PÉTER EKLER

METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN 15TH CENTURY LATIN GRAMMAR BOOKS USED IN HUNGARY: *SAEPES, FAEX, PECUS*[*]

The present case study will introduce the methods applied in teaching and practising a grammar point in the most popular Latin grammars in Europe, and thus in Hungary.

The analysis is focused on the class of nouns out of the eight classes of words *(octo partes orationis),* and within it on the third declination, or more precisely on the answer to the grammar problem posed by the three (or rather: four) *nomina (faex, faecis; pecus, pecudis—pecus, pecoris; saepes, saepis).*

The choice was guided by two main criteria. Firstly, as they applied different approaches, different grammars occasionally supplemented (and even corrected) one another. Secondly, at an early stage of language learning, these words are easily confused with similar words. *Faex* enables textbooks to distinguish it from *fas, falx, fax,* and *fraus. Pecus, pecudis* and *pecus, pecoris* usually are featured in *De Generibus* chapters of grammar books. In the case of *saepes*, the clarification of *seps,* meaning a rare type of snake, is required.

The analysis is directed at grammars used in 15th century Hungary. In this period, there were marked changes in the area of available grammars: besides the antique–late antique grammars (Donatus and Priscian) and then medieval grammars and vocabularies, first in Italy and later beyond the Alps too gradually new grammatical-rhetorical works meeting Renaissance and Humanist ideals started to appear (Guarino Veronese, Lorenzo Valla, Niccolò Perotti, Giovanni Sulpizio, Antonio Mancinelli, etc.). Although a number of important Humanist grammar authors had strong feelings against medieval grammars, they still stayed in use, and saw numerous editions even in the following century. In other words, changes in the grammar literature of the 15th century and the exploration of the relationship between "old" and "new" grammars seem an intriguing research topic.

Naturally, in addition to trying to demonstrate the points concerned, the criterion of logic is also applied. For this reason, the scope of the present paper is limited to the widely used popular (occasionally Hungary-related) grammars. Due to the nature of the problem selected, the task ahead is not the analysis of the (monumental) modist grammatical works, as their main goal was not to teach declinations. It is understood that in the course of time every successful grammar "acquires its own life", is enriched by its own layers through interpolations and contaminations, becoming unique by adjusting to its location of use. It is also to be considered that teaching the Latin language was not

done solely from textbooks. Teachers would often supply books (sometimes printed ones) available to them with annotations. Manuscripts of students' school notes are also used as sources. In addition, several word lists have survived, containing the equivalents of the main Latin words in the vernacular.

Thus, the following authors have been selected: Donatus, Priscian *(Institutiones)*, Papias *(Vocabularium)*, Eberhardus de Bethunia *(Graecismus)*, Alexander de Villa Dei *(Doctrinale)*, Johannes de Garlandia *(Synonyma)*, Guarino Veronese *(Regulae)*, George of Trebizond *(De Partibus Orationis ex Prisciano Compendium)*, Lorenzo Valla *(Elegantiae Linguae Latinae)*, Niccolò Perotti (*Rudimenta* and *Cornucopiae*), Giovanni Sulpizio (*De Generibus Opusculum* and *De Nominum Declinatione Opusculum Compendiosum*), and Antonio Mancinelli *(Carmen de Figuris)*.

Although to differing degrees, at the various levels of education Donatus (4th c.) and Priscian (5–6th c.) were always among the most significant grammarians in medieval Europe and Hungary. Papias (11th c.) with his *Vocabularium*, Alexander de Villa Dei with his *Doctrinale* written around 1200 and Eberhardus de Bethunia (†ca. 1212) with his *Graecismus* are among the most distinguished medieval grammarians (and lexicographers).

Of the outstanding personalities of the 15th century, the first to be listed is Guarino Veronese (1374–1460), whose educational methods and textbooks opened a new era in education.[1] Because of his relations to Hungary, George of Trebizond (1395–ca. 1472) is also to be noted, as his abstract of Priscian's *Institutiones* is an extant and authentic Corvina codex.[2] The authors of grammars usually labelled in the literature as "Humanist" grammars are represented in the present analysis by Niccolò Perotti (1429–1480), Giovanni Sulpizio (15th c.), and Antonio Mancinelli da Velletri (1452–ca. 1506).

Niccolò Perotti's *Cornucopiae* and Lorenzo Valla's (1407–1457) *Elegentiae Linguae Latinae Libri Sex* are not classified as traditional schoolbooks, but due to their method and popularity they are regarded as worthy of including in the present analysis.

For the availability in 15th century Hungary of the works selected for analysis, the literature on Hungarian book culture preceding the battle of Mohács (1526) is to be consulted.[3] The lack of concrete data, however, does not necessarily mean that the item in

---

[1] Cf. Remigio SABBADINI, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Veronese*, Catania, Francesco Calati, 1896.

[2] George of TREBIZOND, *De partibus orationis ex Prisciano compendium,* Budapest, National Széchényi Library, Cod. Lat. 428. For Trebizond's grammatical work, see EKLER Péter, *Georgius Trapezuntius nyelvtani kivonata a priscianusi „Institutiones" alapján: Szövegközlés és -elemzés* (George of Trebizond's grammar abstract on the basis of Priscian's "Institutiones": Text and analysis), PhD dissertation, Budapest, Loránd Eötvös University, Faculty of Arts, Doctoral School in Linguistics, Antique Studies Doctoral Program, 2008.

