

THE TWO LIVES OF AN ORATION. ADDITIONS
TO THE ORIGINS OF TRANQUILLUS ANDRONICUS'
ANTI-TURKISH SPEECH FROM 1541*

Péter Kasza

UDK: 821.163.42.09Andreis, F. T.
Original scientific paper

Péter Kasza
Department for Classical
Philology and Neo-Latin Studies
University of Szeged
H u n g a r y
petrusfalx@gmail.com

The anti-Turkish speech was one of the most popular genres of the 16th century. We can hardly think of any noted humanist in the realm of South-Central Europe who did not write one, either out of his own volition or on behalf of someone else. Yet, the case of Tranquillus Andronicus, a Dalmatian who served Hungary for several years, is still special as he wrote at least four works of this kind, which is a rarity among his contemporaries. Due to the popularity of the genre, however, these speeches contain a great deal of clichés, so it is a question whether it is worth examining them either as literary works of art or sources. The paper starts with a short introduction to the history of the genre, followed by a presentation of the most important biographical information on the life of Tranquillus Andronicus, and then makes an attempt to show, on the basis of the Dalmatian humanist's speech printed in 1541, how this early modern genre can be examined in the light of new sources.

Key words: Tranquillus Andronicus, Buda, speeches against the Turks, *Oratio ad Germanos de bello suscipiendo contra Thurcos* (1541)

* The studies needed for the present paper were made possible by the Collegium Hungaricum scholarship of Tempus Public Foundation. The writing of this paper was funded by NKFIH research project K-119237.

1. Narratio

By the first half of the 16th century, the Kingdom of Hungary found itself more and more on the losing side in its one-and-a-half-century-long war against the Turks. In 1521, Sultan Suleiman captured Nándorfehérvár (the present-day Belgrade), which had been defended 65 years before in a sensational victory. The Sultan thus got hold of the key to Hungary. Five years later on Mohács plain, the Hungarian forces suffered a crushing defeat by the Ottoman army, and the death of King Louis II after the battle was an even more serious blow. The fight for succession drew the country into a civil war that lasted for one and a half decades. One of the participants in the war, John Szapolyai, was compelled to ask for the Sultan's help as early as in 1529. This essentially made Szapolyai a Porte vassal. Even though storm clouds had been gathering above the country, up until the death of King John in the summer of 1540 only a small, though strategically very important part of the country, the county of Szerém (Syrmia) came effectively under Turkish occupation. However, between 1540 and 1544 the situation changed dramatically. As is well-known, in the August of 1541 the Sultan's forces captured the castle of Buda, with which the heart of the Kingdom of Hungary, the residence of the king fell into foreign hands. In 1542, a huge German imperial army made an attempt to recapture Buda, to no avail, while in 1543–1544 the Ottomans rounded off their possessions and stabilized their rule over Hungary by capturing several castles that formed a defensive circle around Buda, such as Pécs, Esztergom, Székesfehérvár, Szeged.

On the basis of the sources we can venture to claim that, from a European perspective, the fall of Buda was the most important (or at least: the most »sensational«) event in Hungary in the first half of the 16th century. The defeat at Nándorfehérvár was a more distant Hungarian business, no matter how hard Hungarian diplomacy tried to convince the European public of the importance of the castle.¹ Though Mohács caused quite a stir throughout Europe, because the Turks did not occupy Hungary after the event, the panic abated with the passing

¹ In 1522, both Stjepan Brodarić (István Brodarics, Stephanus Brodericus) and László Macedóniai tried to secure support for the recapture of Nándorfehérvár, the former in Rome, the latter at the imperial diet of Nuremberg. Though both delivered excellent orations, which were published later (that of Macedóniai in German translation as well), they did not really bear fruit. László Macedóniai's speech is available in Hungarian translation too (Cf. Tibor K l a n i c z a y [ed], *Janus Pannonius – Magyarországi humanisták*, Szépirodalmi, Budapest, 1982, 902-912), while Brodarics' oration, of which only a single copy has survived, is accessible in Latin (Stephanus B r o d e r i c u s, *Oratio ad Adrianum VI. pontificem maximum*, Csaba Csapodi (ed.), Akadémiai, Budapest, 1985). (There is also a bilingual edition with Croatian translation by Stjepan Sršan; cf. Stjepan B r o d a r i ć, *Mohačka bitka 1526*, KIC »Privlačica«, Vinkovci, 1990). A recent paper on Brodarics's speech: Péter K a s z a, *Egy korszakváltás szemtanúja – Brodarics István pályaképe*, [Eyewitness of Changing Time. The Life of István Brodarics] Kronosz, Budapest, 2015, 52-62.

