

THOMAE
LINACRI GRAMMA-
TICES COMPENDIOSA PER
quaestiones expli-
catio.

A
GREGORIO MOLNAR,
sanctę memoria, in vsum stu-
diosę iuventutis con-
scripta,

CVM S. R. M. PRIVILEGIO.

CLAVDIOPOLI
Anno Domini 1566.

ISTVÁN BARTÓK

**A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH–HUNGARIAN
CULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS: THE LINACRE-EDITION
OF GERGELY MOLNÁR IN KOLOZSVÁR**

Both Hungarian and English literature knows about a renowned handbook edited in Hungary. Several Latin grammars appeared in the print-shop of Gáspár Heltai in the Hungarian intellectual centre Kolozsvár (today Cluj-Napoca in Romania), in the mid-16th century. A teacher of the Kolozsvár school Gergely Molnár compiled these. Besides works by Leonhard Culmann¹ and Philipp Melanchthon,² another published work—according to the front cover—is a brief summary of the grammar of Thomas Linacre explained in a question-and-answer format.³ The source of this compendium has been identified incorrectly in the Hungarian and consequently in the English literature. Correction of this mistake is extremely important in regard to Hungarian critical history as well as refining English–Hungarian relationships. That is, if we find its real source and thus designate its exact place in the grammatical literature of the century, we can easily understand that this work marks the beginning of a new era in the history of theoretical handbooks compiled in Hungary.

1. Thomas Linacre and George Buchanan

The first to write about the source of Linacre's grammar was Pál Berg in an English-language paper in 1944. He has no doubts that the source is *Rudimenta grammatices* by the famous English humanist Thomas Linacre. This elementary Latin grammar, which was written originally in English, spread across Europe in a Latin translation by George Buchanan. Pál Berg is convinced that it reached Kolozsvár. He is more cautious regarding the question whether Linacre's work was the model for Gergely Molnár's own grammar published ten years earlier. This work would be republished many times. Berg

¹ First known edition from Kolozsvár: *Aelii Donati viri clarissimi De octo partibus orationis methodus. Questiunculis puerilibus, undique collectis, illustrata per Leonardum Culmannum Crayssheymensem*, 1554. Bibliographic description: *Régi magyarországi nyomtatványok, 1473–1600* (RMNy, Old prints from Hungary), Budapest, 1971, no. 107.

² First known edition from Kolozsvár: *Grammatica Philippi Melantonis ab authore recognita et a Mycillo aucta et ultimo locupletata*, 1556. RMNy no. 135. The first part of the only known copy of this edition is missing; its title can be inferred from the redaction from 1570 (RMNy no. 291).

³ *Thomae Linacri grammatices compendiosa per quaestiones explicatio: A Gregorio Molnar, sancte memoriae, in usum studiosae iuventutis conscripta*, Kolozsvár, 1566. RMNy no. 221. Today all known copies are from this edition only. 19th-century bibliographer of old Hungarian books Károly Szabó reported about a copy of the improved and expanded version from 1578. RMNy no. 412.

hopes that further research would justify his thesis that the source of one of the most popular Latin grammars in Hungary is indeed the English author's work.⁴ He included these ideas in his Hungarian-language book on English influences.⁵ Later, after Berg, it was accepted as fact that Molnár's Linacre-edition was based on *Rudimenta*.

This was included in the bibliography of old prints after authoritative summaries of literary histories. There we can read the following: "The grammar by Thomas Linacre English humanist physician was published many times in the 16th century. According to the front page Gergely Molnár adapted it for school use. Comparison with the original shows that the question-and-answer structure is the work of Molnár."⁶ The authors of this description relied on the literature and considered the Latin adaptation of Linacre's *Rudimenta* "the original", and compared the Kolozsvár edition with that. *Rudimenta* is undoubtedly continuous text both in the English and the Latin versions while Molnár presents his material in dialogue format.

András Varga, in his university doctoral thesis on Gergely Molnár, touches briefly upon grammatical textbooks connected to Molnár. On the Linacre-grammar he writes: "The Kolozsvár edition is not based on the English original but on its Latin translation by George Buchanan published first in 1533."⁷ However, in the relevant note Varga does not specify the title *Rudimenta* of Buchanan's translation but cites another title: "Linacre's textbook with the title 'De emendata structura Latini sermonis', first published in 1524, appeared also in Wittenberg in 1531 with a preface by Melanchthon. No doubt, Molnár benefited from studying the latter in Wittenberg—according to the statutes of the university modified by Melanchthon in 1546 it was Linacre's grammatical textbook that was studied at the Faculty of Arts."⁸ No further attempt is made to establish a stronger connection between this edition and the Linacre-edition from Kolozsvár based on this piece of information.

