

## Interpretations of Janus Pannonius' Eranemos in light of the cultural heritage and library of count Sámuel Teleki and Alexander Kovásznai\*

In 1784 a very modern version of the works of the Neo-Latin poet, Janus Pannonius (1434 - 1472) came in to light in Utrecht. This wonderful edition had been elaborated by the Hungarian literateur and philologist Alexander Kovásznai, in collaboration with count Teleki Sámuel in Marosvásárhely (*now known as: Târgu Mureş, Romania*).

Kovácsznai, researching on the renaissance tradition of critical interpretation and scholarship and leaning on his own and his patron's library, made a perfect critical philology of work on the texts of Janus Pannonius and even more: with the help of the cultural heritage and bibliophil support of count Teleki, created a huge unedited commentary on Janus' texts that now can be considered rather modern not only in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, but even in our times.

There were no more critical editions of Janus until the 21<sup>st</sup> century: the new critical text of Janus Pannonius will be published soon, the first two volumes have been edited recently<sup>1</sup>, and the third volume is still a project of the ELTE<sup>2</sup> research group in which I am a participant.

By way of introduction I would like to enlighten You to the period in which this important literary enterprise was born, with a special emphasis of the Renaissance scholarship tradition, and the exceptional bibliophil and critical work of the commentator, Kovásznai Sándor (1730 - 1792).

He was one of the most important figures of the 18<sup>th</sup> century in Transylvania: poet, scholar, bibliophil and philologist, who was continuously labouring, and who is the real author of the 1784 Utrecht critical edition of Janus<sup>3</sup>.

He was born in Fintaháza (*now known as: Cinta, Romania*) at the first half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, he was the son of a Calvinist pastor, and this fact determined his whole walk of life and his education. At the age of twelve he began his studies at the Reformed College in Marosvásárhely, in the spirit of the Calvinist doctrine. Since the subject matter of instruction was rather poor, he began to improve himself by reading jesuit school-books on philosophy, mathematics and classical-philology. He was highly influenced by the philosopher and professor of Halle and Marburg University, Christian Wolff (1679 - 1754) who propagated his unusual doctrines on the pure *ratio* (*reason*) claiming that we are able to reach the divine mercy merely through the *ratio pura* and that the predestination as a dogma cannot be predominating<sup>4</sup>.

In Hungary however the wolffian followers were not so extreme in professing their doctrines: they were content to propagate that the *evil* can be eliminated by spreading the culture and erudition.

---

<sup>1</sup>\* A tanulmány a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Bolyai János Kutatói Ösztöndíja támogatásával készült. (*This study was supported by the Researcher Scholarship „Bolyai János“ of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences*)

MAYER, Gyula–TÖRÖK, László. *Iani Pannonii Opera quae manserunt omnia Volumen I. Epigrammata. Volumen II. Elegiae. Fasciculus I. Seriem redigunt Stephanus Borzsák et Ágnes Ritoók-Szalay. Textus Edidit, praefatus est et apparatus critico instruxit Iulius Mayer. Similia addidit Ladislaus Török*. Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2006, 2014.

<sup>2</sup> ELTE = Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest

<sup>3</sup> KOCZIÁNY László. *Kovácsznai Sándor. Az ész igaz útján. Válogatott írások (On the Way of the Reason, Selected works)*. Bukarest: Kriterion Könyvkiadó, 1970.

<sup>4</sup> *Studii de istorie, filologie și istoria artei*, Bucuresti, 1972.

In 1755 Kovásznai became the preceptor of count Lázár János' son in the court of Brassó (now: Braşov, Romania) and there Kovásznai could attain a higher level of erudition – he deepened his knowledge of physics, mathematics, German and French languages. After getting the most important scientific basics in these areas, he matriculated to the University of Leiden in 1760, and till 1763 attended lectures of such illustrious professors as the physicist Petrus van Mussenbroek (1692 - 1761) or the classical-philologist Tiberius Hemsterhuis (1685 - 1766). Returning home from Leiden, with the favour of Lázár János, Kovásznai was appointed as professor of world history and classical-philology in the Reformed College in Marosvásárhely. It was during this period that his friendship with count Teleki Sámuel (1739 - 1822) began to flourish.

After the death of Lázár János, Kovásznai found another generous patron, Teleki Sámuel, who was well known at this time among the learned public as the most significant book-collector and bibliophil nobleman of his age in Transylvania<sup>5</sup>.

