

THE CONCEPTS OF HUNGARIA AND PANNONIA IN THE AGE OF THE RENAISSANCE

TIBOR KLANICZAY

Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest
Hungary

In the term "Hungarian Renaissance", the adjective "Hungarian" is far from being so unambiguous as other national denominations in similar expressions, such as French, Italian or English Renaissance. Present day Hungary is entirely different from the old Hungaria with respect to territory; and old Hungaria fell to pieces for the first time precisely during the age of the Renaissance. Moreover, the Hungaria of the Renaissance was the home of several ethnic groups and languages; it was not only the land of the Hungarians. This is the source of much confusion — often characteristic of modern historiography — yet there was some uncertainty even in contemporary consciousness about this. Everything was further complicated by the way the national, territorial and ethnic names of the Carpathian basin were changing during the 16th century.

It is not my aim to outline the juridical and political aspects of this problem or the historical circumstances recorded in the laws and contracts of the period. This was accomplished by historical studies a long time ago, though there are still disputes on some points among the historians of different countries. First and foremost I am interested in the appearance and meaning of the concepts of the various national and territorial units and ethnic groups in the minds of the individuals of the period mentioned above. Naturally, we have to be very careful when we use data about this, as we cannot expect a kind of consistency, a unified usage of the name of a country or its people, based on common consent. Yet, in spite of overlapping and contradictory evidence, certain main lines can be drawn.

The question of what Hungaria and Pannonia exactly were, attracted the attention of 15th and 16th century learned minds, both Hungarian and non-Hungarian. Pietro Ransano in his *Epitome rerum Hungaricarum* (1490) devotes a whole chapter to this problem with the following title: "Of the borders of Pannonia, also called Hungaria, according to its old and new descriptions and of the origins of the names of Pannonia and Hungaria."¹ These questions were answered by the writers of the Renaissance in various

ways. With respect to the territory of Hungaria there are three versions. The concept of Hungaria, in terms of geography, is the broadest in the work of Miklós Oláh, the author of the most detailed and highest quality description of the country. In his *Hungaria*, written about 1536, he presents the two Romanian principalities of Moldavia and Valachia as parts of Hungary. He was probably inclined to do so due to his Romanian descent on his father's side and his consequent Romanian sympathies. Having done so, consistency demanded him to include in Hungaria the southern co-dominions of the Hungarian crown: Croatia and Bosnia, though he only declared this, and gave no detailed description.² The peculiar opinion of Oláh can be disregarded in what follows, for others did not regard the above mentioned co-dominions, vassal or adjoining countries as parts of Hungaria.

The most general definition of Hungaria in the 15th and 16th centuries could perhaps be best quoted from the *Geographia* of the excellent geographical writer Giovanni Antonio Magini (Venice, 1596): "The kingdom of Hungary today is the territory that includes Pannonia inferior by which he [Ptolemaios] means Transdanubia and the area between the rivers Drava and Sava... the whole region of Iazigi and Metanastæ, which has been located by Ptolomeus among the Danube, the Tisza and the Sarmatian Mountains i.e. the Northern Carpathians, and the part of Dacia occupied by Transylvania."³ This is completely concordant with the description of Jacques Esprinchar, a Huguenot traveler visiting Hungary in 1597: "Hungary is bordered in the north by the Carpathian Mountains, which separate her from Poland as well as Moldavia. In the south the River Sava, in the west Austria and Styria and in the east the River Olt are the borders, this territory including Transylvania as well."⁴ Similar descriptions of the borders and the territory have long been passed on as stereotypes from one manual to another, showing that during the 15th and 16th centuries Europe identified Hungaria with the territory circumscribed above. The parties concerned, i.e. the people of the country speaking various languages, were of the same opinion for quite a long time. However, by the second half of the 16th century a more restricted concept of Hungaria began to be formed, though slowly and gradually, which became completely general and accepted in the 17th century. It differs from the one described above in its exclusion of Slavonia beyond the Drava and of the historical Transylvania.

It is illuminating to see what the men of the Renaissance thought of the relationship between Hungaria and these two provinces of medieval Hungary, both of which had separate administrations.

Ransano, who has already been mentioned, refers to the area between the Drava and the Sava which is named Sclavonia after her inhabitants, as part of Hungaria.⁵ Miklós Oláh treats her as "secunda pars Hungariæ" and calls her Sclavonia Hungarica.⁶ Croatia is isolated from her, being a territory beginning on the other side of the Sava and stretching over Italy, just as, according to Magini's *Geographia*: "The southern river of Hungaria is the Sava, which separates her from Serbia and Croacia."⁷ In vain did Croatians live north of the Sava, the constitutional respects were stronger in the minds of the period: Slavonia, marked off by the Sava and including Zagreb, is an inorganic part of Hungaria, whereas the region south of the Sava is a separate country in union with Hungary, which has always been "regnum nostrum Croatiæ" in the usage of Hungarian kings. Whereas the latter was continuously present in the title of medieval Hungarian kings (rex Hungariæ, Dalmatiæ, Croatiæ ...) Sclavonia has never been, as it was implied by Hungaria. Only gradually did Sclavonia become a separate regnum from Hungary, later joining Croatia and finally becoming intertwined with her. This process is aptly represented by the composition of the Hungarian and Croatian delegations which were present at the Imperial Diet in Augsburg in 1530. As "comes et orator Croatiæ", Wolfgangus de Frangepanibus represented the Croatian estates distinctly and delivered his speech promoting their interests, whereas "pro Hungaris et Sclavis" it was Ladislaus de Macedonia who gave an address on behalf of a delegation of four. The contemporary printed material publishing the address also lists the members of the delegation, revealing that Ladislaus de Macedonia, the bishop of Várad and Nicolaus "comes de Thurocz", magister curiæ represented "regnum Hungariæ", while Thomas Kamarius and Georgius Spiiczko the "regnum Sclavoniæ".⁸ So Sclavonia is already present here as a separate regnum, though still in union with Hungaria. In accordance with this change Sclavonia becomes part of the titles of the Hungarian kings: on the great Seal of Ferdinand I, beside many others, there is the title of "Rex Sclavoniæ".⁹