As for the literature in English: monographer of Buchanan MacFarlane refers to Pál Berg's piece from 1944 when he states that the Linacre-edition of Kolozsvár is based on Buchanan's translation, and the latter might even have influenced the grammar compiled by Gergely Molnár himself.⁹ After MacFarlane *Rudimenta* entered English literature as

⁴ Paul BERG, *George Buchanan and His Influence in Hungary*, in: *Yolland emlékkönyv—Yolland Memorial Volume*, eds. Sándor FEST, László ORSZÁGH, József SZENTKIRÁLYI, Budapest, 1944 (Angol Filológiai Tanulmányok—Hungarian Studies in English, 5–6), 98–114. On Buchanan's translation of *Rudimenta* and on Hungarian influence: 102–106. The work also appeared in an offprint (Budapest, 1944), page number references in the English literature refer to this.

⁵ BERG Pál, *Angol hatások tizenhetedik századi irodalmunkban* (English influences in our 17th-century literature), Budapest, 1946, 57, 191–192.

⁶ RMNy no. 221.

⁷ VARGA András, *Molnár Gergely, Melanchthon magyar tanítványa* (Gergely Molnár, a Hungarian student of Melanchthon), Szeged, 1983 (Dissertationes ex Bibliotheca Universitatis de Attila József nominatae, 7), 36.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 56.

⁹ "...an expanded edition by Gregory Molnar was published posthumously in Hungary under the title *Thomae Linacri grammatices compendiosa per quaestiones...* in 1566. Even more surprisingly, the spirit of the work managed to survive in another work of Molnar's, *Elementa grammaticae Latinae*, which went

the source of Molnár's Linacre-adaptation as well as a possible model for the Latin grammar published under his own name.¹⁰

In the Hungarian literature a note in the dissertation of András Varga indicates that Linacre compiled not one but several Latin grammars. However, before going into the details of Linacre's oeuvre as a grammar-writer it seems worthwhile to outline his career. It will show that he as a person deserves attention just for his significance. Just the fact that the work that served as a basis for the Kolozsvár edition was from an eminent humanist author is important in itself.

Thomas Linacre (Latin form: Thomas Linacer, Linacrus) was an outstanding figure of the intellectual élite of his age. He was born around 1460, probably in the Canterbury diocese. He studied in Oxford from 1481 and was elected fellow of All Saints College in 1484. He travelled to Italy in 1487, probably as a member of the delegation sent by Henry VII to Innocent VIII. He stayed in Rome and then, from 1488, in Florence. There he studied Latin, then Greek from, among others, Angelo Poliziano. Giovanni de Medici, later Pope Leo X, supported his studies. He went to Venice in 1492 or '93, and acquired a physician degree in Padua. From 1497 he stayed in Venice again: he joined Aldus Manutius in the publication of Aristotle's *editio princeps* in Greek. He returned home in 1499, became acquainted with Erasmus and Thomas More, took part in the translation of medical and other specialised works from Greek to Latin. Medical history regards his translation of Galen especially highly. He was the court physician of Henry VIII from 1509. In 1518 he founded the College of Physicians, which would become the Royal College of Physicians, with the support of Henry VIII and Cardinal Thomas Wolsey. In 1523 he was appointed tutor of Princess Mary who would become Queen Mary I. He taught medical science in Oxford in 1523–24. He died in London on 20 October 1524.¹¹

2. Description and speculation

Scholarship knows about four Latin grammars by Linacre. The first was not published, its content is not extant even in manuscript, the next three, however, are known in print. The latter two appeared in numerous editions.

through many editions until 1800 or so and was last printed in 1830." Ian Dalrymple MACFARLANE, *Buchanan*, London, 1981, 46.

¹⁰ „This version [Kolozsvár, 1566], apparently a text with commentary, reprinted in 1578, may have been the original form of Molnár's *Elementa grammatices Latinae* of which there were fifteen editions in the seventeenth century. See P. Berg, *George Buchanan and his Influence in Hungary*, Budapest, 1944, pp. 8–11. I am indebted to Professor I. D. McFarlane for this reference." Giles BARBER, *Thomas Linacre: A Bibliographical Survey of His Works*, in: *Linacre Studies: Essays on the Life and Works of Thomas Linacre*, eds. Francis MADDISON, Margaret PELLING, Charles WEBSTER, Oxford, 1977, 290–336, 325.

¹¹ *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation*, ed. Peter Gerard BIETENHOLZ, II, Toronto, 1986, 331–332; *Lexicon grammaticorum: Who's Who in the History of World Linguistics*, ed. Harro STAMMERJOHANN, Tübingen, 1996, 578.

