

Creating A Value-Added Text: *Descriptio peregrinationis Georgii Huszthii*

Gorana Stepanić

Juraj Dobrila University of Pula

gstepanic@unipu.hr

Key Words: Quoting Classics, 16th-Century Travel Literature, Latin Travel Report, Georgius Huszthius, Juraj Hus

1. The traveller and his report

Georgius Huszthi (Husthius, Hus, Hwz) (?- after 1566), a native of the village of Rasinja in Northern Slavonia, today in Croatia (thus called *de Rasinia*; *de Rasinya*; *Rasciniensis*), was educated in the humanist curriculum in Pécs, Hungary. As a young man (1532) he was abducted from his *patria* by a Turkish army on their retreat from an unsuccessful military campaign to the western Hungarian city of Kőszeg. Taken to Constantinople as a slave, he spent the next ten years (1532-1542) in the Muslim Near East, first as a slave, then as a military trumpeter, and finally as a pilgrim.

Several years after he returned home, he wrote a Latin report about his travels. This has been preserved in two manuscript versions: one, entitled *Georgii Huz peregrinatio Hierosolimitana* and dated November 10, 1548 *Posonii* (Bratislava), is preserved in the Hofbibliothek in Vienna. It is a copy of the text the author claims to have sent to Emperor Ferdinand I of Habsburg in the same year (Huszthi 1881, 3). Much later, in 1566, Huszthi wrote a new, expanded and more elaborate version of his voyages and dedicated it to Hieronymus Beck, Ferdinand's counsellor. The manuscript of the latter version has been preserved in the Vatican Library. [1] None of the versions were printed at the time: they had to wait to be published in 1881 by a Croatian academic Petar Matković. The edition (Huszthi 1881) is based on the later manuscript, and different parts of text from the older manuscript are added to illustrate differences between the two versions. The edition comprises 38 pages: the first 28 are an account of Huszthi's travels and the rest of the pages contain a description of selected sites in the Holy Land. The narrative part of the text includes not only a narration of travels and political events, but also descriptions of places, peoples, customs, geographical and cultural notes, as well as reflective and moralizing passages. The author shows his humanist learning with over fifty quotations throughout the text from ancient authors, the Bible and other sources.

The text has been analyzed various times, mainly as a source for the history of the Middle East or of European pilgrimages. [2] This article, however, is concerned with the phenomenon of citations in the first, narrative part of Huszthi's text. It will present a general overview of the contents of Huszthi's report and an analysis of his quotations from ancient and other authors. We interpret the author's extensive use of quotations in

this particular text as a means of legitimizing a text in a non-humanist genre as a learned humanist text.

2. Contents, perspective, ideology

Outline of Contents:

I. Paratexts

1. Quotes from the Gospel of Matthew, Homer, Aristotle
2. Dedicatory epigram by Johannes Seccervitius (1520 - 1583)
3. Elegiac couplet by the author
4. *Ad epitaphium suum per Johannem Seccerovitium Georgius Huszthi* - epigram
5. Epistolary dedication to Hieronymus Beck von Leopoldsdorf
6. Recommendation to the reader (*Pio lectori*)

II. Narrative part

1. *Compendiosa ac brevis captivitatis et peregrinationis meae enarratio*

(1532: abducted by Turks in Rasinja (Slavonia) – Constantinople – slave to *defterdar* Iskender Çelebi, the Sultan's minister of the treasury – apprentice trumpeter in Galata – 1533: tries to escape with a Hungarian delegation – caught in Smederevo, returned to Constantinople and punished – his master executed in Baghdad; new master, Ibrahim Pasha– Turks celebrate victory in Persia – [reflection on the vanity of luxurious feasts] – [information on Ramadan and Bairam] – Ibrahim Pasha executed for suspected treason – [reflection on vanity of power] – H. becomes Sultan's slave – (1536) liberated and hired for salary – hired for a better salary by an Arab captain as a trumpeter for 2 years – Chios, Rhodes, Alexandria, Rosetta, Cairo, Red Sea

2. *Hic commemorabo aliqua terrae et situm Aegypti*

2.1. *De balsamo primum* (types of balsam)

2.2. *Caeterum de fructibus terrae Aegypti, qua usus sum per biennium* (fruits: cherries, sycamore figs, palm trees, dates, peaches, grapes, sugar cane, melons, lemon, oranges, rice)

2.3. *De animalibus* (birds, camels, mules, sheep, giraffes, crocodiles, crocodile hunts)

2.4. *De moribus Aegyptiorum et quidem institutis vitae humanae* (Muslim customs – immoral celebrations during Nile flood)

2.5. *Hic de nostris choreis* (moralizing digression on the harmfulness of dancing in H.'s homeland)

