

EUROPE UNDER ATTACK: SOME THOUGHTS
ON THE CONTINENTAL DIMENSION OF MARKO MARULIĆ'S
EPISTOLA AD ADRIANUM VI. PONTIFICEM MAXIMUM

Isabella Walser-Bürgler

UDK: 821.163.42-6.09Marulić, M
821.124(497.5)-6.09Marulić, M.
Original scientific paper

Isabella Walser-Bürgler
Ludwig Boltzmann Institute
for Neo-Latin Studies
Innsbruck
isabella.walser@neolatin.lbg.ac.at

Marko Marulić's *Epistola ad Adrianum VI. Pontificem Maximum*, published in April 1522, has been the subject of numerous examinations. Even though there is some disagreement on certain points (such as when exactly the letter was written and whether the newly elected pope, Adrian, served as the actual addressee), most scholars agree on its value as a document of the Ottoman threat to Christendom in the sixteenth century from the perspective of a renowned Croatian humanist. However, there is an additional layer, a continental dimension to the text that has, for the most part, been overlooked. This paper aims at providing the letter with a new reading in the light of this continental dimension and going beyond the existing interpretation frame by embedding Marulić's message into the context of the early modern conceptualization of Europe as an ideological entity. In doing so, Marulić's role as a 'Croatian patriot' will be as much revalued as the epistolary format of the text. Europeanization, cosmopolitanism, and public pamphleteering will be the key issues of the paper, offering fresh insights into the understanding of the *Epistola* and its author.

Keywords: Marko Marulić, discourse of Europe, *res publica Christiana*, pope Adrian VI, early modern pamphlet, *Epistola ad Adrianum VI*, Ottoman conflicts

1. Introduction: The Discourse of Europe in the Face of the Ottoman Advance

The early modern discourse of Europe, i.e. the both conscious and self-confident act of searching for the nature and identity of Europe as an ideological entity, was an ongoing process shaping the European political and cultural mindset from the beginning of the fifteenth to the end of the eighteenth century and the onset of nationalism. Due to the continental scope of this formation process, the discourse was to a large degree expressed in Latin. As the supra-national *lingua franca* of the Early Modern Period, which could reach all corners of the continent and which could be understood by people regardless of their respective national backgrounds, notions of Europeanness pervaded almost every existing genre of Neo-Latin literature. Looking at the tens of thousands of texts testifying to the vivid discussion of what Europe supposedly was, we can see today that early modern contemporaries knew many different concepts of Europe, which were sometimes overlapping, sometimes complementing, sometimes superseding each other. In any case, Europe was never just one instance and one instance only, but the continent became manifest in multifarious geographical, political, economic, historical, religious, ethnological, philosophical, and cultural figurations.¹

One of the most prominent concepts was that of Europe as the unity of Christendom (often referred to by Neo-Latin authors as the *res publica Christiana*). Apart from the European encounter with the native population in the Americas and Asia, this concept was formed to a large degree in a partly defensive and partly offensive confrontation with the Ottomans. Curiously enough, it has survived as a successful concept in the context of European integration until this very day: the way the EU's accession negotiations with Turkey are portrayed in the media all over the continent, the way in which European right-wing parties rally against Muslim immigrants, and the way in which the inclusion of the Christian inheritance in the preamble of the Lisbon Treaty roused European emotions is telling in this respect.² The reasons for the concept's success in the Early Modern Period are manifold, but particularly the long continuity of Christianity, along with the

¹ An overview of the early modern European integration in Neo-Latin literature is presented in Isabella Walser-Bürgler, *Europe and Europeanness in Early Modern Latin Literature. Fuitne Europa tunc unita?*, Brill, Leiden, 2021.

² Cf. Walser-Bürgler, *op. cit.* (1), 38–39. For more details on the European interaction with Turkey, the dismissive attitude of nationalist parties, and the controversy surrounding a Christian declaration in the Lisbon Treaty, see respectively Michael Wintle, "Islam as Europe's 'Other' in the Long Term. Some Discontinuities", *History*, 101 (2016), 42–61; Isabella Walser-Bürgler, "Continuities of Historical Crises and Discourses of Europe from the 'Neo-Latin Past' to the 21st Century", *International Relations and Diplomacy*, 7 (2019), 549–563, at 553–554; Sergei A. Mudrov, "Religion in the Treaty of Lisbon. Aspects and Evaluation", *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 31 (2016), 1–16.

ancient Greek and Roman topos of the civilized west fighting the barbarian east, certainly played a major part.

The concept of Europe as a Christian entity reached its first climax in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, in the course of which, after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the Ottomans steadily made their way into Europe. The conquest of Athens (1459), the second and the third Venetian-Ottoman war (1463–1479 and 1499–1503), the conquest of Otranto (1480), Belgrade (1521), and Rhodes (1522), the victory at Mohács (1526), the siege of Vienna (1529), the capture of Buda (1541) and Cyprus (1570), the Austrian-Ottoman war (1526–1555), and the Ottoman-Portuguese conflicts (1538–1559) led to a hitherto unseen wave of solidarization among the Europeans. This solidarization brought with it such a profound reappraisal of European values that the Ottoman wars can actually be considered one of the main catalysts for the contemporary Europe discourse.³ The common Ottoman enemy and the common experience of being at the Ottomans' mercy influenced the perception of Europe on a truly continental scale pretty much everywhere on the continent. Even though there was still plenty of disagreement about Europe as a Christian unit – with Christians living also outside Europe, Muslims inhabiting certain parts of Europe like Andalusia, Southern Italy, and Bosnia, Jews settling in the Polish-Lithuanian region, and the confessional rift splitting Catholics, Protestants, and Orthodox Christians apart – the Muslim threat coming from the east suddenly made it all too clear what the shared frame of reference needed to be: Christianity. And if Europe was the habitat of Christians, then everything that was non-Christian could not have been Europe, thus the simple but insistent assumption ran.⁴ Religion turned into the most compelling argument to form a collective sense of belonging among the continentals, uniting Catholics, Protestants, and Orthodox Christians in the battle against the joint Muslim enemy despite the otherwise remaining irreconcilable rift. As Pärtel Piirimäe pointedly phrases: “No matter how serious the divisions within Christendom, the antagonism

³ Nicolas Detering, *Krise und Kontinent. Die Entstehung der deutschen Europa-Literatur in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Böhlau, Cologne, 2017, 63. See also James Hankins, “Renaissance Crusaders. Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 49 (1995), 111–207.

⁴ Olaf Asbach, *Europa. Vom Mythos zur Imagined Community? Zur historischen Semantik 'Europas' von der Antike bis ins 17. Jahrhundert*, Wehrhahn, Hannover, 107. None other than Enea Silvio Piccolomini had popularized the weighty equation of the *res publica Christiana* with Europe as the homeland of the Christians in his famous speech *Constantinopolitana clades*, held at the Diet of Frankfurt in 1454 on behalf of Christianity: “[...] nunc vero in Europa, id est in patria, in domo propria, in sede nostra percussi cesique sumus.” – “[...] but now we are executed and slaughtered in Europe, that is, in our homeland, in our own house, in our abode.” The speech is edited by Johannes Helmrath in vol. 19.2 of *Deutsche Reichstagsakten unter Kaiser Friedrich III.: Reichsversammlung zu Frankfurt 1454*, Oldenbourg, Munich, 2013, 463–565 (the quotation is found at 495–496).

to the Turks was even stronger.”⁵ Never at any point in time was Europe more readily united than in the face of the commonly hated ‘other’ that posed a threat to all nations alike. The demarcation from the enemy created a joint European identity *ex negativo*, while xenostereotypes equally gave rise to autostereotypes.⁶

One of the many Neo-Latin texts perfectly reflecting these points is Marko Marulić’s *Epistola ad Adrianum VI. Pontificem Maximum*. As yet, the text still awaits a proper integration into the contemporary Europe discourse.⁷ The fact that it does so, despite decades of research into its literary properties, is owing to three major factors. First, together with his Croatian anti-Turkish poems *Prayer against the Turks (Molitva suprotiva Turkom)* and *Lament by the City of Jerusalem (Tužen’je grada Hjeropolima)*, Marulić’s letter to the pope has been promoted since the 1960s as the beginning of Croatian patriotic literature. Marulić, for that matter, has been styled the symbol of Croatian resistance against the Turkish conquest,⁸ although his letter lacks any conclusively region- or culture-specific details that would deviate from the design and content of similar anti-Turkish texts written by other European humanists.⁹ Quite on the contrary, Marulić voices the same concerns and appeals as most of them, some of whose works have even been unambiguously situated within the Europe discourse (e.g. Piccolomini’s aforementioned *Constantinopolitana clades* [1454], Georg von Podiebrad’s peace treaty *Tractatus*

⁵ Pärtel Piirimäe, “Russia, the Turks and Europe. Legitimations of War and the Formation of European Identity in the Early Modern Period”, *Journal of Early Modern History*, 11 (2007), 63–86, at 75.

⁶ Bo Stråth, “Introduction. Europe as a Discourse”, *Europe and the Other and Europe as the Other*, ed. Bo Stråth, Lang, Brussels, 2000, 13–44, at 15.

⁷ Some first observations on the text reflecting central aspects of the early modern Europe discourse have been made in Walser-Bürgler, *op. cit.* (1), 50–54.

⁸ This is literally expressed in Mihovil Komboš, *Povijest hrvatske književnosti do narodnog preporoda*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, ²1961, 89. Cf. also Michael B. Petrovich, “Croatian Humanists and the Ottoman Peril”, *Balkan Studies*, 20 (1979), 257–273, at 270. Petrovich at least tries to eliminate the artificial dichotomy between Marulić’s Croatian patriotism and his humanist cosmopolitanism, but only succeeds partially.