Linacre's linguistic activities are first mentioned in a letter by Erasmus on 13 September 1511 to John Colet, dean of St. Paul School in London. The letter makes it evident that Linacre compiled a grammar for the newly founded school but it was not accepted. We can only guess the reasons. Assumptions can be based on the offering poems in his next work *Progymnasmata*. These are authored by John Colet, Thomas More, and William Lily, author of "Lilius", the grammatical work compiled in England that reached the highest number of editions. It has been assumed that the level of Linacre's work was too high for lower-grade education.

The first grammatical work of Linacre that is extant, *Progymnasmata grammatices vulgaria*, an elementary level Latin grammar written in English, may be an adaptation of the rejected work. It might have been published first between the end of 1514 and March 1517. Copies of this edition are all lost. The only known print can be dated around 1523.

Linacre's next elementary level textbook is *Rudimenta grammatices*, the work that scholarly research considers the source of the Kolozsvár edition after Pál Berg. The English original might have been produced around 1523. It probably appeared in that year in London, but this is only inferred. The first known copy is the London redaction from 1525. As stated earlier, it owes its enormous popularity to Buchanan's Latin translation, especially in French-speaking territories. The Scottish humanist was the tutor of Gilbert Kennedy, Earl of Cassilis III in Paris, where the latter studied from 1532. The Latin translation was made for him. This version was first published in 1533 as stated in András Varga's thesis. 16 further editions followed the first in Paris; there were years when several printers put it on the market. 8 editions came out in Lyon and 2 in Basle. It was often bound together with the Latin grammar of Ludovicus Vives.

Linacre's best-known grammar is *De emendata structura Latini sermonis*. In contrast with his earlier works, Linacre wrote this one in Latin. It appeared first in London in 1524. Historical data on its publication shows the high demand for the handbook: bibliographies report about 50 editions from various towns in Europe (Paris and Leipzig 11 each, Basle and Cologne 7 each, Lyon 6, Wittenberg and Magdeburg 2 each, London and Venice 1 each). This does not include various abstracts and summaries.¹²

The fact—also mentioned by Varga—that Melanchthon wrote a preface for the 1531 Wittenberg edition probably fostered the popularity of *De emendata structura*. Melanchthon recommended this work for teaching Latin grammar at higher levels of education. He points out: knowledge of elementary rules is an indispensable starting point of learning Latin, but it is not enough in itself for gaining knowledge of the nature of speech. Linacre's syntax is quite good for learning the ways of constructing sentences. Because of this, he took steps popularising the work in a wide circle. He urges teachers to teach rules of proper language usage from this book after elementary grammatical knowledge.¹³

¹² D. F. S. THOMSON, *Linacre's Grammars*, in: MADDISON–PELLING–WEBSTER, *op. cit.*, 24–35; BARBER, *op. cit.*, 290–336.

¹³ *Thomae Linacri Britanni, De emendata structura Latini sermonis, Libri VI. cum praeffatione] Philip[p]i Melanch[thonis]*, Wittenberg, 1531, 2r–v. The work came out with two different colophons; Viteber-

We need to emphasise: *De emendata structura* is a turning point in humanistic grammatical literature. It is not just one of the myriads of Latin grammars but the first formulation of the newer (16th-century) philosophical and speculative attitude towards language. In order to highlight the nature and significance of this change we need to outline briefly its place in the history of linguistics.

While the main objective of descriptive grammars is systematic presentation of the most important rules and teaching proper usage, speculative grammars lean towards more abstract, more theoretical aspects. Works in this category are closely related to areas of—in modern terms—general linguistics, philosophy of language, or theory of knowledge. They are more like formulations of scholarly theories.

Problems of syntax appeared in comprehensive grammars already in antiquity. These often pushed the limits of phonetics and morphology and raised several theoretical questions. Philosophical grammar was revived in the Middle Ages starting from the old question how one can know reality with the aid of language. Knowledge of the Aristotelian corpus became more widespread in the 12th century. *Analytica posteriora* and especially *Physica* had strong influence on ideas concerning science. From this time there was a stronger need to study things that are demonstrably necessary and universally valid. Grammarians, too, strived to justify that their activities indeed meet the requirements of science. This was not easy since individual languages are not universal, and it's a basic premise of Aristotelianism that the meaning of words is based rather on habit than on their nature.