2.6. *De pyramidibus Aegyptiorum regum, inter quas figura unius descripta cum enarratione brevi* (1538: excursion to pyramids near Cairo, their history, description; they enter the pyramids)

3. *Profectus in Indiacum bellum ex terra Aegypti*

(description of the Red Sea; Turks in alliance against Portugal undertake an expedition to besiege the Portuguese city of Diu in India; H. is a military trumpeter in the army of Pasha Suleyman; capture of Aden (Yemen) by trick – [digression on ginger] – [digression on Ethiopian Christians]

3.1. *Ex Aden Felicis Arabiae urbe egressi* (navigation to Diu in western India – military speech of Pasha Suleyman – battle, retreat to Arabia – [description of a giant whale] – siege and conquest of Saba in Arabia - Jeddah [Eve’s tomb] [black coral diving], Mecca, Medina [refuses to visit Muhammad’s tomb])

3.2. *Hic commemorabo de victualibus aliqua* (how badly they were fed during the military campaign)

3.3. *Quid sit Mare Suff* (Suez Gulf, desert)

3.4. *Absoluto itaque bello indico, profectus fui ad peregrinandum Syna montem* (dismissed and liberated (1540): Sinai, Egypt – Gaza – Jerusalem – Sichem – Samaria – Galilean Lake – Damascus)

3.5. *Hic commemorabo aliqua de flumine Jordanis* (river Jordan – Dead Sea – Tripoli – Antalya – Anatolia – Chios – Messina – [Etna] – Naples – Rome – Ancona – Fiume (Rijeka) – Metika – Zagreb – Slavonia – Rakenspurg (Radgona) – Petovia (Ptuj) – Austria – Posonia (Bratislava))

III. Descriptive part

1. *Descriptio sive figura montis Synai atque locorum aliquorum eiusdem brevis declaratio*

2. *Terrae Sanctae loca quaedam seu vestigia, per me Georgium Huszti de Raszynia, visa in mense aprili anno domini millesimo quingentesimo quadragesimo*

2.1. *Sequitur de monte Syon et cenaculo Domini*

2.2. *Sequitur de civitate Hierusalem et de loco Calvariae et sepulchro domini descriptio*

2.3. *De sepulchro domini sequitur*

2.4. *De templo Salomonis*

2.5. *Vallis Josaphat quae dicitur*

2.6. *Post haec die uno ad montem Olivarum de monte Syon perrexi*

2.7. *De Betphage*

2.8. *Post Betphage sequitur Bethania*

2.9. *Siloë vallis a meridie Hierosolymis*

2.10. *De civitate Betlehem*

2.11. *Hebron vocatur ab olim oppidum illud, ubi Abraham, Isaac, et Jacob patriarchae sunt sepulti*

IV. Additional document

Copia salvi conductus mei a fratribus et a guardiano Hierosolymis mihi dati in testimonium et piis in hunc modum commendatus, anno domini millesimo quingentesimo quadragesimo

Georgius Huszthi was not the first western author to report his wanderings in places few others had had a chance to visit—places with a reputation of being exotic, mysterious, dangerous, unknown and therefore alluring. Both the Holy Land and the Ottoman Empire—the latter perceived at once as the diabolic and exotic enemy threatening the safety of the Monarchy and the Holy Roman Empire, were destinations

of great interest to Central Europeans in the 15th century. Nor is Huszthi the only person to have been abducted by the Turks and to have later described his travels and reminiscences of the East. [3]

Huszthi's report, however, includes a peculiarity concerning the point and perspective from which his story is told. It is a collection of memories written long after the events it describes. The oldest version of the account, from the Viennese manuscript, was completed in 1548, sixteen years after the adventure started and six years after it ended, while the later report was dated 1566. The report does not suggest that its author ever took written notes of the events or places he visited; indeed there are places in the text where the author renounces the role of a chronicler of Turkish history. [4] Huszthi assumes the role of a writer *a posteriori* and this fact strongly influences the text, which happens to be highly polyphonic, including a multitude of quotations, various types of discourse (narration, description, commentary), and an intense ideological mark throughout the text, especially in the passages on Islam.