The idea of publishing the *opera omnia* of Janus Pannonius was Teleki's, and it was also him who financed the research on the texts, collected the copies of all the known manuscripts and acquired the various printed editions of the Hungarian poet. In 1771 Teleki persuaded Kovásznai into elaborating on the texts of the poems, and handed over to him all the variations of editions and the numerous copies of the manuscripts that he had managed to gather together during the years. Although other persons played a part in the preparation of the volume such as Christophorus Saxe (1714 - 1806) professor at the Utrecht University, Adam Kollar (1718 - 1783) and Cornides Dániel (1732 - 1787) Viennese librarians, also helped to collect material and to verify the authenticity of the texts, but it was still Kovásznai who executed the most significant part of the critical-textual work.

Zilahi Sámuel (1753 - 1800), a pupil of Kovásznai, and also patronized by Teleki, and who was studying at the Utrecht University that time, prepared the volume for printing.

However it is Kovásznai who deserves the greatest recognition, because he was the only scholar who managed to fulfil the huge works of textual criticism.

The volume of the *opera omnia* of Janus edited in 1784 in Utrecht<sup>6</sup> was famous as the work of Teleki Sámuel, and no one knew that the main work was due to Kovásznai, but we have the perfect evidence of his authority, because in the Teleki Téka (*Teleki Library, Marosvásárhely*) his manuscript can be found: a huge and detailed commentary on the works of Janus Pannonius. His annotations are divided into three sections: the first is the reconstruction of all of the variations of the *Janus-corporis* according to the author's intention. The second section contains all the known and up to that time unknown information about the life of Janus, his works, manuscripts and his printed editions. The third part is the commentary itself: more than one thousand pages of critical, letteral and historical apparatus related to the individual poems, with the autographical handwriting of Kovásznai<sup>7</sup>. Due to his *Notae* and *Adnotationes* we can precisely trace all the phases of his 12 years of work: the single stages of the composition of the *Janus-corporis*, the adaptation of the variants of the texts, the insertion of the *errata*, namely the list of differences of the prior editions and manuscripts, and not least the critical explanations of the commentator, adequate to the international commentary tradition of this period in Europe, but still unacquainted in the 18<sup>th</sup> century's Hungary.

All things considered we can say that the illustrious Utrecht-edition is – at least in aspect of the critical philology – it is to the absolute merit of Kovásznai. It is rather incomprehensible

<sup>5</sup> About Teleki Sámuel see the particular monography of Deé Nagy Anikó: DEÉ NAGY Anikó. *A könyvtáralapító Teleki Sámuel (The library-founder Teleki Sámuel)*. Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyes. 1997.

<sup>6</sup> *Iani Pannonii Poemata*. Traiecti ad Rhenum apud Barthol. Wild, M. DCC LXXXIV. [1784]

<sup>7</sup> KOVÁSZNAI Sándor. *Adnotationes ad Ianum Pannonium*, Marosvásárhely, Teleki Könyvtár, 1771–1783, MS autogr., TKt, I–IV. 1462 d/1–4, V. 1462 c. sz.; KOVÁSZNAI Sándor. *Notae in Ianum Pannonium*. Marosvásárhely, Teleki Könyvtár, 1778–1779, MS autogr., TKt, I–III. 401 b, c, d, sz

why Teleki Sámuel did not acknowledge Kovásznai, in addition, there were no more contributory names represented in the volume.

We should ask ourselves what the reason for this – and we have two possible explanations. The first is that the textuary printing practice – commonly used in that period, the only name indicated in the volume is contributory person, in this case the person who financed the printing. During this period only the financial contributor merited the prize of glory and fame, the other collaborators sank into oblivion. The second hypothetical motive of ignoring the co-operators, particularly Kovásznai, was that the friendship between him and the count had been deteriorating during the years, and Teleki, utilizing the practice of this aforementioned printing tradition, making his point of advantage, and failing to show the recognition of his colleague.

To understand the monumental amount of work completed by Kovásznai, we should take a schematic review of the scholarship tradition beginning with the early Renaissance. It should be important to comprehend the significance of the commentary on Janus written by Kovásznai, because in Hungary – apart from a very few examples<sup>8</sup> - there were no other commentators who's work should have been listed among the great European scholars. By all means, it can be ascertained that the genre of the commentary was nearly unknown even to the cultured noble members of the country.