The people became conscious of all this only little by little, and usage remained uncertain until the end of the 16th century. Bartholomeus Georgievich who became famous for his account of Turkey and who published the text of the Lord's prayer, the Hail Mary and the Apostles' Creed "in the Slavonian language" in the appendix of his first book, published in Antwerp in 1544, calls himself Hungarus on the title-page.¹⁰ Croatian students coming from Zagreb and other parts of the historic

Slavonia regard themselves as being from Hungary at universities abroad and sign their names accordingly in the registers. Some examples from Bologna: Georgius de Varasdino dioecesis Zagrabiensis in Ungaria in 1558; Nicolaus de Senicis Zagrabiensis Ungarus in 1577; and Michael Ziligerius Zagrabinus is elected Hungarian consiliarius of the university in 1574 and 1575.¹¹ I have cited data from Bologna deliberately as the university of this town was especially popular among Croats. It is no mere chance that the Collegium Illyrico-Hungaricum was flourishing here. Moreover, the conditions of its foundation illuminate best the changing concept of Hungaria in relation to Slavonia. The founder of the Collegium, Pál Szondy, who was simultaneously great provost of Esztergom and Zagreb, refers to the institution in his deed of foundation, dated 1557, consistently as Collegium Hungaricum or Collegium Hungarorum even though he established it for students coming "de Hungaria ac Sclavonia". Furthermore, he intended to have half of the students representing each language. That is to say, the notion of Slavonia as part of Hungary is still in effect here, though there is a clear acknowledgement of the two territories as speaking different languages. To avoid misunderstanding, Szondy attached a note to the text, where he described exactly what is to be understood by the term Slavonia: basically the territory of the episcopate of Zagreb with the addition of Pozsega (Požega) up to the mouth of the Drava. (Pozsega belonged to the former episcopate of Bosnia.) The institution appears in the documents of the university of Bologna as Collegium Hungaricum for a long time, but as the Slavonians realized their Croatian or Illyrian (to use the term of the humanists) character increasingly, and as Szondy entrusted the supervision of the Collegium to the chapter of Zagreb and Zagreb became the centre of Croatian i.e. Illyrian political life, the name of the Collegium in Bologna changed silently into Collegium Illyrico-Hungaricum.¹²

Let us now turn toward the problem of the other territory gradually dissociating itself from the concept of Hungaria. This was Transylvania. In the 15th century there is still no sign of the isolation of Transylvania from Hungaria. Bertrand de la Brocquière travelling through Hungary in 1433 mentions the mountains of Transylvania as the mountains that divide "Honguerie from Walachie", and Enea Silvio Piccolomini, too, regards Transylvania as part of Hungary in his *Cosmographia*.¹³ Students coming from Transylvania often emphasize their belonging to Hungary at their registration. In Bologna, for example: Augustinus de Salanck archidiaconus de Clus et canonicus in ecclesia Transilvana de Ungaria and Giorgius Zaz de Enyed de Ungaria from 1439; Albertus Blasii Walko de Cusal, de

diocesi transilvanensi in provincia Ungariæ, from 1479; Georgius Michaelis de diocesi transilvanensi de Ungaria, from 1480; Magister Valentinus de Septem Castris de Ungaria ordinis Prædicatorum, from 1491, etc.¹⁴ As for Ransano, he treats Transylvania in his survey of Hungary simply as a county of the country.¹⁵

In the first half of the 16th century the situation was more or less similar. In Miklós Oláh's *Hungaria* Transylvania together with the whole large area stretching from the Tisza up to the Dniester, is mentioned repeatedly as forming the "fourth part" of Hungaria.¹⁶ It is apparent, however, from his remarks concerning Abrudbánya (Abrud), lying on the western border of Transylvania, that the more restricted concept of Hungaria, one excluding Transylvania, was already present in his mind as well. This town is situated as he puts it, where the river Fehér Kőrös arrives in Hungaria from the mountains — i.e. from Transylvania to Hungary.¹⁷ Thereafter for quite a long period, there are definitions calling the Transylvanian territory Hungary as a matter of course, as well as other definitions regarding her as a separate country. The Transylvanian Saxon Georg Reicherstorffer, for example, in his description of Transylvania entitled *Chocographia Transylvaniæ* (published in 1550), declares the library of the school in Brassó (Brasov) to be the best library in Hungary after the annihilation of that of Matthias in Buda.¹⁸ On the other hand, the Hungarian reformer of Debrecen, Péter Melius called the profession of faith accepted at the synod of Marosvásárhely (Tirgu Mureş) the work of preachers having gathered "from both the whole of Hungary and Transylvania" when he published it in Kolozsvár in 1559.¹⁹