[3] For information about extant and lost Hungarian copies of the works concerned, see CSAPODI Csaba, CSAPODINÉ GÁRDONYI Klára, *Bibliotheca Hungarica: Kódexek és nyomtatott könyvek Magyarországon 1526 előtt, I–III, Fönnmaradt kötetek, Lappangó kötetek, Adatok elveszett kötetekről* (Codices and printed books in Hungary before 1526, I–III, Extant volumes, Volumes in hiding, Data for lost volumes), Budapest, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára, 1988–1994. Data for extant copies (15th–early 16th century): Donatus nos. 33, 150, 774, 1273, 1907, Priscian no. 1723, Papias nos. 1445–1446, *Doctrinale* nos. 2303, 2665, Perotti *(Cornucopiae)* no. 559, Perotti *(Rudimenta)* no. 2305, Valla *(Elegantiae)* no. 509, Mancinelli *(Carmen de Figuris)* no. 2304. Data for lost volumes (15th–early 16th century): Donatus nos. 2914, 2990, 2991, 3013, Priscian no. 1394, Papias nos. 825, 875, 960, Perotti *(Cornucopiae)* no. 2428, Valla *(Elegantiae)* no. 1787, Man-

question did not exist in Hungary. This is especially true for good textbooks: because they were in everyday use, they wore off and were usually discarded. On the other hand, thanks to personal contacts among other things, the existence of certain works in Hungary is most likely. For instance, it seems certain that through Janus Pannonius, Guarino Veronese's works widely used across the whole of Europe were in use also in the Carpathian Basin.

For details of the medieval and modern Hungarian school systems, books by Brunó Balassa, Ernő Fináczy, and István Mészáros are among the most reliable sources, whereas for the Latin roots of Hungarian grammars, studies by István Bartók, Zsuzsa C. Vladár, Mihály Imre, and Réka Lőrinczi are to be consulted.[4]

A comprehensive description of medieval Hungarian book culture has been given by Edit Madas, while the study of Latin grammars has been carried out by András Vizkelety. We owe the *census* of medieval Hungarian schoolbooks to István Mészáros.[5] For intro-

cinelli *(Carmen de Figuris)* no. 1962, *Doctrinale* nos. 1261, 1381, 2986, 3018, 3019, Johannes de Garlandia no. 2956.

[4] Balassa Brunó, *A latintanítás története: Neveléstörténeti forrástanulmány* (The history of teaching Latin: Source study in educational history), Budapest, 1930; Mészáros István, *Az iskolaügy története Magyarországon 996–1777 között* (The history of education in Hungary 996–1777), Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1981; István Bartók, *„Grammatica est…" The Significance and Sources of János Sylvester's Definition,* Camoenae Hungaricae, 3(2006), 39–58; Sylvester János, *Grammatica Hungarolatina,* facsimile edition, ed. Kőszeghy Péter, with a study by Szörényi László, Budapest, 1989; *Sylvester János latin–magyar nyelvtana* (János Sylvester's Latin–Hungarian grammar), transl. C. Vladár Zsuzsa, Budapest, 1989; Szenczi Molnár Albert, *Dictionarium Latinoungaricum, Nürnberg, 1604,* ed. Imre Mihály, Budapest, 1990; Szenczi Molnár Albert, *Novae Grammaticae Ungaricae Libri Duo—Új magyar grammatika két könyvben* (New Hungarian grammar in two books), facsimile edition, transl. C. Vladár Zsuzsa, Budapest, 2004; *Kéziratos magyar nyelvtanok: Kolozsvári Grammatika, Fejérvári Sámuel: Institutiones, XVII. és XVIII. század* (Hungarian manuscript grammars: Kolozsvár grammar, Sámuel Fejérvári: *Institutiones,* 17th and 18th centuries), letter-faithful transcript of language relics with an introduction and notes, published, annotated, and introduced by Lőrinczi Réka, the Latin transcript is edited by Adamik Béla, Budapest, 1998.

[5] András Vizkelety, *Gli studi grammaticali in Ungheria nel Medioevo,* in: *L'eredità classica in Italia e Ungheria fra tardo Medioevo e primo Rinascimento,* a cura di Sante Graciotti e Amedeo Di Francesco, Roma, 2001, 105–118; Madas Edit, *Esztergomi iskoláskönyv a XV. század első negyedéből* (Esztergom schoolbook from the first quarter of the 15th century), in: *Művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok a magyar középkorról* (Cultural historical studies about the Hungarian Middle Ages), ed. Fügedi Erik, Budapest, Gondolat, 1986, 159–176; Madas Edit, *Írás, könyv és könyvhasználat a középkori Magyarországon, 1000–1526* (Writing, books and using books in medieval Hungary, 1000–1526), in: Madas Edit, Monok István, *A könyvkultúra Magyarországon a kezdetektől 1800-ig* (Book culture in Hungary from the beginnings to 1800), 2nd ed., Budapest, Balassi Kiadó, 2003, 11–90; Madas Edit, *A középkori könyvkultúra továbbélése Magyarországon az 1430-as évektől az 1470-es évek végéig* (The continuation of medieval book culture from the 1430s to the late 1470s), in: *Csillag a holló árnyékában: Vitéz János és a magyarországi humanizmus kezdetei. Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtár kiállítása, 2008. március 14.–június 15.* (A star in the raven's shadow: János Vitéz and the beginnings of Hungarian humanism. An exhibition by the National Széchényi Library, March 14–June 15, 2008), ed. Földesi Ferenc, Budapest, National Széchényi Library, 2008, 7–21; Mészáros István, *Középkori hazai iskoláskönyvek* (Medieval Hungarian schoolbooks), Magyar Könyvszemle, 1986, 113–134.