⁹ Thus convincingly argues Davor Dukić in “Das Türkenbild in der kroatischen literarischen Kultur vom 15. bis zur Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts”, *Osmanen und Islam in Südosteuropa*, eds. Reinhard Lauer and Hans Georg Majer, de Gruyter, Berlin, 2013, 157–192, at 159. Even Marulić’s promise directed at the pope at the end of the letter that “the remaining Croatian cities, all the princes of Liburnia and the commanders of our [i.e. the Illyrian] fortresses” (p. 106: “Croatiae quae adhuc supersunt oppida Liburniaeque dynastae omnes arciumque praefecti”) will glorify his name if he supports the war against the Ottomans, is tied to a general look at the pope’s leadership of “all Christians” (ibid.: “omnium Christianorum”). The regional aspect is immediately placed within the general European context. The Latin text and English translation of the *Epist. ad Adr.* cited here and in the following are taken from *The Marulić Reader*, ed. Bratislav Lučin, Književni krug, Split, 2007, 90–109.

pacis toti christianitati fiendae [1464], or Juan Luis Vives' dialogue *De Europae dissidiis et bello turcico* [1526]).¹⁰ Second, the discourse of Europe in Neo-Latin literature has only been recognized as a field worth of exploration for a couple of years (which is basically nothing, speaking in broader research terms). Third, Marulić does not apply the term '*Europa*' or '*Europaei*' once. However, this does not mean that Europe could not be present as a concept in a text, or that a text could not have been relevant in the context of European integration. In fact, sometimes a text "might just as well be more sophisticated without necessarily being couched in the language of Europeanness".¹¹ Europe does not always have to be mentioned, but it can simply be perceived or described. In methodological terms, this discursive textual processing of Europe would denote the so-called 'realist' approach (in contrast to the 'nominalist approach', which, in turn, is based on texts bearing the terms 'Europe' or 'European' in their title or argument).¹²

What this study aims to do is to raise awareness of Marulić's *Epist. ad Adr.* being not only an anti-Turkish and pro-Christian, but a decisively pro-European text. In other words, the argument will consist in slightly switching the known perspective and acknowledging that the Ottoman menace really just constitutes the thematic anchor of the text, while the actual topic is the discussion of European unity (or lack thereof). That a reader might get more out of the letter when not exclusively understanding it as a document belonging to the *antiturcica* genre was already cautiously stated by Franz Posset a few years ago, even if he himself did not venture further into this direction.¹³ It will be on us now to follow the path proposed and unveil Marulić's idea of a coordinated continental undertaking to safeguard Europe's future (and not merely that of Croatia or an undefined assortment of neighboring Christian nations, as is often all too hastily assumed). To this end, we will see that Europe appears to be under attack in the letter in two respects: indeed, by the Ottomans, engulfing more and more parts of the continent, yet even more so by the author himself who bitinglly criticizes the European nations for

¹⁰ On this note, cf. also Franz Posset, "The Mouse, the Frog, and the Unidentified Flying Object. Metaphors for 'Empires' in the Latin Works of the Croatian Humanist Marcus Marulus and of the German Humanist Ulrich von Hutten", *CM XVII* (2008), 125–146, at 145–146; Walser-Bürgler, *op. cit.* (1), 41–56.

¹¹ Niels Grüne and Stefan Ehrenpreis, "Liberty and Participation. Governance Ideals in the Self-Fashioning of Sixteenth- to Early-Eighteenth-Century Europe", *Contesting Europe. Comparative Perspectives on Early Modern Discourses on Europe, 1400–1800*, eds. Nicolas Detering, Clementina Marsico, and Isabella Walser-Bürgler, Brill, Leiden, 2019, 275–316, at 277.

¹² For more information on these two approaches, see Isabella Walser, "*Unitas multiplex*: John Barclay's Notion of Europe in His *Icon animorum* (1614)", *History of European Ideas*, 43 (2017), 533–546, at 534–535.

¹³ Franz Posset, "Open Letter of a Croatian Lay Theologian to a 'German' Pope. Marko Marulić to Adrian VI", *CM XVIII* (2009), 135–157, at 136.

their political incoherence. The question of genre will play an important role in our quest for the letter's topic of Europeanization as well. By again building upon some ideas first expressed (but not scrutinized in functional and formal terms) by Franz Posset,¹⁴ the *Epist. ad Adr.* will eventually be exposed as a pamphlet. After all, the pamphlet proved a useful means of communication in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe discourse – and not just the pamphlet in general, but, specifically, the pamphlet in the form of a letter.¹⁵

2. Addressing the Pope or Addressing Europe?

By starting the investigation with the question of genre, some light will be shed on the form which allows Marulić's Europe discourse, presented in the next chapter, to take shape. Also, the discussion of genre will yield some additional background information on the *Epist. ad Adr.* and what instigated the actual message Marulić sought to convey with it.

Living pretty much at the periphery of the western world bordering the Ottoman Empire, Marulić had been familiar with occasional Turkish raids into the surroundings of Split from early childhood on.¹⁶ The Ottoman incursions conducted in the 1460s, 1470s, and 1480s posed a particular threat to the communities on the Adriatic coast and the city of Split, leading to the gradual loss of territory and the social, economic, and cultural downturn of Marulić's homeland. The fall of Belgrade on 29 August 1521 most likely triggered the drafting of the *Epist. ad Adr.* – at least this is indicated by the fact that the fall of Belgrade marks the only mention of a concrete historical Ottoman assault in the text (p. 96): “[...] Belgradum, et natura loci et armorum ui munitum oppidum, quod olim proauus eius capere nequierat, ipse [i.e. Suleiman I] expugnauit.” – “[...] he [i.e. Suleiman I] conquered Belgrade, a city fortified by its location and by the force of arms, which his great-grandfather was once unable to conquer.” Mixed into this mention is the

¹⁴ Cf. Posset, *op. cit.* (13), 145–149.

¹⁵ See Johannes Schwitalla, *Flugschrift*, Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1999, at 43 and 73.

¹⁶ This part of Marulić's biography is richly commented upon in Ivan Slamnig, “Marko Marulić, Cosmopolitan and Patriot”, *Comparative Studies in Croatian Literature*, ed. Miroslav Beker, Zavod za znanost o književnosti, Zagreb, 1981, 81–94, at 81; Norman Housley, “Christendom's Bulwark. Croatian Identity and the Response to the Ottoman Advance, Fifteenth to Sixteenth Centuries”, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 24 (2014), 149–164, at 153–156; Franz Posset and Bratislav Lučin, “Marcus Marulus”, *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History. Vol. 7: Central and Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America (1500–1600)*, eds. Thomas David and John Chesworth, Brill, Leiden, 2015, 90–125, at 91; Ivan C. Kraljić, “‘Nous sommes morts de peur.’ Considérations pathémiques sur les opuscules antitures de Marko Marulić de Split”, *Renaissance and Reformation*, 42 (2019), 105–140, at 107.

sense of the catastrophe that the fall of Belgrade symbolized for eastern and western Europeans alike, given that Belgrade, having repelled Mehmed II in 1456, had turned into the epitome of Christian resistance all over the continent.¹⁷

Despite the immediate trigger of Belgrade's fall, the *Epist. ad Adr.* was not the first piece in which Marulić devoted himself to calling against the Ottoman danger. In fact, the letter was one of the final works he finished before his death in 1524.¹⁸ Anti-Turkish attitudes pervade Marulić's entire oeuvre, which is why people are usually so inclined to see only the anti-Turkish (yet not the pro-European) element in his texts. Nevertheless, at a closer look, the European perspective is nearly always present as well, also in his three big masterpieces which received the greatest reception in international terms: the Croatian epic *Judita* (*Judith*; publ. 1521) and the two didactic-moral pieces, *Evangelistarium* (*The Evangelistary*; publ. 1516) and *De institutione bene vivendi per exempla sanctorum* (*Instruction on How to Lead a Virtuous Life Based on the Examples of the Saints*; 1507).¹⁹ Marulić was a cosmopolitan par excellence, whose supranational values are reflected wherever he sought military and political resistance against the Ottomans, or wherever he called for moral renewal following the triumph over the enemy's incessant attacks.²⁰

One of the most popular ways for humanists to process the Ottoman advance from a Christian and/or European stance during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was to devise Latin orations and letters of a strongly exhortative character and to address those to contemporary potentates of the Christian world, most prominently the pope, the German emperor, the Hungarian king, the Polish king, or the Venetian doge.²¹ Examples of these texts abound; ranking among the better

¹⁷ Housley, *op. cit.* (16), 151.

¹⁸ Posset, *op. cit.* (13), 135.

¹⁹ Cf. Charles Béné, "Marc Marule de Split, un humaniste exemplaire", *Bulletin de l'Association d'étude sur l'humanisme, la réforme et la renaissance*, 60 (2005), 51–56, at 51.

²⁰ Bratislav Lučin, "Marko Marulić. Kroatischer Dichter und europäischer Humanist", *CM XVIII* (2009), 349–355, at 351. Needless to say, Marulić was a polymath whose universalist approach to knowledge and his international network additionally make him a relevant object of interest among scholars of European (intellectual) history. For some general information on the Europe-wide spread and reception of Marulić's works, see Charles Béné, *Études maruliennes. Le rayonnement européen de Marc Marule de Split*, Erasmus naklada, Zagreb, 1998.