Why had Kovásznai been completely different in his chosen way of critical philology in trying to introduce the European scholarship tradition to Hungary? The most obvious explanation could be found in his erudition, in his studies and in his bibliophil activity. First of all – even he was not satisfied with the standards of the Leiden University, he acquired the methods of critical philology of the Low Countries. Count Teleki committed Kovásznai to select and to collect nearly all the books for his private, noble library and he bought for the count and for himself too, the best commentary-editions of classical Greek and Latin authors. Between the numerous erudite annotators of the European scholarship tradition, we have to mention the following names: Daniel Heinsius (1580 - 1655) and Nicolaus Heinsius (1620 - 1681), Gerhardus Iohannes Vossius (1577 - 1649) and Isaac Vossius (1618 - 1689), Friedrich Gronovius (1611 - 1671) and Iacob Gronovius (1645 - 1716) from the Low Countries, Richard Bentley (1662 - 1742) and Thomas Farnaby (1575 - 1647) from England, the French Dionysius Lambinus (1520 - 1572), Isaac Casaubonus (1559 - 1614), Iulius Caesar Scaliger (1484 - 1555) and Iosephus Iustus Scaliger (1540 - 1609) and, certainly, Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466 - 1536).

Comparing the commentaries and the glossaries of these scholars with the notes of Kovásznai on Janus, it is clear that he not only simply bought and read the works of the commentary-authors mentioned above, but he also imitated their working method and writing style. The commentary of Kovásznai has an importance in relation to the Hungarian scholarship too, namely by reason of being neglected by Teleki. According to the modern literary historical tradition, until the appearance of Ábel Jenő (1858 - 1889)<sup>9</sup>, who discovered and critically edited the unknown works of Janus, there were no one nameable critical philologist in Hungary. At least that was the official position of Hungarian literal history.

---

<sup>8</sup> FORTUNATUS Matthaëus. *L. Annaei Senecae Naturalium Quaestionum Libri VII*. Venezia: Aldus Manutius, 1522, (RMK III. 252); VÁRI Rezső. *A classica-philológia encyclopaediája. A classica-philológia tudományágainak módszertanába bevezető kézikönyv (The Encyclopedia of the Classical Philology. Manual to the Methods of the Disciplines of the Classical Philology)*. Budapest: Athaenum, 1906, p. 439., and VÁRI Rezső. *Matthaëus Fortunatus*. p. 346–362.; BORZSÁK István. *Budai Ézsaiás és a klasszika-filológiánk kezdetei (Budai Ézsaiás and the Beginning of our Classical-Philology)*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1955.

<sup>9</sup> ÁBEL Jenő: *Adalékok a humanismus történetéhez Magyarországon (Analecta to the history of Humanism in Hungary) – Analecta ad historiam renascentium in Hungaria litterarum spectantia*. Budapest–Lipsiae: Brockhaus, 1880.

Henceforth I would like to present the history of the commentary in brief from the early Renaissance period, beginning with Petrarca (1304 - 1374) and representing its progress during the years, arriving at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. By the help of this introduction, we can get an insight into the genre, the criteria, the target and the function of the commentary. We will be informed concerning the connection between the main text and the related annotations, accordingly, we can understand the position of Kovásznai in the European scholarship tradition concerning his work.

Many scholars have researched on the genre of the commentary<sup>10</sup> stating the following conclusions: the commentary was born - as an aggregation of notes related to the main text - nearly when the literature itself begun to flourish; it is an integral part of the philological activity; it is difficult to give its definition because of the many examples of the genre; the content of the annotation is rather influenced by the era and the milieu in which it had arisen. It depends on the genre of the commented text, and the personal skills of the annotator: in this sense we can have numerous types of commentary. However there is one common point in all commentaries: the motif and the aim, namely the wish to understand and to be able to interpret the original text. The commentaries are different and diversified according to the era, the environment, the knowledge and aim of the commentator, it has become a resource for scientific research and scholarship<sup>11</sup>. If we would like to have a narrowly interpreted version of the definition above, we should say that the scholarship means the so-called *studia humanitatis*, that is to say the research on the classical authors, and the deep recognition of the whole antiquity through the reading of the ancient texts. As consequence we can arrive at the science of philology, and philology is the scientific method of understanding, inquiring and interpreting the text itself.