of time.² However, it was evident that with the fall of Buda the *propugnaculum Christianitatis* was destroyed. In the case of Buda, a chain of events from the death of Szapolyai (1540) until the end of the first wave of Turkish occupation (1544), kept the ruling elite of Central Europe excited for years and provided the humanists in the region with an inexhaustible supply of subject matter. There is an abundance of Turcica literature in various genres published in the beginning of the 40s. The writings were inspired partly by the horror of witnessing the Ottoman advance, partly by the hope of a quick recapture of Buda.³ An example of the Central European Turcica is a speech by the Dalmatian Tranquillus Andronicus published in Vienna in November 1541, entitled *Oratio ad Germanos de bello suscipiendo contra Thurcos*.

2. Egressus

Even though he lived in Hungary for several years and was in contact with the most notable representatives of the 16th-century Hungarian political and intellectual elite, from Brodarics to Antun Vrančić, Tranquillus Andronicus has been quite neglected in Hungarian literature. The basic facts of his life were collected by Imre Lukinich in a paper published in 1923.⁴ After more than half a century, it was Gábor Barta who supplemented and corrected Lukinich's data using archival sources.⁵ Barta called Andronicus an »unsuccessful humanist«, which seems somewhat doubtful if we look at his career. Born in Trogir in around 1491, Andronicus studied at Italian universities, that is, he received the best possible education he could get at the time. In Rome, he joined the court of the influential Polish archbishop Jan Łaski. After an academic peregrination, Andronicus turned up in the French royal court at the end of the 20s.⁶ It was at the turn of the years

² A reason why the focus of attention was diverted could be that the fall of Nándorfehérvár and the defeat at Mohács was followed by a tragedy which was even more momentous from a European perspective: in 1522, the island stronghold of the Knights of St. John, Rhodes, was captured, while in May 1527 the European public was already shocked by the *Sacco di Roma*. On the reception of the sack of Rome cf. Kenneth G o u w e n s, *Remembering the Renaissance – Humanist Narrations of the Sack of Rome*, Brill, Leiden–Boston–Köln, 1998.

³ For a thorough, though still not complete, overview of the Turcica literature of the era, see Carl G ö l l n e r, *Turcica – Die europäische Türckendrucke des XVI. Jahrhunderts*. I. Band MDI–MDL, Editura Academiei R.P.R., București–Berlin, 1961.

⁴ Imre L u k i n i c h, »Tranquillus Andronicus életéhez«, *Levéltári Közlemények* 1 (1923), 179–186.

⁵ Gábor B a r t a, »Egy sikertelen humanista a 16. században [Andronicus Tranquillus]«, István Z o m b o r i (ed.), *Az értelmiség Magyarországon a 16–17. században*, Csongrád Megyei Múzeumok Igazgatósága, Szeged, 1988, 61–77.

⁶ Andronicus' dialogue *Sylla* was printed in 1527, the letter of dedication was addressed to Johannes Lascaris, a Greek scholar active in Paris in the 1520s. Though the dialogue

1527 and 1528 that he became acquainted with the court of Szapolyai thanks to another of his patrons, the famous diplomat Hieronym Łaski, who was Jan Łaski's cousin. It is true, however, that Andronicus's career was not without its downturns: due to his relationship with Lodovico Gritti he came close to losing his life in 1534, although he later managed to regain the support of kings, aristocrats and prelates, in Hungary primarily that of Tamás Nádasdy and Antun Vrančić. As Andronicus complained of the ups and downs of his life often, extensively, and to a lot of people, it is more appropriate to call him a dissatisfied rather than an unsuccessful humanist.