ducing medieval Hungarian codex literature, the National Széchényi Library held a major exhibition in 1985–1986.[6]

From the international literature on Latin grammars and the educational methods of the Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance, the most important, though not the only sources are studies by G. L. Bursill-Hall, Vivien Law, Margaret Gibson, Jan Pinborg, Robert Black, W. Keith Percival, Louis Holtz, and Kristian Jensen.[7]

Learning the *octo partes orationis* (the eight parts of speech) happened in the early stages of acquiring the Latin language. Discussing and teaching nouns had an outstanding role in grammars. Following in the footsteps of the great masters (Donatus and Priscian), every grammar would usually start with the *nomen*, and was followed by the other declinable *(partes declinabiles: nomen, verbum, participium, pronomen)* and indeclinable word classes *(partes indeclinabiles: adverbium, praepositio, interiectio, coniunctio)*.

Saepes

One of the most popular and most successful methods of medieval Latin teaching at school was collecting synonyms. Johannes de Garlandia (13th c.) lists *saepes* with the following synonyms:

> Materiam vel materiem dic esse domorum,
> A paritate venit paries, quia iungitur illis,
> Sed muros proprie vel menia dicimus urbis,

---

[6] *Kódexek a középkori Magyarországon: Kiállítás az Országos Széchényi Könyvtárban, Budapest, Budavári Palota, 1985. november 12.–1986. február 28.* (Codices in medieval Hungary: An exhibition by the National Széchényi Library, Budapest, Buda Castle, November 12, 1985–February 28, 1986), the exhibition was organised by the National Széchényi Library's Manuscript Collection supervised by VIZKELETY András, Budapest, 1985.

[7] Charles THUROT, *Extraits des divers manuscrits latins pour servir à l'histoire des doctrines grammaticales au Moyen Âge*, Paris, 1869; Frankfurt am Main, Minerva GmbH, 1964 (unveränderter Nachdruck); G. L. BURSILL-HALL, *A Census of Medieval Latin Grammatical Manuscripts*, Stuttgart, 1981; Jan PINBORG, *Medieval Semantics: Selected Studies on Medieval Logic and Grammar*, ed. Sten EBBENSEN, London, Variorum Reprints, 1984; Vivien LAW, *Grammar in the Early Middle Ages: A Bibliography*, Historiographia Linguistica, 20(1993), 25–47; C. H. KNEEPKENS, *The Priscianic Tradition*, in: *Geschichte der Sprachtheorie, III, Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, Tübingen, 1995, 239–264; Robert BLACK, *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001; Richard William HUNT, *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages: Collected Papers*, ed. G. L. BURSILL-HALL, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1980 (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series III, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, 5); Margaret GIBSON, *Milestones in the Study of Priscian, circa 800–circa 1200*, Viator, 23(1992), 17–33; Louis HOLTZ, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical*, Paris, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1981; W. K. PERCIVAL, *Grammar and Rhetoric in the Renaissance*, in: *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. James J. MURPHY, Berkeley CA, University of California Press, 1983, 303–330; Kristian JENSEN, *Rhetorical Philosophy and Philosophical Grammar: Julius Caesar Scaliger's Theory of Language*, München, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1990.

> Dicitur et vallum palis acumen factum,
> Hinc et vallare res est includere vallis,
> Indago silvas silvisque latentia claudit,
> Est indagare res explorare latentes,
> Sepibus et ceptis concluditur ortus et arvum.[8]

Priscian mentions *saepes* when listing the endings of *denominatives* ("…'es' productam: 'pauper pauperies', 'acus acies', 'saepio saepes', 'struo strues', 'sterno strages'…")[9] and in connection with their origin ("In 'es' productam verbalia repperi a praesenti vel praeterito tempore; a praesenti: 'saepio saepes', 'luo lues', 'struo strues'…").[10]

George of Trebizond in his little grammatical treatise *De Partibus Orationis ex Prisciano Compendium* limits himself to the latter ("In es productam verbalia repperi a praesenti et a praeterito, a praesenti, ut 'saepio saepes', 'luo lues', 'struo strues'…").[11] Trebizond was a major figure in Italian Renaissance Humanism, translator of Greek philosophy and literary texts, leader in the development of humanist logic, teacher and major figure in the development of rhetoric.[12] Trebizond shortens the work of Priscian significantly, to about one eighth. Trebizond—unlike Priscian—compiles a catechism—which includes about three hundred questions.

Papias may be seen as the first modern lexicographer; his *Vocabularium* was completed before 1045. Papias uses the alphabet up to the third letter. (Absolute alphabetical order first appears with Johannes Balbus, who completed his *Catholicon seu Summa Prosodiae* in 1286.) Papias' main sources were Isidorus and Priscian. Its printed editions contain later layers as well.[13] His *Vocabularium* originates the word *sepia* from *saepes:* "Sepes sunt monimenta satorum… Sepit munit, circundat, circuntegit. Sepio -pis septum. Sepia piscis, de quo fiebat inclaustrum sepia dicta, quia sepibus interclusa facilius capitur. Obscaenum genus, ore enim concipit, sicut vipera."[14]

Alexander de Villa Dei wrote his *Doctrinale*, the grammar made up of 2645 hexameters around 1200. The *Doctrinale* served practical purposes, became very popular and

---

[8] Johannes de GARLANDIA, *Synonyma, Aequivoca*, Köln, Heinrich Quentel, 1500 (hereafter: GARLANDIA), fol. [h$_{iiii}$^{v}]; *Inkunabelkatalog, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek*, I–VI, Wiesbaden, Reichert, 1988–2005 (hereafter: BSB Ink), III, I 424.