Thus, more philosophically inclined grammarians did not focus on the meaning of words (which they called *significatio specialis*) or their phonetic structure, since both are incidental properties. Instead they paid attention to characteristics that differentiate parts of speech, that is, word classes. Such are case, gender, tense, and the like. These were called *modi significandi* and were said to be universal, i.e. prevalent to all languages. While *significatio specialis* is based on phenomena that are incidental and are based on general consensus, *modi significandi* have a rational connection to real characteristics of things, their way of existence, *modi essendi*. These enter our consciousness as *modi intelligendi passivi*, and, due to our intellect, transform into *modi intelligendi activi*. This is how the meaning of *modi significandi* manifests for us. For instance, the phenomenon of pain can be described using words of different classes or different words: *doleo*, *dolor*, *dolens*, or simply *heu*; we have the corresponding words in every language, not only in Latin. These map the same phenomenon, but *modi significandi* are different. *Doleo*, for example, expresses (*consignificat*) time, which is a general characteristic of all verbs. We can see that one of the key concepts of this outlook is *modus*; this is why its exponents were called modists. They had a wide influence. The work written by Thomas of Erfurt between 1300 and 1310 (*De modis significandi*) played a significant part in this.

gae apud Ioannem Luft: shelfmark in Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel (HAB), S: Alv.: Cb 192 (1); Vitebergae apud Iosephum Klug: HAB, H: P 1009.8° Helmst. (1).

Scholars of philosophical or speculative orientation established a very precise system for the syntactical description of language. Nevertheless, they did not abandon the tradition of Donatus and Priscian, but tried to harmonise it with the new philosophical requirements. Yet, they moved far away from prescriptive grammars of Latin and other languages.

If by grammar in a strict sense we mean an overall, consistent description of language, then we must say that the interest in the Latin language by 15–16th-century humanists was foremost philological, not grammatical. Grammarians cited classical prose-writers abundantly, and expounded at great length on the differences between specific words and phrases and their proper usage. They made countless accurate observations about specific linguistic phenomena, but they did not seek to produce a comprehensive system. The main objective of the humanists was acquiring knowledge of Latin that complied with the language usage of classical authors and attained the stylistic elegance that was considered ideal. They felt that prescriptive systems based on classical writers and grammarians can be helpful in this. The most influential formulation of this view is the work by Lorenzo Valla *De linguae Latinae elegantia* (1449). Erasmus' first prosaic work, which he wrote at the age of 18, was a synopsis of just this work of Valla (*Epitome in elegantiarum libros Laurentii Vallae*), in which he listed knowledge alphabetically. Later he published the entire work in its original form. The most important grammatical work of Erasmus (*De copia verborum ac rerum libri duo*, 1511) is a summary of humanists' views on language usage.

Many voiced their aversion towards modist grammar. Lorenzo Valla declared prominent modist Martinus de Dacia a major enemy of Latin. In Northern-Europe Alexander Hegius—who was a teacher of Erasmus in Deventer—wrote a whole book titled *Contra modos significandi invectiva* (1486). Representatives of humanistic scholarship like Erasmus or Melanchthon also regarded philosophical-logical theories from the Middle Ages speculations and viewed these with suspicion.¹⁴

Linacre's epoch-changing work *De emendata structura* still spread rapidly in an intellectual life influenced by the authority of Erasmus and Melanchthon. Modern scholarship sees the reason of its popularity in the fact that he found the ideal compromise between tradition of the Middle Ages and the humanistic approach of his time. It did not turn against the late-classical tradition held in high esteem to a degree that would have sparked the anger of prominent figures of the era. Still, renewal of elements of the modist outlook served as a starting point for more radical representatives of philosophical and speculative grammars later.

Besides the presence of the medieval tradition, another feature that clearly sets Linacre apart from his humanist contemporaries interested in language is the clear intention of

¹⁴ W. Keith PERCIVAL, *The Grammatical Tradition and the Rise of the Vernaculars* (1975) = W. K. P., *Studies in Renaissance Grammar*, Aldershot, Hampshire, 2004, I, 231–275; Brian CUMMINGS, *The Literary Culture of the Reformation: Grammar and Grace*, Oxford, 2002, 127–143; Gerard Johannes LUHRMANN, *Studies in Rational and Humanist Grammar, with the 1752 Edition of Joannes Daniel van Lennep Oratio inauguralis, de linguarum analogia, ex analogicis mentis actionibus probata*, Münster, 2006, 29–41.

classification. He went beyond the frameworks of medieval and humanistic grammars alike. He modified them fundamentally and opened the way for grasping new grammatical characteristics of language. During this, by discussing classical quotations in a new way, he also found the way of inserting accumulated philological knowledge in the new system without breaking its integrity.

So Linacre succeeded in combining the aspiration for a theoretical system with humanistic tradition that is predisposed to philological detail in a high-level grammar.¹⁵ In the following I briefly present Linacre's system on the basis of *De emendata structura*. A tabular summary is attached in the appendix.

Linacre holds that investigation of grammatically interpretable speech (*oratio grammatica*) has two parts. First we must attend to components, material of speech, i.e. individual words (*dictiones*); then to the way speech appears—its form, which manifests in the order and connection (*dictionum inter se compositio*) of individual words. This is how the sentence's structure (*constructio*) is created. It is not difficult to see in this classification the kinship with invention and disposition in a rhetorical sense. According to Linacre's definition the first two books, morphology, discuss material of speech; the subsequent four deal with form (syntax). Nonetheless, syntactical considerations appear already in the first book besides morphological aspects, and they are more dominant in the second book.

