KRYSTYNA KRAUZE-BŁACHOWICZ

MODI SIGNIFICANDI IN JOHANNES GLOGOVIENSIS’ GRAMMAR

Johannes Glogoviensis (1445-1507) was one of the renowned professors of liberal arts at the Jagellonian University. He taught mandatory courses on Aelius Donatus’ *Ars minor* and on the Second Part of Alexander de Villa Dei’s *Doctrinale*. The two were firmly established as the basic university grammar textbooks containing morphology and syntax, respectively. Glogoviensis’ commentaries on the subject: *Declaratio Donati minoris*, and *Exercitium secundae partis Alexandri* had numerous printed editions starting from 1500 and were popular with masters and students at Cracow. Both books, set in the form of *quaestiones*, took a modest approach to grammatical issues. In this way Glogoviensis continued the tradition of *modi significandi* which flourished in Cracow from the mid-15th century until the end of the 1520s. The University of Cracow became the center of that doctrine’s revival. Its durability and influence deserves continued research to attain a better insight into the specifically Polish tradition of speculative grammar. The study of Glogoviensis’ works is important for that kind of research.

---

2 The title of the Glogoviensis’ commentary on *Donatus minor* slightly varied according to the edition. *Declaratio Donati minoris* is an abbreviated form of the title of the first edition: *Declaratio Donati minoris de octo partibus orationis cum pulcherrimis quaestionibus admodum studiosis scholaribus proficua*, Liptzk 1500.

In this paper I will try to expose some specific features of Glogoviensis’ work and the choices he made in his teaching. These become apparent when his commentaries are compared with standard late 15th century expositions popular in Cracow at the time, i.e. Johannes Versor’s Commentum super Donatum and Gerhard of Züpthen’s first and second part of Glosa notabilis (which is a commentary on the first and second part of Alexander de Villa Dei’s Doctrinale). I will focus on a few issues selected from a catalogue of typical modist queries, provided mostly by Glogoviensis’ and Züpthen’s commentaries on the second part of Doctrinale. The selected issues are as follows: 1) The concept of mode of signifying, 2) grammar as scientia necessaria, 3) The subject of grammar, 4) The concept of construction and the related issues concerning transitivity, congruity and completeness of construction. I will touch on the status of government (regimen) with reference to construction.

MODI SIGNIFICANDI

In the two commentaries, Glogoviensis provides a brief explanation of the doctrine of modi significandi. Unlike Versor and Züpthen, he feels it is didactically necessary. In fact, Glogoviensis’ concept of modi significandi passivi and activi is nothing else but the well-known concept of Thomas of Erfurt. Modes of signifying are distinctive features of parts of speech. The passive mode of signifying is a property of the thing consignified by the expression. The active mode of signifying is the mode or property of the expression given by the intellect to that expression by means of which the expression signifies the property of the thing. Glogoviensis lists further divisions into essential and accidental modes. He divides essential modes into general and special, and accidental modes into absolute and respective ones. The special essential mode refers to the essence of a particular part of speech and distinguishes one part of speech

---

6 Ioannes Glogoviensis, Donati minoris grammatici non vulgaris de octo partibus orationis declaratio, Lipsiae 1506 (henceforth abbreviated as Donati minoris declaratio), f. C3r; idem, Exercitium secundae partis Alexandri, Cracoviae 1517 (henceforth abbreviated as Exercitium), f. A4v.
from another. The accidental respective modes are responsible for congruity of utterance, Glogovian says that every mode of signifying originates from the mode of being through the mode of understanding.

**SCIENTIA NECESSARIA**

While trying to answer the question whether grammar is a necessary science, Glogoviensis is exclusively interested in the ontological aspect of *modi significandi*. The claim that every mode of signifying has to be derived from the mode of being of the thing is an assumption leading to the statement that grammar, and in particular morphology and syntax, are necessary sciences. What is most interesting here are his replies to the objections that being a science of contingent things grammar (and syntax respectively) is not a *scientia necessariorum*. In *Declaratio Donati* he says: «The theorems of grammar are based on the principles that cannot be changed». His argument in *Exercitium* can be summarized as follows: syntax is knowledge about government (regimen) and construction (constructio). These originate from modes of being through modes of signifying and, successively, modes of understanding. And modes of being are necessary, since the knowledge about them is also necessary, and it constitutes natural philosophy. Hence syntax is necessary. By contrast,
Gerhard of Züpthen’s answer to the question about necessary science is based on a different type of argument involving the concept of aim (finis) of science\textsuperscript{11}.