²¹ Dukić, *op. cit.* (9), 158. Pope Adrian VI, to whom also Marulić turned, served as a conspicuously frequent addressee. This was probably due to him not only being the pope, but also a renowned humanist himself, as well as a close confidant of Emperor Charles V. Some lesser-known texts addressed to him are discussed and edited in Isabella Walser, "Lorenzo Campeggis *Promemoria ad Hadrianum Papam VI. de depravato statu Romanae Ecclesiae* (1522) im religions-, gattungs- und literaturgeschichtlichen Kontext", *Zeitschrift*

known ones are Enea Silvio Piccolomini's four speeches given at the German Diets of Regensburg (16 May 1454), Frankfurt (15 October 1454; that is the famous speech entitled *Constantinopolitana clades*), and Wiener Neustadt (one speech held on 25 February, another on 23 March 1455), Matthias Corvinus' letter to Pope Paul II (*Mathiae Corvini Hungariae regis epistolae* 1891, no. 41, dated 2 October 1465), Bernard Zane's oration before the Lateran Council in Rome in 1512, and Juan Luis Vives' letter *De Europae statu ac tumultibus* (1522) addressed to Pope Adrian VI. Yet what distinguishes Piccolomini's, Zane's, and Corvinus's texts from those of Vives and Marulić is that they were personally directed at (Piccolomini, Zane) or sent to (Corvinus) their respective addressees. In other words: the addressees functioned as immediate and traceable recipients. Vives' and Marulić's writings, on the other hand, are specifically addressed to the pope, but there is no definite evidence of dispatch.²² Consequently, these texts must, from the moment of design, have been aimed at a broader public and intended for publication. Marulić, to return to the author of interest here, enjoyed a Europe-wide reputation as an author among personalities as influential as the English king, Henry VIII, the Portuguese king, Manuel II, scholars like Thomas More and Sebastian Münster,

für *Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*, 67 (2015), 142–166; Paola de Capua, *Eleggere il pontefice Adriano VI tra politica e retorica*, Centro Internazionale di Studi Umanistici, Messina, 2020.

²² All we have are slight hints at the possibility that the diplomat Thomas Niger, who had incited Marulić to devise the *Epist. ad Adr.* and who had overseen the printing in Rome, actually delivered the letter upon its publication to Adrian, who was still dwelling in Spain at the time: Cf. Marino Sanuto, *Diarii, vol. XXXIII (I Marzo MDXXII – XXVIII Febraio MDXXIII)*, Forni, Bologna, 1892, col. 411: “A dì 12. [August 1522] La matina vene in Colegio lo episcopo di Scardona domino Thomaso Negro dalmatino, come orator del Papa novo a tutti li potentati del mondo christiano destinato, et ha letere di credenza universal. Disse come questo Zugno fo in Spagna dal Papa, al qual expose li eminenti pericoli turcheschi a ruina di la christianità. Unde comosse molto Soa Santità, prometendo quando el sarà a Roma farà ogni cossa. In questo mezzo l' ha fatto suo orator a tutti li principi et Signorie Christiane, exortandoli aiutar il re di Hongaria contro turchi etc.” But even if we assume that by mentioning Niger's exposition of imminent Turkish dangers Sanuto perhaps refers to the letter devised by Marulić, this does not mean that Adrian reacted to it (cf. Posset, *op. cit.* [13], 17). The fact that Adrian, among others, broached the issue of Christian disunity on the continent in his first speech before the consistory in September 1522 and brought up the issue in a letter to Emperor Charles V a few weeks later (cf. Posset and Lučin, *op. cit.* [16], 119) might have been pure coincidence. After all, this issue did not constitute a revelation to any reasonable political mind, and it was certainly no secret that Christianity was in severe danger regarding the Ottoman threat. For a potential response letter Adrian might have sent to Marulić, see: Branko Jozić, “Nepoznato pismo pape Hadrijana VI. Marku Maruliću (An Unknown Letter of Pope Adrian VI to Marko Marulić)”, *CM XXV* (2016), 149–156.

and a fair number of clerics from different religious orders.²³ It is anything but unlikely, therefore, that he deliberately turned this wide-ranging impact to account when it came to the dissemination of his continental message.

There are a couple of clues indicating that the *Epist. ad Adr.* was rather meant as a public provocation directed at the major powers of Europe than a private plea for crusade directed at the pope alone. First of all, as Franz Posset has rightly observed, the dating, publication, and addressing of the letter involve some conspicuous ambiguities:²⁴ From the accompanying letter to Friar Dominik Buća we learn that the letter must have been written (viz. finished) on 3 April 1522 (p. 92); the colophon in the *editio princeps* refers to 30 April as the date of publication. Yet in April, Adrian was still on his way from Spain to Rome, where he would only arrive at the end of August, before being officially installed as pope in September. Furthermore, in the *editio princeps* Marulić avoids any form of personalization, including the papal name Adrian VI. The reason for this was that he could not have known about Adrian's choice when submitting the letter to print, as the new pope only chose his official name in September. It is merely in the last paragraph that Marulić addresses the pope elect by his baptismal name *Adrianus* (p. 106),²⁵ yet all the while in perfect ignorance about the fact that Adrian would keep his baptismal name as his papal name.

The second aspect implying a public readership pertains to several missing links in the text. Given that Adrian had served as tutor and advisor of Emperor Charles V – in 1522 undoubtedly the most powerful (Christian) ruler on the continent – it is astounding that Marulić does not even once mention Adrian's influence on the emperor's policies.²⁶ After all, if the Christian powers were to be united against the joint Ottoman enemy, surely the emperor would have played a major part in Europe's crusading mission, especially since the collective commitment of the confessionally divided German estates would have been crucial to the mission's successful outcome.²⁷ Likewise, Marulić foregoes any organizational

²³ Cf. Lučin, *op. cit.* (21), 354.

²⁴ The issues are raised in Posset, *op. cit.* (13), 136, and treated *passim*. However, Posset does not consider a general broad European readership as is suggested in the present article, but concludes that Marulić's letter was aimed at any pope at the head of Christianity, whoever that might have been at the time the letter was devised.

²⁵ Even this was, according to Posset (*op. cit.* [13], 138), nothing but a "last minute insert".

²⁶ Posset, *op. cit.* (13), 143–144.

²⁷ Throughout Charles' reign the estates expressed their willingness to support the emperor in his crusading mission only in exchange for an imperial reform that would guarantee them confessional and political autonomy. Cf. Heribert Müller, "Europa, das Reich und die Osmanen. Die Türkenreichstage von 1454/55 nach dem Fall von Konstantinopel, oder: Eine Hinführung zu Großem und Kleinem im Spiegel der *Deutschen Reichstagsakten*", *Europa, das Reich und die Osmanen. Die Türkenreichstage von 1454/55 nach dem*

(i.e. logistical and financial) details concerning the European crusade, of which one would assume they constitute a crucial component in a personal correspondence with the pope about an envisioned political undertaking.²⁸ Instead, he merely begs Adrian in the most vague manner to “[a]ssist with arms, money and all the other necessities” (p. 106: “armis, pecunia, rebus necessariis iuuare”). The grievances and abuses of the Roman Church remain equally unrecognized by the author, which otherwise marked a frequent theme in contemporary exhortative letters to pope Adrian as problems to solve if the Christians were to succeed in a joint venture against the Ottomans.²⁹

The language, structure, and polemical attitude of the *Epist. ad Adr.* make a final argument in terms of its intended audience. The bluntness with which Marulić expresses his condemnation of the internal disputes among the Christians in Europe, accusing them of downright stupidity and shaming them to the point of being insulting, clearly are far from being appropriate in tone and choice of vocabulary if the pope was the actual (and sole) addressee of the text. Moreover, in the course of this polemic it is often not even the pope himself but the European leaders and public who are addressed (e.g. p. 100: “Resipiscite tandem, resipiscite insipientes!” – “Come to your senses at long last, come to your senses, you lunatics!”; “Desinite iam tandem, Christiani, aduersus Christianos bella gerere!” – “Christians, stop fighting your fellow Christians!”). The structure also hints at a potentially more diverse readership as it involves different topics aimed at getting different readers hooked. Passages of amicability (the letter to Dominik Buća and the beginning of the letter to the pope; pp. 90–92) alternate with passages of historical description (the Ottoman advance and menace; pp. 92–96), political consultation (the current behavior of the individual European nations; pp. 96–102), epideictic moralizing (why and how to reconcile the warring European parties; pp. 102–106), and, finally, spiritual supplication (the prayer for Adrian; p. 108). The framing of the actual epistle through the preceding letter to Dominik Buća and the succeeding prayer for Adrian adds an additional layer of Christian interrelatedness to the text on the formal level that would not have been necessary as such if the pope were the sole correspondent in need only of a clear-cut message within a neat sender-addressee-frame. This also holds true for the rhetorical properties of the text which seem to have been chosen for reasons of emotionalization and – eventually – broad-scale mobilization. This particularly

Fall von Konstantinopel, eds. Marika Bacsóka, Anna-Maria Blank, and Thomas Woelki, Klostermann, Frankfurt a. M., 2014, 9–29, at 12–13.

²⁸ Cf. Ruggero Cattaneo, “L’epistola a papa Adriano VI di Marco Marulić in Italiano. Versione e nota traduttologica”, *CM XXII* (2013), 145–149, at 149.

