XXI*, Göttingen–Kassel–Marburg, 1781–1868, XIII (1802); Franz GUNDLACH, *Catalogus professorum Academiae Marburgensis: Die akademischen Lehrer der Philipps-Universität in Marburg von 1527 bis 1910*, Marburg (Hessen), N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung–G. Braun, 1927 (Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Hessen und Waldeck, 15), 13.

<sup>39</sup> So far I have had access to the second edition only: Johannes SCHOLLIUS, *Hebraicae linguae in illustri Academia Marpurgensi quondam professor, Praxis Rhetorica, sive Scholae et Exercitationes Eloquentiae. In quibus concinna methodo investigationes argumentorum cujusque generis causarum instituuntur, et variarum rerum quaestiones oratorio artificio tractantur*, opusculum secundo cum notis et indice in lucem emissum, ab infinitis mendis repurgatum, nunc demum tyronibus eloquentiae apprime necessarium, Lubecae, 1612 (hereafter: SCHOLLIUS 1612). In the material of booklists of the early modern Hungary published so far I found

bookseller Samuel Iauchius, who covered the expenses of the Lübeck edition, describes the circumstances of the publication briefly. As far as he knows, Scholl “aliquibus Eloquentiae studiosissimis juvenibus privata cura Marpurgi Cattorum proposuit” the material of the book. “Cujus laboris exemplum magnifieri cepit, et ab aliis, qui nescio quo cursu in Eloquentiae studio contenderent: horumque et istorum manu descriptum Francofurtum tandem est delatum, et ante quatuor plus minus annos praelo publico descriptum.” This first edition, however, had many errors in it, and there was an attempt to correct those in the second edition.

Of course, Pécseli Király could not yet use the second edition in 1611; he could only work with the first edition from 1607. He drew from it quite a lot. The two orations demonstrating status coniecturalis, “in quibus exercitii oratorii specimen liquido ostenditur”, come from there. Sempronius is the victim of a fictitious crime—he was killed in the forest. Titius is accused with the murder, but he denies it. The first oration is “oratio accusatoris in reum”, and the other is “defensoria rei ipsius”.<sup>40</sup> Status iuridicialis is demonstrated through Scholl’s examples too. Their political subject is a rarity in Hungary: “in priore exercitii gratia, defensio suscipitur pro Belgii ordinibus adversus Hispanos; in posteriore vero contrarium docetur”, i. e., “negatur, ordines in Belgio legitime secessisse ab Hispanorum rege”. Here Pécseli Király indicates his source in a marginal note (“Ex Schollii Rhetorica”); what’s more, he extends the reference to the previous two speeches.<sup>41</sup> Among example texts of genus deliberativum, the oration, “in quo suadetur imitatio Ciceronis”, is also from Scholl.<sup>42</sup> In the same genre, it turns out that the petitoria sample oration—despite its contemporary Hungarian subject—is not the work of Pécseli Király, but also comes from Scholl’s book: “Oratio periclitantis Ungariae ad Sigismundum III. Poloniae regem, in qua proceres Ungarici petunt, ut Poloni secum foedus faciant, sibi que suppetias ferant adversus Turcam”. This piece of text was not part of the first edition of Pécseli Király’s rhetoric; it was added to the third edition.<sup>43</sup> All three examples of “factorum et rerum demonstratio” are from Scholl. On the side of the first a marginal note informs us that it is borrowed “Ex Schollii praxi”: “de facto Davidis, qui Goliathum divino armatus Spiritu (in Pécseli Király’s first edition: “Spiritu sancto”); it is the third edition which corresponds to Scholl’s original text) confecit”,<sup>44</sup> the second is “de laude

only one reference to Schollian rhetoric: one of its editions is listed in the bequest of a citizen of Selmebánya (today Banská Štiavnica in Slovakia) from 1656: *Magyarországi magánkönyvtárak, III, A bányavárosok olvasmányai (Besztercebánya, Körmöcbánya, Selmebánya) 1533–1750* (Hungarian private libraries, III, Books of the mining towns), eds. Viliam ČIČAJ, KEVEHÁZI Katalin, MONOK István, VISKOLCZ Noémi, Budapest–Szeged, OSZK–Scriptum Rt., 2003 (Adattár, 13/3), 398. In 1610, in Frankfurt, the textbook *Praxis Logica, sive Scholae et Exercitationes Dialecticae* by Schollius was published too.