To avoid misunderstanding it has to be emphasized, however, that reference to the separation of Transylvania never means the territory of the realm of the later Princes of Transylvania, as the latter included, beside historic Transylvania, also a part of Hungary in the restrictive sense. When John II, elected king of Hungary, reigning in the eastern part of Hungaria in the original broader sense, was compelled to abdicate the royal title in 1570, his official title became "Princeps Transsylvaniæ et Partium Regni Hungariæ Dominus". In this the separate status of Transylvania within the region under his rule already finds legally expression.²⁰ Although there was no common agreement that Transylvania belonged to the countries of the Hungarian crown from that time on, it was more and more often mentioned as a *former* part of Hungary. The French ambassador, Pierre Lescapier, sojourning there in 1574, referring to Gyulafehérvár (Alba Julia), the capital of the principality, wrote as follows: "Everybody speaks the original

language of the country, Hungarian, as Transylvania used to be a province of Hungary".²¹ Giovanni Francesco Baviera in his *Raguaglio di Transilvania* written in 1594 also states that "this province used once to be a part of the Hungarian kingdom".²²

The change is well illustrated by the way the Transylvanian people themselves specify their places of origin. At the registrations in the 16th century we can hardly find specifications such as the ones quoted earlier, "in ecclesia Transilvana de Ungaria", for example. They call themselves "Transylvanus" most frequently, which term was of course used also before, especially by the Transylvanian Saxons. The Saxons enter the names of their home towns almost without exception at the universities abroad in the 16th century in the following manner: "Coronensis Transylvanus", "Cibinensis Transylvanus", etc. It is also the motherland in the narrow sense that appears on the front page of their publications. *Iacobi Pisonis Transylvani...Schedia* — this was the title Georg Wernher used in 1554 for the publication of the poems of his friend the eminent humanist poet from Medgyes (Medias) who had died in 1527. In the publication of his epic *Ruinæ Pannonicæ* (Wittenberg, 1571), the author, Christian Schaesaeus appears as "Mediensis Transylvanus", just like Leonhard Uncius, the Saxon poet who treats Hungarian history in verse and calls himself Transylvanus on the title-page of his work published at Cracow in 1579.²³ The Transylvanian Saxon Jacobus Lucius, who worked at the Heltai press in Kolozsvár (Cluj-Napoca) and later on in Wittenberg and in other German towns as a printer, always attaches to his name the specification of Transylvanus or Sövenbürger (Siebenbürger) in the imprints of his pressworks.²⁴ In the second half of the 16th century even the Transylvanian Hungarians call themselves Transylvanus most of the time, although they often use the term together with the word Ungarus. In 1562 in Wittenberg there are four students with Hungarian names registering as Ungari Transylvani; in 1587, in Heidelberg, Johannes Sylvasius Ungarus Transylvanus is registered, whereas at the same time István Szamosközy, who later became the famous Transylvanian historiographer specified himself merely as Ungarus.²⁵ Moreover, István Gálffy appears in Padova as Transylvanus in 1578 and as Ungarus in 1579.²⁶ In the early 17th century the Saxons begin to use the attribute Saxo-Transylvanus in order to be distinguished from the Transylvanian Hungarians: this is how the treatises of Franciscus Schimerus of Medgyes and Andreas Zieglerus of Brassó are published in Wittenberg in 1605 and 1606.²⁷

Thus by the end of the 16th century the concept of Hungaria in the narrow sense is slowly being formed and firmly established, already excluding Slavonia which became Croatian and Transylvania, populated by Hungarians, Saxons and Romanians and governed by a Hungarian Prince. The situation is well illustrated by the representation of students from Hungary at the university of Bologna. In the University Statutes published in 1561 we can read that "Ungaria habet unam vocem et unum consiliarium", referring to the constitution of the senate of the university. It is interesting that in spite of this there were two senators elected "pro Ungaria" in 1564: Ioannes Donitus Ungarus and Thomas Iordanus Ungarus. Characteristically, one of them, originally called Donić was a Croatian from Slavonia whereas the other, Tamás Jordán was a medical doctor from Transylvania who later became famous in Moravia; that is to say both of them were citizens of Hungaria only in the broad sense. However, in 1572 Matthias Varasdinus living in the Collegium Ungarorum is already elected senator "pro Illyria"; and in 1595 it is entered into the official copy of the Statutes in handwriting that thereafter an independent seat is due to the Transylvanians in the senate, separate from the Hungarians.²⁸

The same is manifest on the maps of the 16th century. Lazarus's memorable map of Hungary published in 1528 does not mark any distinction in relation to Slavonia and Transylvania. The inscription "Transylvania" appears on it in the same way as the designation of the other geographical units of the country, such as "Cumanorum Campus" in the Great Hungarian Plain. On the other hand, the new maps drawn in the second half of the century begin to mark off Slavonia and Transylvania with different colours, though with considerable vagueness and inaccuracy.²⁹ Yet it is characteristic that the territory under Turkish rule was never set apart on the maps. The territory occupied by the Turks was considered part of Hungaria throughout the whole period. For example the imperial legates heading for Constantinople via Hungary denote in their travel reports that they are leaving Hungary each time they reach Belgrade though they have been travelling through the region under the same Turkish rule for quite a long time. Stephan Gerlach writes in his diary (1573), on reaching Belgrade: "Hier endet sich Ungarn".³⁰ In 1622 Adam Wenner von Krailsheim, too, writes of Belgrade that here the Sava flows into the Danube, dividing Hungary from Serbia.³¹ It was totally exceptional that when the letter of the preacher Imre Eszéki written in Tolna to the famous reformer Flacius Illyricus was published in Magdeburg in 1550 it was said to arrive "aus der Türckey" in the title of the publication.³²