The latter characteristic of this text is to be expected: in general, very few Early Modern Period texts were completely devoid of religious or ideological content. In this case the religious stamp can be expected due to the very content of the text—after all, it is partly a description of a journey through Christian *loca sancta*. What is more interesting is the clash of two religions: a Christian spending ten years against his will in the Muslim world. He reports only few instances of personal religious harassment, two from the beginning of his adventure when he was a slave: a forced indoctrination in Constantinople when the Turks tried to make him deny Christ and commence a Muslim education (in which they failed), and a forced circumcision performed on him when his attempt of escape was frustrated, though this latter was an act of punishment and humiliation rather than a religious act (Huszthi 1881, 4; 6). Later, as a free person, he was protected *iure gentium* from such harassments and was able to work as a free person (although with limited freedom), to travel and visit Christian religious sites and communities. The narrator occasionally tries to be objective regarding the Turks and recognizes good and interesting aspects of their civilization, but cannot hide his contempt for their religion. The most pronounced statement of ideological scorn regards the commemoration of Mecca and Medina: *Mecha autem civitas inde distat longius a portu maris rubri duorum dierum itinere, in qua templum per Mahometum deo suo vindicatum dicitur, et observatur honorifice a Mahometis prout antea commemoravi. Mydina vero in hac regione civitas altera est, quae distat a Mecha itinere dierum septem, sicut intellexi, in qua sepultum Mahometum esse tradunt impostorem illum. At mihi sepulturam illius visitare aut eo ire non libuit neque placuit.* (Huszthi 1881: 21; underlining mine).

3. Weaving the text

Persuading his readers of the religious zeal which he never abandoned behind “enemy lines” was not so difficult a task for the narrator. It was a far more complex challenge to put the story together—to create an interesting text from a mass of events, thoughts and impressions, all of them dating from at least six years before the act of

writing took place. One of the tasks was to put the story together and the other was to present it as a viable story narrated by a plausible narrator. Huszthi's text, as the overview of the content shows, is a cloth in which there are three main types of tissue interwoven:

1. Narration of events
2. Description of cities, landscapes, history of places, political background, customs, flora, fauna and food
3. Reflections on religion, customs, human character.

These three 'ingredients' make the report a generically complex text, combining elements of many different genres—including those of an autobiographical short story, a memoir, narrative fiction, geography, *antiquitates*, pilgrim report, and religious literature. The composition of the text reveals the difficulties Huszthi had when composing the work. For example, while the majority of the pilgrimage report (III) with its moral reflections is situated apart from the narrative part (II), the latter includes much descriptive and reflective material, even entire chapters which have little to do with the story being told or the culture described, such as the reflection on the moral dangers of dancing in a circle (Huszthi 1881, 13-14). Our author was not able to concentrate solely on the act of telling his story, exceptionally interesting though it is and by all means attractive to read; cultural and religious observations were equally, if not more important to him and his audience. Apart from the very nature of a travel story, which inevitably includes the narrator's comments on the described reality, it was the strong contemporary literary system that promoted the non-narrative aspects of the text. We shall come back to this point when discussing the use of citations.

4. Paratexts

Huszthi dedicated the second, extended version of his manuscript to Hieronymus Beck von Leopoldsdorf (1525-1596), an Austrian noble and at that time royal counselor and chamberlain to the Habsburg King and Emperor Maximilian II (1562-1576). In the dedicatory, Huszthi addresses his traveling experience: Beck had indeed been to Egypt where he had come into possession of old Turkish chronicles, an important source for the history of Turkey. Huszthi's dedicatee and potential patron of the printing of his manuscript was thus an educated courtier. In 16th century central Europe, to be educated meant to have studied within the framework of the humanist educational curriculum. In this system, the ancient authors were the ultimate authority on questions of (Latin) language, literature, style and a great deal of knowledge of the world. [5]

Huszthi aimed at an educated audience and chose to write his report in Latin. It would not have been too difficult for him to write in Latin, as he had received some humanist education in the Hungarian city of Pécs (*Quinqueecclesiae*). [6] But writing in Latin was not merely a matter of language; in such a highly prescriptive literary system, it included more complex factors such as choosing an adequate literary genre or form for one's subject matter, using the appropriate style, showing the expected tribute to ancient authors as one's forerunners. An ambitious text could not be properly conceived or

accepted without observing the linguistic, generic and stylistic rules of writing set down by the ancient authors.

The difficulty our author faced concerned the theme of his work: how could a simple travel report be 'elevated' to a higher level and presented as a serious literary work? How could he legitimize a text as a humanist text when it lacked the typical generic characteristics of high, learned ancient genres? How could he 'dress' his text as one pertaining to institutionalized "high" literature? Huszthi uses two principal devices to achieve this goal: paratexts and intertextuality, present here mainly in the form of extensive quoting. [7]

The paratexts or threshold texts which come before the main text are, in this case, mottoes declared to be taken from Bible and two ancient authors, a dedicatory epigram by German humanist Johann Seccerwitz (Wrocław 1530 – 1583), an elegiac couplet by Huszthi, an epigram-answer by the same author to an epitaph by Seccervitius, an epistolary dedication and a recommendation of the work to the benevolent reader. At the end of the text there is a copy of *salvus conductus*, a sort of passport in which the guardian of the Jerusalem Franciscan monastery guarantees for the traveler. While the latter paratext is a real, historic document added *ad libitum*, the liminary texts located before the main text are a highly conventional body of texts.