[9] PRISCIANI Grammatici Caesariensis *Institutionum Grammaticarum Libri XVIII* ex recensione Martini HERTZII (*Grammatici Latini* ex recensione Henrici KEILII, II–III), Hildesheim, Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961 (unveränderter reprografischer Nachdruck der Ausgabe Leipzig, 1855–1859; hereafter: KEIL), II, 118, 14–15.

[10] KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 130, 11–13.

[11] George of TREBIZOND, *De Partibus Orationis ex Prisciano Compendium*, [Milano, Philippo da Lavagna, 1471] (hereafter: TREBIZOND), fol. [15]. The *Compendium* has a number of early printed editions (see *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, IX, Stuttgart–Berlin, 1991, nos. 10659–10663).

[12] For his life and lifework, see John MONFASANI, *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of His Rhetoric and Logic*, Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1976; John MONFASANI, *Collectanea Trapezuntiana: Texts, Documents, and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond,* Binghamton NY, 1984.

[13] *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, Hrsg. Norbert ANGERMANN, VI, München, 2003, cols. 1663–1664.

[14] PAPIAS, *Vocabularium (Elementarium Doctrinae Rudimentum)*, Venice, Philippus Pincius, 1496 (BSB Ink IV, P 13; hereafter: PAPIAS), fol. [u$_v$^{v}].

saw a number of editions in the 15th century. The *Doctrinale* mentions the noun *seps*, the word whose form is close to *saepes*, as follows:

> Sepe per um vel ium facit ans aut ens genitivum
> Glans, dat ium gens, dens, mens, sociabitur istis
> Calx, puls, seps, stirps per ium falx, arx simul et lans.

Some of the editions were issued with commentaries. One of Villa Dei's best known commentators was Ludovicus de Guaschis (or Guastis, 15th c.), who explains the meaning of *seps* as follows: "Seps sepium enim est quidam exiguus serpens, qui carnem et ossa veneno consumit et in pulverem redigit."[15]

Giovanni Sulpizio wrote several grammatical manuals. In the chapter *In s Praecedente Consonante* of his short work, *De Generibus Opusculum,* the word *seps* is listed as: "Masculina sunt 'mons', 'pons'… Adde et 'seps' appellativum serpentis, Lucanus «vel inficus spes»."[16]

Sulpizio does not know exactly the site cited. Moreover, even the "misprint" *(spes)* may have disturbed his reading. Nevertheless, it is obvious that *seps* refers to a kind of snake and is masculine.[17]

Faex

Horace repeatedly mentions *faex* in his verses. It usually means the dregs of wine (e. g. *Carmina*, III, 15, 16).[18] The pleasant but weak wine of Surrentum was improved by the dregs of Falernum wine (*Saturae*, II, 4, 55).[19] Dried, roasted, and crushed, it was also eaten as a delicacy (*Saturae*, II, 4, 73).[20] At the time of the "Great Dionysia" feast, members of the ancient comic group smeared their faces with dregs so that they should not be recognised (*Ars poetica*, 278).[21]

In the second book, Priscian mentions *faex* in a section devoted to the syllable ("Sciendum autem, quod nulla diphthongus in duas consonantes potest desinere, in duplicem

---

[15] Alexander de Villa Dei, *Doctrinale*, Venice, Manfredus de Bonellis, 1494 (*Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, I, Leipzig–Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1925, no. 1203; hereafter: Villa Dei), fol. [b$_v$^{r}].

[16] Sulpizio, *De Generibus Opusculum*, [sine loco, sine anno; hereafter: Sulpizio, *De Generibus*], fol. [d$_{ii}$^{v}].

[17] Lucanus, *Pharsalia*, IX, 723: "ossaque dissolvens cum corpore tabificus seps"; cf. Lucanus, *Pharsalia*, IX, 762–765: "sed tristior illo / mors erat ante oculos, miserique in crure Sabelli / seps stetit exiguus; quem flexo dente tenacem / avolsitque manu piloque adfixit harenis".

[18] Horatius, *Ódák és epódoszok* (Odes and epodes), ed. Borzsák István, Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó, 1975 (Auctores Latini, 18), 343.

[19] Horatius, *Szatírák—Horatii Saturae*, ed. Borzsák István, Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó, 1972 (Auctores Latini, 16), 223.

[20] Horatius, *op. cit.,* 225.