All that has been said about Hungaria is partly complicated and partly illuminated by what can be established about the concept of Pannonia. "I have often heard from King Matthias — writes Galeotto Marzio — that the historians of our time are wrong to write the names of the regions and towns according to the ancient terminology." The king mentioned several examples of this, among others, one stating that Hungaria "includes part of Pannonia and Dacia", making it inappropriate to use one of the ancient names instead of the name Hungaria.³³ In spite of all his enthusiasm for antiquity, the great king disregarded fashion and had himself referred to as "rex Hungariæ" consistently in his inscriptions and documents, providing evidence of an uncommon sense of reality as well as accurate historical knowledge. His contemporaries, in contrast, intoxicated by the greatness of ancient Rome, tried to wipe out the barbarous names even if this could only be done by force. In the case of Hungaria it was self-evident to identify her with Pannonia, which had traditions of bygone centuries. From the time of King Peter through Saint Ladislas the inscription on the coins of 11th century Hungarian kings is consecutively "Pannonia", and when Saint Ladislas attacked Croatia it was registered in Zadar (Zara) in the following way: "Pannoniorum rex Chroatiæ invadet regnum".³⁴ In the early Hungarian chronicles, — including that of Anonymus' — the term "Pannonia" is constantly present, meaning Hungary, but later on this usage was completely dropped by Hungarians. Its revival was actually brought about by Italian Humanists and not by Hungarians. The first Hungarian to apply this term to himself was probably Janus Pannonius who felt it "decent" to change the barbarous name of Johannes Sclavonus or Giovanni Unghero in Ferrara at around 1450.

As a short digression, let me venture a supposition about the problem of what the Hungarians might have been able to call the poet in their own language. His name was most probably János Tót. It is well known that the name of the Slavs living within the territory of Hungary and having no independent state (i.e. the name of the Slavonians and Slovaks) was "Tót" in Hungarian. This name excellently fitted the Slavonian descendant János, bishop of Pécs. That this is more than mere fancy is proved by folk tradition. In his verse chronicle about King Matthias (1575), Péter Ilosvai Selymes, the 16th century Hungarian author, describes a scene (that has no written source) in which the king threatens János Tót, bishop of Pécs, because of his feudal tyranny, with hanging him on the door-post if he does not remedy the injustice he has committed. It is obvious that this is the folkloristic resonance of the tragic opposition of poet and king.³⁵

But let us return to the term Pannonia. Except for the poems of Janus we can find hardly any examples of its use for quite some time. Even János Vitéz³⁶ mentions it only once in a letter dated 1464, speaking of the Sava as one of the rivers of Pannonia. In the same year, however, Antonio Costanzi from Fano, previously schoolmate of Janus in Ferrara, addresses Mathias as King of Pannonia in a poetic exhortation addressed to the king. In contrast to this, Janus, answering for the king, calls his lord "Matthias, rex Hungarorum", seeking to be faithful to the king's own preference.³⁷

From the end of the 1460s the term begins to be applied extensively. The Carthusian monk from Ferrara who had been a soldier of Hunyadi and had rocked the cradle of Mathias (and who obviously sought to follow the example of Janus), called himself Andreas Pannonius in his *Libellus de virtutibus* (1467). Battista Guarino, another friend of Janus and the son and heir of the great Guarino, also from Ferrara, mentioned Hungary in one of his letters in 1467 as "universa Pannonia" and as "tota Pannonia"; at the same time Georgius Trapezuntius calls Mathias "Pannonum rex" in the dedication addressed to Janus in his translation of Basilii; and János Vitéz is called Johannes Pannonus by Johannes Argyropulos when the latter recommended to the bishop Aristotle's *De coelo*.³⁸ The abundance of data from Ferrara and the fact that the persons are all connected to Janus are worth noting. He may have had a significant role in the creation of the cult of Pannonia.

Even later on it was primarily in the works of Italian humanists that the more distinguished Pannonia stood for the term Hungaria. Thus Marsilio Ficino, Poliziano, Lodovico Carbo, Naldo Naldi, Ugolino Verino, Bartolomeo Fonzo, Brandolini Lippi entitle Mathias "king of Pannonia" in each of their letters written to him or works dedicated to him. It was only Galeotto Marzio, in agreement with the opinion of Mathias, who refrained from the use of the term all throughout. That in Hungary itself, the epithet was slow to strike root, is demonstrated by the fact that Antonio Bonfini, in the prefaces to his translations of Hermogenes presented to Mathias in 1486 and that of Philostratos, presented in 1487, uses the title "Ungariæ et Boemiæ rex". It was only in his translation of Filarete, finished as late as in 1489, that he dedicates his work to "Pannoniæ et Boemiæ rex".³⁹ It is remarkable, that the following inscription was engraved in the sepulchre of the palatine Imre Szapolyai in Szepeshely where the magnate was buried in 1487: "Hic iacet... Dominus Emericus Comes perpetuus Sepesiensis et palatinus regni Pannoniæ".⁴⁰ Subsequently, during the 16th century, every respectable learned man of Hungary was glorified in the name of Panno-