<sup>40</sup> PÉCSELI KIRÁLY 1612/1639, *op. cit.*, 66–72; SCHOLLIUS 1612, *op. cit.*, 263–273.

<sup>41</sup> PÉCSELI KIRÁLY 1612/1639, *op. cit.*, 81–89; SCHOLLIUS 1612, *op. cit.*, 286–299.

<sup>42</sup> PÉCSELI KIRÁLY 1612/1639, *op. cit.*, 112–116; SCHOLLIUS 1612, *op. cit.*, 207–214.

<sup>43</sup> PÉCSELI KIRÁLY 1612/1639, *op. cit.*, 117–121; SCHOLLIUS 1612, *op. cit.*, 245–252.

<sup>44</sup> PÉCSELI KIRÁLY 1612/1639, *op. cit.*, 148–151; SCHOLLIUS 1612, *op. cit.*, 114–118.

PRAXIS RHETORICA,  
SIVE  
SCHOLÆ ET  
EXERCITATIONES  
ELOQVENTIÆ.

*In quibus concinnâ Methodo investigatio-  
nes argumentorum cujusq; generis cau-  
sarû instituantur, & variarum rerum  
questiones oratorio artificio tractantur.*

AUCTORE  
M. IOHANNES SCHOLLIO,  
*Hebraica lingua in illustri Acade-  
mia Marpurgensi quondam Pro-  
fessore.*

Opusculum secundo cum Notis & Indice in lu-  
cem emissum, ab infinitis mendis repurgatum,  
nunc demum Tyronibus eloquentiæ apprime  
necessarium.

*Elenchum Orationum & questionum  
vide post præfationem.*

LUBECÆ  
Typis Iohannis Albini, sumptibus  
Samuelis Iauchii.

---

*Anno M. DC. XII.*

rei, id est, magistratus, e triplici fundamento, dignitatis, necessitatis et utilitatis desumentum”;<sup>45</sup> and the third is “Aliud paradigma vituperationis superbiae”.<sup>46</sup>

It is necessary to clarify a few more details regarding one of the examples adapted from Scholl. The oration given to Polish King Sigismund III<sup>47</sup> in the name of the Hungarian estates is not a fictional piece of text by Scholl but a real political speech with a retraceable background. It was given on 2 March 1595 in Kraków; according to the consensus among Hungarian scholars of literary history, the author is Demeter Naprágyi, grand provost of Eger. The speech is usually praised as a powerful, clear oration in good Latin, giving evidence of oratorical abilities, the last piece of a Humanistic genre of oration practised since János Vitéz and László Vetési: a speech given in an international diplomatic setting in the name of the Hungarian king asking for military help against the Turks.<sup>48</sup> Even though it did not bring actual political results,<sup>49</sup> it was one of the well-known pieces of texts in the era: it was published several times in Latin in the same year—once in Transylvania—, and later it was reprinted in anthologies. It got published in Polish, Czech, and German translations.<sup>50</sup>

The connection between Naprágyi’s oration and Pécseli Király’s rhetoric is certainly indirect: it came about through Scholl. Pécseli Király’s text is identical to that of Scholl, whereas Scholl’s version is an abridged and revised version of Naprágyi’s speech. There

<sup>45</sup> PÉCSELI KIRÁLY 1612/1639, *op. cit.*, 151–157; SCHOLLIUS 1612, *op. cit.*, 55–63.

<sup>46</sup> PÉCSELI KIRÁLY 1612/1639, *op. cit.*, 157–162; SCHOLLIUS 1612, *op. cit.*, 64–70.

<sup>47</sup> Sigismund III was elected Polish king after István Báthory in 1587. He ruled until 1632. Between 1592 and 1604 he was Swedish king too.

