

Alfonso Lombana Sánchez 

Sámuel Teleki and Janus Pannonius

TERMINUS

Vol. 26 (2024)

Iss. 3–4 (72–73)

pp. 295–309

[https://ejournals.eu/
en/journal/
terminus](https://ejournals.eu/en/journal/terminus)

Early View

Abstract

Count Sámuel Teleki (1739–1822) was, by all accounts, a “Neo-Latinist”. His love for the written word went beyond his book collection, which is now preserved in the Teleki Library in Târgu Mureş / Marosvásárhely. He is also one of the most important editors of the Hungarian Neo-Latin writer Janus Pannonius; after twenty years of preliminary work, Teleki prepared the first *editio* of the poet’s *opera omnia*. This text, which was published in Utrecht in 1784, contributed to the revival of Janus and has been constantly used by researchers over the years—nearly up until modern times. The *editio* exhibits some excellent philological achievements. Not only is Teleki responsible for the first *collatio* of some very important manuscripts and editions of Janus, but he also completed the edition with a biography and a collection of valuable historical testimonies. My proposal thus aims both to present both the work of Sámuel Teleki and analyse his *editio* of Janus.

Keywords

Sámuel Teleki,
Sándor Kovásznai,
Janus Pannonius,
Teleki-Téka,
history of the
book, Neo-Latin
literature

1. Introduction

Count Sámuel Teleki (1739–1822) stands out as one of the most interesting personalities in the history of books during the eighteenth century.¹ Among his many accomplishments, his most important achievements in philology are his edition of Janus Pannonius' works² and the foundation of the Teleki Library in Târgu Mureş / Marosvásárhely, also known as "Teleki-Téka".³

Throughout the eighteenth century, individuals and aristocrats had private libraries in their homes with collections of old books and manuscripts. In contrast to some of his contemporaries, Teleki promoted the concept of an open "private" library collection that interested readers could easily access. As stipulated in his will, the library was available to the public at certain times.

Deé Nagy has provided evidence that Teleki intended to create a public library for everyone. His books were no longer considered luxury items but rather meant to be read. Miller Jakab Ferdinánd, a library visitor, confirmed that the library's value was "not so much for its impressive appearance, but rather because the public can use it as their own on a daily basis."⁴

Although many individual books have survived, Teleki's collection is best-known today because of the catalogues he prepared.⁵ The impressive library contained 40,000 books at the time of his death and was established at its present location in 1802. It is now one of the most important cultural monuments of Marosvásárhely.

2. The idea of the Teleki-Téka

Establishing a library is closely related to the works on textual criticism and editions of the eighteenth century. Sámuel Teleki visited the important centres of knowledge

¹ When discussing the famous Teleki family, it is important to differentiate between his grandfather Mihály Teleki (1634–1690), who was the General Chief of Transylvania and a close friend of the Rákóczi kings (I and II), and his grandson Sámuel Teleki (1845–1916), who became a famous explorer during the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Moreover, Pál Teleki (1879–1941), a politician, Prime Minister of Hungary, and expert in geography, was also a member of this family.

² *Ianni Pannonii Poemata quae uspiam reperiri potuerunt omnia*, ed. S. Teleki, Utrecht 1784. A facsimile edition was prepared by Péter Koószeghy and others: *Jani Pannonii Opera omnia*, ed. P. Koószeghy et al., Budapest 2002.

³ The most comprehensive works have been written by Anikó Deé Nagy, *A könyvtáralapító Teleki Sámuel*, Kolozsvár 1997, and Deé Nagy, *A marosvásárhelyi Teleki-Bolyai könyvtár ex librisei*, Budapest and Kolozsvár 2001.

⁴ The original quote, cited after Deé Nagy, *A könyvtáralapító Teleki Sámuel* (p. 176), says "Növeli a könyvtár értékét nem annyira lenyűgöző látványa, mint inkább az, hogy naponta a publikum úgy használhatja mint sajátját". The letter was written on 31 December 1785.

⁵ The complete reference for the catalogue is as follows: Sámuel Teleki, *Bibliotheca Samuelis SRI Com. Teleki de Szék*, Vienna 1796–1819.

of his time, and it is likely that it was during these European travels that he became aware of the necessity of creating a collection.

Teleki began his studies in Basel, where he moved to study mathematics (1760–1761). He went to Utrecht and Leiden after this period to study history, law and electricity. His interest in books and textual criticism arose during this period, when he first met Petrus Wesseling, Christoph Saxe, and Johan David Hahn. Later, his studies took him to Paris, where he also met Alexis Claude Clairaut (mathematics) and Charles-Marie de La Condamine (physics).

It is thought that it was at this time that he began to purchase books and reflect on the nature of library collections. Moreover, after his return to Sáromerke, he started his edition of Janus Pannonius, which was finally published in 1784. As will be demonstrated in the subsequent pages, the authorship of Teleki, who compiled this collection, requires verification in certain instances, as his work on the texts was suddenly interrupted by his increasing involvement in politics.⁶

It is important to note that the contextualisation of both the library and the edition of Janus must be understood in relation to the development of critical editions of classical texts in the eighteenth century. The intellectual climate of the Enlightenment had a significant impact on textual criticism. Scholars applied rational and scientific methods to study texts, challenging traditional interpretations and including extensive commentaries and annotations. The eighteenth century also saw advances in printing technology and editorial practices that improved the accuracy of printed books. In this sense, Teleki was aligned with the concerns of his time preparing his edition of Janus Pannonius.