[21] Horatius, *Epistulae*, ed. Borzsák István, Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó, 1969 (Auctores Latini, 10), 207.

autem invenitur, ut 'faex faecis' et 'fax facis'.").[22] In the fifth book *(De Generibus),* first he emphasises its feminine character ("Alia vero omnia monosyllaba in x quacumque vocali sive consonante antecedente feminina sunt, ut 'lex', 'faex', 'crux'…"),[23] and then hints that according to the "antiques" it may have been masculine as well ("Sciendum tamen, quod vetustissimi in multis, ut diximus, supra dictarum terminationum inveniuntur confudisse genera, nulla significationis differentia coacti, sed sola auctoritate, ut 'hic' et 'haec aspergo' … 'hic' et 'haec faex'…").[24] In the seventh book *(De Ceteribus Casibus)* he lists it as an example among the nouns in the third declination ending in -*aex* ("In 'aex' femininum: 'haec faex huius faecis'.").[25]

In his abstract of Priscian's work, Trebizond mentions it only once and says that *faex* can be both masculine and feminine: "Sciendum tamen est veteres in multis nulla ratione coactos, sed sola auctoritate genera confudisse, ut hic et haec cardo … hic vel hec faex…"[26]

Niccolò Perotti's popular Latin grammar mentions *faex* when listing the endings of the nouns in the third declination *(De Tertia Declinatione. Prima Regula):* "Quot sunt terminationes nominum tertie declinationis? Quinquaginta quattuor. Que? In a, ut poema, in e, ut monile … in ax, ut fax, in ex, ut fex, in ix, ut phoenix, in ox, ut velox…"[27]

Giovanni Sulpizio brings *faex* in connection with the genitive of nouns ending in *x* in the third declination: "Cetera omnia Latina perdunt x et cis capiunt, ut fallax fallacis, nex necis, fex fecis."[28]

Other grammars and lexicographic works placed more stress on the interpretation of the meaning of the word. In Papias' *Vocabularium,* there is the following explanation: "Faeces reliquiae purificati vini et cuiuslibet rei ut olei."[29]

Eberhardus (Ebrardus) Bethuniensis is the author of the grammar in verse generally called *Graecismus*. His work was enriched with parts interpolated after his death. In education, *Graecismus* was very popular to the detriment of Priscian. It was primarily useful for consolidating knowledge originating from Donatus and Priscian rather than for gaining new knowledge.[30] It is worth quoting the section of *Graecismus* relevant from the point of the present paper: "Fex vini tibi sit, olei dicatur amurca", and also the commentary of the grammar in verse:

Fex est vini putredo illud, quod remanet in fundo dolii…[31]

---

[22] KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 51, 13–14.

[23] KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 164, 8–11.

[24] KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 169, 6–19.

[25] KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 323, 20.

[26] TREBIZOND, *op. cit.*, fol. [21ᵛ].

[27] Niccolò PEROTTI, *Rudimenta Grammatices*, Paris, Ulrich Gering, 1479 (hereafter: PEROTTI 1479), fol. bᵢʳ.

[28] SULPIZIO, *De Generibus,* fol. bᵢᵢᵢᵢʳ.

[29] PAPIAS, *op. cit.,* fol. [hᵢᵢᵢᵛ].

[30] *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, Hrsg. Norbert ANGERMANN, III, München, 2003, col. 1523.

[31] *Graecismus*, Paris, Pierre Levet, 1487–1488 (*Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, VII, Leipzig, Hiersemann, 1968, no. 9215), fol. [gᵥᵢᵢʳ].

Johannes de Garlandia's work mentions *faex* several times, first with *unguentum, aroma, nardus,* and others:

> Dicitur ungentum, cathaplasma, nardus, amomum,
> Suaviter redolens illis sociatur aroma.
> Fertur aromaticum, similem quod prestet odorem.
> Debet fex olei sedimen vel amurca vocari.

The commentary attached to the verse originates *faex* from the verb *feteo* ('smelly'): "…Sed fex fecis dicitur ab illo verbo feteo -es, -ere, quod idem est, quod olere. Inde oleum, quia oleum olet."[32]

In another case, *faex* is included after the words meaning 'splendour' (*splendet, irradiat, fulget, nitet* etc.), in the company of words indicating dirt and squalor:

> Pluvies, scabies, caries, pus res eedem sunt,
> Sordes, sordicia, fex et fetulentia, squalor,
> Cum macula, tabes assint, contagia, labes.

The accompanying commentary suggests that the sediments of wine and beer are not clean. The commentary quotes the line from *Graecismus* that we have referred to earlier. "Sed fex est inmundicies vini vel cerevisie, unde Grecista: «Fex vini sit tibi, olei dicatur amurca»."[33]

In Garlandia's work *faex* features again:

> Nobile, formosum, rarum notat et generosum,
> Fece carens non obscurum resonat et manifestat.

Here *faex* emerges in the company of 'exclusive', 'famous' and 'noble'. Reading the commentary ("Unde primo est idem, quod nobilis. Unde legitur de Beato Gregorio, quod erat claris ortus natalibus. … Quinto est idem, quod non obscurum, ut ibi, Clara dies Pauli multos fructos notat anni"),[34] a strong contrast is taking shape between the methods applied by Garlandia, and Valla, Perotti, who supported linguistic phenomena by examples from classical authors.