The dedication to a wealthy and influential person and the recommendation to the reader were practically obligatory elements which accompanied any text with an ambition to be printed in Early Modern Ages. The presence of these in Huszthi's manuscript are a clear sign that he esteemed his work worthy of publishing, and thus sufficiently ornate according to the rules of good writing. Paratexts like these usually involve the frequent use of epistolary commonplaces (praise of the addressee, disparaging the author's literary abilities, enumeration of the benefits of the text) and are rhetorically highly defined. [8]

The presence of another author in the paratexts, a northern European humanist poet Johannes Seccervitius, in the form of a "custom made" laudatory 10-verse epigram composed specifically to adorn Huszthi's future book and to commemorate his travels, means that Huszthi was included in at least some sort of humanist network. [9]

5. Quoting

These paratexts do legitimate Huszthi's text as one pertaining to a matrix of well prepared, learned texts. The problem arises when it comes to the main text: how can one present an adventure, one's own travels, all the interesting elements which constitute a described real world, and make them literature, high literature if possible? Huszthi, a pupil and follower of humanist poetics, tries to resolve the problem by quoting: there are at least fifty quotes in the text, as enumerated in the Table [pdf].

The Table cites the phrases, sentences or verses we were able to identify as quotations. There are fifty instances of quotation in the first, narrative part of Huszthi's text, including the paratexts mentioned. In a printed text of some twenty- eight pages, this means about two quotes per page; still, the quotations are distributed very unevenly and tend to be grouped in "clusters". As a rule, there are few quotations in the

descriptive parts of the texts, and the most typical moment at which Huszthi inserts a quotation is in passages of reflective digression. There are, however, narrative places in the text which also include intensive quoting, to which we shall come back later.

Huszthi quotes openly, pointing to the part of the text where he quotes. He reveals the majority of the sources of his quotations, usually mentioning the source author's name or, rarely, the work ("... quod et apud Ovidium simile legitur", "verba Plauti", "... apud Vergilium sic legitur Aeneidos 8", "capite 13 Machabeorum"). Sometimes the source is simply named *poeta* ("velut ... poetica vox indicat", "poeta sic ait", "illud poeticum consonat"). There are two main sources of Huszthi's quotations: the Bible and ancient literature. There is, however, a third source of quotations which we could only name neutrally as "other sources": these are the places where the quotation is placed under the category of proverbs or sayings ("illud", "quod dicitur", "proverbium turcicum", "vulgare proverbium est"). Some of these "proverbs" indeed are proverbs or sayings, usually adopted from a medieval or humanist collection of sayings (v. n° 50 in the Table). Other "proverbs" can easily be identified as masked quotations from ancient authors, as is the case with the *dictum* "Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor" (=Ov. *Met.* 7,20-21, n° 11 in the Table).

On the other hand, there are quotations which are not defined as such: there is no signal in the text which indicates a "foreign tissue", as in the case of some Virgilian verses (Table, n° 37, 38, 40).

The most quoted Bible books are Psalms (3 occurrences), Ecclesiastes (2), Sirach (2), Esra (=Proverbs, 1) and Gospel (1, non-attested). More numerous are quotations from ancient authors. At three points Huszthi quotes Greek authors, always in their Latin translations: Homer is quoted once in a motto at the beginning (which we have not been able to confirm as Homer's text), and once in the dedicatory, where his third verse of the Latin translation of the *Odyssey* is quoted; there is also a quotation which is declared to be from Pythagoras. As a motto, there is also a quotation from Aristotle.

As expected, Latin authors prevail. The most quoted Roman author is Virgil (35 verses), followed by Ovid (5 verses), Lucan (2 verses), Seneca the Younger, Pliny the Elder and Pliny the Younger (considered one in the text), Horace, Plautus, Juvenal (=Ovid), Lactantius. Huszthi also quotes one of the most celebrated humanists, Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466-1536): once in an open quotation from his epistolography manual *Brevissima conficiendarum epistularum formula* (1522); and once, at the very end, quoting "an old saying" which appears in a somewhat different version in Erasmus' monumental collection of *Adagia* (Paris 1500).

There are, unfortunately, many quotations for which we were not able to find a source. Most of them are *dicta*, but there are also passages attributed to the classics (Homer, Aristotle, Pythagoras, even one from a gospel) without identification. Some of the sayings have been identified as appearing in – if not proceeding from – contemporary or medieval collections of sayings of commentaries (*Adagia* by Erasmus or a commentary on Aesop; v. Table, n° 45 and 47). In more than ten cases we were, however, unable to determine the source of the quotation or even speculate what the source might be.