3. The edition of 1784

Both the first edition of the *Jani Pannonii opera omnia* prepared by Sambucus in 1569⁷ and the collection prepared by Teleki⁸ in 1784 have been used up until the present.⁹ In this sense, Teleki's edition has determined the texts of Janus that we have been reading for the last two centuries. Teleki's comprehensive work includes every known work of Janus: the edition not only collects poems or “epic *carmina*”, but also a collection of letters and translations. As common in editions of that time,

⁶ In 1787, he moved to Vienna and became the chancellor of Transylvania in 1791. He passed away in Vienna in 1822 and was buried in Sáromerke (Dumbrăvioara).

⁷ *Jani Pannonii episcopi quinqueeccles: illius antiquis vatibus comparandi, recentioribus arte anteponendi, quae usipam reperiri adhuc potuerunt omnia opera Joannis Sambuci*, ed. Johannes Sambucus (János Zsámboky), Vienna 1569.

⁸ Teleki, *Poemata*.

⁹ Teleki's edition has decreased in significance since the release of the new edition of Janus Pannonius' works, edited by Gyula Mayer and others: *Jani Pannonii opera quae manserunt omnia*, ed. G. Mayer et al., Budapest 2006, 2014 and 2018.

a selection of bibliographical notes with quotations from famous thinkers or writers was also included.

Two letters from Peter Wesseling to Sándor Teleki in 1763 and 1764 confirm that this Utrecht professor entertained the idea of editing Janus.¹⁰ Certainly, Teleki did not undertake the project alone. Regarding Teleki's results, it would be unfair to attribute the edition solely to him. In the preface,¹¹ he acknowledges the assistance of several colleagues, including Adam Kollar (1718–1783) and Dániel Cornides (1732–1787), librarians in Vienna, and Christophorus Sax (1714–1806), professor at Utrecht. Moreover, it is worth noting that Teleki's list of names is incomplete.

Recent research has revealed additional contributors that were not mentioned. The most important is Sándor Kovásznai, a teacher from Marosvásárhely who also worked on the texts and their commentaries. Recent research has shed light on his contributions to this extensive project.¹² As Zaynab Dalloul has shown, Kovásznai created a huge unedited commentary on Janus' texts that now "can be considered rather modern not only in the eighteenth century, but even in our times."¹³

In the preface to his edition, Mayer notes that Kovásznai wrote a letter to Sámuel Zilahi requesting that his co-authorship be considered during the editing process of Janus Pannonius:

Legalább olyan editioja Janusnak soha sem volt több; igaz, hogy a manuscriptumnak lehet tulajdonítani, mert a nélkül semmi sem lett volna belőle. És így a gróf hozta életre Janust, de mi is amit lehetett segítettünk in obstetricando.¹⁴

Dalloul examined Kovásznai's role in detail and argues that the edition was indeed not only the work of Teleki but also of Kovásznai.¹⁵ His argument is based on Kovásznai's editing process, his knowledge of old literature, and his work style. Dalloul argued that Kovásznai was responsible for preparing the collation and doing most of the hard work. The manuscript found in the Teleki-Téka provides perfect

¹⁰ Deé Nagy, *A könyvtáralapító Teleki Sámuel*, pp. 143–156.

¹¹ Teleki, *Poemata*, p. xxx.

¹² Zaynab Dalloul, "Interpretations of Janus Pannonius' Eranemos in Light of the Cultural Heritage and Library of Count Sámuel Teleki and Alexander Kovásznai", *Kniha. Zborník oproblémoch* (2016), pp. 182–192.

¹³ Dalloul, "Interpretations of Janus Pannonius' Eranemos", p. 190.

¹⁴ "There has been no edition of Janus quite like this; true it can be owed to the manuscript without which nothing would have come of it. And thus did the count bring Janus to life, and so did we also do our part to help him into the world." Quote and translation from Mayer, *Opera quae manserunt omnia*, vol. 1, 2006, p. 29.

¹⁵ In addition to the interesting last discoveries of Dalloul, "Interpretations of Janus Pannonius' Eranemos", see Dalloul, "Kovácsznai Sándor és az európai kommentártörténeti hagyomány", *Irodalomtörténeti közlemények* 114 (2010), pp. 99–121, and Dalloul, "Sándor Kovásznai and Janus Pannonius", in: *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Budapestinensis: Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies, Budapest, 6–12 August 2006*, ed. R. Schnur, Tempe, AR 2010, pp. 213–222.

evidence of his authorship because it is “a huge and detailed commentary on the works of Janus Pannonius.”¹⁶

Dalloul states that the edition drew significant inspiration from Justus Lipsius (1547–1606) and Janus’ last publications in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which were rediscovered and re-edited several times. Firstly, Pareus had paid attention to Janus and edited some of his works in 1619;¹⁷ years later, Norbert Conradi prepared an edition with the help of Adam Kollar from Vienna.¹⁸

Also Györy Klimó, Bishop of Pécs (1710–1777), who knew that Teleki was preparing an edition,¹⁹ asked József Koller (1745–1832) to compile some of Janus’ works in Italy and promoted the edition of some hitherto unknown texts in the parts of the *Historia Episcopatus Quinqueecclesiarum* dedicated to Janus Pannonius. The book appeared some years later.²⁰

Hence, it is important to acknowledge that Teleki’s achievements were made possible by the collective efforts of a dedicated team and that this edition is merely one link in a long chain.