nus or was honoured with it. It is sufficient here to mention the names of Fülöp Csulai Móré, Bartholomeus Frankfordinus, Gábor Pesti, János Sylvester, Zsigmond Gyalui Torda, János Zsámboky (Johannes Sambucus), András Dudith, Márton Berzeviczy, Farkas Kovacsóczy. But Gergely Gyöngösi, the erudite Pauline friar writer also appears as Pannonius on the title pages of his books, as well as the Calvinist theologian István Szegedi Kis, or the German Christoph Preyss from Pozsony (Bratislava) who ascended to a university chair in Königsberg, or the German Paulus Rubigallus from Selmezbánya (Braská Štiavnica), or the Slovak nobleman Martin Rakovský.⁴¹

Thus humanist fashion made the identification of Hungaria with Pannonia general. "Hungaria vero, quæ Pannonia dicebatur" writes Filippo Buonaccorsi (Callimachus Experiens) as early as the end of the 15th century, in his work on king Vladislas I.⁴² "The part of Europe now called Hungaria used to be named Pannonia" Ransano begins his description of Hungary;⁴³ and the two terms appear as mere synonyms in the Hungarian history of Bonfini. Naturally the humanists as well as Mathias were well aware of the fact that the borders of Roman Pannonia were not identical with those of 15th century Hungary but there were only a few who instated on historic fidelity. One of them was Enea Silvio Piccolomini who, treating Hungary in his *Cosmographia* writes as follows: "This country is called Pannonia by some, as if the Hungarians took the place of the Pannonians: in reality neither can Hungaria match the boundaries of Pannonia nor was the latter as far-reaching as the Hungaria of our age."⁴⁴

The humanists tried to overcome this twofold problem in various ways. Their situation was further complicated by their knowledge of the division of Pannonia by the Romans into a superior and an inferior part without a clear understanding of the exact borderlines. Hence most of the variations appear in their works. The writers of the end of the 15th century unanimously drew the line between Austria and Pannonia. According to Ransano Austria and Upper Pannonia are separated at Hainburg, with Pozsony as the first Pannonian town scanning from the west. Bonfini is of a similar opinion, and regards the town of Bruck beside the Lajta as the border town between Austria and Upper Pannonia. Francesco Pescennio Negro, travelling here in the 1490s, also stated that "I came to Vienna from Pannonia".⁴⁵ Meanwhile the humanists of Vienna discovered that they, too, were living in the territory of the former Pannonia. This is shown by the appearance of the place-name "Viennæ Pannoniæ" in the imprints of Vienna pressworks from 1509 onwards, especially in publications of a

humanistic character.⁴⁶ This, then, alternated with the form "Viennæ Austriæ" until the latter displaced the former. It is interesting that the last publication to bear the Viennæ Pannoniæ imprint is the 1561 edition of Werbőczy's *Tripartitum*.⁴⁷ Recognizing the indubitable fact that the border of Roman Pannonia lay west of Vienna, the solution became self-evident for 16th century humanists: Pannonia Superior corresponded to Austria, and Pannonia Inferior to Hungaria. This is the position adopted by Taurinus and, most consistently of all, by Miklós Oláh in his *Hungaria*.⁴⁸

A more serious difficulty was that Oláh, as well as his predecessors and followers, had to face the fact that Hungaria reached farther towards the north and the east than old Pannonia. Ransano solves the problem simply by first relating what the antique writers (Strabo, Plinius, Ptolomeus) wrote about Pannonia, then listing what can be found in the same territory in his day, in the course of which he describes the Transdanubian and Slavonian counties. Then he turns to the discussion of the counties left of the Danube, including Transylvania, though, as he points out, they are not mentioned in the antique descriptions of Pannonia.⁴⁹ That is to say, according to his view the Pannonia of this day, which was identical with Hungaria, was larger than the old one. We can read something similar in Sebastiano Compagni's *Geographia* written about 1509: Pannonia inferior in his age, he says, is called Hungaria, "Hungaria, however, reaches far beyond the border of Pannonia".⁵⁰ In the usage of Miklós Oláh, the original Pannonia — i.e. Transdanubia and Slavonia — corresponds to the "western part" of Pannonia inferior, hence the part east of the Danube is the eastern part of Pannonia inferior for him. Georg Wernher in his famous work about the waterways of Hungary (1549) also emphasizes that he means by the term Pannonia not only the region between the Raba and the Sava but the territory lying on the other side of the Danube as well, up to the Carpathians; in other words, all that is under Hungarian rule.⁵¹ The validity of the concept of Pannonia thus was expanded over the whole of Hungaria, in the same way Battista Guarino had done some decades earlier, in 1467, when writing about "universa" and "tota" Pannonia. This is not surprising: in the same letter he speaks of Várad (Oradea), as "provinciae Pannoniæ urbs".⁵²

After all this, we cannot be suprised to find that the Tiszántúl (the territory east of the river Tisza) or towns such as Sárospatak or Szeged are said, without much ado, to be within Pannonia in the writings of the 16th century. Besides, everybody calls himself Pannonius regardless of what part of the country he comes from; they have themselves appear like this on the

title-pages of their publications abroad and have a predilection for entering their names in this form in the registers of the universities. As far as I know, the first example of this kind is that of Miklós Csáki, bishop of Csanád and later impaled by Dózsa, who appears at the university of Padova as Nicolaus Ciachi Pannonius in 1498.⁵³ From that time on there is no end of the similar entries, no matter whether their writers come from Kecskemét or from Besztercebánya (Baňská Bistrica), Debrecen or Lőcse (Levoča), or whether they are of Hungarian, German or Slovak origin.