Guarino Veronese's work was published in several printed editions. The *Regulae*, precisely the "section" *Carmina Differentialia* (or *Versus Differentiales*) was an extraordinarily useful work because it collected in an easy to memorise fashion the words that young students would often confuse with *faex (falx, fax, faux, fas)*. Good teachers were likely to know from their own practice that non-native children had to be warned about

---

[32] GARLANDIA, *op. cit.*, fol. [c$_{iiii}$^{v}].
[33] GARLANDIA, *op. cit.*, fol. [k$_{vi}$^{v}].
[34] GARLANDIA, *op. cit.*, fol. [o$_i$^{v}].

paronyms. The last half line is nearly identical with the text of *Graecismus* (or as seen before, with the text of Johannes de Garlandia):

> Falx metit, ast ardet fax, faux utraque mandit,
> Fas neutri generis significat licitum.[35]
> …
> Fex est de reliquis; olei dicetur amurca.[36]

The line *Fex est de reliquis* refers to the meaning of *faex* as 'the remainder' and reminds us of Martial's lines where *faex* means the remaining part of money:

> Si quid adhuc superest in nostri faece locelli,
> Munus erit. Nihil est: ipse locellus erit.[37]

Antonio Mancinelli wrote several popular grammatical, lexicographical, and rhetorical manuals. Although it does not contain *faex*, in connection with Guarino it is worth recalling the relevant lines of Mancinelli's *Carmen de Floribus*, dedicated to János Vitéz "Junior" (?–ca. 1499), the nephew of Archbishop János Vitéz (ca. 1408–1472):

> Falx metit aut scindit, fax urit, faux quoque mandit,
> Laetificat fama, ipsa fames constristat habentem,
> Fas neutri generis licitum signare memento.[38]

Perotti's major work was the *Cornucopiae*, a commentary on Martial's *De Spectaculis* and the first book of his epigrams. The *Cornucopiae* is not only a commentary but also a source of lexicographic and encyclopaedic information. Perotti repeatedly uses *faex* in *Cornucopiae;* the basic meaning of the word is 'anything that is left over of something' ("Fex excrementum, quod unaquaeque res facit").[39] According to the interpretation of epigram XXVI[40] *faex* may mean poor quality wine and the ignoble character or origins of something: "A copone tibi fex laletana petatur… Fex vinum ignobile. Fecis enim vocabulum usurpamus, quotiens alicuius rei ignobilitatem volumus exprimere…"[41]

---

[35] GUARINO, *Regulae*, Venice, Guilelmus Tridinensis, 1490 (BSB Ink, III, G 420; hereafter: GUARINO), fol. C$_{\text{iiii}}^{\text{r}}$.

[36] GUARINO, *op. cit.*, fol. [C$_{\text{vii}}^{\text{r}}$].

[37] MARTIALIS, *Apophoreta*, XIII.

[38] MANCINELLI, *Carmen de Floribus,* Venice, Johannes Tacuinus, 1498 (BSB Ink, III, M 75; hereafter: MANCINELLI), fol. C$_{\text{ii}}^{\text{r}}$.

[39] PEROTTI, *Cornucopiae,* Venice, Johannes Tacuinus, 1496 (BSB Ink, IV, P 220; hereafter: PEROTTI 1496), fol. LXXXIIII.

[40] "A copone tibi faex Laletana petatur / Si plus quam decies, Sextiliane, bibis", MARTIALIS, *Epigrammaton Liber I*, XXVI, 9–10.

[41] PEROTTI 1496, *op. cit.,* fol. CCLXXI.

Pecus, pecudis—pecus, pecoris

Priscian's *Institutiones* is a treasure trove not only because of the authors included in it, but also because it often draws attention to a number of words and phenomena. It is not accidental that only with the help of indices and concordances can you find all the occurrences of a certain word.[42] *Pecus* emerges many times. Priscian refers to the rare and archaic *pecu* form among the *denominatives*. ("In u derivativa pauca invenio: 'specus specu', 'pecus pecu'…").[43]

He mentions it in the fifth book *(De Generibus)* because among the nouns ending in short *-us* it is an exception, as it may be feminine as well. ("In 'us' correptam tertiae declinationis nomina neutra sunt, ut 'munus', 'opus'. Excipitur 'hic lepus', 'haec Venus', 'hic' et 'haec Ligus', 'hic' et 'haec' et 'hoc vetus', et 'pecus', quod femininum 'haec pecus pecudis' declinatur, teste Capro neutrum: 'hoc pecus pecoris'.")[44] A few pages later in the same location, he repeats the statements about gender ("In multis aliis etiam confudisse genera vetustissimi inveniuntur sive in eisdem terminationibus seu immutantes ea. … 'Hic' et 'haec' et 'hoc pecus'—Ennius in Nemea: Pecudi dare viva marito").[45] In the sixth book *(De Nominativo et Genitivo Casu),* he brings *pecus pecoris* next to the genitive *(penoris)* of *penus* as an analogy ("cuius neutri [sc. penus] genetivus est 'penoris', ut 'pecus pecoris' ").[46] Also in the sixth book, he repeats that it may be feminine and neutral; he cites numerous authors, and referring to the antiques, he mentions the form *pecu* as well with a number of quotes. (" 'Pecus' quoque femininum 'pecudis' facit, quod etiam neutrum est, 'hoc pecus pecoris'. Caesar in auguralibus: si sincera pecus erat. Virgilius in I: Ignavum fucos pecus a praesepibus arcent. Vetustissimi etiam 'hoc pecu', unde 'haec pecua' plurale, dicebant.")[47] Still in the same place when introducing the formation of genitives, he mentions it among the nouns ending in *-us*, and warns that in the genitive the -o- is short ("Alia omnia mutant 'us' in o productam quidem, si sint comparativa, et accepta 'ris' faciunt genetivum, ut 'hoc melius huius melioris', 'hoc felicius huius felicioris', correptam vero, si non sint comparativa, ut 'hoc decus decoris', 'hoc stercus stercoris', 'hoc pecus pecoris'…").[48]

In the *Compendium,* Trebizond is limited to the following: 1) nouns ending in short *-us* in the third declination are neutral, with the exception of *pecus pecudis* (feminine);[49]

---

[42] *Prisciani Institutionum Grammaticalium Librorum I–XVI Indices et Concordantiae,* curantibus Cirilo García ROMÁN, Marco A. GUTIÉRREZ GALINDO, I–IV, Hildesheim–Zürich–New York, Olms–Weidmann, 2001 (Alpha–Omega, Reihe A: Lexika, Indizes, Konkordanzen zur klassischen Philologie, CCXIV, 1–4).