4. The edition

Teleki’s edition comprises two octavo books. Both copies were printed in Utrecht (Traiecti ad Rhenum) by Bartholomeus Wild in 1784. The complete title of the first volume, which spans XVI and 691 pages, is:

IANI PANNONII. Poëtarum sui Seculi facile Principis. In Hungaria. Quinque Ecclesiarum olim Antistitis POËMATA quae uspiam reperiri potuerunt omnia. Ad Manu scriptum Codicem Regium Corvinianum exacta, reconita et cum omnibus quae adhuc prodierunt editionibus diligenter collata, plurimisque Epigrammatis e praedicto M[anu] S[cripto] nunc primum depromtis aucta, et emendata.

The title page also reproduces two verses of Epigram 401 by Janus Pannonius (I 371 in the Teleki edition).

Nolunt Pieriae latere merces,
quas fama pretium manet perennis. (Ep. 401, 30–31)

¹⁶ Dalloul, “Interpretations of Janus Pannonius”, p. 190.

¹⁷ *Delitiae Poetarum Hungaricorum: Nunc primum in hac Germania exhibitae, a Joh. Philippo Pareo, ed. Joh. Philippus Pareus, Frankfurt 1619.*

¹⁸ *De Jani Pannonii Quinque Ecclesiarum episcopi vita et scriptis. Libri III poematum elegiarum et epigrammatum, ed. Ignatius Norbertus Conradi, Budapest 1754.*

¹⁹ Deé Nagy, *A könyvtáralapító Teleki Sámuel*, pp. 145ff.

²⁰ The manuscripts he consulted during this journey were the codex in the Vatican Library (n. 2847), as well the manuscripts in Milan and Florence. His editions appeared as “Ioannes III”, in: *Historia Episcopatus Quinqueecclesiarum*, ed. J. Koller, Bratislava 1796, pp. 1–359. For the related bibliography concerning this editorial project, see Mayer, *Opera quae manserunt omnia*, vol. 1, 2006, pp. 30–31.

The second volume, which spans 415 pages, is titled:

IANI PANNONII OPUSCULORUM PARS ALTERA, in qua exhibentur. Pauca e Plutarcho et Demosthene in Latinum eodem interprete translata; nec non orationes ejus et epistolae quae reperiri potuerunt omnes; quibus Appendicis loco subjunguntur auctoris vitae a variis consignatae, una cum dedicationibus, praefationibus, testimoniis et elogiis doctorum de Iano Pannonio virorum; ac denique varietates lectionum e manu scripto libro et diversis editionibus excerptae.

By reading the title pages, one can discern the accuracy and high level of critical objectivity in this edition.

The first page references manuscript B, which is currently preserved in Vienna.²¹ The fascinating history behind this manuscript created an aura of authority that has continued until now. The manuscript was found by Peter Lambeck in Buda in 1666. A delegation was invited to take some books from a devastated collection. Peter, as he wrote in his memorial,²² took three exemplars: this collection of Janus Pannonius, one exemplar of Gregory of Nazianzus (Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 759) and one book of Augustine of Hippo (Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 706). For several years, as advocated by Lambeck, it was believed to be a codex of Mathias Corvinus. However, although some researchers and readers—Teleki among them—believed that this manuscript was a collection of the Buda corpus, recent research has invalidated this hypothesis and dated the copy to around 1500, and not necessarily from Hungary.²³

In any case, Teleki's team used this manuscript as an example of the "meliores" and recognised it as an authority. Therefore, its variants were carefully considered, and Teleki's order of poems followed that of the manuscript.

Nevertheless, Teleki's critical work was far-ranging and accurately considered other manuscripts and books. In the forward, he declared that he had used other exemplars, including the manuscript in Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 9977, which contained the text found by Sambucus in Florence in 1567, as well as other copies of Janus that he was familiar with, including one in Milan (Ambr. R 93 sup. + 26 sup.). He was also aware of additional Janus manuscripts in Florence (Plut. 34,50), Brescia (Bibl. Civica C VII 1), and other libraries, which he collected to

²¹ Vienna, ÖNB, 3274. For a complete description and bibliography, see Mayer, *Opera quae manserunt omnia*, vol. 1, 2006, p. 11.

²² See Petrus Lambeckus (Lambeck), *Commentarii de Augustissima Bibliotheca Caesarea Vindobonensi II*, Vienna 1669, Cap. 11, pp. 989–996.