<sup>48</sup> JENEI Ferenc, *Az utolsó magyar humanista főpap: Náprági Demeter* (The last Hungarian Humanist prelate: Demeter Náprági), *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények*, 69(1965), 137–151, 140; VÁSÁRHELYI Judit, *A győri Székesegyházi Könyvtár possessorai* (Possessors of the books of Győr Cathedral Library), *Magyar Könyvszemle*, 96(1980), 117–130, 230–263, 325–349, 119. A detailed presentation of the line of thought in the oration: IMRE Mihály, „Magyarország panasza”: *A Querela Hungariae toposz a XVI–XVII. század irodalmában* (The Querela Hungariae topos in the literature of the 16–17<sup>th</sup> centuries), Debrecen, Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 1995 (Csokonai Universitas Könyvtár: Bibliotheca Studiorum Litterarium, 5), 156–159, 162, 230–231; the location providing the topos of fertilitas: IMRE Mihály, *A termékeny Magyarország toposza Szőnyi Benjámín latin nyelvű versében* (Topos of fertile Hungary in a Latin poem by Benjámín Szőnyi), *Könyv és Könyvtár*, 25(2003), 159–177, 169.

<sup>49</sup> The illusory nature of a possible Polish–Hungarian cooperation against the Turks is illuminated by a much stronger political alternative for Poland, the Polish–Turkish neighbourly coordination seen during the fifteen-year war: VÁRKONYI Gábor, *Angol békeközvetítés és a lengyel–török tárgyalások a tizenöt éves háború időszakában (1593–1598)* (English mediation and Polish–Turkish negotiations in the period of fifteen-year war, 1593–1598), *Aetas*, 18(2003)/2, 44–62.

<sup>50</sup> Latin editions: Kraków, 1595 (RMK III, 857); Danzig, 1595 (RMK III, 5545); Kolozsvár (today Cluj-Napoca in Romania), 1595 (*Régi magyarországi nyomtatványok* [Old Hungarian printed materials], I, 1473–1600, eds. BORSA Gedeon, HERVAY Ferenc, HOLL Béla, KÁFER István, KELECSÉNYI Ákos, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1971, no. 762); Luca ad Thayam, 1595 (RMK III, 5552); Nuremberg, 1595 (RMK III, 859); *Selectissimarvm orationvm et consvltationvm de bello Turcico variorvm et diversorvm auctorvm volvmina quatuor*, ed. Nicolaus REUSNER, Lipsiae, 1596 (RMK III, 5569), vol. III, pars 2, 24–38. Polish translation: Kraków, 1595 (RMK III, 858). Editions in Czech, location unknown: RMK III, 869, 870. German translation: *Auserlesene christliche und überaus schöne Ermahnungen, Rathschläge und Werbungen von dem Türcken-Krieg*, Nuremberg, 1664.

is no trace of the lengthy introductory part of the original text, which expounded the topos of fertilitas Pannoniae. The first paraphrased part can be identified on the sixth page of Naprágyi's oration. We can speak of following the original line of thought only from the tenth page on. Scholl replaced the missing first third with just one opening sentence. He then followed thematic units of the Kraków speech step-by-step, yet he shortened the text everywhere and applied stylistic changes, so he needed to write some sentences himself for smooth transitions. Thus he managed to compress the text that took up 27 quartos to less than five octavos. Since there are no significant differences between those editions of Naprágyi's text that I've seen, and there is no revised version similar to Scholl's among them, presumably abridgment and revision comes from Scholl himself. To make the extent and nature of revisions clear, it seems worthwhile to compare the beginning part of Pécseli Király's version—that is identical to that of the Marburg professor—with the corresponding original passages.<sup>51</sup>

## Naprágyi

“Nostrane obsecro socordia, vel Christianorum dissidiis discordibusque animis, vel certe Hungarorum peccatis id ita commerentibus, impurae, foedae, barbaraeque Turcorum et Scytharum genti violanda relinquitur? [...] Audite quaeso, nobilissimi ordines, in quantam, quamve miserabilem calamitatem et angustiam levitas, inconstantia, perfidiaeque Turcica nos praecipitaverit.” (8–9.)