Hungarian scholarship treats Andronicus mostly as Gritti's secretary and views him in the context of his apologetic biography of the Italian adventurer.⁷ But the humanist from Trogir is far from being a single-book author. He was actually a very prolific writer who during his long lifetime experimented with many genres and subjects. In the first half of his life, he mostly tried to make good at poetry,⁸ but he also wrote dialogues in the style of Lucian,⁹ biographies, poems on the theory of poetry,¹⁰ a philosophical treatise,¹¹ and, last but not least, a number of anti-Turkish works.

3. Propositio

It was in 1518 that Andronicus made his first attempt at a call to arms against the Turks. He published *Ad Deum contra Thurcas oratio carmine heroico* in Ingolstadt in March 1518, and a few months later he returned to the subject in a prose work. This second time the addressee was not God, but the people of the

was printed without indicating the place of printing, the decorations of the title page and the typefaces are typical of those used in the printing office of Pierre Vidoue. Vidoue was keen on publishing books in smaller formats, and Tranquillus Andronicus' *Sylla* printed in octavo, fits also well into Vidoue's ideal. See: B. M o r e a u (ed.): *Inventaire chronologique des éditions parisiennes du XVIe siècle III. 1521-1530*. Abbeville 1985, 322. I owe the data mentioned above to my student, Szabolcs Zsótér.

⁷ *De rebus in Hungaria gestis ab illustrissimo et magnifico Ludovico Gritti deque eius obitu epistola*. Its Latin edition Henrik K r e t s c h m a y r, »Adalékok Szapolyai János király történetéhez«, *Történelmi Tár* 26 (1903), 198-231. It was recently published in Hungarian in the translation of Péter Kulcsár Cf. Péter Kulcsár, *Krónikáink magyarul III.*, Balassi, Budapest, 2008, 53-78.

⁸ Cf. M a r i a C y t o w s k a, »Andronicus Tranquillus Dalmata. A Łaski-család és Zápolya János udvarának familiárisa«, István Csapláros et al. (ed.), *Tanulmányok a lengyel-magyar irodalmi kapcsolatok köréből*, Akadémiai, Budapest, 1969, 129-135.

⁹ *Dialogus Sylla* (1527). Cf. Zsigmondné R i t ó k, »A politikai szatíra Magyarországon a 16. században«, *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 75 (1971), 265-277.

¹⁰ Cf. C y t o w s k a, *op. cit.* (8), 134.

¹¹ Cf. C y t o w s k a, *op. cit.* (8), 135-138.

Holy Roman Empire (*Oratio contra Turcas ad Germanos habita*). This work was published in Augsburg in June 1518 with a dedication to Emperor Maximilian. Subsequently, he did not write anti-Turkish works for more than twenty years. This is not surprising if we take into account that, from 1528 at the latest, he was in the service of Szapolyai, essentially a Turkish vassal prince, and that Andronicus got even closer to the arch-enemy of Christianity when he became the secretary the illegitimate son of the Doge of Venice, Ludovico Gritti, who, being a close friend of Grand Vizier Ibrahim, had excellent connections with the inner circles of the Sublime Porte. Thanks to his influence at the Ottoman court, Gritti's star was rising lightning-fast in the court of Vassal-King, Szapolyai: the Italian adventurer was first appointed royal treasurer, then (in 1531) governor. Gritti's career, hopeful for Andronicus as well, was cut short at Medgyes in 1534 when the Transylvanian nobles, enraged by the killing of Imre Czibak, captured and beheaded the detested governor. Andronicus was also taken captive,¹² and he barely escaped the fate of his master.

With Gritti's fall, Andronicus found himself in a difficult situation. It was primarily as a self-justification that he penned the apologetic biography of the Italian adventurer in December 1534.¹³ In spite of this, he was not trusted any more at the court of Szapolyai, so he was compelled to look for another patron and took measures to make himself available to Ferdinand of Habsburg. In this setting, Andronicus' new anti-Turkish speech (*Oratio ad Germanos de bello suscipiendo contra Thurcos*), printed in Vienna in 1541 after a hiatus of more than a quarter of a century, can be rightly considered a literary attempt at erasing his pro-Turkish past.¹⁴ A few years later, he wrote yet another anti-Turcicum, a warning to the Poles (*Ad optimates Polonos admonitio*), which was published in Krakow in 1545.

In the rest of the paper, I will deal in more detail with the work published in 1541.