As is shown by the case of the initiator, Janus, someone descending from Slavonia is naturally Pannonius, like Valentinus Cybeleius Varasdiensis, to whom we are indebted for his beautiful ode *Ad Pannoniam* (1509).⁵⁴ On the other hand, someone from Croatia would never have called himself Pannonius, as Croatia was not considered part of Hungaria, and, consequently, of Pannonia either, but was identical with the classical Illyria so her sons were "Illyrici".

As Hungaria in the broad sense included Transylvania, the terms "Pannonia" and "Pannonius" became expanded anachronistically over Transylvania, too. In 1523 a "dominus Franciscus panonus de Transylvania" appears in Bologna, in 1550 "Emericus Pannonius Colosvarinus" publishes his theses in Paris, in 1551 "Simon Osdolanus Transsylvanus Pannonius" is registered in Wittenberg, and in 1563 a "Johannes Baptista Keresturi Transylvanopannonius".⁵⁵ When Máté, younger brother of Miklós Oláh died in Transylvania in 1536, the mourning brother living in Brussels at the time concieved a small string of memorial poems in the title of which the deceased appeared as "præfectus... oppidi Szazwaras, in Transylvania Pannoniæ".⁵⁶ Gáspár Heltai, publishing one of his works in Wittenberg in 1555, referred to himself on the title page as a priest practising "in urbe Claudio-poli in Pannonia".⁵⁷

The application of the name of Pannonia to Transylvania and the Transylvanians, however, remained restricted not only because in the second half of the 16th century Transylvania began to be excluded from the conceptual sphere of Hungaria but, first and foremost, because Transylvania had her well-known antique predecessor, Dacia. The humanists were fully aware that the classical Dacia was divided into three separate parts in their age: Moldavia, Valachia and Transylvania. The latter they usually declared as "the part of Dacia under Hungarian rule". Similarly, already in the second half of the 15th century Nicholaus Machinensis, bishop of Modrus stated in his *De bellis Gothorum* that "in our age the inner part of

Dacia is called Transylvania, which is held by the Huns [i.e. the Hungarians] whereas the lower part stretching toward the coast of the Black Sea belongs to the Valachians".⁵⁸ Miklós Oláh also treated Transylvania as part of the former Dacia and called her "Dacia Hungariæ";⁵⁹ and Georg Wernher also separated her from Pannonia which extended up to the Carpathians. According to the latter, Transylvania was "cultissima pars" of Dacia, where there lived Germans, Hungarians, and Romanians "but where power is in the hands of the Hungarians and for this reason the Transylvanians are called Hungarians, too."⁶⁰ In other words, there is a concept of Pannonia which includes a part of the former Dacia as a simple substitute for Hungaria. But there is a notion of Hungaria which identifies only the larger western part of this with classical Pannonia or Pannonia inferior, whereas the smaller eastern part of Hungary is regarded as the western, inner part of Dacia. This is the opinion of Justus Lipsius among others, who declared in a work written in 1604 that Hungaria "almost includes the Pannonia and Dacia of the old".⁶¹ Finally, it is extremely instructive to see the definition of Giovanni Antonio Magini whose description of Hungaria in the broad sense I quoted above. He extends the validity of Pannonia only as far as the border of Transylvania. The latter qualifies as part of Dacia vetus but a part which has been the tributary of the king of Pannonia since Saint Stephen, and is inhabited by Pannonians. Hence he calls it simply Pannodacia.⁶²

Examining the concepts of Pannonia and Hungaria, though by no means exhaustively, we are led to the conclusion that in spite of the political events and the fact that the Aren was inhabited by several peoples, it represented as a country and a historical and cultural unit in the eyes and consciousness of both its own population and the foreign observers who visited it in the 15th and 16th centuries. This is the country that was called "dulcis patria" by the Hungarian János Sylvester; the country called "patria nostra" by the Slavonian János Vitéz who was partly or wholly of Croatian origin; it was the country Miklós Oláh, born of a Rumanian father, wrote of in his letter to Erasmus as "mea Hungaria"; and in a dedication written to him by András Dudith, born in Buda in a family partly of Italian and partly of Dalmatian origin, it was named "communis patria".⁶³ The civilization — the cultural, literary and artistic production — accomplished by the sons of this common motherland called Hungaria or Pannonia, constitutes what we can refer to as the Hungarian or Pannonian Renaissance.

Despite the fact that Hungarians represented a majority of the population in 15th—16th-century Hungary, the Renaissance culture flourishing in

this country was the common product of the sons of several peoples. The vehicle of the Hungarian Renaissance was not an ethnic group speaking the same language but an ethnically mixed society belonging to the same country and subscribing to a patriotism of the given state.⁶⁴ In the framework of this unity, linguistic—ethnic consciousness only developed slowly among the Hungarian and the other peoples of Hungary during the course of the 16th century but this would not endanger the cultural unity of Pannonia—Hungaria for a long time yet to come.