“Ac proinde Rex Sereniss. Illustrissimique Principes, caeteraque clarissima Poloniae lumina; tria a vobis uti sociis, amicis, et vicinis, omnes omnino Hungariae ordines, vestra pietate, amicitia, et vicinitate freti, amice et officiose petunt.

Primum, velitis aliquot auxiliares copias vestris propriis sumptibus conscriptas in subsidium periclitantis Hungariae, statim primo Vere expedire.

Alterum, non tantum propriis sumptibus conscripto milite nobis auxilio vos esse, sed et si quos milites ex amplissimo hoc regno, ac vicinis eius provinciis aut nostris, aut aliorum Christianorum Principum expensis educere conati fuerimus; eis liberam in Hungariam proficiscendi facultatem concedere.

Denique novo, perpetuoque foedere nobiscum sancte pacto, vestram in armis, in copiis, aliisque contra

## Pécseli Király

“Utinam, Rex Serenissime, et Incltyti huius Regni Proceres, eiusmodi nostrae gentis esset conditio, ut non necesse haberemus supplices venire.

Nunc quoniam peccatis nostris ita commerentibus, barbara et efferata Scytharum gens Hungariam nostram in miserabilem calamitatem praecipitavit, metuendumque est, ne brevi etiam reliquiae illae Hungaricae, quibus Dei beneficio furor Turcicus adhuc pepercit, in extremam adducantur vastitatem...”

“Tria vero a te, Rex Serenissime, et a Polonis sociis, amicis et vicinis, Hungariae Ordines, vestra imprimis pietate, amicitia et benevolentia freti, petunt.

Primum, ut aliquot auxiliares copias vestris sumptibus in subsidium periclitantis Hungariae quamprimum expediatis.

Alterum, ut si quos milites e vestro Regno et adjacentibus provinciis, expensis nostris, ad signa nostra vocaverimus, illis liberam in Hungariam proficiscendi facultatem benigne concedatis.

Tertium est, ut novo perpetuoque foedere nobiscum sancte pacto, vestram in armis societatem, cum

<sup>51</sup> Naprágyi's text is quoted from the Kraków edition: *Hungariae Periclitantis Legatorum [...] ad Serenissimum Potentissimumque Sigismundum Tertium, Poloniae et Sveciae Regem, Magnvm Dvcem Lithvaniae, Rvssiae, Prvssiae, Masoviae, Livoniae, Samogitiaeqve: et Incltytos Regni Poloniae, Magnique Dvcatvs Lithvaniae, etc. Ordines, Oratio, in comitiis generalibus Cracouiae habita, die 2. Mensis Martij Anno Domini M.D.XCV, Kraków, 1595 (RMK III, 857), 3–29.*

manifestum Christiani nominis adversarium belligerandi facultatibus societatem, virtutemque heroicam, qua apud omnes gentes mirifice excellitis, cum nostra quamvis parva et exigua manu coniungere.

Consideranda enim in primis vobis est, nostra et patriae nostrae conditio, extremum quod ex interitu nostro vobis imminet periculum, tum huius sanctae societatis novique foederis summa necessitas, tum etiam hostis importunitas, tum etiam expeditae copiae perfidia, inconstantia, et in augustissimum Iesu Christi nomen et gloriam insitum illi a natura odium.” (12–13.)

All the mentioned military incidents of the ongoing war against the Turks have fallen prey to omissions and shortenings; names of castles occupied by the Turks are all missing; only the names of Croatia and Slavonia remained as warnings; among rulers who regarded military glory highly, only the names of Casimir of Poland and Vladislaus of Bohemia and Hungary survived shortening. It is worthwhile to cite the last lines of the two orations:

Naprágyi

“...vestrae denique genti tot Illustrium historicorum commendationibus et scriptis celebratae, decus, gloriam, nomenque immortale, nulla unquam posteritatis memoria aut temporis iniuria delendum, inter omnes orbis Christiani populos et nationes comparabit. Dixi.” (29.)

Pécseli Király

“Vestrae denique genti nomen comparabit immortalē inter omnes orbis Christiani nationes. Dixi.”