The anti-Turkish *oratio* was certainly a »hit genre« in the 16th century, and with the escalation of the Ottoman threat, more and more speeches of this kind

¹² On 9 October 1534, Brodarics wrote to Poland: »Pauper Tranquillus noster, secretarius Gritti et iste captus servatur.« Cf. Stephanus Brodericus *Epistulae*, ed. Petrus Kasza, Argumentum–MOL, Budapest, 2012, 431.

¹³ After he was redeemed for 500 golden coins by a fellow countryman Ivan Statilić (János Statileo, Ioannes Statileus), he withdrew into the castle of János Keserű in Radnő and wrote his biography of Gritti there.

¹⁴ It is important to stress that it is a separate work, even though in Péter Kulcsár's *Inventarium (Inventarium de operibus litterariis ad res Hungaricas pertinentibus ab initiis usque ad annum 1700, <http://www.tankonyvtar.hu/hu/tartalom/tkt/inventarium-de-operibus/ch02.html>)* the text of 1541 is described as the second edition of the oration written in 1518. Kulcsár probably did not have the chance to take the text into his hands, since no copy can be found in Hungary. I used the digital copy of the exemplar held in the National Library of Austria (ÖNB): Tranquillus Andronicus, *Oratio ad Germanos de bello suscipiendo contra Thurcos*, Ioannes Singrenius, Vienna, 1541.

were written.¹⁵ Specifically, it was the more significant Turkish victories or the threats of imminent Turkish wars that gave inspiration to the humanists. In 1541, when the Ottoman army captured Buda and Charles V's fleet suffered a humiliating defeat at Algiers, there was a staggering abundance of such works. In June, Franjo Frankapan (Ferenc Frangepán or Franciscus de Frangepanibus), bishop of Eger, delivered an inflammatory anti-Turkish speech at the imperial diet of Regensburg, which was so successful and timely that, in the same year, at least three Latin editions of it were printed, and it was published twice in German and once in Italian translation as well.¹⁶ The illustrious Italian humanist Jacopo Sadoletto published a homily in Paris on the occasion of the fall of Buda,¹⁷ the speech of the Pole Martinus Franconius saw the light of day in Krakow in the same year,¹⁸ while one of the most notable German humanists of the era, Joachim Camerarius, made his only anti-Turkish writing, entitled *Oratio senatoria*, available in February 1542.¹⁹ Publishers apparently welcomed the popular and saleable anti-Turkish works. Those who could not get their hands on new material, reprinted something older: Cuspinianus's speech, written after the battle of Mohács, appeared again in Antwerp in 1541, while from this period we know of at least three editions of Paolo Giovio's Ottoman-related *Commentario*, originally published in 1531. We can also add several of Luther's German-language sermons to this list.²⁰ In such an abundance of works, is there a special reason for singling out and thoroughly examining any of them? In the case of Andronicus, we have some reasons for suggesting that it is.

4. Argumentatio

The *Oratio ad Germanos* was published in Vienna on 1 December 1541, in the printing press of Ioannes Singrenius. The dedication to Cristoforo Madruzzo (1512–1578), bishop of Trent, was dated a few days earlier, 24 November. Bishop Madruzzo was a diplomat popular with Charles V and Ferdinand I, and represented the emperor at the imperial diet of Regensburg in 1541, where, besides the healing

¹⁵ The phenomenon has most probably something to do with the fact that, in 1529, even Erasmus published an oration entitled *De bello Turcis inferendo*.

¹⁶ Cf. Göllner, *op. cit.* (3), 323-325. It was extremely popular: not only was it reprinted in anthologies at the end of the 16th century, but even Albert Szenci Molnár decided to include it in his work entitled *Idea Christianorum* in 1616. For more details: Mihály Imre, »Szenci Molnár Albert 'Idea Christianorum'-a«, Béla Várjas (ed.), *Irodalom és ideológia a 16-17. században*, Akadémiai, Budapest, 1987, 231-252.

¹⁷ *De regno Hungariae a Turcis oppresso et capto homilia*, 1541. App. 282.

¹⁸ Cf. Göllner, *op. cit.* (3), 323.

¹⁹ Joachim Camerarius, *Oratio senatoria de bello Turcico*, Egenolph, Francofurti, 1542.