**Subiectum scientiae**

*Subiectum scientiae* is a formal subject, that is *subiectum attributionis*. Glogoviensis acknowledged four conditions of such a subject\textsuperscript{12}:

1) it must be the most common term considered in that science (*terminus communissimus*)

2) it must be the term which is primarily considered in that science (*primo notus*)

3) it must not exceed the boundaries of that science (*non excedens limites illius scientiae*)

4) everything that is considered in this science must be considered with respect to it (*ad quem omnia in tali scientia considerata habent attributionem*)

It looks as if they were patterned on the three conditions given by Züpthen in *Glosa Notabilis*\textsuperscript{13} and Glogoviensis had divided Züpthen’s first condition into two. Both Glogoviensis’ and Züpthen’s conditions are similar in their contents to the conditions comprised in the anonymous commentary on the second part of *Doctrinale* preserved in Erfurt, Amplon.

\textsuperscript{11} Gerardus de Zupthania, *Glosa notabilis secundae partis Alexandri*, Coloniae 1499 (henceforth abbreviated as *Glosa notabilis II*), f. A1v: «Necessitas sumitur ex parte finis, sed talis est congrua locutio huius doctrinae. Secunda ratio: illa scientia est necessaria per quam rerum omnium habitudinem essentialem et accidentalem cognoscre possimus, sed hoc facit noticiam, huius scientia ergo est necessaria. Tertia ratio est: illa scientia necessaria est per quam instruirum ad eliciendum perfectam scientiam ex variis scripturis, sed hoc fit per istam scientiam, ergo est necessaria».


\textsuperscript{13} Gerardus de Zupthania, *Glosa notabilis II*, f. A3v: «Prima est quod sit aliquid communissimum principaliter in illa scientia consideratum. Secunda est quod non excedat metas illius scientiae. (...) Tertia conditio est quod omnia in tali scientia considerata habent ordinem ad ipsum». 
Q. 70 A and attributed formerly to Marsilius of Inghen\textsuperscript{14}. Nevertheless the wording and explanations given by Glogoviensis resemble this text much more than Züpthen’s. While Glogoviensis and the anonymous author say \textit{terminus communissimus, primo notus}. Züpthen says \textit{quod sit communissimum principaliter}. With reference to his fourth condition Glogoviensis says:

«\textit{alia [considerata in scientia] habent attributionem ad subiectum verificativam} (...) \textit{alia autem habent attributionem reductivam}»\textsuperscript{16}.

The Anonymous puts it as follows:

«\textit{talis terminus [i.e. subiectum] sit verificabilis de omnibus principaliter consideratis in scientia; (...) minus principaliter considerata considere
\textit{n}tur in ordine et attributione ad ipsum»\textsuperscript{17}.

It is therefore obvious that Glogoviensis does not use Züpthen directly. His source is closer to that of the anonymous commentary included in Erfurt, Ampl. Q. 70 A. It should be noted that Versor does not touch upon the problem of \textit{subiectum attributionis} at all in his grammar whereas it falls within the scope of interest of Cracow grammarians\textsuperscript{18}.

According to both Gerhard of Züpthen and Johannes Glogoviensis, \textit{sermo significativus} is the subject of grammar as a whole\textsuperscript{19}. In Züpthen’s opinion the \textit{vox litterata articulata articulatione secunda} is the subject of syntax, where the second articulation means combination of one part of speech with another under the proper proportion of modes of signifying\textsuperscript{20},


\textsuperscript{20} Gerardus de Zupthania, \textit{Glosa notabilis II}, f. A3r.
Glogoviensis says that the subject of syntax is *pars orationis ad aliam relata*, that is «in habitudine et in respectu ad aliud cum quo constituit orationem congruum et perfectam» 21. The two authors differ here only in their terminology (and not in the concepts themselves) 22. If we are to believe the commentary on Ludolf de Luchow’s *Flores*, which was read in Cracow in the times of Glogoviensis, *articulatio prima* and *secunda* in the meaning used by Gerhard of Zülpchen originate from the tradition of non-modist grammar 23. Glogoviensis with his *pars orationis ad aliam relata* sticks to the modist line represented in classical speculative grammar, e.g. by Simon Dacus Modista and preserved by the Cracow tradition 24.