The foundation of modern critical philology was placed by the aforementioned Francesco Petrarca by inventing the method of interpreting and commenting in a critical way. This means he reconstructed the the best readings of the text according to the author's original intention by using and confronting the *variae lectiones (the different versions of the texts)*. Using this method he succeeded in retracing and placing in order the books of Roman history<sup>12</sup> by Livius. He also clarified some unexplained identities of authors.<sup>13</sup>

The next most notable commentator was Omnibonus Leonicensis (1412–1474), he represented the *accessus ad auctorem* as one of the first steps of the evolution in history of scholarship. The genre of *accessus ad auctorem* tries to understand the original author's aim (*intentio*), the motif of choosing the title and the argument, and then enquires to the personality and the curriculum of the writer. The notes of this commentary-style has grammatical, rhetorical, historical and moral features, and it is ascertainable that these characteristic attributes are considered as transition between the medieval and the renaissance commentary.

The renaissance commentary differs from the medieval: the medieval commentators used the methods of compilation, they made *florilegia, excerpta (a kind of extraction of one or more original works)* and epitomes, while the renaissance commentators made an effort to reach

---

<sup>10</sup> Some names worth mentioning: Friedrich August Wolf, Gottfried Hermann, August Boeckh, John Edwin Sandys, René Wellek, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Michael von Albrecht, Rudolf Pfeiffer, Marianne Pade, Anthony Grafton, Roy Gibson

<sup>11</sup> Rudolf Pfeiffer gives an exact circumscription about the essence of the commentary: „Scholarship is the art of understanding, explaining, and restoring the literary tradition. It originated as a separate intellectual discipline in the third century before Christ through the efforts of poets to preserve and to use their literary heritage, the »classics«. So scholarship actually arose as »classical« scholarship.” PFEIFFER, Rudolf. *History of Classical Scholarship. From The Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968. p. I, 3

<sup>12</sup> About the philological activity of Petrarca, see: MARTELLOTTI, Guido. *Scritti petrarcheschi. (Petrarchian writings)*. Padova: Editrice Antenore, 1983, p. 538-548.

<sup>13</sup> It was Petrarca to understand the first that Terentius Afer (B.C. 195-159.) and Terentius Culleo (B.C. 3-2. century ) are different persons, see: PFEIFFER, Rudolf. *History of Classical Scholarship. From 1300 to 1850*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976. p. II, 7.

and understanding of the work in its entirety. A fairly remarkable example of this is Niccolò Perotti (1429 - 1480) with his work titled *Cornu copiae seu linguae Latinae Commentarii*<sup>14</sup> (*Cornucopia, or the Commentary of the Latin Language*) which is formally a commentary on the epigrams of Martialis, but more like a significant experiment to illustrate the complexity of the whole Antiquity. Another essential diversion from the preceding commentaries is, that Niccolò Perotti cites not only the classical but even the contemporary authors to verify or – to the contrary – to refute certain statements.

The most grandiose attempt to vivify the ancient world is the example of Filippo Beroaldo's (1428 - 1497) commentary on Apuleius, as he made an attempt to raise the commentary to a higher level: he created an original and independent<sup>15</sup> writing.

The renaissance culture coming from Italy during the centuries spread first to Germany and to the Low Countries, then to France and England, thereafter the whole of Europe.

We cannot describe the activity of all the philologists, but we try only to represent those who added something new to the criteria of the genre. Erasmus of Rotterdam tried to conciliate the Antiquity and the Christianity not with the help of the mystical symbolism, as usual, but merely with the methods of pure critical philology. His work *Methodus*<sup>16</sup> is the summary of interpreting methods written in the New Testament saying „Scriptura Sacra sui ipsius interpres“, that means the text interprets itself, and the only thing is the commentator has to do is to be in perfect possession of the classical languages and the knowledge of the Antiquity.

The french Guillaume Budé (1468–1540) defined the later philological activity in France: for his initiation the Collège Royal has been founded by the king Francis I of France (1494 - 1547). The Collège Royal had numerous excellent pupils such as Calvin (1509 - 1564), Rabelais (ca. 1490 - 1553), Ignatius of Loyola (1491 - 1556), Amyot (1513 - 1593), Ronsard (1524 - 1585), Henricus Stephanus (1528 - 1598) and Jean Dorat (1508 - 1588).