One of the reasons for this is the manner of quoting in which one cannot expect high fidelity to the source: what matters is the idea transmitted in the quotation, the wording is secondary. The source text can be grammatically adapted if syntax so requires, verses can be quoted as prose without preserving their metrical structure. If a source is signed, the most it reveals is the book from which a quotation is taken. We face many difficulties when trying to identify a source, and there are many different reasons why this is so. First of all, humanists used editions (or manuscripts) different from those we take as standards, often with substantial errors and readings different from ours. Next, very few of them knew Greek and they read Greek authors in Latin translations which are very often difficult to identify. The most pronounced problem, however, is the problem of multifold sources: sometimes the quotes were not taken directly from ancient texts but from different types of medieval or contemporary reference literature: moral literature with quotes of different origin, collections of sayings and proverbs, *compendia* on different themes and other sorts of “prefabricated” ancient literature pieces or repertoires.

Apart from the problem of sources, one has to face the pre-philological attitude of humanists towards ancient texts: they were seen as material to be molded and shaped like clay to the needs of the author and the context. [10] This is reflected not only in the imprecision of quoting, but also in the tendency to neglect entirely the context of the quotation. Many instances from Huszthi’s text illustrate what has been said and take their form from this flexible attitude towards source texts. Here we shall mention some of them.

In the episode of the Turkish siege of the Arabic city of Aden, its king asks them to state their intentions. In a comparison, the situation is illustrated by two of Virgil’s hexameters from the sixth book of the *Aeneid* (A. 6,388-389). Huszthi brings the following text (n° 30 in the Table):

*Quisquis es, armatus, nostram qui tendis ad urbem
Fare age, quid venias iam istic, et comprime gressum.*

In the first line of its Virgilian source, the second part reads: “qui nostra ad flumina tendis”: Charon meets Aeneas in the Underworld, at the river Styx, and asks him to identify himself. The verses which are supposed to illustrate the king of Adens’s inquiries were changed and adopted to the new scenery: he asks his “visitors” why they had come to his city, not river.

In another example, the Sultan orders a public feast to be held in Constantinople in celebration the victory in Babylon and to glorify his person. Huszthi has a comment on that, his point being that the winner sets the rules: “Cuius sententiae consona haec verba Ovidii astipulantur:

*Victorque volentes per populos dat iura
Victaque pugnaci iura sub ense iacent.* [11]

The first verse as presented here is metrically impossible, which does not seem to have bothered our author. In fact, it is a phrase which extends through two verses in Virgil (*G.* 4,561-562), not Ovid. The second verse is a pentameter from Ovid (*Tr.* 5,7b,48).

The couplet presented here is a patchwork made of sentences (not actually verses) which illustrate the situation narrated.

In various places Huszthi uses entire verses from Virgil, but in reverse order and sometime not even contiguous verses (Table: n° 41, 46). In one instance he makes a small cento out of perfectly quoted verses from Virgil (Table: n° 32):

*Huc omnis turba ad portus effusa ruebat,
Cernit ibi maestos et mortis honore carentes.
Exoritur procurva ingens per littora fletus;
Unum pro multis dependitur caput.*

The verses (Verg. A. 6,305; 6,333; 5,765; 5,815), introduced as *Vergilii dictum*, illustrate the mourning of the citizens of the recently conquered city of Aden when they saw their king and three other persons hanged on the Turkish ship's mast. As can be seen, the cento actually fulfills its function and works as a poetic text with a desired meaning. *Dependitur* in the last verse is *dabitur* in Vergil.

The intertextuality in Huszthi's text does not work only at the level of quotations, but also at the level of discourse. In order to make the reality similar to literature, Huszthi, when telling the stories of sieges and wars, introduces elements of well-known literary stories. The siege and capture of Aden irresistibly reminds us of the conquest of Troy ("quod non poterant vi, fraude assequi solent"). In the episode of the war in India with the Portuguese, an hortatory speech allegedly pronounced by Pasha Suleyman is cited. [12] The Turks are facing defeat and their general holds a speech echoing those of Cesar to his soldiers. His prose speech, however, includes at least two hidden quotes from Virgil (v. Table: n° 37, 38). The whole episode, one of the most detailed, comprises thirteen verses of the Mantuan poet, three of which are masked in the prose text. [13] The most peculiar usage of the classical quotes is the one in the second speech of Pasha:

Quibus (i.e. militibus) convocatis, velut vates, rumpit e pectore haud dissimilem vocem:

*Nec nos obniti contra, nec tendere tantum
Sufficimus. Superat quoniam Fortuna, sequamur.* [14]

Pasha's speech was *haud dissimilis*, "not very different" from the words of Vergil's Palinurus who refers to the storm rising, not to the enemy forces as Pasha. The Turkish general here is shown as if he were adopting in his discourse the classical epic style, a literary tradition foreign to his own. A real military scene becomes literature: as in the epic, there is one style for the narrator as well as for the characters. Pasha Suleyman acts as an epic hero. Reality is compared to literature, not the other way round. Reality imitates literature because the target audience knows ancient literature better than contemporary foreign reality.