²⁹ Lorenzo Campeggi’s *Promemoria ad Hadrianum Papam VI. de depravato statu Romanae Ecclesiae* serves as a paradigmatic text in this regard (cf. Walser, *op. cit.* [22]).

pertains to the long-winded description of the Turks and their crimes.³⁰ Vigorously following specific stereotypical patterns, Marulić proves the “urgency of the situation” (p. 90: “[r]erum necessitas”) by outlining the harsh reality of his very own personal everyday experience (p. 92–96):

Mala quae nos premunt haec sunt: Quotidianis infidelium Turcarum incur-
sionibus infestamur, sine intermissione carpimur; alii trucidantur, alii in
captiuitatem abeunt; res diripiuntur, pecus abducitur, uillae uicique igni com-
buruntur; agri, quibus cultis uitam sustentabamus, partim uastantur, partim
sublatis cultoribus deserti obsitque spinis, non frugibus germinant; [...] Olim
fleuimus, olim lamentis lachrymisque prosecuti sumus monasteria desolata,
uirgines constupratas, pueros baptismate sacro dudum purificatos deinde uero
Maumethanae perfidiae more circumcisos et ex fidelibus infideles factos. [...] Vix enim ullo die cessant immanes infidaeque bestiae quamcunque possunt
iniuriam Christi inferre cultoribus. Templata in quibus iugiter Deo sacrificaba-
tur stabula iumentorum fiunt; sanctorum corpora, quae fidelibus uenerationi
erant, infidelium pedibus conculcantur. Pictae ficteque beatorum imagines,
ipsius etiam Saluatoris nostri et Mariae uirginis, eius matris, aut dissipantur
aut in sterquilinum proiciuntur. Denique nihil praetermittere impii pium
putant quod religioni nostrae ludibrio fore arbitrantur.

The distress that has befallen us is this: the infidel Turks daily inflict suffering on us with their raids – they torment us incessantly; some [of us] are slain, others carried off into slavery; our farms are devastated, our cattle driven off; villages and hamlets are left in flames, and the fields, which we cultivated to gain our livelihood, are either ravaged or deprived of their labourers and overgrown, yielding thorns instead of wheat. [...] It is a long time since we began to lament and began to shed tears at the sight of our pillaged monasteries, the rape of our maidens, the circumcision, according to the custom of the Mohammedan heresy, of boys who had been purified by holy baptism and then turned into infidels. [...] Not a day passes without these terrible infidel beasts perpetrating all manner of violence against the followers of Christ. The temples in which worship used to take place have been turned into stables, the bodies of saints, once venerated by the congregation, are trampled underfoot by infidels. They wreck or throw on rubbish heaps pictures and statues of the saints, and even of our Saviour and the Virgin Mary, his mother. Finally, these infidels take it as their sacred duty not to leave out any act that they think will degrade our religion.

³⁰ Marulić’s fixation on the Ottoman evils is so insistent that Kraljić (*op. cit.* [16], 119) in this context even speaks of the “demonization” of the Ottoman enemy.

Following this rhetorically powerful and haunting depiction of the Christian suffering brought about by the Ottomans, Marulić goes on to compare the latter with the shattering power of elemental force, of water and fire (p. 98): a flood that could “spread and engulf the countries that remain” (“sese effundat et quod residuum est terrarum occupet”) and a fire that might “[burn] down everything” (“quaeque exhausit”). Unmercifully, yet concerning his mission effectively, he by turns dismisses the Ottomans as “perfidus” (p. 94: “vile”), “infideles” (ibid.: “infidels”), “immanes infidaeque bestiae” (ibid.: “terrible infidel beasts”), “prophanis” (p. 106: “heathens”), or “infideles lupos” (ibid.: “infidel wolves”).

Whether the pope would in a private letter actually need this sort of versatility in expression and depiction – even by the high rhetorical standards of humanist letters – can be disputed. In fact, it is more likely that Marulić put so much effort into arousing his reader’s emotions because he aimed his text not only at the leader of Christianity but at the entire Christian world, i.e. Europe with its Christian nations. The purpose was to mobilize the European audience to common action, whereby the pope merely functioned as the “spiritual leader”,³¹ representing the most fundamental value that kept the European world together: the Christian religion. Perhaps the address to the pope could even have been intended as a provocation directed only at the political leaders of Europe. After all, most of the time they were anything but happy about the interference of the Holy See in political matters.

This form of literary mobilization presented by Marulić was typical of one specific genre of early modern literature: the pamphlet. Pamphlets served as a targeted strategy to win the public’s attention, steer the information flow on current political affairs, influence the public opinion based on the assessment of these political affairs, and stimulate a particular reaction from the audience.³² Comfortably enough, the pamphlet could come dressed in a variety of formats, most notably the dialogue, the sermon, the collection of theses, the treaty, the testament, and – the letter.³³ The letter proved a particularly useful means for the humanist pamphleteering mission when trying to disseminate crucial deliberations on contemporary issues. Addressing a letter to a powerful person but publishing it in wide circulation, was considered an effective way of getting the public hooked. A letter attracted readership because it signalled intimacy where there was none

³¹ Posset, *op. cit.* (13), 141.

³² Daniel Bellingradt, *Flugpublizistik und Öffentlichkeit um 1700. Dynamiken, Akteure und Strukturen im urbanen Raum des Alten Reiches*, Steiner, Stuttgart, 2012, 17.

³³ For more details on these pamphleteering formats, see Johannes Schwitalla, *Deutsche Flugschriften 1460–1525. Textsortengeschichtliche Studien*, Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1983, 88–108. Cf. also Johannes Schwitalla, “Tendenzen der Textsortengeschichte der deutschen Flugschriften im ersten Viertel des 16. Jahrhunderts”, *Freiburger Universitätsblätter*, 21 (1982), 37–58.

and gave access to a suggestively exclusive communication with a high-ranking confidant. This, in turn, lent a letter's message significance and reach.

Marulić makes perfect use of these properties when applying a strong emotionalized rhetoric, accusing attitudes, and a plot merging observation and fact-gathering (the account of the Ottoman raids) with incitation for political transformation (the confrontation of the pope and the Christian leaders to come together against the Ottoman enemy).³⁴ As is typical of pamphlet literature, the scenography and agent structure Marulić creates through his rhetorically accomplished language are dominated by the categories of good versus evil. However, the author imposes this black-and-white scheme not only on the (obvious) dichotomy between Ottomans and Christians but also on the (paradoxical relationship of the) conflicting European parties. After all, the more sensational a pamphlet sounded, the more persuasive it turned out to be – and persuasiveness stood in the service of the pamphlet's central objective: to trigger action for a change of the social and political conditions.³⁵ Marulić's less factual than subjectively argumentative, exhortative, and deliberative speech renders him the advisor of the pope and the European public alike. By means of rhetorical questions and direct address in the second person (e.g. p. 100: "Quousque ratio uos fugiet, quousque perniciem uestram ignorabitis?" – "How long will you persist in your madness? How long will you close your eyes to the peril that threatens you?"), insertions of opinion (e.g. p. 96: "Actum est, mihi crede, de Re publica Christiana [...]." – "Believe me, the Christian community will be lost [...]"), and emphatic exclamations (e.g. p. 98: "proh nefas, proh facinus!" – "oh, infamous deed!") Marulić opens up a dialogic situation so persuasive that his appeal to action gives rise to an acute sense of the need for action on the readers' side. In a way, Marulić thus not only invites consent, but forces it.

The reason for Marulić opting for the pamphlet to accommodate his thoughts on the present and future state of Europe is understandable from a contemporary point of view. As research on the pamphlet in the sixteenth and seventeenth century in the German Empire has shown, the pamphlet was often used to negotiate Europe

³⁴ Walser-Bürgler, *op. cit.* (1), 51. Posset's reasoning that the *Epistola's* acidency might also be owed to the fact that it was designed as a pasquinade, with the Feast of Pasquino on 25 April surrounding the date of the text's publication, does not ring too convincing in light of this context (cf. Posset, *op. cit.* [13], 144).

³⁵ Apart from minor characteristics like the small extent, the sensational rhetoric, and the reference to current affairs – all of which the *Epist. ad Adr.* features – propagandistic opinion formation on behalf of the public interest is still classified as *the* standard definition of the pamphlet. Cf. Hans Köhler, "Die Flugschriften. Versuch der Präzisierung eines geläufigen Begriffes", *Festgabe für Ernst Walter Zeeden zum 60. Geburtstag*, eds. Horst Rabe, Hansgeorg Molitor, and Hans-Christoph Rublack, Aschendorff, Münster, 1976, 36–61; more recently, cf. Schwitalla, *op. cit.* (15), 1–2 and 7.

as a shared political space, reflecting on its problems and particularities.³⁶ Especially the issues surrounding the Ottoman threat and the various domestic moves towards national accomplishment – both a great danger to Europe as a whole – were to a large degree situated within the realm of pamphlet literature. After all, pamphlets were known for their speedy international reach (they were produced more cheaply and more quickly than most other prints) and served as the public medium number one before the traditional journals and newspapers came up in the second half of the seventeenth century. A discourse as broad as the discourse of Europe naturally tended towards the big international public the pamphlet could offer, as it addressed the biggest public imaginable at the time – Europe.