In the manuscript of Kovásznai there can be found numerous citations from Henri Étienne (1528 - 1598), member of the Collège Royal, genius of languages, collector of manuscripts and typographer, who after inheriting his father's press, began to publish a huge amount of works of classical authors, always edited with adequate commentaries and prefaces, and became the ideal example for the following editions. Moreover, Kovásznai referred also the Parisian director of the Press Royal, Adrianus Turnebus (1512 - 1565) who draw attention to the importance on inquiring the manuscript tradition, and confronting the variants. We also know, that Kovásznai had a few editions of classical authors followed by the commentaries of Turnebus, in his own library. Another often mentioned philologist in the Kovásznai manuscript is Marc-Antoine de Muret (Muretus 1526 - 1585), who performed lectures at the University of Rome.

The next role model of Kovásznai was a professor in the Leiden University, Iustus Lipsius (1547 - 1606), who's commentary editions took part not only of Kovásznai's own library but that of the Teleki Téka so far.

Kovásznai collected theoretical works of the critical philology as well, e.g. writings of Gerhardus Johannes Vossius (1577 - 1649) about the importance of the manuscript tradition and the differences between the original text and the literal translation. Nicolaus Heinsius (1620 - 1681) is mentioned as predecessor of Kovásznai, and he can be considered as father of the modern critical philology in the 17<sup>th</sup> century as well, with his editions of classical authors followed by a huge apparatus of notes.

---

<sup>14</sup> see: PADE, Marianne. *Niccolò Perotti's »Cornu Copiae«: Commentary on Martial and encyclopedia*. In: PADE. *Renaissance Commentaries*, 49–63.

<sup>15</sup> see: CASELLA, Maria Teresa. *Il metodo dei commentatori umanistici esemplato sul Beroaldo (The method of the Humanist commentators, based on Beroaldo)*. In: *Studi medievali*, 1975, 16, p. 627–701.

<sup>16</sup> *Novum Instrumentum omne, diligenter ab Erasmo Roterodamo recognitum et emendatum*, Basileae: apud Iohannem Frobenium, 1516.

We have a manuscript-catalogue of Kovásznai's library, probably with the handwriting of a student – all we know is that this register was not written by Kovásznai himself.

Presumptively, it has been finished only after the death of Kovásznai, it contains more than 500 volumes and counter to the manuscript-commentary which is in the Teleki Téka, the list of his books can be found in the Manuscript Department of the Library and Information Centre of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences<sup>17</sup>. If we have a catalogue of a private library, we can understand the main bibliophil activity of the collector, than we can get information about his knowledge and erudition.

According to the backgrounds of formation of Kovásznai's annotation on Janus Pannonius, we can make the following statements: he never signed exactly the editions that he had used for writing his commentary, he marked only the authors. However there were more classical authors quoted in his commentary than listed in his book-register, that's why we should draw the conclusions, that he had used not only his private library for elaborate the commentary, but even that of Teleki Sámuel and that of the Reformed College in Marosvásárhely, where he was professor of world history and classical philology. Three categories of his books can be found according to his great commentary work: the first contains the editions of classical Greek and Latin authors with *apparatus criticus* and commentary; the second category of the volumes includes the poetical works of classical and contemporary humanists authors, while the third category has the books with the argument of history and literary history. Inquiring these three categories it is very markable that Kovásznai preferred to buy the volumes edited in the Low Countries and in France. We have no idea of the manner how he acquired the books for his private collection from abroad, but we know the fact, that for three years he had studied at the Leiden University than there has been his pupil Zilahy Sámuel who bought books surely and frequently to his patron, Teleki, and possibly he made some kind of favour for Kovásznai too.

The commentary editions of the classical authors in his library were edited predominantly in Leiden, Amsterdam, Rotterdam and Hague from the annotators like Isaac Vossius, Isaac Iohannes Pontanus (1571–1639), Iustus Lipsius, Nicolaus Heinsius and the Gronovius-family. Kovásznai had also historical and literary history works in his collection from the composers like Vossius, Pontanus, Grotius, and Paulus Iovius (1483–1552), from the Low Countries. He collected also the very pretious and perfection-made volumes of the french *in usum serenissimi Delphini* series, with commentaries of more authors together like Adrianus Turnébus and Dionysius Lambinus, furthermore, he cited rather often philologists like Marc-Antoine Muret, Isaac Casaubonus and Henri Étienne. He also referred all the editions of Frobenius in Basel, and he bought some theoretical works of William Spencer (?–1714) Thomas Farnaby, Carolus Sigonius (1524–1584), Flavius Blondus (1392–1463), Robertus Keuchenius (16. sz.), Bongars (1554–1612), Fayus (17. sz.), Minellius (1625–1683) and Duiatius (1609–1688).