6. Seeing and telling

It is interesting to see what makes the narrative or reflexive text not to reject the tissue of quotes, which rhetorical means or text strategy holds them together. At the level of content, the factor that "triggers" a quotation or an allusion is normally the

semblance of situations. When Suleyman the Magnificent had Ibrahim Pasha, Huszthi's master, killed for disloyalty and treason, they are compared to a far better known, similar case of Parmenion and Alexander (Huszthi 1881, 8). At the level of wording, there are "bumper phrases" which absorb the shock of putting the quotation into the text, such as "huic similis", "quemadmodum et", "legitur simile". A narrative strategy is also used in several instances. Huszthi, the narrator, overlaps two narrative perspectives: the text is narrated from the perspective of the autobiographic "narrating I" (older Huszthi when writing the events and quoting classics); however, the "narrated I" ("sentient I", "observing I", younger Huszthi within the story, at the time of the events) claims to be remembering some quotes on the spot, forging thus the perception of the "narrative I":

"... mihi *tunc* illud in memoriam percurrerat", (Huszthi 1881, 4)

"Verum ubi libertatem adeptus essem... cui me tutius committerem ... cogitabam, *memor* veteris huius proverbii..." (Huszthi 1881, 8)

"A quo (Genuensi) exceptus hospicio, aliquantisper ibi quievi, *memor tunc temporis* veteris illius dicti:..." (Huszthi 1881, 27)

"Tandem in patriam Sclavoniam intra decennium *memor* huius dicti quod refert ita Juvenalis: ..." (Huszthi 1881, 27).

8. Classics as added value

The quoting of a poetic text within a non-poetic one is not a humanist invention: it was known in ancient literature too. Aristotle, Plutarch and Diogenes Laërtius have an instance of Solon quoting Homer as an authority resolving territorial disputes between Megarians and Athenians, and the method was also well known in the Roman world. [15] The tradition of quoting poetic authorities in a 'scientific' text continued through the Middle Ages well into the Early Modern Period. What is interesting here is the use of quoting as a method of adding extrinsic (traditional literary) value to a plain narrative text.

Humanism created a collective "invented reality" proceeding from fascination with ancient worlds and words. This invented reality determined the major part of western literary production. To write meant to write like the ancients who served as authorities in so many fields of human life: philosophy, history, medicine, science, architecture, and above all, language and literature. Up to as late as the mid-18th century, the classics were the standard authority for any major issue of civilization, and even today they serve as moral authorities, presented above all in collections of ancients proverbs and sayings.

The mediation of reality in a (travel) text generally depends on the knowledge of the narrator (traveller) and their perception of the world—which is necessarily conditioned by that knowledge. Huszthi's knowledge is the knowledge of a humanist, and this determines not only his image of the world but also the content and discourse of his text. Other ways of presenting perceived and remembered reality were certainly possible, but only the humanist perspective of telling it in Latin and relying on classical tradition gives it the added value—the *gravitas*—the author believed his story deserved.

Classics quoted in Huszthi's text gave his travel report an intellectual legitimacy it otherwise would not have achieved.