Knowledge related to individual words can be divided into two main parts. Particular or legitimate (*propriae seu legitimae*) properties belong to the first group, and the second contains those that do not ensue from the words themselves but have significance in the construction of sentences (*impropriae seu figuratae*).

The first book expounds particular properties of words; this is the one that is the most similar to the eight parts of speech (*octo partes orationis*), i.e. the traditional explanation of word classes, etymology. Declinable word classes (*declinabiles*) are followed by indeclinables (*indeclinabiles*). Declinable parts of speech are treated according to three aspects of word classes. The first is exact definition (*accurata definitio*). Definitions are most often based on Donatus and Priscian, but the influence of medieval modists, perhaps of Thomas of Erfurt is discernible. The second is separation of species of the given part of speech, taking into account phonetic form (*vox*) and the thing it designates (*res*). The third is additional properties (*accidentia*): *casus, genus, numerus, persona, tempus, and modus*.

The second book discusses characteristics of words that do not come from the words themselves but are related to the construction of sentences. The most comprehensive category of changes occurring during the construction of sentences (*mutatio, commutatio*) is *enallage*: all further subgroups are included in that.

Enallage can be of two different kinds: *anthimeria* or *heterosis*. *Anthimeria* includes the cases when in place of a word class another is used (*pars orationis pro altera parte*

¹⁵ Kristian JENSEN, *De emendata structura Latini sermonis: The Latin Grammar of Thomas Linacre*, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 49(1986), 106–125.

orationis). *Heterosis* can be one of two kinds: in one of them instead of a kind of a certain word class another kind (*species pro specie*) is used. *Anthimeria* and this kind of *heterosis* are closely related to specific word classes (in syntactical context), so it is discussed in book 2, which belongs to morphology. The other kind of *heterosis*, when an additional property is replaced by another (*accidens pro accidente*) will be discussed in detail in book 6. Book 2 ends with this promise.

In the third book begins the discussion of syntactical problems in a stricter sense. First we are given an overview of the structure of syntax. Form of speech, i.e. fitting together its components, can be of two kinds: regular or irregular. Regular (*iusta, legitima*) construction follows grammatical rules (*secundum analogiam*), i.e. definitive grammatical prescriptions (*sicuti recta Grammatices ratio exigit*) using either declinable or indeclinable word classes. Its main features: nothing is missing from the sentence relative to the standard construction, nothing is superfluous, and everything falls into its place, nothing changes (*nec deest quippiam, nec redundat, nec loco suo abest, nec immutatur*). The majority of eminent old authors formulated their sentences this way both in speech and in writing (*qua [forma] veterum probatissimi, plurimum loquendo, tum scribendo usi sunt*).

In irregular (*iniusta*) or freely formed (*figurata*) construction sentences are not created following grammatical rules (*contra analogiam*). In such cases something is missing, something is superfluous, misplaced, or changed (*deest aliquid, vel redundat: vel loco suo abest, vel immutatur*). Nevertheless, there are plenty of examples in the works of the most famous writers in Latin (*non tamen sine summorum virorum in Romana lingua exemplo*).

Free construction can be of two kinds: Latin (*Latina*) or Greek (*Graeca*) type. The former means an important requirement in Latinity in the Quintilianian sense: linguistic correctness. In this context it manifests rather in the proper selection of words than in adherence to grammatical rules. Hellenisms belong to Greek-type construction.

After the review of the construction of sentences come detailed descriptions of the cases: information on regular construction first, by word class. In subsequent chapters of book 3 we find syntax of nominal (*nomen*) and pronoun (*pronomem*).

The fourth book presents the rules of inserting verb (*verbum*) and participle (*participium*), while the fifth book those of inserting indeclinable word classes: preposition (*praepositio*), adverb (*adverbium*), interjection (*interiectio*), and conjunction (*coniunctio*) into the sentence.

The sixth book classifies various cases of free-form construction. The discussion of Latin syntax reveals that deviation from the rules can happen in relation to three elements, these are: quantity (*numerus*), order (*ordo*), and change (*immutatio*).

The aspect of quantity is the basis for grasping cases in which there is deficiency (*defectus*) or excess (*excessus*). The former is described with the terms *ecclipsis*, *aposiopesis*, *zeugma*, *syllipsis*, *prolepsis*, and *anapodoton*, the latter with *pleonasmus*, within that with *parelton* and *epanalepsis*.

Irregularities regarding order are described with hyperbaton and its subcategories. These are *anastrophe*, *hysteriologia*, *tmesis*, *parenthesis*, *synchysis*, and *metathesis*.