Notes

1. Petrus Ransanus, *Epithoma rerum Hungararum*. Ed. Petrus Kulcsár (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977), 37 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Ævorum, II).
2. Nicolaus Olahus, *Hungaria — Athila*. Eds. Colomannus Eperjessy, Ladislaus Juhász, Budapest, Egyetemi Nyomda, 1938 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Ævorum).
3. Antonius Maginus, *Geographiæ Cl. Ptolomæi* (Venetiis, 1596), Pars secunda, f. 158r.
4. Leopold Chatenay, *Vie de Jacques Esprincharde Rochelais et Journal de ses voyages au XVI^e siècle* (Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N., 1957), 163.
5. *Op. cit.*, 62.
6. *Op. cit.*, 7: 15—16.
7. *Op. cit.*, f. 158r.
8. Károly Szabó, Árpád Hellebrant, *Régi magyar könyvtár* (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1896), 3: Nos 276, 289. (In the following this work will be abbreviated as RMK.) See also: *Orationes Ladislai de Macedonia*. Ed. I. K. Horváth (Szeged, 1964), 20 (Acta Universitatis de Attila József nominatæ. Acta antiqua et archæologica, VII).
9. Ignác Acsády, *Magyarország három részre oszlásának története (1526—1608)* (Budapest: Athenæum, 1897), 162—163, 663—664 (A magyar nemzet története. V).
10. RMK III: No 349. — See also Mrs. Zsigmond Ritoók, "Egy 16. századi vándor literator: Bartholomæus Georgievits". In *Szomszédság és közösség. Délszláv—magyar irodalmi kapcsolatok*. Ed. Sztojan Vujicsics (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1972), 53—70.
11. *Matricula et acta Hungarorum in universitatibus Italiæ studentium, 1221—1864*, ed. Andreas Veress (Budapest: Academia Scientiarum Hungarica, 1941), 88, 97, 106, 108 (Monumenta Hungariæ Italica, III).
12. Anton Mária Raffo, "Appunti sull'atto di fondazione del "Collegio Ungarico" di Bologna". In *Venezia e Ungheria nel contesto del barocco europeo*. Ed. Vittore Branca (Firenze: Olschki, 1979), 391—397.
13. Bertrandon de la Brocquiere, *Le voyage d'outremer* (Paris, 1892), 236; Æneæ Sylvii Piccolominei postea Pii II. papæ *Opera geographica et historica* (Helmstadii, 1699), 219 sqq.

14. *Matricula et acta...*, 38, 56, 57, 59.
15. *Op. cit.*, 69.
16. *Op. cit.*, 21.
17. *Ibid.*, 33.
18. Quoted by Bernhard Capesius, *Die förderten den Lauf der Dinge* (Bukarest: Literaturverlag, 1967), 132.
19. *Res litteraria Hungariae vetus operum impressorum, 1473–1600*. Ed. Gedeon Borsa et alii (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1971), No. 155.
20. See Tibor Klaniczay, "La Transylvanie: naissance d'un nouvel état". *Etno-psychologie* [Le Havre] XXXII (1977): 287–301.
21. Hungarian edition: *Pierre Lescaplier utazása Erdélybe (1574)*. Eds. Kálmán Benda & Lajos Tardy (Budapest: Európa–Helikon, 1982), 71.
22. Giovanni Francesco Baviera, *Ragguaglio di Transilvania (1594)*, published in *Corvina*, N. S., III (1940): 692.
23. RMK III, Nos 419, 613, 679.
24. Mrs. Zoltán Soltész, *A magyarországi könyvdíszítés a XVI. században* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1961), 54.
25. *Album Akademiae Vitebergensis, 1502–1601*. Ed. Carolus Eduardus Foerstmann, vol. I–III (Lipsiæ–Halis, 1841–1905), 2: 44; *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg von 1386 bis 1870*. Ed. Gustav Toepke (Heidelberg, 1886), 2: 134, 142.
26. *Matricula et acta Hungarorum in universitate Patavina studentium, 1364–1864*. Ed. Andreas Veress (Budapest: Stephaneum, 1915), 89 (*Fontes Rerum Hungaricum*, I).
27. RMK III. Nos 1023, 1040.
28. *Matricula et acta...* 1941, cit. in note 11, pp. 100, 101, 105, 115.
29. *Lazarus secretarius, The First Hungarian Mapmaker and His Work*. Ed. Lajos Stegena (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1982).
30. Stephan Gerlach, *Tagebuch* (Frankfurt am Main, 1574).
31. Adam Wenner von Crailsheim, *Ein gantz new Reysebuch von Prag auss bis gen Constantinopel* (Nürnberg, 1622), 23.
32. RMK III, No. 390.
33. Galeottus Martius Narniensis, *De egregie, sapienter, iocose dictis ac factis regis Mathiæ*. Ed. Ladislaus Juhász (Lipsiæ: Teubner, 1934), 25 (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentique Ævorum*).
34. Henrik Marczali, *Magyarország története az Árpádok korában (1038–1301) (A magyar nemzet története, II*. Budapest: Athenaeum, 1896), 20, 60, 90, 110, 114, 116, 140, 680–684; György Györffy, "Die Nordwestgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches im XI. Jahrhundert und die Ausbildung des 'ducatu Slavoniæ'", in *Mélanges offerts à Szabolcs de Vajay* (Braga: Cruz, 1971), 299–300.
35. The text is edited by Edit Lévy, "Ilosvai Selymes Péter ismeretlen historiás éneke Mátyás királyról (A Pompéry-kódex)". *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* LXXXII (1978): 657. It is worth noting that this same verse chronicle similarly refers to the Moravian Jan Filipecz, chancellor of king Mathias with the name János Tóth. It seems obvious that the two politicians, both called János and both of Slavic origin, were merged into one person in the popular memory. The name János Tóth, however, must have referred originally only to Janus Pannonius; the other being a Moravian, i.e. a foreign Slavic person who could never have been called *tót* in Hungarian. Furthermore, we