[43] KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 123, 8.

[44] KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 163, 19–22.

[45] KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 169, 19–20; 171, 4–5.

[46] KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 261, 4.

[47] KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 270, 2–271, 1.

[48] KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 274, 7–12.

[49] TREBIZOND, *op. cit.*, fol. [20ᵛ].

2) the "antiques" used *pecus* in all three genders (e. g. Ennius in masculine);[50] 3) *pecus* has the genitive *pecudis* or *pecoris* rather than a form ending in *-us.*[51]

Perotti cites Priscian word by word in the following section *(Rudimenta Grammatices. De Generibus Nominum. XXVI. Regula)*: "Munus cuius generis? Neutri, quia in us correptam desinentia tertie declinationis neutra sunt. Excipitur hic lepus, haec Venus, hic et haec Ligus, hic et haec et hoc vetus, haec pecus pecudis, nam hoc pecus pecoris facit."[52]

Lorenzo Valla's famous stylistic work, the *Elegantiae Linguae Latinae*, appeared in the mid-1440s.[53] In his *pecus* "study", Valla places a lot of emphasis on synonyms (e. g. *bos, grex*) as well, supporting his argument with numerous quotes:[54]

> ille meas errare boves, ut cernis, et ipsum
> ludere quae vellem calamo permisit agresti.[55]

> mille greges illi totidemque armenta per herbas
> errabant, et humum vicinia nulla premebat;[56]

Perotti's *pecus*-interpretation *(Cornucopiae)* is related to Martial's *pecori* in the epigram:[57] "Pecori: Animalibus mitibus, proprie enim, pecus pecoris sive pecus pecudis utroque enim modo dicimus, significat omne animal, quod sub hominis imperio e pabulo terrae pascitur, ut boves, asini, equi, cameli, oves, caprae et reliqua huiusmodi. … Reperitur tamen interdum pecus pecoris pro multitudine pecudum sive pecorum."[58]

Perotti's commentary, which is shorter than Valla's, includes a number of ideas mentioned by Valla: "Pecus pecudis et pecus pecoris prope nihil differunt. Significatur hoc nomine animal, quod sub imperio hominum ex pabulo terrae pascitur. … Veruntamen pecus pecoris nonnunquam reperitur pro multitudine pecudum sive pecorum, sed gregalium potius, quam armentalium…"[59]

In various contexts, Priscian cites 13 (14) classical sites (one of them is repeated) for illustrating *pecus*. His Ennius quote ("Pecudi dare viva marito") is taken over by Trebizond's abstract,[60] and his Virgil quote ("Caprigenumque pecus nullo custode per her-

---

[50] TREBIZOND, *op. cit.*, fol. [21ᵛ].

[51] TREBIZOND, *op. cit.*, fol. [28ʳ⁻ᵛ].

[52] PEROTTI 1479, *op. cit.*, fol. [aᵥᵢᵢʳ]; cf. KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 163, 19–22.

[53] Cf. Wolfram AX, *Lorenzo Valla (1407–1457): Elegantiarum Linguae Latinae Libri Sex (1449)*, in: *Von Eleganz und Barbarei: Lateinische Grammatik und Stilistik in Renaissance und Barock*, Hrsg. Wolfram AX, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 2001 (Wolfenbütteler Forschungen, 95), 29–57.

[54] VALLA, *Elegantiae,* [Venice, 1493] (hereafter: VALLA 1493), fol. [gᵥᵢᵛ–hᵢʳ].

[55] VERGILIUS, *Eclogae,* I, 9–10.

[56] OVIDIUS, *Metamorphoses*, IV, 635–636.

[57] "Adfuit inmixtum pecori genus omne ferarum / Et supra vatem multa pependit avis", MARTIALIS, *Liber Spectaculorum*, XXI, 5–6.

[58] PEROTTI, *Cornucopiae,* Venice, Bertocchi Dionigi, 1494 (hereafter: PEROTTI 1494), fol. CCXXVᵛ–CCXXVIʳ.

[59] VALLA, *Elegantiae,* [Venice, Philippus Pincius, 1492/1493] (BSB Ink, V, V 35], fol. [gᵥᵢᵛ].

[60] KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 171, 5; TREBIZOND, *op. cit.*, fol. [21ᵛ].

bam") is mentioned by Perotti and Valla.[61] Valla and Perotti apply classical quotes that Priscian did not in discussing *pecus:*

> Hoc pecus omne meum est, multae quoque vallibus errant,
> multas silva tegit, multae stabulantur in antris,[62]

> Dic mihi, Damoeta, cuium pecus? An Meliboei?[63]

The already cited Hungary-related work in verse by Mancinelli *(Carmen de Floribus)* interprets *pecus* in the following line:

> Omne animal praeter hominem pecus est vocitandum.[64]