²³ Mayer has given the summary of the history of the codex. Csápodai demonstrated that the book did not belong to the Corvina library, see Csaba Csápodai, *A budai királyi palotában 1686-ban talált kódexek és nyomtatott könyvek*, Budapest 1984. Mayer investigated the watermarks to determine the date of the manuscript, see Mayer, *Opera quae manserunt omnia*, vol. 1, 2006, p. 12. One of the possible copyists could have been Bartolomé Fonzio, see Klára Csapodiné Gárdonyi, "Bartholomaeus Fontius. (Újabb adalékok magyarországi kapcsolataihoz és Poétikája)", *Magyar Könyvszemle* 93 (1977), no. 1, p. 42.

publish later. However, these copies may not have been considered for the 1784 edition.²⁴

The edition also considered the printed books of Janus editions, to which Teleki referred.²⁵ He quoted the two first editions of *Panegyricus in Guarinum*²⁶ and the collection of Elegies printed in Vienna.²⁷ He also knew the collection of Rhenanus and Frobenius of Basel²⁸ and the three editions of Bologna, which were very important not only for the elegies,²⁹ but also especially because they are the only printed versions of *Panegyricus in Marcellum*³⁰ and Janus' translations.³¹ He also worked with the books of Cantiuucula, which he owned in both the Venice and Basel editions,³² and of course with the three collections of Sambucus.³³ Additionally, he worked with the Hungarian *Eranemus*³⁴ and the collections of Pareus³⁵ and Conradi.³⁶ He may have used the edition of 1743 of Kassa (EMC)³⁷ for the epistles. As Mayer said,

Teleki's philological and bibliophilic activity was enormously successful in finding printed editions. He came across thirteen editions, ten originals of which the Teleki Library still owns Only two other solo Janus Pannonius volumes, or rather booklets, are known by the research to date: the two Kraków volumes.³⁸

²⁴ See Mayer, *Opera quae manserunt omnia*, vol. 1, 2006, pp. 31–32 for a complete relation of this complementary material, preserved at the Teleki Téka under the shelf number Ms 305 = Tq 675 b/3.

²⁵ Teleki, *Poemata*, pp. V–XIII.

²⁶ *Ioannis Pannonii episcopi quinque ecclesiarum, poetae et oratoris clarissimi panegyricus: in laudem Baptistae Guarini Veronsis praeceptoris sui conditus*, ed. Paulus Crosnensis (Pawel z Krosna), Vienna 1512, and *Ioannis Pannonii ... Sylva panegyrica in Guarini Veronenis praeceptoris sui laudem condita*, ed. S. Magius (Sebestyén Magyi), Bologna 1513.

²⁷ *Iani Pannonii Quinque Ecclesiarum praesulis, poetae candidissimi, Elegiarum aureum opusculum*, ed. Benedictus Bekenius (Benedek Békeny) and Johannes Camers, Vienna 1514.

²⁸ Teleki seems to have much appreciated these collections. *Iani Pannonii Quinqueecclesiensis episcopi, Sylva Panegyrica ad Guarinum Veronensem, praeceptorem suum: Et ejusdem epigrammata, nunquam antehac typis excusa*, ed. Beatus Rhenanus, Basel 1518.

²⁹ *Ioannis Pannonii ... Elegiarum liber unus*, ed. Adrianus Wolphardus, Bologna 1523.

³⁰ *Jani Pannonii Panegyricus Jacobo Antonio Marcello Patritio Veneto*, ed. Adrianus Wolphardus, Bologna 1522. This work has only been transmitted here. There are no more copies or manuscript versions of it.

³¹ *Plutarchi Cheronaei philosophi Libellus, quibus modis ab inimicis iuvari possimus Ioanne Pannonio episcopo Quinque Ecclesiensi interprete*, ed. Adrianus Wolphardus, Bologna 1522. Although other manuscripts have transmitted these translations, this is the *editio princeps* and the only copy that Teleki knew. See Alfonso Lombana Sánchez, “Las traducciones de Janus Pannonius”, in: *Ventanas al mundo húngaro*, ed. A. Lombana Sánchez, D. Faix, G. Zombory, and G. Tóth, Budapest 2021, pp. 71–78.

³² *Iani Pannonii ... Ad Guarinum Veronensem panegyricus. Eiusdem elegiarum liber. Et epigrammatum syluula*, ed. Hilarius Cantiuucula, Venice 1553 and *Iani Pannonii ... Ad Guarinum Veronensem panegyricus. Eiusdem elegiarum liber. Et epigrammatum syluula*, ed. Hilarius Cantiuucula, Basel 1555.

³³ That is the already quoted large collection of Johannes Sambucus, *Omnia opera*, but also *Iani Pannonii ... lusus quidam et epigrammata, nunc primum inventa et excusa*, ed. Johannes Sambucus, Padova 1559 and *Reges Ungariae, ab An(no) Christi 401 usq(ue) ad 1567. Item Jani Pannonii ... Eranemus nunc repertus*, ed. Johannes Sambucus, Vienna 1567.

³⁴ *Iani Pannonii Eranemvs. Hoc est, ventorum contentio*, Debrecen 1594.

³⁵ *Delittiae Poetarum Hungaricorum*.

³⁶ *De Jani Pannonii ... Libri III poematum elegiarum et epigrammatum*.

³⁷ *Epistolae Matthiae Corvini Regis Hungariae*, ed. Stephanus Huszti, Kassa 1744.