3. Marulić Goes Continental

Imagined communities are by nature difficult to specify. As Benedict Anderson emphasizes in his monumental study on the topic, even the terms ‘nation’, ‘nationality’, and ‘nationalism’ are hardly definable, although they pertain to a small territory of common interests.³⁷ However, the situation becomes yet more complicated when we turn to the vast continental space, where perceptions and notions might differ from nation to nation despite a common interest in the collective. The only way to grasp ideas of Europeanness is via its denominations, the categories of inclusion and/or exclusion applied, and the degree of continuity created between Europeans and their social environment. As in so many other texts from the early modern discourse of Europe, Europe in the case of Marulić’s *Epist. ad Adr.* turns into a so-called *Appellbegriff*. *Appellbegriffe* do not only denote a specific matter but postulate it by deriving from the employment of a term or concept the existence of the matter itself.³⁸ In terms of Europeanness, the concept of Europe is postulated as texts make Europe a subject of discussion regarding the future organization of reality. More precisely, by ascribing something common or unifying

³⁶ Cf. Georg Schmidt, “Das Reich und Europa in deutschsprachigen Flugschriften. Überlegungen zur rasonierenden Öffentlichkeit und politischen Kultur im 17. Jahrhundert”, *Europa im 17. Jahrhundert. Ein politischer Mythos und seine Bilder*, eds. Klaus Bußmann and Elke Anna Werner, Steiner, Wiesbaden, 2004, 119–148 (esp. at 140); Wolfgang Harms, “Europa in der deutschen Bildpublizistik der Frühen Neuzeit”, *Auf dem Weg nach Europa. Deutungen, Visionen, Wirklichkeiten*, eds. Irene Dingel and Matthias Schnettger, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 2010, 41–53; Isabella Walser-Bürgler, “The Perfect Match: Pamphleteering in Oratory. A Case Study from the Europe Discourse during the Thirty Years’ War”, *Antike und Abendland*, 67 (2021), 96–114.

³⁷ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso, London, 2006, 3.

³⁸ Paul Richard Blum, “Europa – ein Appellbegriff”, *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte*, 43 (2001), 149–171, at 149. One of the most cited examples of such an *Appellbegriff* is ‘God’.

to the continent as a whole, Europe is implicitly generated as a notion. If therefore an author like Marulić implores the Christian powers of Europe (and we know that Europe disposed of no real religious powers other than Christian), nothing else emerges than Europe in the postulated form of the *res publica Christiana*.³⁹ In order to construct Europe and bring to life European identity this way, Marulić employs some striking patterns that were popularly used to underpin the contemporary discourse of Europe. Three of them will be discussed in the following, thus showing that the *Epist. ad Adr.* indeed makes an affirmative continental contribution to the early modern Europe discourse beyond a mere anti-Turkish claim: the argument of culture, notions of continental geography, and – most importantly – the discourse of peace.

Highlighting the distinctness of European culture in contrast to the cultures prevailing elsewhere in the world was a typical trait of early modern Europeans trying to set themselves apart as a continental community. Literally ages before Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803) would come up with the idea of culture as the fabric of delineated societies, Europe had often been understood in a common cultural sense, according to which the individual European nations are tied by a joint bond, since the beginning of the fifteenth century.⁴⁰ Particularly in the context of the Ottoman threat, Europeans preferably invoked their common cultural heritage which was not shared by the Ottomans. Marulić fits in neatly with this tendency. He too makes culture a compelling argument against the Ottomans in his *Epist. ad Adr.*, by setting the western Latin culture in opposition to the eastern Arabian culture. This obviously includes the religious belief – for instance, when he applies the antithesis of ‘us’/‘the Christians’/‘the victims’ and ‘the infidels’/‘the Turks’/‘the perpetrators’ as early as in the introductory letter to Dominik Buča (p. 90) to establish it as a leitmotif popping up time and again subsequently (e.g. p. 92; p. 94).⁴¹ Apart from the Christian religion, however (which, as has been stressed many times, was perceived as a pan-European affair anyway), Marulić also expresses his conviction that the west and the east constitute two distinct parts of the world, separated by a distinct set of cultural properties. He plays upon this claim when condemning the recent ‘alliance’ between the Republic of Venice and

³⁹ Marulić even explicitly subsumes all European powers involved in the fight against the Ottoman enemy under the term “Res publica Christiana” (p. 96), thus equating Europe with Christianity. At other times, he also speaks of the similarly weighted “Christianorum regna” (e.g. p. 106) as a byword for Europe.

⁴⁰ Walser-Bürgler, *op. cit.* (1), 89–90. Various examples of this trend from the realms of Neo-Latin literature throughout the early modern centuries are presented at 89–102.

⁴¹ Walser-Bürgler, *op. cit.* (1), 51–52.

the Ottoman Empire by assuring that those who do not share the same cultural upbringing could never be true friends (p. 94):⁴²

Tunc autem et urbes ipsas perfidus ille procul dubio inuasurus est et dominis nostris Venetis, quibus nunc se amicum simulat, bellum aperte indicturus cum aliorum regna oppresserit. Quomodo enim ullius Christiani amicus esse potest qui Christo aduersatur, qui neque religione neque legibus neque moribus nobiscum conuenit? Profecto ubi tanta rerum dissimilitudo est, ibi nulla unquam intercedere amicitia potest nisi simulata.

However, that infidel who has conquered other kingdoms doubtlessly intends to attack the towns, too, and declare open war on our masters, the Venetians, whom they now call their friends. But how can one who opposes Christ be a friend to any Christian? One who differs from us in faith, in laws and in customs? Indeed, where there is such a difference in everything, no friendship can be established other than feigned friendship.

It is not difficult to grasp from this passage that Marulić does not simply refer to the Christian religion when setting the west apart from the Ottomans. By explicitly mentioning the “laws” and the “customs”, he opens up a universal European frame, by which the entire European way of life, i.e. the ancient heritage handed down from the Greeks and Romans, and the political and social system are entailed as well. As a native of Split, Marulić must have felt this cultural difference especially severely, since he dwelled at the interface of the Italian humanist tradition, on the one hand, and the Ottoman civilization, on the other. As Michael Petrovich aptly formulates: “the Croatian humanists of the 15th and 16th centuries were, of all Catholic and Protestant Europeans, the closest both to the cultural influences of Italy, home of the Renaissance, and to the depredations of the invading Ottoman forces.”⁴³ While the appeal to the joint values and achievements transmitted from Antiquity (e.g. literature, law, philosophy, politics, science) marked a common feature of pro-European texts in terms of cultural properties,⁴⁴ the premises of Croatian humanism in particular strongly relied on the fact that ancient Roman culture had survived in Croatia throughout the Middle Ages via

⁴² Cf. Slamnig, *op. cit.* (16), 83; Walser-Bürgler, *op. cit.* (1), 97 n. 261. What Marulić regards as an alliance between Venice and the Ottoman Empire was, in fact, a truce following three years of war in 1502.

⁴³ Petrovich, *op. cit.* (8), 257.

⁴⁴ This notion was widespread in texts from all over the continent between 1400 and 1800. We find it voiced by humanists such as Lorenzo Valla, Enea Silvio Piccolomini, John Barclay, or Olof Rudbeck the Younger (all discussed in Walser-Bürgler, *op. cit.* [1], 93–98).

the close commercial and educational links to Italy.⁴⁵ To emphasize the cultural argument, Marulić's letter does not fall short of allusions to and quotations from ancient Latin literature.⁴⁶ For example, Cicero's accusations of Catiline from the beginning of the first speech echo through Marulić's address to the European leaders, in which he puts to shame their hostile behavior towards each other by repeated investigative rhetorical questioning (p. 100):

Quid enim magis iniquum quam in eos hostiliter agere quibus in omni necessitate adiumento esse deberemus? In eos, inquam, caedibus grassari pro quorum salute Christus mori non dubitavit? [...] Quousque ratio uos fugiet, quousque perniciem uestram ignorabitis? [...] Si per omnia igitur fratres estis, ut quid fraternitatis, immo etiam humanitatis obliti, discordibus animis inuicem confligitis? Nonne ob hoc maxime irascitur uobis Deus atque ut criminis huius a uobis poenas exigit infidelibus fauet atque opitulatur?

Is there anything more unjust than to treat with hostility those whom we should help in their hour of need? Attack and murder those for whose salvation Christ did not hesitate to die? [...] How long will you persist in your madness? How long will you close your eyes to the peril that threatens you? [...] If you are brothers in everything, why do you fight among yourselves with discord in your hearts, forgetting brotherhood and even common humanity? Is not God furious with you, favouring the infidels and helping them in order to punish you for this sin?

In another instance, Marulić approaches the issue of unity and solidarity from the angle of classical erudition. Again demonstrating that his conception of a close-knit European community goes beyond the limits of Christianity and rather embraces the common cultural heritage coming from Antiquity, he advises all European unbelievers to at least listen to the words of acknowledged ancient authorities on the value of togetherness (pp. 104 and 106):

Id futurum si quis Euangelio minus credulus dubitat, audiat etiam gentilem illum, qui ait: *Concordia paruae res crescunt, discordia maximae dilabuntur.*

⁴⁵ Lučin, *op. cit.* (9), 7 (introduction).

⁴⁶ Before Marulić, this strategy has been successfully applied by Piccolomini in his speech *Constantinopolitana clades*. An in-depth study of his intertextual appreciation of the ancient culture as part of his notion of Europeanness is provided in Ronny Kaiser, "Antikettransformationen in Enea Silvio Piccolominis *Clades*-Rede (15. Oktober 1454)", *Europa, das Reich und die Osmanen. Die Türkenreichstage von 1454/55 nach dem Fall von Konstantinopel*, eds. Marika Bacsóka, Anna-Maria Blank, and Thomas Woelki, Klostermann, Frankfurt a.M., 2014, pp. 87–109, at 92–94.

Audiat alium quoque ethnicum nomine Scilurum idem sentientem. Hic octoginta (ut Plutarcus refert) filiorum erat pater. Quibus conuocatis hastilium fascem colligatum ut singuli confringerent iuebat. Non ualentibus ipse soluto fasce unumquodque hastile separatim assumens facile cuncta perfregit et ad illos conuersus: “Videte”, inquit, “quod donec simul uniti eritis, inuicti permanebitis; sin uero diuisi, omnium offensis uos ipsos exponetis.”