²⁰ Cf. Göllner, *op. cit.* (3), 322-328.

of the Protestant schism, at the top of the agenda was support for the anti-Ottoman fight. By the time the speech was published, the imperial diet had long been dissolved, but recently unearthed archival sources suggest that the work had been completed long before it was put into print at the end of 1541.

On 16 January 1541, Franjo Frankapan, archbishop of Kalocsa and bishop of Eger, penned a letter to Ferdinand, recommending Tranquillus Andronicus, whom he had known well from the court of Szapolyai (**Appendix 1**). Frankapan asked the ruler to bestow a benefice on the Dalmatian humanist. On the previous day, also from Vienna, Andronicus sent his plea directly to the king, asking to be granted a recently vacated deanery in Transylvania.²¹ Frankapan's letter provided support for that request. At the same time, Frankapan informed the ruler that Andronicus had written a speech that was perfectly suitable for the upcoming imperial diet in Regensburg. The archbishop had read the work and encouraged the ruler to get acquainted with it; if he deemed it useful, he might like to make sure that it would be read aloud at the imperial diet.²²

It seems that Frankapan did not enclose the speech with the letter. This is suggested by Ferdinand's reply, written five days later (**Appendix 2**). The king assured Frankapan that he was inclined to take care of Andronicus by granting him a proper benefice if an opportunity presented itself, partly because of the archbishop's recommendation, partly of his own will as he was also aware of how useful Andronicus' services were. And he would be happy to read the speech if Andronicus sent it.²³ It seems that Andronicus ended up like the fabled king: he both got a present and did not get one. Though the ruler acknowledged that the Dalmatian might be useful, he obviously did not seriously consider granting him the Transylvanian benefice, and he only made a vague promise for the future. We do not know what was decided about the speech. We can be almost certain

²¹ Cf. Vince Bunyita – Rajmund Rapai cs – János Karácsonyi (eds.), *Egyháztörténeti emlékek* II, Szent István Társulat, Budapest, 1902, 521-522. The original of the letter: ÖStA, HHStA, UA, Fasc. 45. Konv A, fol. 35.

²² »Is praeterea orationem quandam composuit opportunam admodum in rebus Ratisbonae pertractandis, quam mihi ostendit. Volui hoc Maiestati Vestrae Sacrae significare, ut eandem orationem Maiestas Vestra Sacra vel sola videat, vel videri iubeat, et si eam commodam et opportunam rebus suis iudicaverit, non dedignetur uti opera Tranquilli in ea recitanda in publico conventu, si eam negotiis suis conducere Maiestas Vestra Sacra consuevit.« Cf. ÖStA, HHStA, UA, Fasc. 45. Konv A, fol. 36.

²³ »Ad prospiciendum egregii Tranquilli Andronici secretarii nostri fortunis ita, ut gratularum servitorum suorum nos non immemores esse aliquando sentiat, non solum devotionis tuae commendatione, verum etiam nostra sponte admodum benigne propensi sumus. Facile enim agnoscimus ipsius operam industriamque nobis, ut antea fuit, sic etiam imposterum usui esse posse. Quare de sustinendo eo interim rationem inire curabimus, quoad oportuna aliqua oblata occasione rebus suis augendis eo modo, quo ipse optat, providere possimus. Quam vero ad orationem ab eo compositam attinet, si illa vel per eum, vel eius nomine nobis offeretur, libenter ipsam videbimus.« Cf. ÖStA, HHStA, UA, Fasc. 45. Konv A, fol. 44.

that Andronicus or Frankapan did not fail to send it to the ruler, but there is no information on whether it was read out in Regensburg. What we do know is that Frankapan himself delivered an oration at the diet, which proved to be very successful, as mentioned above.

The fact that Andronicus' speech was dedicated to a Habsburg diplomat, rather than to the ruler, makes it probable that Ferdinand did not fully endorse the work or provide financial support for its publication. In any event, the exchange of letters between Frankapan and Ferdinand proves that, though Andronicus' speech was published in November 1541, a version of it must already have been completed by January of that year. This is what makes Andronicus' third anti-Turkish speech special and opens a number of questions. Should we claim that Andronicus, who had not written any anti-Turkish text for more than 20 years, conceived his oration of 1541 as a ticket into the Habsburg court? If Franjo Frankapan, who himself delivered an anti-Turkish speech in June 1541, had known Andronicus' work in January, can we find any demonstrable connection between the two texts? Last but not least, how timely, how up to date did Andronicus want to be? In other words, did he intend to rewrite or, rather, to refine his text in the light of the changes that happened during the year 1541?