³⁸ Mayer, *Opera quae manserunt omnia*, vol. 1, 2006, p. 30. The two volumes of Kraków are *Insunt praeterea Ioannis Pannonii Quinqueecclesiensis Episcopi Epigrammata, lectu haud indigna, hactenus non*

The edition of works he prepared consists of the following:

Volume 1

Preface (pp. III–XVI),

Epic works:

Sylva Panegyrica ad Guarinum (pp. 1–59),

Panegyricus ad Marcellum (pp. 59–210),

Carmen pro pacanda Italia (pp. 211–231),

Diomedis et Glauci Congressus (pp. 231–238), which is a translation of Homer, *Iliad*, 6, 119–236,

Carmen ad Ludovicum Gonzagam (pp. 238–251),

Eranemus (pp. 251–271),

Elegies

Liber primus (pp. 273–357), with the 15 elegies of ms. B,

Liber secundus (pp. 358–449), with the 18 elegies of the editions not found in ms. B,

Epigrams

Liber primus (pp. 451–640), with the 374 epigrams of ms. B and two epigrams in the Milan manuscript,

Liber secundus (pp. 641–660), with other epigrams,

Appendix carminum (pp. 661–691), with verses written to Janus Pannonius or attributed to him,

Volume II

Versiones (pp. 3–53), which consist of Latin translations of Plutarch (*M.*, 2, 6; *M.*, 6, 39) and Demosthenes (*Phil.*, 11, 3),

Orationes (pp. 54–69), three speeches by Janus Pannonius,

Epistolae (pp. 70–107), twenty-three letters,

Vita a variis consignata (pp. 109–242), reproducing historiographical sources, diplomatic documents, and arguments related to the poet's own work,

Dedicaciones et praefationes (pp. 243–317), where different forwards of earlier editions were reprinted,

Testimonia et iudicia selecta (pp. 319–336) and

Varietas lectionum (pp. 337–414), where the variants and the collations are given.

impressa, ed. Hieronymus Vietor, Krakow 1518, and *Epigrammata Iani Pannoini (sic) Quinque Ecclesiarum praesulis, viri omnium certe ore doctissimi, omnibus lectu gratissima et iucunda*, ed. Hieronymus Vietor, Krakow 1518.

Regarding the biographical aspects, it should be noted that the exhaustive work done on the sources, meticulously cited, lends authority to the text presented. Because of all that, this edition has several undeniable merits of exceptional quality, which deserve to be analysed in depth.

5. Criticism and philological work in Teleki's edition

The precision of Teleki's team in preparing the Janus Pannonius collection is evident in the accurate reproduction of the sources and the meticulous preparation of the *lectiones*. In the edition, the decisions follow a *modus operandi* familiar to other contemporaries. The edition primarily relies on classical sources but also employs intuition and often favours printed books as source material.

5.1. Classical sources

The edition prioritised certain options based on classical sources. It can be demonstrated that knowledge of old sources played a decisive role in choosing or changing some text words. In this regard, it is reasonable to assume that Kovásznai was the most important support for Teleki, which aligns with Dalloul's perspective that Kovásznai was the principal editor.

The decision on the *lectio melior* was often based on the old sources. In Ep. 11, 6 (II Tel. 10), *pars pro toto*, we can observe the corrections made by Teleki to Beatus Rhenanus' edition, which was his unique source:

Rhenanus, p. 96 (Ep. 11, 1–3, 8)

II Teleki 10 (p. 649)

Ocius ite deae, celeres precor ite Camenae,
corripe dulcisonam pulcher Apollo lyram,
et tot Mazono pro munere reddite grates,

Ocyus ite deae, celeres, precor, ite Camenae,
corripe dulcisonam, pulcher Apollo, lyram;
Et tot Mazono, pro munere, reddite grates,

...

...

quot gignit **rapidas** terra Libyssa **feras**

quot gignit **rabidas**, terra Libyssa, **feras**

Between 'rabidas' and 'rapidas', Teleki proposes a *lectio* inspired by the standard reading of Ovid (*Her.* 11, 111–112)³⁹ or Statius (*Theb.* 8, 71),⁴⁰ which historically could be

³⁹ Ovid, *Her.*, 11, 111–112: "Nate, dolor matris, rabidarum praeda ferarum, | Ei mihi! natali dilacerate tuo."

⁴⁰ Statius, *Theb.*, 8, 71–72: "Sit, qui rabidarum more ferarum | mandat atrox hostile caput."

supported by Seneca (*Her. O.* 1213),⁴¹ Silius Italicus (*Pun.* 8, 638–640),⁴² Tito Strozzi (*Erot.* 1, 5, 20)⁴³ or Enea Silvio Piccolomini (*Cynth.* 23, 4).⁴⁴

However, Ovid's edition of the *Heroides* makes this discussion particularly interesting, especially in relation to *Her.* 10, 96 and 11, 111.⁴⁵ As Reeson demonstrated in the case of Ovid, “‘rabidarum’ is a reading in some late manuscripts” and “it is a moot point whether ‘rapidus’ may be applied to wild beasts where, as here, the context concerns rather their ferocity than their rapidity.” Therefore, Reeson chose ‘rabidarum ... ferarum’ because “while ‘rapidus’ may sometimes have the sense of ‘snatching’, it must have a sense of rapid motion.” Additionally, as Arthur Palmer stated: “it seems possible that Roman writers sometimes intentionally used ‘rapidus’ with the derivation from ‘rapio’ before their eyes in the sense of ‘tearing.’”⁴⁶ It was exactly this option that Janus should be aiming for: Rhenanus perceived it, but Teleki did not.

This was later confirmed by the appearance of manuscript T, which contained the phrase ‘rapidas ... feras’. Both the Reeson’s reflection and the authority given to this manuscript⁴⁷ may have promoted the edition by Mayer as ‘rapidas ... feras’.⁴⁸ Re-writing ‘rapidas’ as ‘rabidas’ demonstrates the importance given to classical sources in selecting or altering certain words in the text.