The connection between the texts—which definitely deserves further detailed comparison—already provides some conclusions. Even the fact, that a fully armoured Humanistic oration given by the Hungarian estates that had extraordinary political stake, became rhetorical teaching material at the Marburg university in a few years, and the textbook came into use in Northern and Central Germany, has its significance. It can be seen what kind of grammatical and stylistic simplifications, what emphases and polarisations that make following the content easier were deemed necessary for educational purposes. The differences essentially outline—with paradigmatic relevance—“zwei konkurrierende Textmodelle”.<sup>52</sup> By this distinction, a powerful trend in recent European research in the history of rhetoric intends to describe the difference between scholarly rhetoric taught at schools and actual political eloquence in courts. From the perspective

<sup>52</sup> Georg BRAUNGART, *Praxis und poesis: Zwei konkurrierende Textmodelle im 17. Jahrhundert*, in: *Rhetorik zwischen den Wissenschaften: Geschichte, System, Praxis als Probleme des „Historischen Wörterbuchs der Rhetorik“*, Hrsg. Gert UEDING, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1991 (Rhetorik-Forschungen, 1), 87–98.

of Pécseli Király's place in the history of ideas, it is also important that the work of a Humanist prelate of Hungarian Catholicism gets back to him from German Protestant sources.

Of course, the oration of Demeter Naprágyi has its sources too. The depiction of common Polish–Hungarian past has many similarities with the speech of Farkas Kovácsóczy given at the Warsaw electoral national assembly in 1586,<sup>53</sup> and there are complete paragraphs taken unchanged from the oration that Ladislaus of Macedonia had given in 1522 in Nuremberg or, at some places, Germany is replaced with Poland, as the country approached for help.<sup>54</sup> Thus Scholl—without being aware of it—adapted and bequeathed a text that is related to earlier representative pieces in the genre, from the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Some of the orations of Hungarian royal envoys attempting to forge an anti-Turkish alliance might have been known to Szenci Molnár, since he included in his *Idea Christianorum*, 1616, a speech given at the imperial assembly in Regensburg by Archbishop of Kalocsa, Ferenc Frangepán in 1541.<sup>55</sup> We cannot preclude that, besides Scholl's condensed version, Szenci Molnár knew the complete original text. On the other hand, we have no meaningful data on similar knowledge of Pécseli Király.

Having registered the use of example material from the Marburg professor, I need to point out that the basic principles of Scholl's rhetorical approach differ considerably from those of Pécseli Király. The Hessen author's work covers invention only; it has no part on elocution whatsoever. Even though he, too, begins treatment of the subject with the six parts of speech, his book goes on to give a detailed presentation of genus demonstrativum on 143 pages, then comes genus deliberativum on 67 pages, and then genus iudiciale (he calls it iurediciale) on 44 pages altogether. There is no fourth genre of speech in the work at all: at the end of the introduction he plainly states that there are three genres of speech and gives no further hint about that.<sup>56</sup> Within the treatment of each genre of speech, the ratio of theoretical knowledge and practical examples is completely different from that of Pécseli Király. After a brief introduction immediately comes the sentence: "exemplis illud melius doceri potest", and example texts give major parts of the chapters. The order and the length of the genres also demonstrate different focal points of interest: staying within genus demonstrativum, after praise of persons and deeds come animals, lands, towns, rivers, trees, plants, and precious gems too. Topics include praise of the dog, the stork, elogium on Hessen, the Nile, and the Eder, which meanders near Scholl's birthplace. All this suggest a much more secularly oriented oratorical culture and representational need than what we can reckon with in the Hungarian author's work.

<sup>53</sup> RMK III, 760.

<sup>54</sup> MACEDÓNIAI László, *Orationes*, eds. HORVÁTH István Károly, VALACZKAY László, Szeged, 1964, 13–18. On the mission in 1522 and the speech of Ladislaus in beautiful Latin, a speech that shows an experienced, knowledgeable Humanist orator, see HORVÁTH István Károly, OBERMAYER Erzsébet, *Macedóniai László: Egy humanista élete és működése a Mohács körüli évtizedekben* (Ladislaus of Macedonia: Life and work of a Humanist in the decades around 1526), *Századok*, 93(1959), 773–801, 785–788, 799.