Various kinds of changes fit into subclasses of *enallage* not utilised so far. Cases of *heterosis* in which an additional property is replaced with another one (*accidens pro accidente*) belong here. Changes of case, gender, number, person, time, and mode are discussed here exhaustively.

The sixth book and the whole work end with examples of Hellenisms.

This short overview shows how important rhetorical considerations are in the system. This example demonstrates that grammar, poetics, and rhetoric rely on one another inseparably. So handbooks of grammar are not only interesting for historians of linguistics but can provide useful additional material for gaining deeper knowledge of the old outlook on language and literature. Because different aspects of the same unified outlook appear in connecting scholarly fields. Whether they formulated rules for creating text or searched for points of reference for explanations of works by writers and poets, an exact grasp on linguistic phenomena proved to be suitable. The structure of language provides a way to describe phenomena perceived on the levels of letters, syllables, words, and sentences. Categories that we traditionally link mainly to rhetoric were created just for this. Depending on the reason of and the purpose for the identification of various solutions in language, the same categories can be applied in grammar, poetics, and rhetoric alike with appropriate modifications suitable for the given discipline. Their logical structure in itself or their place in a larger context can be determined based on dialectic. Modern research definitely should take this complexity into account. Critical history cannot avoid a theoretical formulation of the requirements in any of the affected fields. It would be a waste to ignore specific expectations recorded by contemporaries from the aspects of investigations of old texts.

After this we may appreciate the significance of the fact that Gergely Molnár's edition was not based on *Rudimenta*, which is descriptive, but—without doubt—on *De emendata structura*, which introduced a new era of philosophical grammar and contains rhetorical considerations abundantly. It is verifiable through what channels it reached Molnár.

3. Johann Sager and Gergely Molnár

The first pages of the little volume from Kolozsvár already tell us where to look for the direct source. On the verso of the title page there is a short offering by Kolozsvár printer Gáspár Heltai. The publisher, besides praising the author's merit, provides a piece of philological data. He notes: when Molnár was shortening Linacre's huge work, he followed a collection of tables from Breslau (*Tabularium Vratislaviense*) as guiding line.

This way all necessary pieces of information found their place in a clear, applicable way.¹⁶

An interesting piece of data from the history of schools in the town brings us closer to the nature of the tables of Breslau. In the afternoon of 22 October 1556, at 3 o'clock the faculty of the St. Elisabeth secondary school gathered for a ceremonial event. Their colleague David Rhenisch gave his farewell talk on the occasion of leaving the town. He would continue his career in Wittenberg. Remembering the years he had spent at the school he praised each of his fellow-teachers. From our perspective the appreciation of Johann Sager is especially important. Rhenisch acknowledged his methods of teaching Greek language and then went on to speak about his activities related to Latin: Sager compiled tables based on Linacre's book on an improved structure of the Latin language and attached quite useful exercises to it.

In November 1556 Rhenisch was already in Wittenberg. Sager grabbed the opportunity and entrusted his elder colleague with handing over the manuscript of the Linacre-adaptation to Melanchthon and ask him to revise it and help in its publication. He felt that by doing this the *praeceptor* would not only do a great favour for him but also for the town council of Breslau and schools in the town. Sager thought that teaching Linacre's grammar could be introduced in Mary Magdalene School besides St. Elisabeth. Melanchthon replied only that he was going to attend to the matter after his son-in-law Kaspar Peucer's return home. We have no information about further events along this line: either about any commentary from Melanchthon or about an edition in Wittenberg.¹⁷ Sager's adaptation of Linacre would finally appear in Breslau in the following year,

¹⁶ "Caspar Heltus Studiosis Adolescentibus, verum studiorum profectum. Omnes videre possunt, nisi qui cerebro destituuntur, ac invidentia livore occupati sunt, quantum emolumenti Reipublicae labores viri optimi, D. Gregorio Molnar, honestissimae reminiscentiae, attulerint. Compendium Grammatices commune fundamentum verae eruditiones iecit: ut porro aliud existeret pro formando studiosorum iudicio, opus illud egregium et gravissimum Thomae Lynacri, mira industria in hanc brevitatem redegit. Habuit quidem duces Tabularium Vratislaviense. Cum magna perspicuitate et apposite omnia necessaria in suum ordinem collocavit. Gratia sit igitur omnibus studiosis huius boni viri memoria. Quin et nostram erga vos propensitatem eadem gratitudine amplectamini, qui non parvis laboribus ac sumptibus haec publicamus: ac bene valete." LINACRE-MOLNÁR, *op. cit.*, A2v.