5.2. Intuition

In second place, it must be acknowledged that Teleki relied heavily on his intuition. Intuition is a crucial quality for textual critics. Teleki’s edition exhibits accurate and often correct proposals that align with the art of editing, where the editor distances themselves from the text and proposes daring alternatives. As far as Teleki is concerned, the textual tradition and further collations have approved his changes after comparing different manuscripts. Two examples serve to illustrate his exceptional intuition.

Ms. B, f. 53r

Teleki, p. 643

In te uis omni sapiens nimis Vgo uideri;
sed minus ille sapit: *quí* nimis, Vgo, sapit.

In re vis omni, sapiens nimis, Ugo, uideri,
sed minus ille sapit, qui nimis, Ugo, sapit.

⁴¹ Seneca, *Her. O.*, 1213: “Rabidaeque necem debere ferae.”

⁴² Silius Italicus, *Pun.*, 8, 638–640: “Castra quoque et uallum rabidae sub nocte silenti | inrupere ferae raptique ante ora pauentum | adiunctos uigilis sparserunt membra per agros.”

⁴³ “Dilacerent rabidae membra cruenta ferae?”, *Tito Vespasiano Strozzi. Carmina*, ed. A. della Guardia, Modena 1916. Here *Erot.* 1, 5, 20.

⁴⁴ “Non dii, sed rabide te genuere fere”, *Enea Silvio Piccolomini. Cinthia, Historia y De remedio amoris*, ed. A. Van Heck, Vatican City 1994. Here *Cynth.* 23, 4.

⁴⁵ See James Reeson, *Ovid, Heroides 11, 13 and 14: A Commentary*, Leiden, Boston, and Cologne 2001, p. 104.

⁴⁶ Palmer quoted after Reeson, *Ovid*, p. 104.

⁴⁷ See Alfonso Lombana Sánchez, “The Janus Legacy in Seville”, *Hungarian Studies* 38 (2024): *Special Issue on Early Modern Hungary*, <https://doi.org/10.1556/044.2023.00238> [forthcoming].

⁴⁸ Mayer, *Opera quae manserunt omnia*, vol. 1, 2006, Ep. 11, p. 76.

Epigram 266 was copied in six of the seven manuscripts where it was preserved as ‘In te.’⁴⁹ This is the version of the Vienna manuscript that Teleki used. However, Teleki improved the *lectio* of Vienna by correcting ‘in te’ to ‘in re’ for the first time. This is clearly the most convincing version—and almost the only possible one. Also Mayer proposed ‘In re’.

An interesting emendation can be found in Ep. 189 (I Tel. 289), an erotic poem edited by Teleki for the first time, where he also made textual interventions. Janus’ love poetry was heavily censored. Thus, Teleki’s team carried out the first edition of this poem, although it had been copied in six different exemplars. Once again, they did an excellent job correcting what he read in the manuscript B.

Ms. B, 53r

Teleki, p. 583

NVnc cum Lucia, mentulatiorem
qui **nasatior** est inepta credas;
riuali puto me carere summon;
quod nondum tibi uisus est Philemon.

Hunc cum, Lucia, mentulatiorem,
qui **nasatior** est, inepta credas,
riuali puto me carere summo,
quod nondum tibi visus est Philemon.

The initial word ‘nunc’ was replaced during the editing process with ‘hunc’. Additionally, there was disagreement with using the word ‘nasatior’. Although it was ultimately left unchanged, Teleki commented: “Etsi forte scripserit Ianus, *nasatum*; melius tamen legeretur: *vasutus* vel *nasutus*.”⁵⁰

Despite the authority given to the manuscript B, Teleki and his team had to develop a coherent alternative, and they opted for ‘nasutus’, which is very similar to Martial’s style.⁵¹ Since Janus was a reader of Martial, this intuition can truly be corroborated. Also Mayer suggested ‘nasatior’, the superlative comparative of Martial’s ‘nasutus’, which was also used to describe people with a fine, mocking, satirical spirit.

Therefore, the option ‘nasutus’ was also proposed in this direction. Therefore, although Teleki trusted manuscript B, he also relied on his intuition to create a comprehensive version.

5.3. Printed books

This said, Teleki consistently preferred options found in the old books and first editions he consulted when in doubt. Therefore, printed books containing texts of Janus

⁴⁹ See the *collatio* in Mayer, *Opera quae manserunt omnia*, vol. 1, 2006, p. 170. Only one manuscript corrected ‘in re’ as ‘tute’.

⁵⁰ Teleki, *Poemata*, p. 583.

⁵¹ “Nil nasutius hac maligniusque” (Mart., *Epigr.*, 2, 54, 5) or “Nasutus nimium cupis videri. | Nasutum volo, nolo polyposum” (Mart., *Epigr.*, 12, 37, 1–2).

Pannonius played an important role. The following four examples provide a brief list of instances in which Teleki chose the printed version, even though it may not always be the best choice in my opinion.

Ep. 55, 5	inquit B] inquis Eh Tel + S
Ep. 137, 4	sunt B] sint Edh Tel.
Ep. 168, 12	quisquam iuris B] iuris quisquam Edh Tel.
Ep. 417, 2	facies B] facias Eh Tel

However, it should be pointed out that, when editing elegies, Teleki displayed a more critical approach and did not trust Sambucus. An example emending the printed editions can be seen in relation to El. 7 (II Tel 17).