Notes

- [1] For a detailed description of both manuscripts and textual versions, as well as the transmission of the text and manuscript ownership, see Matković (1881) 119–122.
- [2] For the bibliography on Huszthi, see Humski (2002).
- [3] On the abductees and travellers Schiltberger (early 15th century) and the so-called Erdély Teacher from Sebeş in southern Transylvania, see Matković (1881), 181–184.
- [4] «... quod (i.e. bellum) me eloquentioribus narrare relinquo, videlicet, qui eo non veneram illorum acta scribere, sed semper tantum curabam effugere». Huszthi (1881), 20.
- [5] The epistolary dedication to H. Beck is an example of a humanist dedicatory which to a great extent imitates the rhetoric of ancient letters—with *SPD* at the beginning, the classical *tu-* form of addressing the dedicatee. Huszthi's earlier dedication, written 18 years earlier to the pronotary of the Reign of Slavonia, Michael von Rawen, gives an example of medieval *dictamen*: the author makes extensive use of formulas of modesty and submission (*deditissimus clientulus, sibi addictissimus servulus*) and employs the second person plural (*vos*) and the third person singular (*dominatio vestra*) when referring to the addressee. It is not rare for both types to occur in the writing of the same author. The humanist need to avoid the medieval *dictamen* was formulated in the epistolary writings of Desiderius Erasmus in *De conscribendis epistolis* (1522). For the two types of epistolary dedications, see Stepanić (2004).
- [6] He reports that the Turks discovered he was educated in literature: «Comperit autem patronus ille... me utcunque scire litteras latinas, utpote quibus paulo ante in Quinqueecclesiis, licet brevi quidem tempore, operam dederam» (Huszthi 1881: 4). We take «utcunque» and «brevi tempore» as commonplace expressions of modesty.
- [7] We follow here Genette's notions *intertextuality* and definitions of *paratext*, *hypertext*, *hypotext* and *metatext* as described in his *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré* (1982), as summarized in Schmitz (2002), 81. The notion of paratext is taken from Genette (1987).
- [8] For liminary texts and types of the rhetoric of epistolary dedications in Croatian humanism v. Stepanić (2003) and Stepanić (2004).
- [9] There is a reference to an epitaph by Seccervitius written for Huszthi, apparently *ante mortem*, of which we have no further notion (Huszthi 1881, 1).
- [10] This sometimes applies even to the Bible text, which was supposed to be fixed and in which, according to St. Jerome «even the word order encompasses mystery» (Hier. *Ep.* 57,5). Here, in general, the Bible quotes from the Vulgate are more precise than the quotes from classics.
- [11] See Table, n° 10.
- [12] Sparsa voce exacerbatos sic acclamabat: “O Othmanli milites et amici, quos vivere fas est, et quos dulcis patriae honor spesque certa praemii expectat, omnibus enim honor unus: occurrite saltem posticae turri!”, additisque similibus verbis: “Nunc animis opus est, nunc pectore firmo, quum nunc iam deditio tentanda, aut extrema queque mors ipsa perferenda”, Huszthi (1881), 19. The narrative strategy of speech interpolation in a historiographic text is present and well known from Caesar and Livy.
- [13] The Turks kill eighty prisoners from the war at Deu: “... una hora decollati sunt ab uno tortore pariter omnes, in quos saevit amor ferri et scelerata insania belli”. Huszthi (1881), 20; italics mine = Verg. *A.* 7, 461.
- [14] Table: n° 39.

[15] Cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1,15,13; Plu. *Sol.* 10,1; D. L. *Vita Sol.* 1,2,48. Seneca, when talking of the general deluge in *Quaestiones naturales* (3,27,13), quotes Ovid (*Met.* 2,264; 1,292; 1,304) and implicitly Vergil (*A.* 3,126-127) as an illustration, i.e. as an authority on what a deluge looks like. Edmunds (2001), 55-57.

Bibliography

- Aesop (1548), *Aesopi Phrygis et aliorum fabulae*. Apud Seb. Gryphium: Lugduni.
- Alberus, Erasmus (1892), *Die Fabeln des Erasmus Alberus: Abdruck der Ausgabe von 1550*. Max Niemeyer: Halle a. S.,
<http://www.archive.org/stream/diefabelndesera01albegoog#page/n8/mode/2up>, 20.04.2011.
- Aristotel (1989), *Retorika. Sa starohelenskog preveo, studiju i komentare sačinio Marko Višić*, Naprijed: Zagreb.
- Charles Fantazzi (1989), «General Introduction» in: *Ioannis Ludovici Vivis De conscribendis epistolis. Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation and Annotation*, Brill: Leiden – New York – København – Köln, 1-21.
- Duda, Dean (1998), *Priča i putovanje. Hrvatski romantičarski putopis kao pripovjedni žanr*. MH: Zagreb.
- Edmunds, Lowell (2001), *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*, Johns Hopkins UP: Baltimore-London.
- Erasmus, Desiderius (1521), *Brevissima coficiendarum epistularum formula*, Paris.
<http://www.grexl.com/biblio/brevissima/textus.html>, 20.04.2011.
- Erasmus, Desiderius (1820), *Ecclesiastae, sive de ratione concionandi libri quattuor*, In libraria Weidmannia: Lipsiae.
- Erasmus, Desiderius (1980), *De conscribendis epistolis*, in: W. Welzig (ed.), *Erasmus von Rotterdam. Ausgewählte Schriften*, 8, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft: Darmstadt.
- Erasmus, Desiderius (1998), *Adagiorum chiliarum prima. Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami II*, 2. (edd. Poll-van de Lisdonk, M.L., van & Cytowska, M.). Elsevier: Amsterdam.
- PHI 5.3 (1991), *Latin Texts and Bible Versions*, Packard Humanities Institute: Los Altos, CA.
- Genette, Gérard (1987), *Seuils*, Seuil: Paris.
- Humski, Vera (2002), “Hus, Juraj”, in: *Hrvatski biografski leksikon*, 5, Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža: Zagreb, 769.
- Huszthi, Georgius (1881), *Descriptio peregrinationis Georgii Huszthii* (ed. Petar Matković), *Starine JAZU*, 13, 1-38.
- IJsewijn, Jozef; Sacré, Dirk (1998), *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies. Part II: Literary, Linguistic, Philological and Editorial Questions*, Leuven UP: Leuven.
- Matković, Petar (1881), *Gjuro Hus, Hrvat iz Rasinje, glasovit putnik XVI vieka*, *Rad JAZU*, 55, 116-184.
- Schmitz, Thomas A. (2007), *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts. An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stepanić, Gorana (2003), “Marulićevi latinski paratekstovi” (“Marulić’s Latin Paratexts”), in: Lučin, B – Tomasović, M. (eds.), *Colloquia Maruliana XII*, Književni krug Split: Split, 58-72.
- Stepanić, Gorana (2004), “Retorika Marulićevih epistolarnih tekstova” (“The Rhetoric of Marulić’s Epistolary Texts”), in: Lučin, B – Tomasović, M. (eds.), *Colloquia Maruliana XIII*, Književni krug Split: Split, 41-55.