Let us examine these questions one by one. Regarding the personal objectives of the speech, we would claim that the answer is yes: Andronicus did intend the speech as a kind of penance. It is true that he did not dedicate it to Ferdinand (and probably he would not have been allowed to), but the title page still makes mention of the Habsburg brothers. After the title, there comes a two-line epigrammatic motto:

Orbi iura dabunt gemini duo sydera fratres
Alter ab Eois, alter ab Hesperiiis

Though the dedication is addressed to Cardinal Madruzzo, the epigram makes it clear that the text is under the auspices of the twin stars governing the world from the East and the West. The main body of the text treats Ferdinand even more favourably, at times to the detriment of Charles. Andronicus says that the Hungarians could find just one suitable ruler among all the Christian princes, and that it was Ferdinand, the Roman king of immovable spirit, who was courageously fighting against the barbarians, though in an unequal war, to defend Christianity.²⁴

As to the connection with Frankapan's speech, there are some common motifs, but the two texts turn out to be dissimilar. Their length differs significantly: while Frankapan's work comprises eleven pages, that of the Dalmatian humanist is forty seven pages long, including a much more detailed argumentation. The

²⁴ »Unum dumtaxat inter Christianos principes senserunt [...] invicti sane animi Ferdinandum principem, regem Romanorum cum barbaris pro religione fortissime depugnantem, qui conatibus hostium obviam eundo, dum impar cum potentissimo adversario congregitur, vehementer suas opes afflixit.« Tranquillus A n d r o n i c u s, *op. cit.* (14), fol. F.

difference may be explained by the fact that Frankapan actually delivered his speech, while that of Andronicus was written for reading. It should not be surprising that both orations describe the sufferings of the Christians under Turkish rule in a similar manner, as the genre has a lot of obligatory commonplaces. However, at one point Frankapan warns the German estates that, if they do not act quickly to help the Hungarians, it may happen that the nation will go over to the Turkish side, which could have terrible consequences: because the Germans had previously only barely managed to overcome the Hungarians themselves, and should the latter now join forces with the Ottomans, it could be a disastrous blow.²⁵ The same argument is elaborated in Andronicus' text: if the Germans let the Hungarians down, the country will fall under Turkish rule, and the desperate Hungarians will turn their weapons against the Germans. These are the same Hungarians whose arms were once dreaded throughout Italy and Germany. And if they side with the Turks now, no one knows if they can be stopped, as it was difficult to hold back the Hungarians even when they were alone.²⁶ This is an argumentation typical of the Szapolyai court. It is possible that it was Frankapan who borrowed this motif from Andronicus, and not the other way round, given the fact that the bishop of Eger could already have read it in January 1541, in the text written by his Dalmatian friend.

Finally, let us have a look at the question of timeliness. Though it follows from the nature of the genre that speeches of this kind often use clichés, they are more like scholarly works in which the author had the opportunity to show off both his rhetorical skills and erudition. However, in the case of Andronicus it is possible to examine if the text reflects a real and significant historical event. We have only the printed version, so we cannot tell what the manuscript version completed by January 1541 actually contained, but we do know *what it did not*. It could not have included references to the most decisive events of 1541, the crushing defeat of the German army which had laid an unsuccessful siege to the castle and the capture of Buda by the Turks. But, by the time the speech reached the printing press, Buda was already under Suleiman's control. Any references to this fact in the text must indicate that Andronicus rewrote and adapted it to the new developments.

For several pages, it seems that Andronicus talks only about generalities. He keeps repeating clichés concerning the cruelty and perfidy of the Turks and enumerating Greco-Roman examples of fearless resistance and harmful cowardice. When the reader is on the verge of giving up hope that the text will ever surpass

²⁵ »Quod si nunc Turcarum vires vobis formidandae videntur, cavete, ne Hungarica milicia illis adiungatur, quae sola temporibus patrum nostrorum et Thurcae et aliis nationibus formidabilis fuit.« Franciscus de Frangepanis, *Oratio... ad Caesarem, electores et principes Germaniae*, Augsburg, Steyner, 1541, Fol. A ii.