Elegy 7 (II Tel 17) has only been preserved in the second edition of Sambucus. The options suggested by Teleki are significant. Mayer (El. 15–23) has also considered and reproduced them in his edition. They are the result of a very concentrated reading:

Sambucus, ed. 1569, p. 434	Teleki, ed. 1784, p. 434
Quanta tuumne canam decoret prudentia pectus?	Quanta tuumne canam decoret prudentia pectus?
Quam clarus canas factus es ante comas?	Qua clarus canas factus es ante comas. *****
Cuncta per hanc praesens, quae fert, intelligis, aetas,	Cuncta per hanc praesens quae fert, intelligis, aetas, *****
Ipse fui aspectus ausus adire tuos, et me qua reliquos, regum placidissime, fronte	***** Ipse fui aspectus ausus adire tuos. Et me qua reliquos, regum placidissime, fronte
excipis, et dulces fundis ab ore sonos.	excipis, et dulces fundis ab ore sonos.

Teleki's edition demonstrates meticulous attention to detail in the texts. Despite having only one printed source and generally following the lead of previous editors, he is particularly cautious in this case. Upon close reading of the text, rhythmic incongruities and meaningless parts of the elegy were identified. And in a pioneering way, the edition suggested these gaps, which Mayer has also accepted⁵²—but which in the case of Sambucus might have gone unnoticed.

⁵² Mayer supported Teleki's proposal but suggested adding a second verse after "qua clarus canas...".

6. Conclusion

Sámuel Teleki was active during a time of revolution and proliferation of textual criticism. He emerges as a significant figure in eighteenth-century textual criticism, and the critical edition of Janus Pannonius' works, and the foundation of the Teleki Library are his most notable achievements. These endeavours reflect his dedication to preserving and advancing knowledge of classical literature. Regarding Janus Pannonius, his dedication to disseminating one of the most important authors of Hungarian literature is noteworthy.

Furthermore, his vision for his library should always be remembered. Thanks to this project, he broke away from tradition by advocating for an open and accessible collection, welcoming all interested readers, during an era when private libraries were common among the aristocracy. This forward-thinking vision transformed his library into a public treasure. The Teleki Library has endured as a vital cultural heritage of Marosvásárhely over the years, and his vision of the library promoted books as working elements and a source of authority.

Teleki's editorial work on Janus Pannonius' *oeuvre*, moreover, has left a lasting mark on the texts we read today. However, the expression 'Teleki' does not necessarily refer to 'Count Sámuel Teleki' but rather to the 'team' that he promoted. Some important absences are noted throughout the acknowledgments, and one of them is Sándor Kovászani.

Regarding the edition, it should be noted that Teleki's commitment to preserving and interpreting Janus' works was influenced by Enlightenment ideals and the rational, scientific approach of his time. Teleki's editorial decisions were guided by three main streams: they chose variants wisely based on classic sources, demonstrated an intuition that is often correct, and maintained critical management of sources. Although the team often preferred the printed version, in places it does not follow them.

To conclude, Count Sámuel Teleki's contributions to textual criticism, library development, and the preservation of classical literature have left an indelible mark on both the field of philology and cultural heritage. His approach to libraries and editorial work reflects the intellectual climate of the Enlightenment and is still celebrated today for its innovation. And in the case of Janus, his work has been instrumental for preserving his *oeuvre* to the present day.

Bibliography

Primary sources

De Jani Pannonii Quinque Ecclesiarum episcopi vita et scriptis. Libri III poematum elegiarum et epigrammatum, ed. Ignatius Norbertus Conradi, Budapest 1754.

Delitiae Poetarum Hungaricorum: Nunc primum in hac Germania exhibitae, ed. Joh. Philippus Pareus, Frankfurt 1619.