Those who do not believe Holy Writ and doubt that this will happen should listen to that pagan who says: “Unity makes small things grow, division destroys even the greatest.” Let them also hear another heathen by the name of Scilurus. Plutarch tells us that he had fathered eighty sons. One day he summoned them all and ordered each of them to break a bundle of spears. They all tried but could not do it. Then the father untied the bundle, took the spears one by one and broke them all easily. He then said to his sons: “You see, if you are united you will be invincible; if you are divided, you will lay open yourselves to attack by all.”

The references have been recognized as quotations from Sallust *Iug.* 10.6 and Plutarch 174 F (*Reg. et imp. apophth.*) and 511 C (*De garrul.*).⁴⁷ They signal that ancient wisdom handed down through literature can be as powerful as the messages contained in the Bible, thus legitimizing the notion of European communality on the basis of its underlying cultural tradition and independent of the Christian religion.

Marulić’s plea for unity among Europeans is also manifest in the second element cited above, which renders his letter a contribution to the contemporary Europe discourse: the negotiations of continental geography. Concretely, the author makes sure to draw the contours of the entire continent when advertising the joint fight against the Ottomans and to refer to the periphery’s relation to Europe’s center. The perspective he takes, in this respect is, of course, that of a Croatian living on the south-eastern border of the continent and looking towards the west and the north. Marulić purposely envisions Europe’s common effort against the Ottomans as a coordinated collective venture of a cohesive geographical unit, whose gateway is formed by Croatia and Hungary. The role he thereby ascribes to his homeland is that of the *antemurale Europae*,⁴⁸ which at the same time ascribes to Croatia and Hungary the role of the continent’s periphery.

Questions circling the relationship between periphery and center have defined the early modern discourse of Europe for centuries (asking, for instance, which nations belong to Europe at all, where Europe’s eastern borders are, whether the

⁴⁷ Lučin, *op. cit.* (9), 107 note 13 and 14.

⁴⁸ On Croatia’s role as the bulwark of Christianity/Europe as well as on the archetypal ‘rhetoric of *antemurale*’ in general, see Housley, *op. cit.* (16), esp. 151, 157, and 163–164.

center plays a more important role in political terms than the periphery, what the responsibilities of the center and peripheries are towards each other)⁴⁹ – and in a way still do today. In Marulić’s case, the underlying notion of Europe is revealed through the *antemurale* ascription, which is accompanied by a description of how exactly the periphery is linked to the center, viz. how the two should interact to fight the Ottomans: Croatia and Hungary, i.e. the Pannonian kingdom, prevent the Ottomans from entering Europe. However, the nations closer to the center and the northwestern borders – that is to say, the rest of the continent – ought to interfere and send help against the increasing external pressure. If the kingdom of Pannonia eventually falls, Marulić gloomily concludes, not just the kingdom of Pannonia but all of Europe – among its nations Germany and Italy at the center – will be open to invasion (p. 96):

Quo ipso [i.e. Pannoniae regno] amisso quid, quaeso, reliquum spei Christianis erit se suaque tuendi aut quae fiducia cum tam ualido hoste manum conserendi? Actum est, mihi crede, de Re publica Christiana nisi omnes pari animo, equali fide, concordi proposito, opes uiresque coniungant [...]. Auxilia igitur quamprimum ab omnibus mittenda censeo illi regno quo, si hostis [...] potitus fuerit, aperta erit ei uia Germaniam Italiamque inuadendi, Illyriam omnem opprimendi, reliquum denique [...] orbem sibi subiugandi.

If that kingdom [i.e. the kingdom of Hungary] should fall, what hope will Christians have of protecting themselves and their property? What confidence will they have to stand up against so formidable an enemy? Believe me, the Christian community will be lost, unless they all, with the same intention, the same faith and in unity, join forces [...]. I also believe that everyone should send aid as soon as possible to that kingdom, after the conquest of which [...] the way would be open for the enemy to attack Germany and Italy, conquer the whole of Illyria and, finally, subject to their power the rest of the [...] [continent].

In other words, the center and the periphery need to come together to form one political entity, one continental stronghold to defy the Ottoman power. All European nations – the ones mentioned and, quite significantly for the argument, all the others (p. 98: “quod residuum est terrarum” – “the countries that remain”) – are asked for solidarity. This is also insinuated by the striking string of words and phrases expressing unification in the passage cited (e.g. “omnes”, “pari animo”,

⁴⁹ Cf. Wolfgang Schmale and Reinhard Stauber (eds.), *Menschen und Grenzen in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Spitz, Berlin, 1998; Christof De Jung and Martin Lengwiler (eds.), *Ränder der Moderne. Neue Perspektiven auf die Europäische Geschichte (1800–1930)*, Böhlau, Cologne, 2016.

“equali fide”, “concordi proposito”, “opes uiresque coniungant”, “ab omnibus”).⁵⁰ The desperate need for collective power is further underlined by Marulić’s latent motto of *United we are strong*, which is ruled by the parallelism of “common threat” and “combined campaign”, as well as the juxtaposition of ‘one’ and ‘many’ in the following passage (p. 98):

Commune periculum communibus armis propulsandum est. [...] Nemo praeterea propriis uiribus confidat nisi fratri ab inimicis circumuento opem tulerit: et ipse similiter peribit. Potentissimus omnium est si cum singulis conferas. Ad unum illum debellandum tot regum, tot principum uiribus opus est quot ipse quondam regna [...] erepta possidet ac regit.

The common threat should be repelled in a combined campaign! [...] Moreover, nobody should rely on his own strength alone; if he does not offer help to his brother who is beset by enemies, he himself will perish in a similar fashion. The enemy is the most powerful if matched against each of them individually. In order to defeat him the power of as many kingdoms as he himself possesses and rules over is needed [...].

There is no room for individual action; all that counts is collaboration. This collaboration can only be enforced successfully, if – and here Marulić takes us back to the geographical conceptualization of Europe as an entity – the center and the periphery work as one. The responsibility of the center of Europe towards its periphery is as great as that of the periphery towards the center. In this regard, however, Marulić not only refers to the southeastern borders along which he sits, but also to the northern and eastern borders (presumably Scandinavia, Britain, and France as they constitute natural continental borders due to their being bounded by the sea). This is another hint at Marulić’s continental understanding of the *res publica Christiana* he evokes (p. 98):

Nemo in eo se tutum arbitretur quod ab impiorum finibus multa distet locorum intercapedine. Incendium quod timemus, nisi mature extinguitur, cum proxima quaeque exhausserit, ad extrema quoque proserpendo penetrabit.

Let no-one think himself safe because a great expanse of territory separates him from the frontiers of the infidels. If the fire which we fear is not soon extinguished, if it burns down everything in its immediate surroundings, it will gradually spread and reach the farthest limits.

⁵⁰ Walser-Bürgler, *op. cit.* (1), 52.

Anyone living on the continent, no matter what they call their homeland and no matter where exactly and how far off the conflict they live, ought to feel solidarity for their brothers (in confessional spirit) and neighbors (in a geographical sense).⁵¹ Otherwise, “each and everyone on the continent will perish” without distinction (p. 104: “actum est de omnibus”).

Marulić’s call for unity as expressed in the *Epist. ad Adr.* accommodates a third element typical of the discourse of Europe: the discourse of peace. Notions of supranational peace have accompanied the discourse of Europe from the beginning, as the Europe discourse was in principle nothing but an elaborate form of discursively negotiating international peace.⁵² Approaching the letter from the perspective of supranational peace-making, the topic of the letter entirely shifts from the Ottoman menace to the discord among the Europeans, viz. the discourse of Europe. What Marulić perceives as the ultimate problem of the time is the fact that Christians are fighting Christians – which meant nothing else than that Europeans are slaughtering Europeans. Instead of joining forces and repelling the common Ottoman enemy, the European nations are prioritizing the campaign against each other for predominance and political gain. As a paradigmatic example, Marulić cites the Italian wars raging since 1494 (they would continue until 1559), in which Emperor Charles V and the French King Francis I fought bitterly over possessions in Italy, France, and Spain (p. 98):

Parum hoc praesides regesque nostri attendunt: Si attendissent, nequaquam inter se, sed cum solo illo digladiarentur atque certarent. Nunc autem Hyspani cum Gallis miscent praelia: Itali inter se diuisi sunt, alii aliis fauent; [...] Ecce non multo ante in Italia bellatum est; adhuc Ausoniae campi externorum domesticorumque cruore madent, nunc iterum inundandi nisi praesentis furoris motus opportuno pacis interuentu compescatur. Quod si paulo anteacti temporis, quando in Italia pugnatum est, caesorum cadauera numeremus, nonne exclamare licebit: *Heu, quantum terrae potuit pelagique parari / Hoc quem ciuiles hauserunt sanguine dextrae!*

Little do our rulers and kings care! Were they more careful, they would not fight each other but only the common enemy. Now the Spanish and the French are at war; the Italians are disunited, and some side with this party and others with the other. [...] It is not so long since a war was raging in Italy; the Ausonian fields are still steeped in the blood of foreigners and the native population and now they will be flooded again unless an equitable peace

⁵¹ Walser-Bürgler, *op. cit.* (1), 52.