<sup>55</sup> IMRE Mihály, *Szenci Molnár Albert „Idea Christianorum”-a* ("Idea Christianorum" of Albert Szenci Molnár), in: VARJAS 1987, *op. cit.*, 231–252, 243–245.

<sup>56</sup> SCHOLLIUS 1612, *op. cit.*, 27.

At the same time, we cannot speak about incompatible approaches. Scholl, for example, like Pécseli Király—and thus like Goclenius—resolves differences regarding the purpose of rhetoric by distinguishing “internus” and “externus finis”: the former is identical to “bene dicendi”, the latter is equivalent to the requirement of “persuadere”. According to him, convincing is not always the orator’s purpose. Namely, the purpose is not “inani verborum multorum sonitu, more muliercularum, aures aliorum obtundas, sed ut res utiles, graves et necessarias perspicue, et sapienter, et ornate possis explicare”. He admits that the primary subject of rhetoric is hypothesis, yet treatment of the thesis is not only the philosopher’s task. This is connected to the previous one, so it is not as alien from rhetoric as others tend to think.<sup>57</sup>

Incidentally, scattered example texts of other German textbooks are to be found in Pécseli Király. The example in the chapter of genus didascalicum, a text that gives an affirmative answer to the question “An liceat homini Christiano gerere bellum?” comes from the rhetoric of David Chytraeus.<sup>58</sup> With the examples adapted from Scholl, Dresser, and Chytraeus, we nearly exhausted the examples of the first book of rhetoric. For the sake of completeness, we go through the rest of the examples. Of course, we cannot assume more originality about those either, but clarification of the sources is still ahead. An argumentation example of the instructional genre, “de amicitia” (45–47), is based on Cicero’s *Laelius*. In the chapter on genus deliberativum, the first “paradigma sive exemplum” summarises the arguments against Antonius in Cicero’s *Philippicas* (108–110). In the chapter *De Genere Demonstrativo*, there is a “paradigma laudationis de Thucydide historico ex Aphthonio Graeco” (138–140). The Latin translation of the text example given for encomium—the eighth genre of progymnasmata—in Aphthonios, which praises Thucydides, is shortened only once in comparison to the Greek original (the list of events in the Peloponnesian war is shortened to half of its size).

It is also remarkable, what it is that Pécseli Király did not take from Scholl’s rhetoric. He and people around him in Heidelberg, Oppenheim, and even Komárom had to know these parts of the book too. In the enumeration of topoi of praise of persons Eobanus Hessus is mentioned, who “ex obscuris, honestis tamen parentibus natus: propria virtute sic emersit”, and Isocrates’ laudation of Helene becomes subject of thorough structural analysis (99–103). The sample text of personal vituperation is about the Jesuits (104–113); this oration became a popular piece in anthologies.<sup>59</sup> One of the samples on the glorification of deeds tells the well-known story about women of Weinsberg, who saved

<sup>57</sup> SCHOLLIUS 1612, *op. cit.*, 4–6, 25–27.

<sup>58</sup> PÉCSELI KIRÁLY 1612/1639, *op. cit.*, 49–50; DAVID CHYTRAEUS, *Praecepta rhetoricae inventionis, Oratio in funere Henrici Ducis Megaloburgensis, Oratio de oppido Suerino, Oratio de urbe Rostochio – Vorschriften der Rhetorik, Rede zum Begräbnis Herzog Heinrich V., Rede über die Stadt Schwerin, Rede über die Stadt Rostock* (1556), Einleitung, Text und Übersetzung Nikolaus THURN, Friedemann DREWS, Katharina GRAUPE, Anja LIESKE, Rostock, Universität Rostock, 2000 (Rostocker Studien zur Kulturwissenschaft, 3), 82–84.