- Enea Silvio Piccolomini. Cinthia, Historia, De remedio amoris*, ed. A. Van Heck, Vatican City 1994.
- Epigrammata Iani Pannoini (sic) Quinque Ecclesiarum praesulis, viri omnium certe ore doctissimi, omnibus lectu gratissima et iucunda*, ed. Hieronymus Vietor, Krakow 1518.
- Epistolae Matthiae Corvini Regis Hungariae*, ed. Stephanus Huszti, Kassa 1744.
- Iani Pannonii ... Ad Guarinum Veronensem panegyricus. Eiusdem elegiarum liber. Et epigrammatum syluula*, ed. Hilarius Cantiancula, Venice 1553.
- Iani Pannonii ... Ad Guarinum Veronensem panegyricus. Eiusdem elegiarum liber. Et epigrammatum syluula*, ed. Hilarius Cantiancula, Basel 1555.
- Iani Pannonii ... lusus quidam et epigrammata, nunc primum inventa et excusa*, ed. Johannes Sambucus (János Zsámboky), Padova 1559.
- Iani Pannonii Eranemvs. Hoc est ventorum contentio*, Debrecen 1594.
- Iani Pannonii opera quae manserunt omnia*, ed. G. Mayer et al., Budapest 2006, 2014 and 2018.
- Ianni Pannonii Poemata quae usquam reperiri potuerunt omnia*, ed. S. Teleki, Utrecht 1784. A facsimile edition: *Jani Pannonii Opera omnia*, ed. P. Košzeghy et al., Budapest 2002.
- Iani Pannonii Quinque Ecclesiarum praesulis, poetae candidissimi, Elegiarum aureum opusculum*, ed. Benedictus Bekenius (Benedek Békeny) and Johannes Camers, Vienna 1514.
- Iani Pannonii Quinqueecclesiensis episcopi, Sylva Panegyrica ad Guarinum Veronensem, praeceptorem suum: Et ejusdem epigrammata, nunquam antehac typis excusa*, ed. Beatus Rhenanus, Basel 1518.
- Insunt praeterea Ioannis Pannonii Quinqueecclesiensis Episcopi Epigrammata, lectu haud indigna, hactenus non impressa*, ed. Hieronymus Vietor, Krakow 1518.
- “Ioannes III”, in: *Historia Episcopatus Quinqueecclesiarum*, ed. J. Koller, Bratislava 1796, pp. 1–359.
- Ioannis Pannonii ... Elegiarum liber unus*, ed. Adrianus Wolphardus, Bologna 1523.
- Ioannis Pannonii ... Sylva panegyrica in Guarini Veronenis praeceptoris sui laudem condita*, ed. S. Magius (Sebestyén Magyi), Bologna 1513.
- Ioannis Pannonii episcopi quinque ecclesiarum, poetae et oratoris clarissimi panegyricus: in laudem Baptistae Guarini Veronsis praeceptoris sui conditus*, ed. Paulus Crosnensis (Pawel z Krosna), Vienna 1512.
- Jani Pannonii episcopi quinqueeccles: illius antiquis vatibus comparandi, recentioribus arte anteponendi, quae usquam reperiri adhuc potuerunt omnia opera Joannis Sambuci*, ed. Johannes Sambucus (János Zsámboky), Vienna 1569.
- Jani Pannonii Panegyricus Jacobo Antonio Marcello Patritio Veneto*, ed. Adrianus Wolphardus, Bologna 1522.
- Lambecus (Lambeck), Petrus, *Commentarii de Augustissima Bibliotheca Caesarea Vindobonensi II*, Vienna 1669.
- Plutarchi Cheronei philosophi Libellus, quibus modis ab inimicis iuuari possimus Ioanne Pannonio episcopo Quinqueecclesiensi interprete*, ed. Adrianus Wolphardus, Bologna 1522.
- Reges Ungariae, ab An(no) Christi 401 usq(ue) ad 1567. Item Jani Pannonii ... Eranemus nunc repertus*, ed. Johannes Sambucus (János Zsámboky), Vienna 1567.
- Teleki, Sámuel, *Bibliotheca Samuelis SRI Com. Teleki de Szék*, Vienna 1796–1819.
- Tito Vespasiano Strozzi. Carmina*, ed. A. della Guardia, Modena 1916.

Secondary literature

- Csápodi, Csaba, *A budai királyi palotában 1686-ban talált kódexek és nyomtatott könyvek*, Budapest 1984.
- Csapodiné Gárdonyi, Klára, “Bartholomaeus Fontius. (Újabb adalékok magyarországi kapcsolataihoz és Poétikája.)”, *Magyar Könyvszemle* 93 (1977), no. 1, pp. 38–42.
- Dalloul, Zaynab, “Interpretations of Janus Pannonius’ Eranemos in Light of the Cultural Heritage and Library of Count Sámuel Teleki and Alexander Kovásznai”, *Kniha. Zborník oprob-lémoch* (2016), pp. 182–192.
- Dalloul, Zaynab, “Kovásznai Sándor és az európai kommentártörténeti hagyomány”, *Irodalomtörténeti közlemények* 114 (2010), pp. 99–121.
- Dalloul, Zaynab, “Sándor Kovásznai and Janus Pannonius”, in: *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Budapestinensis: Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies, Budapest, 6–12 August 2006*, ed. R. Schnur, Tempe, AR 2010, pp. 213–222.
- Deé Nagy, Anikó, *A könyvtáralapító Teleki Sámuel*, Kolozsvár 1997.
- Deé Nagy, Anikó, *A marosvásárhelyi Teleki–Bolyai könyvtár ex libriséi*, Budapest and Kolozsvár 2001.
- Lombana Sánchez, Alfonso, “The Janus Legacy in Seville”, *Hungarian Studies* 38 (2024): *Special Issue on Early Modern Hungary*, <https://doi.org/10.1556/044.2023.00238> [forthcoming].
- Lombana Sánchez, Alfonso, “Las traducciones de Janus Pannonius”, in: *Ventanas al mundo húngaro*, ed. A. Lombana Sánchez, D. Faix, G. Zombory, and G. Tóth, Budapest 2021, pp. 71–78.
- Reeson, James, *Ovid, Heroides 11, 13 and 14: A Commentary*, Leiden, Boston, and Cologne 2001.

ALFONSO LOMBANA SÁNCHEZ

✉ MSCA-Researcher, Universidad Complutense de Madrid

@ alombana[at]ucm.es

🌐 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2982-544X>

Alfonso Lombana Sánchez is a philologist, researcher, translator, and expert in Renaissance studies. Over the past decade, his work has primarily centred on textual criticism and Central-European Latin literature of the Middle Ages. His exploration of the Hungarian Middle Ages and Renaissance led him to the works of Janus Pannonius, which he has extensively studied through the MSCA-Project FLOR-JP.