⁵² Paul Michael Lützel, “The European Imaginary in the Discourse on Peace”, *Early Modern Constructions of Europe. Literature, Culture, History*, eds. Florian Kläger and Gerd Bayer, Routledge, New York, 2016, 194–210, at 198.

halts the flood of the prevailing fury. If we count the dead in recent times, when battles were being fought in Italy, are we not justified in exclaiming: *Alas, how many countries and seas might have been won with the blood now shed by so many men!*

The author's direct quotation of Lucan *Phars.* 1.13–14 at the end of this graphic passage telling of pointless bloodshed illuminates his general understanding of the intra-European conflicts (while again linking his message to the ancient literary heritage discussed above): they are 'civil wars' – clearly a political rather than a religious category –,⁵³ wars fought between the citizens of the 'state of Europe', between "brothers" ("fratres"; p. 100) fueled by "deadly hatred" ("capitali odio"). Marulić drives this argument of fellow citizenship even further to the point where the Ottomans become the mere by-product of the actual conflict that is the intra-European dissent. The Ottoman threat, he argues, is simply God's punishment for the current animosity on the continent (cf. p. 98: "mutuis itaque odiis flagrantes Dei aduersum se iram prouocant." – "Hating each other, they [i.e. the European nations] incur God's wrath."; also p. 100: "[...] igitur praeda impiorum fiet Deo ipsos ulciscente, qui tam nequiter inuicem dissident [...]". – "Therefore they will surely fall prey to the infidel, because God will punish them, those who so wickedly quarrel with each other [...]"). Admittedly, the Ottoman danger was often broadly perceived as a divine sanction for the sins the Christians committed in the contemporary antithetic stereotyping of the Christian-Muslim relation.⁵⁴ For our purpose it is, however, intriguing to see that in the *Epist. ad Adr.* the Ottomans are not said to emerge as a penalty for the Christian sins in general, but for the disunity among the Christian European nations in particular. This is exactly where the *antiturcica* discourse is overridden by the Europe discourse.

This predominance of the Europe discourse over the Ottoman discourse is also evident from several specific textual properties. In the retelling of Aesop's fable of the mouse and the frog (p. 102: "apologus muris et ranae") – yet another reference to the ancient literary heritage – who fall prey to a bird whilst being busy trying to prevail over each other, the pro-European element is way more at the center than the anti-Ottoman. As Franz Posset argues, the focus of the story is clearly on the two warring parties, the frog and the mouse, whereas the "hawk" (as the translation all too freely interprets) more or less only comes in to dissolve the parable.⁵⁵ The fact that the "miluus", the "bird of prey", is not specified, only goes to show that for Marulić it really does not matter whether this bird is a hawk or an eagle or any other bird of prey. All that counts is that the bird is dangerous to

⁵³ Lucan's epic bears the title *De bello civili* (On the civil war), which is, however, more commonly cited as *Pharsalia* (a reference to the Battle of Pharsalus).

⁵⁴ Cf. Dukić, *op. cit.* (9), 158; Posset and Lučin, *op. cit.* (16), 119.

⁵⁵ Posset, *op. cit.* (10), 142–143.

both the mouse and the frog, who share the spotlight. Similarly, the sheer number of stories and quotes from the Bible inserted on pp. 102 and 104 reflect the higher value Marulić puts on peace among the European nations than on the war against the Ottomans:⁵⁶ among others, we find quotes from Luke 2.14 (“Gloria in excelsis Deo et in terra pax hominibus bonae uoluntatis” – “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will”), John 20.19 and 26 (“Pax uobis” – “Peace be with you”), John 14.27 (“Pacem meam do uobis, pacem meam relinquo uobis” – “Peace I leave with you; my peace I give to you”), and Matthew 12.25 (“Omne regnum diuisum contra se desolabitur et omnis ciuitas uel domus diuisa contra se non stabit” – “Every kingdom divided against itself will be ruined, and every city or household divided against itself will not stand”).

The last of these quotes also refers to a specific sort of peace that has played a crucial role for the unity of Europe in the face of the Ottoman menace: the bridging of confessional gaps among Christianity. Also in this case, the intra-European peace takes priority over the war against the Ottomans, as the former constitutes the prerequisite for a successful outcome of the latter. It is therefore that Marulić urges the pope to set aside, or at least postpone, the punishment of those (i.e. the Protestants) who have stirred up the community of the Christians (p. 102: “[...] differ ultionem, obsecro, et iustam aduersus delinquentes poenam in aliud tempus reserua inferendam [...]” – “[...] postpone, I beseech you, your retribution and delay the just punishment of the offenders [...]”);⁵⁷ it is therefore that he cites Solomon’s deferred punishment of Joab and Shimei for the killing of two peers as an example for Adrian to follow (ibid.: “Eius tu exemplo, Sanctissime pater, mulctam, quam illi qui ecclesiam offenderunt merentur, supprime parumper [...]” – “Follow his example, Holy Father, and postpone the penalty which those who have sinned against the Church deserve”); it is therefore that he reminds the pope of Jesus’ role as the prince of peace (p. 104: “Quis est iste deus pacis nisi Iesus Christus Dominus noster [...]” – “Who is this God of Peace, if not Jesus Christ, our Lord [...]”); it is for this that he praises God as the defender of peace and despiser of hate (ibid.: “Cum ergo Deo et Domino nostro pacem ueram tam gratam esse apparet, [...] nonne manifestum est quanto eidem odio sint discordiae simultates, irae rixae, bella, inter illos praesertim qui de caelestibus unum credunt [...]” – “Since it is clear that God our Lord loves peace so dearly, is it not obvious that he hates discord, rivalry, anger, quarrels, wars, especially between those who share the same faith in heavenly matters [...]”); and it is therefore that he highlights the oneness of Christian institutions regardless of confession (ibid.: “In Christo credentium unum est regnum, una ecclesia” – “Those who believe in Christ have one kingdom and one church”).

⁵⁶ Cf. Posset, *op. cit.* (10), 141. The references have been identified in the translation’s apparatus in Lučin, *op. cit.* (9), 105.

⁵⁷ Cattaneo, *op. cit.* (28), 149.

The language plays another important part in Marulić's calling for peace. On the one hand, it appeals by means of the frequency and intensity with which harmonizing words and phrases appear. On p. 100, for instance, Marulić almost exaggerates by pleading for "reconciliation" ("placabilitas"), "harmony" ("concordia"), "justice" ("aequanimitas"), and "mutual benevolence" ("mutua benivolentia"), while obsessing over placidity ("Desinite [...] bella gerere! Desinite caedibus inter uos desaeuire!" – "Stop [...] fighting! Stop enraging yourselves with blood and thunder!"). On the other hand, Marulić paints an apocalyptic picture of the present and future situation of the continent by means of deliberate linguistic alignment. The bleak description of the Ottoman atrocities at the beginning of the text (quoted above), along with the mention of the impressive fighting strength of the Ottomans (p. 96: "tam ualido hoste" – "so formidable an enemy"), are really meant to incite the Europeans' community spirit by way of reverse psychology.⁵⁸ Altogether, the language throughout the letter is as emphatic, and the argument it forms, as coherent as the author wishes the European nations to act.

The language, or rather its rhetorical expressiveness, finally, is also relevant regarding further aspects of peace as part of the Europe discourse. For one thing, moralizing about peaceful behavior on the continent tended to show up frequently in animal allegories within the realm of the Europe discourse. This pertained to the affirmation of unity as much as to the criticism of disunity. In terms of the former, for example, Europe was often referred to as a flying dragon ('draco volans') in many seventeenth-century geographical and cosmographical treatises. This had to do both with the suggestive contours of the continent (Spain forming the dragon's head, Italy its left wing, Denmark its right wing, western, central, and eastern Europe its upper and lower body, and Scandinavia its curved tail) and the virtues the dragon as a century-old mystical creature symbolized (e.g. wisdom, immortality, power).⁵⁹ As far as the early modern criticism of disunity is concerned, the Spanish doctor Andrés Laguna devised a paradigmatic speech entitled *Europa heautimorumene* (*Europe, the Self-Tormentor*) in 1543, "probably the most forceful literary plea for European unification of all times".⁶⁰ In this speech, the personification of Europe as a sick and feverish lady makes an appearance; she has fallen ill over the constant fights between her children, the princes of Europe. In this context, Lady Europa tellingly compares herself with a blameless mother

⁵⁸ On the use of reverse psychology in the European peace discourse, see Kraljić, *op. cit.* (16), 119–120.

⁵⁹ The notion of Europe as a flying dragon is expounded in Isabella Walser-Bürgler, "Draco Volans. A Political Replacement of the Myth of Europe in Seventeenth-Century Latin Cosmographies", *Le voyage d'Europe au fil des siècles / Europa's Journey through the Ages*, eds. Maria C. Alvino, Matteo Di Franco, Federica Rossetti, and Gabriella Rubulotta, Brepols, Turnhout, 2021, 87–104.

⁶⁰ Walser-Bürgler, *op. cit.* (1), 63.

of the most poisonous snakes (p. 144: “O me matrem infelicissimam [...] quae prolem plus quam uiperinam ediderim [...]” – “Oh, what an utterly unfortunate mother I am, [...] having given birth to more than just serpent offspring [...]”), as well as a mother sheep that has suckled and raised a wolf cub which is now preying on the innocent sheep (p. 144):⁶¹ “Merito igitur possum uti querela eadem in meis acerbissimis malis, qua illa simplex ouicula, suis uberibus lupi catulum alens, haud iniuria se discruciat.” – “Rightly thus I can submit the same complaint in the utmost bitterness of my calamity, with which that poor lambkin, nourishing a little wolf, afflicts its soul not without any good reason.”