**CONSTRUCTIO, REGIMEN**

While commenting on Alexander’s brief fragment on construction 25, both authors agree on the most proper understanding of construction that

---

22 In fact it is what Glogoviensis calls «unio unius partis cum alia», *Exercitium*, f. A4r.
23 Ludolphus de Luco, *Flores grammaticae sive Florista cum commento*, [Basel c. 1490-1497], f. A3v: «Dubitatur, quid sit subjectum floristae. Respondetur, quod vox articulata articulatione secunda. Pro illo sciendum, quod ‘prima’ secundum modistas est prima impositio dictionis ad significandum unam rem sic quod non aliam, ut cum ille terminus hoc imponitur ad significandum ‘animal rationale’, est articulatio prima. Secunda est, quando aliqua dictio imponitur ad significandum aliquam rem sub certam proprietatem et sub certo modo significandi, sicut cum ille terminus ‘homo’ imponebatur ad significandum animal rationale per modum per se stantis et sub modo habitus et quietis. Sed secundum communes grammaticos articulatio prima est, cum terminus imponitur ad significandum unam rem sic, quod non aliam. Sed articulatio secunda est, quando terminus ordinatur cum alio termino sub debitis accidentibus grammaticalibus. Sic patet qualiter vox articulata articulatione secunda est hic subjectum. Quia in isto docetur qualiter unus terminus debet combinari cum alio».
relates to the definition of Thomas of Erfurt. In Züpthen’s opinion this
definition describes congruous union of constructibles. Glogoviensis,
whose terminology is more traditional, states that the construction in that
sense dictates congruous order of words and their proportion. Both Züpthen and Glogoviensis impose on this concept of construction –
proper and modistic according to them – the condition that it be
congruous, thus departing from their modist model towards the non-
modist didactic model of construction. On the other hand, both authors try
to present construction as a formal component of a sentence, even though
they are not always consistent about it. Züpthen tries not to confuse unio
constructibilium with oratio, while Glogoviensis tries to talk about
construction as a cause of oratio and not treat it as oratio. There is yet
another understanding of construction, equivalent to the definition of a
complete sentence. Both Glogoviensis and Züpthen acknowledge that it is
Alexander’s understanding of construction; the former, however, counters
Alexander’s position with the modist stance that a construction does not
always entail a complete sentence. A construction can be complete or
incomplete – totalis or partialis, as Glogoviensis puts it.

Gerhard of Züpthen lists the school (semantic) definitions of
transitive, intransitive, retransitive and reciprocal constructions. He then

26 Thomas de Erfordia, Op. cit, p. 279: «the construction is a combination
of constructibles made up of the modes of signifying, caused by the intellect and devised for
the purpose of expressing a compound concept of the mind».
29 Ioannes Glogoviensis, Exercitium, f. M7r: «nulla oratio incongrua est constructio»
30 Gerardus de Zupthania, Glosa notabilis II, f. O3v.
31 Ioannes Glogoviensis, Exercitium, f. M7r: «Constructiones istae dicuntur totales quae causant orationem perfectam»
33 Gerardus de Zupthania, Glosa notabilis II, f. O4v: «Constructio transitiva est in qua constructabilia pertinent ad diversa vel videntur pertinere ad diversa (...) sed
defines them relating to the *motus* model\textsuperscript{34}. Finally he quotes definitions based on the modist conception of dependency of constructibles\textsuperscript{35}. Glogoviensis appears to be solely interested in taking a stand in the controversy concerning reciprocal construction. According to Alexander de Villa Dei, a reciprocal construction is an intransitive construction. This is because he uses a traditional (semantic) definition of intransitive construction stating that constructibles signify the same thing: «constructibilia significant idem»\textsuperscript{36}. On the other hand Thomas of Erfurt holds that reciprocal construction is transitive\textsuperscript{37}. Glogoviensis strongly favours the modist solution, making use of the conceptual apparatus of Thomas. When we do not refer to semantics (*quoad significatum*) but only to the modist concept of constructibile *primum* and *secundum* and the concept of dependency (*quoad modos significandi*), reciprocal construction will prove to be transitive\textsuperscript{38}. In a sample of a reciprocal construction *ego diligo me*, the first constructible *diligo* depends on the

\[\text{constructio intransitiva est in qua constructibilia pertinent ad idem vel videntur pertinere ad idem} \ldots \text{Notandum quod dictiones transitive construi est illas diverse significare, sed intransitive construi est illas idem significare}].\]