²⁶ »[...] illi Hungari [...] quorum armis Italia Germanique olim quassata est, si barbarorum imperio adiciuntur, nescio quo pacto utrosque sustinebimus, cum solos Hungaros non sustineremus.« Tranquillus Andronicus, *op. cit.* (14), fol. G.

the clichés, all of a sudden the name of Buda pops up. Andronicus emphasizes the fatal wound and blow that has just been received with the fall of Buda.²⁷ He adds that the capture of Buda is the culmination of the nearly 20-year-long war the divided Hungarians had fought against the Ottomans since the death of King Louis, the war in which the Turks launched four campaigns against the country, all led by the Sultan in person.²⁸ These elements must have been added to the text later, after the events of the summer of 1541.

Nonetheless, the main objective of the speech must have remained the same even after this change. In January 1541, its goal must have been to persuade the German estates to provide military support. In December 1541, it still had the same purpose, though that time it aimed to win the estates over to another campaign, the great imperial expedition that was ultimately launched in 1542. The huge imperial army led by Joachim of Brandenburg set out to recapture Buda, and Andronicus could not yet have known that the immense and powerful forces were to be defeated at Pest. Published at the end of 1541, his speech was perfectly suited to encourage the German readers to support a spring campaign. As Andronicus put it, taking up arms against the Turks was important not only in order to repel future attacks against Germany, but because the Ottomans would strengthen the fortifications of Buda, and from that city, as if from a Trojan horse, start making devastating raids into the Empire.²⁹ Then it would be too late to think about recapturing the city. So the Germans needed to decide where they wanted to wage a war next spring: on Turkish territory in an offensive war, or on their own land defending themselves.³⁰ It is possible that the spring campaign was already included in the original variant, but in that case it must have referred to a potential campaign in 1541. After the fall of Buda, the original idea got a new meaning. Though the original text was most probably written for the Diet of Regensburg (1541) in order to influence the estates attending the assembly, however, rounded off with the above-mentioned minor but important additions, it became suitable for use at the next imperial diet to be held in Speyer in February 1542 to encourage the German princes to support the new campaign aiming for the recapture of Buda.

²⁷ »Nequeo, viri Germani, sine maximo meo scelere praetermittere [...] gravissimam calamitatem et lethaleque vulnus, quod recens accepimus in amissione Budae.« Tranquillus A n d r o n i c u s, *op. cit.*, fol. E vi.

²⁸ »[...] quattuor maximis hostium expeditionibus, praesente semper Thurcorum imperatore.« Tranquillus A n d r o n i c u s, *op. cit.*, fol. E vi.

²⁹ »[...] interim vero per quietem Buda munitur, unde Thurci tamquam de equo Troiano praedabundi decurrant in circumiectas partes.« Tranquillus A n d r o n i c u s, *op. cit.*, fol. F ii.

³⁰ »[...] statuatis, utrum ineunte vere in Thurcia geratur bellum, an in Germania.« Tranquillus A n d r o n i c u s, *op. cit.*, fol. G.

5. Peroratio

Andronicus' speech was a precursor of a series of anti-Turkish texts almost mass-produced by humanists between 1541 and 1544. It was in 1543 that Johannes Lang's elegy (*De bello Turcae decernendo elegia*) and Marszewszki's oration to the Polish nobility (*Ad equites Polonos de bello Turcis inferendo*) were published, the latter by Viator in Krakow.³¹ In the same city the anthology *Pannoniae luctus*,³² born out of an unprecedented cooperation between Central European Neo-Latin poets, was also printed. Even though the anthology contained mostly epigrams mourning Louis II and others who had died in the battle of Mohács almost twenty years before, it was still relevant, thanks to the ongoing Ottoman war. The war was the subject of János Sylvester's anti-Turkish elegy written in 1544 as well.³³ The event reverberated even in distant Ragusa, where the Benedictine friar Mavro Vetranović composed a *tuzžba* on the occasion of the fall of Buda. It was not the humanists' fault that the Ottoman advance could not be halted after all: not only did Buda remain a Turkish stronghold but, with the fall of Székesfehérvár, Pécs and Esztergom, the central part of Hungary also fell under long-lasting Ottoman occupation. Andronicus did manage to win Ferdinand's trust, though to little avail. He never got a benefice in Transylvania. Instead, in 1542, it was him the ruler chose to send to Constantinople as his envoy to negotiate with the Turks about the cession of Hungary. The mission could not be successful but Andronicus could at least comfort himself with what he had written in his 1541 speech: »Even if my efforts yield no results I am still pleased to know that I could ease my conscience with my proposals, which, I believe, are beneficial and useful to the whole of Christendom.«³⁴