In Marulić’s *Epist. ad Adr.* the reader similarly comes across various allusions to animal allegories on the matter of the unity/peace and disunity/peacelessness of Europe. For instance, at the end of the letter (p. 108), as well as in the ensuing prayer for the pope (v. 5–6), Marulić refers to the European leaders as a herd of bleating sheep, ignorant of the stalking wolf (i.e. the Ottoman enemy). In this allegory, the pope as God’s earthly representative aptly takes the role of the shepherd, aligning with Psalm 23.1–4 (“The lord is my shepherd [...]”). Most prominently among the animal allegories in the *Epist. ad Adr.* ranges, of course, the fable of the mouse and the frog torn apart by a bird of prey whilst wrestling with each other, the allegory of which is even interpreted by the author himself (p. 102): “Sic, reor, istis fiet qui nunc inter se dissident, nisi dissidere iam desierint.” – “This, it seems to me, will be the fate of those who are now quarrelling among themselves, if they do not stop.” What is especially spectacular about the fable of the mouse and the frog regarding the discourse of Europe is the fact that the pond (“lacus”; p. 102) as the site of the scene is likened to the setting where the current political “domestic injustices” (“domesticarum iniuriarum”; *ibid.*) take place. Put another way, the pond is likened to Europe, which – by derivation of the adjective “domestic” – becomes the ‘House of Europe’, a term not only used to describe the modern European integration, but also familiar to the early modern reader, given this wording was employed for the first time by Enea Silvio Piccolomini

⁶¹ A Latin-Spanish edition of the text is provided in Andrés Laguna, *Europa heautimorumene, es decir, que miseramente a sí misma se atormenta y lamenta su propia desgracia*, ed. Miguel Ángel González Manjarrés, Junta de Castilla y León, Valladolid, 2001. A thorough investigation of the text as a contribution to the early modern Europe discourse is presented in Ronny Kaiser, “*Tota caduca et dehiscens* – Europe’s Critical Condition in Andrés Laguna’s *Europa* (1543)”, *Contesting Europe. Comparative Perspectives on Early Modern Discourses on Europe, 1400–1800*, ed. Nicolas Detering, Clementina Marsico, and Isabella Walser-Bürgler, Brill, Leiden, 2019, 39–53; Isabella Walser-Bürgler, “Staging Oratory in Renaissance Germany. The Delivery of Andrés Laguna’s *Europa Heautimorumene* (1543)”, *Rhetorica. A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 38 (2020), 84–117; Walser-Bürgler, *op. cit.* (1), 63–68.

in the face of the Ottoman threat (i.e. in a similar context to Marulić's) after the fall of Constantinople.⁶²

4. Conclusion

This article aims to offer a new perspective on Marko Marulić's *Epist. ad Adr.* (1522) as well as Marulić's role as a truly Europe-oriented humanist. Harking back to Franz Posset's proposition expressed more than a decade ago that the epistle "may not only be classified as an *antiturbica* text",⁶³ an effort is made to rank it among the contemporary discourse of Europe and to examine it with a view to notions of continental community. To this end, the epistle finds novel appreciation as a piece of pamphleteering literature addressed not only to the pope but to the entire Christian public on the continent. The highlighting of specific elements characteristic of the sixteenth-century Europe discourse in the text further contributes to the revaluation of both Marulić and his *Epist. ad Adr.* Presenting the letter as a document of pro-European communal policies might eventually also change the way we read other works by Marulić.

⁶² Cf. pp. 495–496 in the edition of Helmrath (*op. cit.* [4]). The metaphor of the 'House of Europe' in Piccolomini's *Constantinopolitana clades* is examined in Walser-Bürgler, *op. cit.* (1), 43–44. Generally on this metaphor, see Georg Kreis, "Das Europäische Haus", *Europäische Erinnerungsorte. Bd. 2: Das Haus Europa*, ed. Pim den Boer, Heinz Duchhardt, Georg Kreis, and Wolfgang Schmale, Oldenbourg, Munich, 2012, 577–585.

⁶³ Posset, *op. cit.* (13), 141.

Isabella Walser-Bürgler

EUROPA POD NAPADOM: NEKOLIKO MISLI O KONTINENTALNOJ
DIMENZIJI MARULIĆEVE *POSLANICE PAPI HADRIJANU VI.*

U radu se *Poslanica Marka Marulića papi Hadrijanu VI.* (1522) istražuje iz nove perspektive. Nudi se revalorizacija Marulićeve percepcije kršćanske borbe protiv Osmanlija, i to tako što se pismo uvrštava u šesnaestostoljetni diskurs o Europi. Umjesto da se ono ponovno čita kao izraz hrvatskoga humanizma, iznosi se tvrdnja da Marulić u njemu priziva koncept Europe poznat u to vrijeme kao *res publica Christiana*.

U prvom se koraku ideja europejstva povezuje s europskom borbom protiv zajedničkog neprijatelja svih europskih naroda: Osmanlija. Kontinentalni sukob sa susjednim carstvom na istoku poprimio je potpuno novu kvalitetu padom Carigrada 1453. i osmanskim napredovanjem prema zapadu tijekom 15. i 16. stoljeća. U tom razdoblju Europljani u svakom kutku kontinenta počeli su Europu snažno doživljavati kao vjerski entitet, različit od muslimanskog neprijatelja, stvarajući tako prvi put u povijesti pojam Europe kao *res publica Christiana*. Posljedično, religija se pretvorila u snažan argument za definiranje Europe i za obranu njezinih vrijednosti. Po logici tadašnjih Europljana sve što je bilo nekršćansko nije moglo biti Europa. Sjetimo li se nedavne izbjegličke krize iz 2015. i populističkih slogana koji su u novije vrijeme preplavili kontinent, možemo zaključiti da je koncept Europe kao kršćanskog entiteta opstao do danas. U Marulićevoj *Poslanici Hadrijanu VI.* i u idejno sličnim tekstovima, koji tvore koherentnu tradiciju protuosmanske, ali još više izrazito proeuropske novolatinske književnosti, možemo naslutiti korijene te moderne konceptualizacije.

Dalje istraživanje pokazuje kako tvrdnje o europejstvu postaju vidljive kad se *Poslanica* ponovno promotri iz generičke perspektive tj. kad se ona shvati kao primjer ranonovovjekovne pamfletske književnosti, a ne kao osobno pismo odaslano papi Hadrijanu VI. Do sada se u literaturi uglavnom prihvaćalo da je Marulić tekst zasnovao kao pravo pismo upućeno Hadrijanu. Ipak, u tom suglasju struka godinama nije uspjela prepoznati i razjasniti neka ključna pitanja u vezi s vremenom pisanja, datumom objave i političkom ulogom koju je Hadrijan preuzeo kao vođa traženoga križarskog pohoda. Osim što ova problematična pitanja iščezavaju kada se poslanica shvati kao pamflet namijenjen široj europskoj javnosti, u samom se tekstu otkriva niz važnih karakteristika pamfletske literature. U radu se među inim ukazuje na emotivni jezik kojim se Europljani potiču da udruže snage, na strukturnu raznovrsnost, zahvaljujući kojoj tekst djeluje na različite vrste čitatelja, te na polemički stav, usmjeren na to da uvjeri, a ne da iznese puke činjenice.

Na takvoj generičkoj pozadini, prikladnoj europskoj svrsi teksta, izdvajaju se tri karakteristična elementa *Poslanice* koji čine temeljne građevne blokove ranonovovjekovnog europskog diskursa. Prvi se tiče takozvanoga kulturnog

argumenta, kojim su se Europljani odredili naspram drugih dijelova svijeta pozivajući se ne samo na kršćansku religiju nego i na književnu, političku, pravnu i općekulturnu baštinu antike, koja se prenosila kroz srednji vijek. Pokazuje se da je Marulić potpuno svjestan razlika između Osmanlija i Europljana; štoviše, on takvo svoje uvjerenje naglašava uporabom citata, odnosno referenci iz antičke rimske književnosti.

Drugi element prisutan u *Poslanici*, a tipičan za ranonovovjekovni europski diskurs, tiče se odnosa što ga autor uspostavlja između europske periferije (Hrvatska, Mađarska, krajnje zapadne i sjeverne granice) i središnjeg dijela kontinenta (glavne sile, koje uključuju Njemačku, Francusku, Španjolsku, Italiju). Ta se uspostava usredotočuje na promišljanje tko će biti odgovoran za izvršenje pojedine zadaće u zajedničkoj borbi protiv Osmanlija, i to na temelju zemljopisnoga položaja ove ili one nacije. Jasno je da Marulić na taj način zagovara sveobuhvatan kontinentalni pristup, dakle takav koji nadilazi granice hrvatskoga kršćanstva.

Treći element svojstven ranonovovjekovnom europskom diskursu odnosi se na lajtmotiv mira, koji je u Marulićevoj *Poslanici* sveprisutan. Naime, kao što europski diskurs zapravo nije bio ništa drugo nego govor o miru (baš kao što Europska unija označava moderni mirovni projekt), tako se i u *Poslanici* na mnogo mjesta spominje jedinstvo i mirna kohabitacija. Ali ne samo to: pogledamo li поближе neke od najistaknutijih Marulićevih izjava o miru (npr. njegovo korištenje Ezopove basne o mišu i žabi, biblijske citate o božanskom miru ili izraze »mirovne retorike«), uočiti ćemo da osmanska opasnost služi kao tematska os teksta, dok je stvarna poruka usmjerena na proces europske integracije. Ovo zapažanje čini tekst neospornim primjerom šesnaestostoljetnog europskog diskursa, koji se može izravno usporediti s drugim novolatinskim primjerima što sadrže slične zahtjeve za mirom, kao što su Piccolominijeva *Constantinopolitana clades* (1454), *Europa heautentimorumene* Andréa Lagune (1523) ili kozmografska tradicija prikazivanja Europe kao letećeg zmaja (17. st.).

Ključne riječi: Marko Marulić, diskurs o Europi, *res publica Christiana*, papa Hadrijan VI, ranonovovjekovni pamflet, *Epistola ad Adrianum VI*, sukobi s Osmanlijama