\textsuperscript{34} *Ibidem*, f. O5r: «reciprocum est in qua constructibilia significant idem vel videntur significare idem et tamen actio vel passio denotatur transire in seipsum vel in id a quo exivit»; f. O4v: «Queritur quo modo capitur hic transitivum et intransitivum. Dicendum quod similitudinarie sicut in motu reali est transitus de termino a quo ad terminum ad quem. Sic in constructione transitiva actus denotatur transire in rem obliquam. Et sicut alius motus est simplex ita est aliquia constructio simplex et sicut alius motus est compositus ita aliquia constructio dicitur esse composita».


\textsuperscript{36} Ioannes Glogoviensis, *Exercitium*, f. M7v.


second constructible *me*, according to precisely the same syntactic rules as in the case of *lego lectionem*, where the first constructible *lego* depends on second constructible *lectionem*. Glogoviensis concedes that Alexander’s approach is more common but claims that it is the modists who are right. Züpthen on the other hand refrains from evaluating the approaches he presents.

The issues of congruity and completeness of construction are dealt with by Glogoviensis in just a few passages that do not move far away from Thomas of Erfurt’s text. The differences coincide with the ones that can be found in the Cracow manuscript treatise on construction. Züpthen claims that congruity and incongruity are not worthy of discussion because it has been assumed that every construction that Alexander talks about is congruous. A complete construction is one which represents a complete sentence in the mind of the listener: «perfectam sententiam repraesentat in animo auditoris».

Some of the 15th century grammarians including Züpthen show no interest in congruity and completeness according to sense (*ad sensum*) and according to understanding (*ad intellectum*). By contrast, Glogoviensis shows a great interest in those issues, similarly to the author of the above mentioned Cracow treatise on construction. Clearly he considers these problems as significant and his text shows traces of a debate on whether subjectless expressions with the verb in the third person were good examples of constructions according to understanding.

41 Gerardus de Zupthania, *Glosa notabilis II*, f. O6r.
43 Ioannes Glogoviensis, *Exercitium*, f. M8r: «congruitas ad intellectum est quando non ambo constructabilia secundum vocem quoad congruitatem sunt expressa, sed alterum illorum per intellectum subintelligitur; ut quando verba primae personae vel secundae personae proferuntur. (...) [Perfectio] est duplex: ad sensum et ad intellectum. Ad sensum est, quando ambo constructabilia congruitatis secundum vocem sunt expressa, (...) ad
With most classical modistae, *regimen* is not discussed, but it is not possible to avoid it when discussing *Doctrinale*. Züpthen sums up the problem with a short non-modist explication of the term. In Glogoviensis’ lengthy discussion the concepts of regimen and construction are linked with each other, and the concept of *modus significandi* is involved in the definition of regimen, which entails the four causes presented in a similar manner to Thomas of Erfurt’s definition of construction. Glogoviensis’ discussion of regimen aims towards presenting it as a genuine modist concept.

This brief outline shows that the teaching of Glogoviensis is not a restatement or simple compilation of the work of Gerhard of Züpthen. The reason for that is certainly not his unfamiliarity with the standard handbook. On the contrary, Glogoviensis’ text gives the impression that the author prepares or revises his commentary with the *Glosa notabilis* in his hand. On the basis of the material presented here, it is also possible to reflect on the specificity of his sources and predilections. He chooses different terminology and argumentation than his western colleague. He presents himself as a more eager adherent of modism than Gerhard and modifies the didactic tradition in a specifically understood spirit of modism. In doing so he paradoxically shows an attachment to the traditional school grammar, which he endeavours to reinterpret according to the modist principles (*secundum modistas*). All this appears to have been characteristic of the phenomenon which I refer to as the Cracow revival of speculative grammar.
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* I wish to thank Dr. Marek Gensler and Dr. Janice Bell for their help in revising the English version of this text.