The common features of these cited works regarding to the style and method of the commentary is the following: the *variae lectiones* has been signed most of the time in the appendix, the *errata* has been marked, there could be found a preface in which the author's life and intention, furthermore the method of the commentator had been presented with a dedication to a powerful patron. Below the main text there could be read the commentary itself with it's historical, poetical, geographical, medical, astronomical ecc. annotations to familiarize the texts to the readers helping and facilitating the interpretation.

One of the longer poems of Janus Pannonius, the Eranemos (*Eranemos, seu carmen de certamine ventorum - Eranemos, or the competition of the winds*) was written at a young age

---

<sup>17</sup> *Catalogus librorum clarissimi quondam Alexandri Kovásznai*, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára, Kézirattár (Manuscript Department of Library and Information Centre of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences), M. Irod. Könyvészet, 2. r. 1. sz.)

in the school of Guarino Veronese (1374 - 1460) who was a famous educator in Verona. The *Eranemos* contains a kind of oratorical emulation of the four main personalized winds of the ancient Greek-Latin mythology: Eurus (the southeastern wind which blows during the winter solstice), Auster (the southern wind which blows during the beginning of the summer bringing warmth), Zephyrus (the western wind that brings spring), and Boreas (the northern wind that brings cold and rainy clouds). These four winds are competing with each other to be the strongest: who will get the prize? Aeolus, the king of the winds is the judge, he will choose the winner, and the four winds will make an oratorical speech about their excellent virtue<sup>18</sup>. At the end the palm is assigned to Boreas as it was expected, as he has spoken about 163 lines in this epic poem, more than the others!

A typical humanistic poem is full of references to the antiquity: Janus Pannonius as an emerging young talent that time, - even as a student of Guarino and the best-known humanist school that time, used a lot of allusions: not only regarding to the argument, but even to the words, expressions and sometimes full verses that were taken from the classical authors.

A well educated commentator – as Kovásznai - has to know all classical texts quasi by heart, and has to be able to interpret the text by all means, like historical, political and scientific background. When examining the commentary written by Kovásznai on Janus's *Eranemos* we can recognise how detailed, profound and complete was his knowledge not only according to the antiquity, but also to the whole Humanism, including history, geography, metrics, astronomy, medicine, physics, philosophy and mythology.

The commentary of the *Eranemos* begins with the introduction: Kovásznai gives the title, and all variation of the titles in the different manuscripts and printed editions disserting the Greek origin with a detailed etymologic explanation of the word itself. Then he begins to examine the poem. Quoting 4-5 lines, he makes a very elaborate, and circumstantial explanation about the participants, the mythology, and the nature of the winds.

He also refers to the precedent printed editions of Janus, especially the volume edited in Debrecen, in 1596<sup>19</sup>, and he often mentions Johannes Sambucus<sup>20</sup> (1531-1584), one of the most famous Janus-editors, who had found a manuscript in Florence.

His interpretation begins always with the explanatory reading of the cited text: Kovásznai tells us in his own words the meaning of the poem. He then examines exhaustively all the *variae lectiones*, namely, all the possible variations of the texts verbatim, that word by word, and points out all the differences. His next step is to enlighten us to all the poetic images, in particular, the metaphores of the text, always supported by citations on the classical authors, describing even the *locus (location)* of the original text. The most quoted authors by Kovásznai are the following: Vergilius, Ovidius, Claudianus, Cicero, Lucanus, and Lucretius, and this fact has two unambiguous reasons: the first is coming from the genre itself: obviously, Janus cited the *locus* of epic poets in his allusions, and this fact reflects the erudition of Janus Pannonius itself. On the other hand we can understand also the erudition of Kovásznai, because he invokes all the classical authors known by him to give an intire and exact explanation of Janus' text, complemented by his own interpretations and annotations regarding to history, poetry, astronomy, medicine, philosophy, and grammar.