¹⁷ On Sager's activities: Gustav BAUCH, *Geschichte des Breslauer Schulwesens in der Zeit der Reformation: Der Universität Breslau zur hundertjährigen Jubiläum*, Breslau, 1911 (Codex diplomaticus Silesiae, 26), 176–198. Bauch quotes Rhenisch's farewell address in his own translation: "Außerdem hat er Tafeln aus dem Werke des Thomas Linacre über die verbesserte Konstruktion der lateinischen Rede zusammengestellt und sehr nützliche Übungen damit verbunden, die zeitweise schon vor uns versucht und mit großem Nutzen für die Studien durchgeführt worden sind." He specifies in the notes where to find the original Latin text (*Declamaciuncula composita et recitata Vratislaviae in Schola Divae Elisabeth loco valedictionis Anno 56. die Octob. 22. hora 15.*), 178.

1557, in Crispianus Scharffenberg's print-shop.¹⁸ It would be published three years later in Basle as well.¹⁹

Before presenting Johann Sager's work it seems worthwhile to outline his career briefly, since, as we will see, he served as a direct model for Gergely Molnár. He came from Wittstock, Priegnitz, and studied in Frankfurt; he earned baccalaureate degree 21 June 1547 and *magister* degree on 1 September. He enrolled at the university of Wittenberg on 9 August 1547. He is probably identical to Vratislaviensis Johannes Sagerus, who appears in the Bologna university register, and listened to subjects in the natural sciences with Ulisse Aldrovandi. As a town physician of Lübeck he studied more: he studied astronomy and Greek language. He was a teacher of Greek at St. Elisabeth secondary school in Breslau from 16 June 1552. He taught there until 1568. Then he travelled to Italy. We have no data about his fate afterwards.²⁰

Editions of the original text of *De emendata structura* were large volumes in octavo format, and had 5–600 pages depending on the typography. Different editions tried to facilitate orientation in the huge work through various indices. Editors of a Basle edition were convinced that their 51-page index was more extensive and more complete than any other before.²¹ The most important revision, which did not change the size of the book, was made by Johannes Camerarius (Leipzig, 1545). Sager managed to compress Linacre's original text to one fourth of its size, 150 pages.

The front page of the Breslau edition does not say the author's name, but Sager names himself on the next page, in the offering's title, as he greets members of the town council.²² After praising Linacre's teaching, he goes on to tell: original text of *De emendata structura* is probably not easy to understand for those not accustomed to such treatises. He considers it his task to transform it in a way students can understand it. The adaptation's question-and-answer form serves this purpose. He indicates that he intends his work to explain his previously published tabular summary.²³

¹⁸ *Grammatices Thomae Linacri brevis et perspicua per quaestiones et tabulas explicatio*, Breslau, 1557. According to my knowledge it is not available in Hungary. I used the copy from Wolfenbüttel: HAB, H: P 859.8° Helmst. (2).

¹⁹ *Tabulae in Grammaticam [...] Thomae Linacri*, Basel, 1560. VD 16: ZV 25011. Its copies are available in Augsburg and Berlin.

²⁰ BAUCH, *op. cit.*, 176–180; Danuta QUIRINI-POPLAWSKA, *I visitatori Polacchi del museo di oggetti naturali di Ulisse Aldrovandi*, in: *Commentationes historicae: Almae Matri Studiorum Bononiensi novem saecula feliciter celebranti ab Universitate Iagelonica Cracoviensi oblatae*, ed. Stanislaw CYNARSKI, Warsaw, 1988, 147–165, 164.

²¹ *Thomae Linacri Britanni De emendata structurae Latini sermonis libri VI. Cum epistola commendatitia Philippi Melancthonis. Et cum indice quam antea copiosiore & diligentiore*, Basel, 1543. Index: E5r–H7r. HAB, H: P 1010.8° Helmst. (1).

²² "Amplissimo Senatui inclytæ urbis Vratislaviae, Dominis ac Patronis suis perpetua observantia colendis, Ioannes Sagerus, S. D." SAGER, *op. cit.*, A2r.

²³ "... in quibus si quae nonnullis, ad eius dictionem, nondum assuefactis, forsan obscuriora videbuntur, fidelis interpretis erit officium, ut ea familiaribus verbis declaret, & [...] explicans isti obscuritatis difficultati medeatur [...]. Ut autem illud, quid institui rectius assequeretur, & ea omnia, quae in ipso autore difficilia videri possunt, redderem adeo intellectu facilia, ut etiam pueris commode proponerentur. Primum ordinem et metho-

There are no tables in Gergely Molnár's Linacre-edition of Kolozsvár, just as there are no tables in the above-mentioned Breslau publication. Both are abridged versions of *De emendata structura* in question-and-answer form. They follow the structure of the original and have similar sizes. Besides fundamental similarities there are also differences. Gergely Molnár adopts Sager's solutions precisely in many cases, but in other places abstracts and interprets the common source in a different way. From the differences it seems that Molnár's reduction is more clear-cut than Sager's. The structure of the whole work is clearer and formulation of individual entries is simpler, more comprehensible. To demonstrate this, it seems fruitful to put fragments from the two books side-by-side. I chose the first sentences because both authors allude to Linacre's work that served as a basis.