As we have seen, Priscian discussed *pecus* at several points. So does Giovanni Sulpizio, who proceeds by endings of nouns and first mentions it among the ones ending in *-us (De Tertia Declinatione):* "…fenus fenoris et feneris, penus penoris, olim peniris et peniteris. Que antea verba in ero desinentia habent in eris, correptum faciunt genitivos genitivos, ut ulcus ulceris, ulcero ulceras, olus oleris, olero oleras. Tempus vero temporis facit. Hoc pecus pecoris. Haec pecus pecudis. Hic intercus intercutis producit u…"[65]

Next, he analyses it from the point of grammatical gender *(Que Diversi Sunt Generis):* "Adduntur et illa diversa significantia: hic collus et hec collus, hic cassis et hec cassis, hic malus et hec malus, hic lens et hec lens, hic glis et hec glis, hic vas et hoc vas, hec pecus et hoc pecus…"[66]

Alexander de Villa Dei does the same in discussing nouns ending in *-us (De Tertia Declinatione):*

> Dat pecus hec pecudis, pecus hoc pecoris sibi format.[67]

And then in *De Generibus* chapter:

> Est pecus hec pecudis, pecus hoc pecoris tibi format.[68]

---

[61] VERGILIUS, *Aeneis*, III, 221; KEIL, *op. cit.*, II, 196, 12; VALLA 1493, *op. cit.*, fol. [g_vi^v]; PEROTTI 1494, *op. cit.,* fol. CCXXV^v.

[62] OVIDIUS, *Metamorphoses*, XIII, 821–822; VALLA 1493, *op. cit.,* fol. [g_vi^v]; PEROTTI 1494, *op. cit.,* fol. CCXXV^v.

[63] VERGILIUS, *Eclogae*, III, 1; VALLA 1493, *op. cit.,* fol. [g_vi^v]; PEROTTI 1494, *op. cit.,* fol. CCXXV^v.

[64] MANCINELLI, *op. cit.,* fol. [D_i^v].

[65] Giovanni SULPIZIO, *De Nominum Declinatione Opusculum Compendiosum*, [sine loco, sine anno] (hereafter: SULPIZIO, *De Nominum Declinatione*), [fol. b_iii^v].

[66] SULPIZIO, *De Nominum Declinatione,* fol. [c_iii^v].

[67] VILLA DEI, *op. cit.*, fol. b_i^r.

[68] VILLA DEI, *op. cit.*, fol. [d_iv^v].

Summary notes

1. For the three examples investigated in the present paper, Donatus provides no data. The *Donatus Minor*, used at the elementary level of education and also the *Maior*, which gives more space to the *octo partes orationis* and deals with tropes and figures, mentions only the vitally important examples when discussing grammar phenomena. As Donatus was writing for native speakers, he used few example words. Later, teachers of non-native students had to make up for these shortcomings. This is one of the explanations of why the medieval "Donatus" grammars do not have a uniform stock of example words and for their fairly large variety in paradigms.[69]

2. A considerable part of the medieval grammars in verse (and *vocabularia*) appeared in print in the 15th century (some even in the 16th century). Their great advantage is that they presented the main points about gender, the genitive and usually about morphology in a very easy to memorise manner. In the case of words that are easily confused (*fax, faex, far, fas,* etc.), they were definitely useful as the difficult items were juxtaposed in the lines of the verse.

3. Our examples were repeatedly discussed by Priscian. Analysing word endings, in the fifth book he made general statements about their gender. In the sixth book, also proceeding according to word endings, he introduced how their genitives are formed. In the seventh book, he explained the formation of other cases, proceeding by declinations. In addition, a word could occur also when discussing *diminutives,* in a phonetic context or in other ways, as for example in connection with forming the *perfectum* or *supinum* of verbs. His complicated system was impossible for young students to memorise. It is understandable that based on his grammar used at higher levels of education, usable abstracts were compiled for children. The significance of Priscian's system, of the classical norms and practice he conveyed is indicated by the fact that both with and without commentaries it was reproduced in a large number of manuscripts and printed editions.

4. In the same way as elsewhere in Europe, medieval and new grammars lived side by side in Hungarian educational practice. Whether a grammar gained popularity or not depended to a great extent on its size, length, form (e. g. catechism), and on whether it was presented in verse or in prose. It is no coincidence that Humanist grammarians like Sulpizio would often compile several small works (e. g. cited in the present paper: *De Generibus Opusculum, De Nominum Declinatione Opusculum Compendiosum*), each focusing on a different grammar point or problem.

5. One of the main characteristics of Valla's and Perotti's "encyclopaedic works" *(Elegantiae, Cornucopiae)* is that rather than using artificial example sentences, they

---

[69] HOLTZ, *op. cit.* In the apparatus too no codices with *pecus–faex–saepes* readings have been found. However, it should be emphasized that the *Barbarismus*-section *(Ars Maior)* points out the mistakes caused by adiectio *(abisse–abiise)*, detractio *(salmentum–salsamentum)*, inmutatio *(olli–illi)*, and transmutatio *(Euandre–Euander).* It is also important that the chapter *De Schematibus* contains *paronomasia* (e. g. *amentium, amantium).* These grammatical phenomena show similarity with the phenomena discussed earlier *(faex, fas, far, falx,* etc.), cf. HOLTZ, *op. cit.*, 196.

cited a large number of classical authors for highlighting grammar points, as the Renaissance authors' aesthetic values were best reflected by the language usage of Cicero, Virgil etc.

6. The present analysis is not extended to grammarians beyond the Alps (German, Spanish etc. authors) whose works definitely made good use of the achievements of the 15th century. Therefore their analysis might reveal new aspects of the relationship between medieval and Humanist grammars.