---

<sup>18</sup> For the review of the *Eranemos* in Hungarian language see: HUSZTI, József. *Janus Pannonius*. Pécs: Janus Pannonius Társaság, 1931, p. 66-73; and PAIS Dezső. *Janus Pannonius Eranemusa és a latin klasszikusok*. In: *Egyetemes Philológiai Közlöny*, XXXIV, 1910, p. 760-776.

<sup>19</sup> *Iani Pannonii Eranemus, hoc est ventorum contentio. Nunc seorsim excusus*. Debrecini: 1594. (RMK II. 248)

<sup>20</sup> Johannes Sambucus or Zsámboky János was a scholar, born in Nagyszombat (now: Trnava, Slovakia), a polyhistor, doctor of philosophy and medicine, author of history works and the famous *Emblemata* book. The printed volume of Janus' *Eranemos* edited by him is: *Reges Ungariae ab an. Christi CDI. usque ad MDLXVII. Item Iani Pannonii Quinqueecclesiensis Eranemus nunc repertus*. Viennae Austriae [Wien]: excudebat Casparus Stainhofer, Anno M.D.LXVII. [1567.]. (RMK III. 557)

To summarize the essence of this essay we have to say that the Kovásznai's studies, erudition, knowledge of classical philology and accuracy of preparedness was influenced directly by the spiritual tradition of the Dutch humanists and the milieu of the Leiden University.

Furthermore, indirectly, he was influenced by the generosity of his patron.

The methods of the quondam professors and humanists of Leiden can be traced directly in the commentary of Kovásznai on Janus: in his manuscript there can be found numerous citations of the methodical and literary history works of his great predecessors.

Indirect evidence of the similarity of their annotations can be the correspondence of the style and method of the notes, furthermore, there is Kovásznai's book-catalogue, also in manuscript form: so we can have the evidence that in his library the texts edited of the classical authors could be always found with commentary, prepared by the dutch philologists.

## **LIST OF BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES**



ÁBEL Jenő: *Adalékok a humanismus történetéhez Magyarországon (Analecta to the history of Humanism in Hungary) – Analecta ad historiam renascentium in Hungaria litterarum spectantia*. Budapest–Lipsiae: Brockhaus, 1880.

BORZSÁK István. *Budai Ézsaiás és a klasszika-filológiánk kezdetei (Budai Ézsaiás and the Beginning of our Classical-Philology)*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1955.

CASELLA, Maria Teresa. *Il metodo dei commentatori umanistici esemplato sul Beroaldo (The method of the Humanist commentators, based on Beroaldo)*. In: *Studi medievali*, 1975, 16, p. 627–701.

*Catalogus librorum clarissimi quondam Alexandri Kovásznai*, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára, Kézirattár (Manuscript Department of Library and Information Centre of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences), M. Irod. Könyvészet, 2. r. 1. sz.)

DEÉ NAGY Anikó. *A könyvtáralapító Teleki Sámuel (The library-founder Teleki Sámuel)*. Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyes. 1997. ISBN 973-98092-1-9

FORTUNATUS Matthaeus. *L. Annaei Senecae Naturalium Quaestionum Libri VII*. Venezia: Aldus Manutius, 1522, (RMK III. 252);

HUSZTI, József. *Janus Pannonius*. Pécs: Janus Pannonius Társaság, 1931, p. 66-73; and PAIS Dezső. *Janus Pannonius Eranemusa és a latin klasszikusok*. In: *Egyetemes Philológiai Közlöny*, XXXIV, 1910, p. 760-776.)

*Iani Pannonii Eranemus, hoc est ventorum contentio. Nunc seorsim excusus*. Debrecini: 1594. (RMK II. 248)

*Iani Pannonii Poemata*. Traiecti ad Rhenum apud Barthol. Wild, M. DCC LXXXIV. [1784]

KOCZIÁNY László. *Kovácsnai Sándor. Az ész igaz útján. Válogatott írások (On the Way of the Reason, Selected works)*. Bukarest: Kriterion Könyvkiadó, 1970.