³¹ Cf. József Waldapfel, »Magyarország sorsának XVI. századi lengyel visszhangjához. Bielecki Joachim epicediuma Balassi apjának halálára«, *Egyetemes Philológiai Közlöny* 64 (1940), 197-201.

³² For an analysis with a novel approach, see: Bálint Lakatos, »Pannoniae Luctus – Egy humanista antológia és a törökellenes Habsburg-lengyel összefogás kísérlete, 1544«, *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 112 (2008), 259-286.

³³ Cf. Klaniczay, *op. cit.* (1), 344-358.

³⁴ »Quod si etiam studia mea nulli fructus sequerentur, tamen abunde me iuvabit conscientiam exonerasse propositis iis, quae salubria atque utilia esse universae Christianitatis censeo«. Tranquillus Andronicus, *op. cit.*, fol. A vi.

Appendix 1.

Franciscus de Frangepanibus to Ferdinand I King of Hungary

Vienna, 16. January 1541

Manuscript: ÖStA, HHStA, Ung. Akt. Fasc. 45. Konv. A, fol. 36

Sacratissime Rex et Domine, Domine semper colendissime. Post devotionum, orationum et fidelium servitiorum commendationem.

Scit Maiestas Vestra Sacratissima me de rebus Tranquilli cum eadem aliquoties egisse, qui iudicio meo potest Maiestati Vestrae Sacrae in multis servire. Is tali provisione indigeret, qua commode et praeter molestiam Maiestatis Vestrae Sacrae eidem in rebus suis parere posset. Quare supplico Maiestati Vestrae Sacrae, ut pro clementia sua aliquo modo ei providere dignetur.

Is praeterea orationem quandam composuit oportunam admodum in rebus Ratisbonae pertractandis, quam mihi ostendit. Volui hoc Maiestati Vestrae Sacrae significare, ut eandem orationem Maiestas Vestra Sacra vel sola videat, vel videri iubeat, et si eam commodam et oportunam rebus suis iudicaverit, non dedignetur uti opera Tranquilli in ea recitanda in publico conventu, si eam negotiis suis conducere Maiestas Vestra Sacra consuevit. Quam Deus diu et pro nobis conservare dignetur.

Viennae, die 16 Ianuarii 1541

Eiusdem Maiestatis Vestrae

servitor humillimus et capellanus Agriensis sst.

Appendix 2.

Ferdinand I King of Hungary to Franciscus de Frangepanibus

Vienna, 21. January 1541

Manuscript: ÖStA, HHStA, Ung. Akt. Fasc. 45. Konv. A, fol. 44.

Reverendissime in Christo Pater, devote fidelis sincere nobis dilecte.

Ad prospiciendum egregii Tranquilli Andronici secretarii nostri fortunis ita, ut gratorum servitiorum suorum nos non immemores esse aliquando sentiat, non solum devotionis tuae commendatione, verum etiam nostra sponte admodum bene propensi sumus.

Facile enim agnoscimus ipsius operam industriamque nobis, ut antea fuit, sic etiam imposterum usui esse posse. Quare de sustinendo eo interim rationem inire curabimus, quoad oportuna aliqua oblata occasione rebus suis augendis eo modo, quo ipse optat, providere possimus.

Quam vero ad orationem ab eo compositam attinet, si illa vel per eum, vel eius nomine nobis offeretur, libenter ~~equidem oculis lectioneque nostra ipsam~~ videbimus.

Id, quod ad devotionis tuae litteras clementer rescribendum duximus.

Datum in nostra civitate Nova Austriae, die 21 Ianuarii 1541