<sup>59</sup> It was published in 1610 in Rostock, in a compilation by Johannes Simonius (1566–1627): JOHANNES SIMONIUS, *Lutherus Theosdotos Triumphans. Addita est Joannis SCHOLLII, professoris quondam Marpurgensis, De Laudibus Jesuitarum, Oratio*, Rostock, 1610, 65r–68v.

their husbands carrying them on their backs. The subject of the comparison between good and good is Demosthenes and Cicero (178–182), the example for comparing evil and good expounds cultural differences between old and new Germany, following a favoured line of thought of Protestant Humanists (183–190). German history, namely, an episode from 1519, appears again, in an example for suasion: “Elector Moguntinus suadet collegis Electoribus, ut in locum Maximiliani defuncti Imperatorem crearent Carolum Austriacum” (202–207). One sample oration for dissuasion contains “rationes dissuadentes matrimonium”, of course, only for “exercitij causa” (215–224), and another one follows immediately, “superiori contraria, dissuadens coelibatum et continens exhortationem ad conjugium” (224–232). Since Aphthonios, arguing for marriage had been an innocent exercise for centuries, aimed at learning to speak about the thesis, and when marriage was suggested to a historical figure in a customarily fictitious oration, it was a way of teaching how to relate hypothesis back to thesis. But Erasmus raised a storm with his letter to a friend coaxing him to marry, because it was considered an anti-celibacy pamphlet. In his apology in 1519, the author defended himself arguing that it was an ordinary test in oratory, and he also wrote the opposite counterpart too.<sup>60</sup> Since then it had become clear that practising such oratorical exercises without theological stake would hardly be possible. A quite interesting example demonstrates status definitivus as well: “An Monachus, qui propter interfectum Regem Galliarum superioribus annis ultimo supplicio affectus est, mortuus sit ut Martyr, an vero ut parricida?” Denominational tolerance is really stretched to its limits here: only the second item of the two possible arguments is written up (277–282). There was no way for Scholl to prepare an oration that defends Dominican friar Clément, the murderer of Henry III, and the instigator, Jesuit priest Guignard, a speech that follows the arguments the Jesuits had after 1589. After Ravaillac’s repeated assassination in 1610, the issue of fanatical regicide was very much in the air. No doubt, it was heavily debated in Pécseli Király’s circles in Heidelberg.

It is possible that as the acquaintance of Pécseli Király and Goclenius can be traced back to Szenci Molnár’s intervention, the latter might have played a role in the fact that a major part of the example material of the rhetoric textbook is taken from Scholl’s book. Szenci Molnár had no way of knowing Scholl in person; when he first visited Marburg, the former professor had been dead for nine months. Yet, he could hear about Scholl in the intellectual circles in Marburg, especially from Goclenius. Scholl held a dispute in physics “de natura coeli” in 1593, and this was led by Goclenius. Goclenius obviously followed the career of his former student, later colleague with attention. But Pécseli Király could have heard about Scholl from his fellow students as well, who had studied in Marburg earlier. Obviously, the Frankfurt edition might have raised the attention of

<sup>60</sup> Thomas O. SLOANE, *Rhetorical Education and Two-sided Argument*, in: *Renaissance-Rhetorik – Renaissance Rhetoric*, Hrsg. Heinrich Franz PLETT, Berlin etc., de Gruyter, 1993, 163–178. Both letters are available, for instance, in *Opus de Conscribendis Epistolis*; Judith Rice HENDERSON, *Erasmian Ciceronians: Reformation Teachers of Letter-writing*, *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 10(1992), 273–302, 293.

Szenci Molnár or the students in Heidelberg independently of people at the university in Marburg.

The use of Scholl's rhetoric has its significance in the history of ideas, besides aspects of history of rhetoric in a narrow sense. The Calvinist Pécseli Király has been known to have an irenic mentality, and his portrait is enriched by the fact that he compiled a good part of his rhetoric textbook from a Lutheran source. He did not adapt the part in which the Lutheran link is most emphatic, the laudation titled *Oratio de Laboribus et Certaminibus D. Martini Lutheri*,<sup>61</sup> which is in the part about the praise of persons, still, in the passages he did adapt, we find references to Luther as the highest authority. One such point is the argument about the magistrate that rejects Catholic and Anabaptist extremes alike.<sup>62</sup>