KOVÁCSNAI Sándor. *Adnotationes ad Ianum Pannonium*, Marosvásárhely, Teleki Könyvtár, 1771–1783, MS autogr., TKt, I–IV. 1462 d/1–4, V. 1462 c. sz.; KOVÁCSNAI Sándor. *Notae in Ianum Pannonium*. Marosvásárhely, Teleki Könyvtár, 1778–1779, MS autogr., TKt, I–III. 401 b, c, d, sz

MARTELLOTTI, Guido. *Scritti petrarcheschi. (Petrarchian writings)*. Padova: Editrice Antenore, 1983, p. 538-548. ISBN 978-88-8455-223-5

MAYER, Gyula–TÖRÖK, László. *Iani Pannonii Opera quae manserunt omnia Volumen I. Epigrammata. Volumen II. Elegiae. Fasciculus I. Seriem redigunt Stephanus Borzsák et Agnes Ritoók-Szalay. Textus Edidit, praefatus est et apparatu critico instruxit Iulius Mayer. Similia addidit Ladislaus Török*. Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2006, 2014. ISBN 978-963-506-929-3

*Novum Instrumentum omne, diligenter ab Erasmo Roterodamo recognitum et emendatum*, Basileae: apud Iohannem Frobenium, 1516.

PADE, Marianne. *Niccolo Perotti's »Cornu Copiae«: Commentary on Martial and encyclopedia*. In: PADE. *Renaissance Commentaries*, 49–63. ISBN 3487129558

PFEIFFER, Rudolf. *History of Classical Scholarship. From The Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968. p. I, 3.

PFEIFFER, Rudolf. *History of Classical Scholarship. From 1300 to 1850*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976. p. II, 7. ISBN 0 19 814364 8

*Studii de istorie, filologie și istoria artei*, Bucuresti, 1972.

VÁRI Rezső. *A classica-philológia encyclopaediája. A classica-philológia tudományágainak módszertanába bevezető kézikönyv (The Encyclopedia of the Classical Philology. Manual to the Methods of the Disciplines of the Classical Philology)*. Budapest: Athaeneum, 1906, p. 439.

ZSÁMBOKY János. *Reges Ungariae ab an. Christi CDI. usque ad MDLXVII. Item Iani Pannonii Quinqueecclesiensis Eranemus nunc repertus*. Viennae Austriae [Wien]: excudebat Casparus Stainhofer, Anno M.D.LXVII. [1567.]. (RMK III. 557)

Budapest, 2016-04-05

Zaynab Dalloul  
National Széchényi Library  
Department of Early Printed Books  
Budapest, H-1014  
Szent György tér 4-5-6

Title of the paper: **Interpretations of Janus Pannonius' Eranemos in light of the cultural heritage and library of count Sámuel Teleki and Alexander Kovásznai**

<p>Name and surname:  <b>Zaynab Dalloul PhD</b></p>
<p>Organization:  <b>National „Széchényi“ Library, Budapest  Department of Early Printed Books</b></p>
<p>Adress:  <b>1014, Budapest, Szent György tér 4-5-6</b></p>
<p>Phone contact, e-mail: +36 30 373 3529  <a href="mailto:zaynab.dalloul@yahoo.com">zaynab.dalloul@yahoo.com</a></p>
<p>Title of the paper: <b>Interpretations of Janus Pannonius‘ Eranemos in light of the cultural heritage and library of count Sámuel Teleki and Alexander Kovásznai</b></p>
<p>Brief information about author and scinetific researches:  <b>The author studied at the University of Szeged, than had her doctorate degree in Neo-Latin Philology in 2009. Now she is working at the Széchényi Library, Budapest, at the Department of Early Printed Books. Her speciality is the Incunabula, the sixteenth century editions and she made researches on the Hungarian Neo-Latin literature and Humanism.</b></p>
<p>Abstract :  <b>In 1784 came in to light a very modern version of the works of Janus Pannonius (1434-1472), in Leiden. This nice edition was elaborated by the literateur and philologist Alexander Kovásznai, in collaboration with the count Teleki in Târgu Mureş (now: Marosvásárhely, Romania). Kovásznai, leaning on his own library, and researching on the renaissance tradition of critical interpretation and scholarship, made a perfect critical philology work on the texts of Janus and even more: with the help of the cultural heritage and bibliophil support of count Teleki created a huge unedited commentary of the texts that can be considered modern not only in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, but even in our days. There were no more critical edition of Janus untill the 21<sup>th</sup> century: the new critical edition of Janus Pannonius is to be published, the first two volumes have been edited recently, and the third volume is still under project of the ELTE research group with my participation.</b></p>