- know nothing of any abusive deeds of Filipecz, nor that he had any kind of conflict with the king.
36. Iohannes Vitéz de Zredna, *Opera quae supersunt*. Ed. Iván Boronkai (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1980), 213 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum, N. S., III).
 37. *Analecta nova ad historiam renascentium in Hungaria litterarum spectantia*. Eds. Eugenius Abel & Stephanus Hegedűs (Budapest: Hornyánszky, 1903), 110; *Jani Pannonii Opera, Latine et Hungarice*. Ed. Sándor V. Kovács (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1972), 348.
 38. *Andreae Pannonii Libellus de virtutibus Matthiae Corvino dedicatus*. In *Két magyarországi egyházi író a XV. századból*. Eds. Vilmos Fraknoi & Jenő Ábel (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1886), 1–133 (Irodalomtörténeti Emlékek, I); *Adalékok a humanizmus történetéhez*. Ed. Jenő Ábel (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1880), 170, 201, 209–210.
 39. *Anselecta nova*..., 47, 52, 65.
 40. *Schallaburg '82. Matthias Corvinus und die Renaissance in Ungarn*. Eds. Tibor Klaniczay, Györgyi Török, Gottfried Stangler (Wien: Niederösterreichische Landesregierung, 1982), No. 836.
 41. RMK III. Nos 320, 323, 363, 372, 427, 455, 609, 727, etc.
 42. *Philippi Callimachi Historia de rege Vladislao*. Ed. Irmina Lichońska (Varsoviae, 1961), 18 (Bibliotheca Latina Medii Recentiores Aevi, III).
 43. *Op. cit.*, 54.
 44. *Op. cit.*, 219., cf. note 13.
 45. Ransanus, *op. cit.*, 79–80; Antonius de Bonfinis, *Rerum Ungaricarum decades*. Eds. I. Főgel, B. Ivány, L. Juhász, vol. IV/1 (Budapest: Egyetemi Nyomda, 1941). 121 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum); Giovanni Mercati, *Ultimi contributi alla storia degli umanisti* (Città del Vaticano, 1939), 71.
 46. Gedeon Borsa, "Der lateinische Name der Stadt Wien in Druckwerken". *Biblos XXXI* (1982): 251–253.
 47. RMK III. No. 486.
 48. Stephanus Taurinus Olemucensis, *Stauromachia id est Crutiatorum servile bellum*. Ed. Ladislaus Juhász (Budapest: Egyetemi Nyomda, 1944), 62 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum); Oláh, *op. cit.*, 6.
 49. *Op. cit.*, 66–70.
 50. Florio Banfi, "Imago Hungariae' nella cartografia italiana del Rinascimento". In *Janus Pannonius* [Roma] I (1947): 409.
 51. *Georgii Weneri De admirandis Hungariae acquis hypomnematium* (Basileae, 1549). A facsimile of the 1595 Köln-edition was published in *Communicationes ex Bibliotheca Historiae Medicæ Hungarica* 29 (1963): 147–168. The quoted part: p. 60 of the Köln-edition.
 52. *Adalékok*...Ed. Ábel, cit. in note 38, p. 204.
 53. *Matricula et acta 1915*, cit. in note 26, p. 20.
 54. Valentinus Cybeleius Varasdiensis, *Opera*. Ed. Mária Révész (Budapest: Egyetemi Nyomda, 1939), 2–4 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum).

55. *Matricula et acta... 1941*, cit. in note 11, p. 84; Astrik L. Gabriel, *The University of Paris and its Hungarian Students and Masters during the reign of Louis XII and François Ier* (Frankfurt am Main: Josef Knecht, 1986), 142–143; *Album... Vitebergensis*, cit. in note 25, 1: 266; 2: 55.
56. Budapest, University Library Ms. H. 46. f. 31r.
57. RMK III, No. 432.
58. Giovanni Mercati, "Notizie varie sopra Niccolò Modrusiense". *La Bibliofilia* XXVI (1924–1925): 363.
59. *Op. cit.*, p. 6.
60. *Op. cit.*, in note 51, *ibid.*
61. *Iusti Lipsi Diva virgo Hallensis. Beneficia eius et miracula fide atque ordine descripta* (Antverpiæ, 1604).
62. *Op. cit.* in note 3, f. 160.
63. Ioannes Sylvester Pannonius, *Grammatica Hungaro-Latina* (1539). In *Corpus grammaticorum linguæ Hungaricæ veterum*. Ed. Franciscus Toldy (Pesthini: Academia Scientiarum Hungarica, 1866), 6: Vitéz *op. cit.* in note 36, p. 38; Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*. Ed. P. S. Allen (Oxonii, 1941), 10: 72; *Matricula et acta... 1915*, cit. in note 26, p. 189.
64. Cf. Tibor Klaniczay, "La nationalité des écrivains en Europe Centrale". *Revue des Études Sud-est Européennes* X (1972): 585–594.