Identification of the source that constitutes a significant part of the book is telling because it reinforces the assumption that it was Pécseli Király himself, who carried out later revisions of the first edition. As we have seen, the third edition preserved a broader version, and one addition came from Scholl's textbook that had been used for the first edition. In another case the later version returns to Scholl's original from an altered text in the first edition. Probably these corrections and additions do not come from the publisher in Nuremberg, who had no close knowledge of the conception or the sources, but from Pécseli Király himself, who owned Scholl's textbook and regarded it highly. And if we are listing differences of the third edition from the first, another one worth mentioning is that the closing chapter of the first book written *De Affectibus* is supplemented with further references. The sentence that compares affects to blood in the body, and thus highlights their importance, got included with a reference to Dresser's rhetoric ("in Prolegom. in Rhet. pag. 34.")<sup>63</sup> The use of Dresser could be taken for granted, based on the observations above, another addition, however, is a real surprise. Beside the list of considerations relevant to the rise of emotions—"qui, erga quos, quibus de causis"—we find the following reference: "Vossius in sua Institutione oratoria pag. 213."<sup>64</sup> Vossius' influence has never been mentioned in connection to Pécseli Király, even though he, who later became a renowned scholar in Leiden, published the first edition of his voluminous manual under the title *Oratoriarum Institutionum Libri Sex* already in 1606, when he was rector of the Latin school in Dordrecht. (The title changed to *Commentariorum Rhetoricorum, sive Oratoriarum Institutionum Libri Sex* with the third, expanded edition in 1630.<sup>65</sup>) Thus Pécseli Király could have used it for the first edition of his rhetoric. It seems he didn't, but he added a reference to the third edition. Several interesting conclu-

<sup>61</sup> SCHOLLIUS 1612, *op. cit.*, 79–97.

<sup>62</sup> PÉCSELI KIRÁLY Imre, *Bevezetés a retorikába két könyvben (Isagoges Rhetoricae Libri Duo, 1639)* (Selection in Hungarian translation), in: IMRE 2000, *op. cit.*, 265–334, 300.

<sup>63</sup> PÉCSELI KIRÁLY 1612/1639, *op. cit.*, 165.

<sup>64</sup> PÉCSELI KIRÁLY 1612/1639, *op. cit.*, 168.

<sup>65</sup> TARNAI Andor, *G. J. Vossius retorikájának kolozsvári kiadásai* (Kolozsvár editions of the rhetoric by G. J. Vossius), in: *Tótfalusi Kis Miklós: Előadások* (Papers on Miklós Tótfalusi Kis), eds. GOMBA Szabolcsné, HAIMAN György, Debrecen, KLTE Könyvtára, 1985, 151–157, 152–153. The work had four editions in Vossius' life—the fourth in 1643—, all in Leiden, except for the second (Dordrecht, 1609).

sions follow from this. One is that at the time of compilation, in 1611, it was not known in Heidelberg, that in the midst of a huge number of Melanchthonian textbooks of rhetoric published in Germany, a work of great importance had appeared in the Netherlands, one which would open a new chapter in the history of the discipline.<sup>66</sup> Another conclusion we need to draw is that the attention of the Hungarian author—who returned to his homeland and worked as a priest—to European developments in rhetoric did not flag. He soon realised the significance of the work published in the Netherlands. The pastor, who gives sermons to soldiers in the border castle of Érsekújvár and reads Vossius in his spare time—a bizarre image, but perhaps we have to get used to it.

<sup>66</sup> The scholarly community in the Netherlands and France received Vossius' work with enthusiasm immediately (the professors in Leiden, above all Josephus Justus Scaliger, just like Isaac Casaubon in France); the author's enlivening contacts with England after 1619 (about these: C. S. M. RADEMAKER, *Gerardus Joannes Vossius and His English Correspondents*, *Lias*, 19[1992], 173–213) speeded up his reception there (Thomas Farnaby). The first unauthorised editions in Germany came out in 1616 and 1617 in Frankfurt an der Oder supplemented with examples from two other rhetorical novelties, works by Keckermann and Tympius. Cf. C. S. M. RADEMAKER, *Life and Work of Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577–1649)*, Assen, Van Gorcum, 1981 (*Respublica literaria neerlandica*, 5), 74–81.