Creazione di un testo di valore aggiunto: *Descriptio peregrinationis Georgii Huszthii*

RIASSUNTO

Gorana Stepanić

Università Juraj Dobrila di Pola
Dipartimento di Scienze Umanistiche
Sezione di Filologia Romanza e Classica
I. Matetića Ronjgova 1, 52100 Pola, Croazia
gstepanic@unipu.hr

Parole chiavi: citazione di autori classici, letteratura di viaggi nel Cinquecento, relazioni di viaggi in latino, Georgius Huszthius, Juraj Hus

Il testo latino sulle avventure e viaggi attraverso l'Impero Ottomano dell'umanista Juraj Huszthi (Georgius Huszthi, Husthius, Hus, Hwz) comprende gli avvenimenti accaduti fra 1532 e 1542, periodo che l'autore trascorse, prima come prigioniero e schiavo degli ottomani, poi come trombettista militare e finalmente come pellegrino, nel Vicino Oriente.

Dopo le informazioni sui manoscritti del viaggio del Huszthi, l'edizione del testo (Zagabria 1881), il suo contenuto e il bagaglio retorico dei suoi paratesti, si analizza il rapporto del relatore del viaggio nei confronti del contenuto narrato, ovvero il modo in cui l'ideologia e la prospettiva narrativa si manifesta nel testo. Oltre ai passaggi narrativi, il testo del Huszthi comprende frammenti descrittivi (descrizioni di città, di costumi, della flora e della fauna, della storia dei paesi visitati) e riflessivi (sulla morale, sulla religione). Proprio in quest'ultimo tipo di discorso si manifesta più chiaramente l'ideologia cristiana del Huszthi e, ciò che per questo studio è più importante – l'ideologia e la poetica dello scrittore umanista.

La parte centrale del lavoro si occupa del fenomeno della citazione delle fonti antiche, bibliche e post-antiche nel testo del Huszthi. Huszthi cita una trentina di autori antichi (Omero, Aristotele, Pitagora, Virgilio, Ovidio, Lucano, Seneca il Giovane, Plinio il Vecchio, Plinio il Giovane, Orazio, Plauto, Giovenale, Lattanzio), la Bibbia e alcune fonti post-antiche (medioevali e moderne), come Erasmo di Rotterdam, i commentatori di Esopo, le collezioni di sentenze), e le sue citazioni sono identificate per la maggior parte. Le fonti antiche e le altre fonti vengono citate liberamente, spesso solo annoverando il nome dell'autore e della città, senza una localizzazione approssimativa; molto spesso annovera versi in modo incompleto, adattandoli sintatticamente ed raggruppandoli arbitrariamente. A parte il citare gli autori antichi, la formazione umanistica del Huszthi si evidenzia anche nel modo in cui egli innesta le citazioni degli autori antichi in scene non finzionali della propria biografia (per ess. nella scena della battaglia il pascià turco incoraggia i suoi soldati con parole di Virgilio). La percezione e la presentazione del mondo del relatore del viaggio è determinata essenzialmente dalla sua formazione

umanistica, e la citazione estensiva di fonti letterarie in un testo misto di autobiografia e racconti di viaggio s'inserisce nel comune fine della scrittura dotta umanistica: solo gli autori classici (accanto alla Bibbia) possono servire come mezzo di "valore aggiunto", con cui si aggiungerà la desiderata *grauitas*, ai successi prosaici.