Johann Sager	Gergely Molnár
Quem sibi Linacer scopum & finem Grammaticae institutionis suae proponit?	Quid docet Linacer?
Finem et scopum principalem instituti operis titulus ostendit, quod in eo emendatam Latini sermonis structuram potissimum tradat et explicet.	Docet Grammaticen, hoc est Latini sermonis structuram emendatam.

To sum up we can point out: the English, Latin-language source of the Linacre-edition of Kolozsvár is *De emendata structura Latini sermonis*. The direct model for Gergely Molnár was the adaptation by Silesian Johann Sager. It is very important for Hungarian critical history that—in accordance with the changes occurring in European grammatical history—a high-quality summary came out in Transylvania, even if in a simplified form. Earlier similar works published in Hungary and Transylvania were descriptive grammars. Such is *Grammatica Hungarolatina*, a parallel Latin–Hungarian grammar by János Sylvester (1539)²⁴ and such are the other compendia of Brassó (today Braşov in Romania, 1539) and Kolozsvár (1554, 1556).

As for English influences: in the light of the presented results we can conclude that we have gained and we have lost something. We have to remove the Linacre-edition from

dum, quam in eo expeditissimam animadverti, secutus, totum illius doctrinae corpus singulaque eius membra (interdum insertis disputationibus, & orationis etiam serie longius distracta) in breves quasdam tabulas contraxi, & quodque ad suum locum & numeros redeggi, verbisque in communi usu positae ea, quae obscurius dicta, aut etiam praetermissa videbantur, declaravi & supplevi ac veluti in pictura aliqua omnia oculis spectanda, & uno intuitu animo comprehenda proposui. Nunc vero Isagogen quandam illis addendam putavi, qua per institutas quaestiones illis, qui istiusmodi tabularum usum minus intelligunt, easque inspicere, & inde rectissime facillimeque totum Grammatices negocium plenius cognoscere expetunt, viam & rationem singula suo ordine considerandi & observandi monstrarem, & ad tabularum diagrammata rectius aspicienda & percipienda quasi manu deducerem." *Ibid.*, A4v–A6r.

²⁴ Critical edition: Ioannes SYLVESTER, *Grammatica Hungarolatina*, edidit, introduxit et commentariis instruxit Stephanus BARTÓK, Budapest, 2006 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum: Series Nova, 15), with an English-language introductory essay, explanations, and notes. Electronic version: <http://mek.oszk.hu/05700/05725/05725.pdf>.

the documents of Buchanan's Hungarian influence, because its source is not *Rudimenta* translated by Buchanan from English to Latin. But we are compensated abundantly by the fact that the basis of the Kolozsvár adaptation is Linacre's most famous grammatical work, the first and most influential manual of philosophical or speculative grammar in the 16th century.

Appendix

Thomae Linacri grammatices compendiosa per quaestiones explicatio: A Gregorio Molnar, sancte memoriae, in usum studiosae iuventutis conscripta, Kolozsvár, 1566. An outline of the structure of the work.

Liber primus:

[Oratio grammatica, 1.]

Materia: dictiones

[Dictiones, 1.]

Propriae, seu legitimae: octo partibus grammaticae orationis explicantur

Liber secundus:

[Dictiones, 2.]

Impropriae, seu figuratae

[Enallage, 1.]

Antimeria: cum pars orationis pro altera parte orationis ponitur

[Enallage, 2, 1.]

Heterosis [1.]: cum species pro specie usurpatur

Liber tertius:

[Oratio grammatica, 2.]

Forma: dictionum inter se compositio (constructio)

[Constructio, 1.]

Constructio iusta seu legitima

De constructione nominis

Liber quartus:

De constructione verborum et participiorum

Liber quintus:

De non declinatarum partium constructione

Liber sextus:

[Constructio, 2.]
Constructio figurata

[Constructio figurata, 1.]
Constructio figurata Latina

Numero

Defectus
Ecclipsis
Aposiopesis
Zeugma
Syllepsis
Prolepsis
Anapodoton
Excessus
Pleonasmus

Ordo

Hyperbaton
Anastrophe
Hysteriologia
Tmesis
Parenthesis
Synchysis
Hypallage

Immutatio

[Enallage, 2, 2.]
Heterosis [2.]: cum accidens pro accidente usurpatur
Causa
Genus
Numerus
Persona
Modus
Tempus

[Constructio figurata, 2.]
Constructio figurata Graeca: Hellenismus