

STUDIEN ZUR SPRACHE, GESCHICHTE UND KULTUR DER TÜRKVÖLKER

Band 23

# Identity and Culture in Ottoman Hungary

Edited by

Pál Fodor and Pál Ács



KLAUS SCHWARZ VERLAG • BERLIN

EMŐKE RITA SZILÁGYI

*TEUCRISIVE TURCI*

HISTORY OF AN IDEOLOGICALLY LADEN DESIGNATION  
IN FIFTEENTH-CENTURY LATIN WORKS

Introduction

The beginning of the so-called Ottoman Age in Hungary is conventionally dated to 1526, whereas awareness of the Turks need not be tied to the disaster at Mohács. The appearance of the Turks in the Christian world dates centuries earlier, the first written traces can be found in earlier travel accounts, followed by eleventh-century works on the Crusades. Hungary's first encounters with the Ottoman Turkish army were at the battle of Kosovo (1389) and the battle of Nicopolis (1396).<sup>1</sup> From then on, the Ottoman peril had first priority in military strategy and diplomacy, as is confirmed by the correspondence still available. This interest in, and hostility to the Ottomans can be traced throughout the fifteenth century, including an intriguing phenomenon in the use of a designation of the Turks. The Latin word for Turkish is *Turcus*, but a part of the fifteenth-century Latin sources describe them by the term *Teucus*, that is, Trojan. It needs no explaining that a foe is given negative epithets or nicknames, and it was a time-tested practice to call the Turks savage, Tatar, or pagan.<sup>2</sup> Trojan, however, is not necessarily a mocking nickname or negative epithet.

---

1 In scholarly literature the Wallachian campaign of 1375 is usually not mentioned, for more detail, see L. Bernát Kumorovitz, 'I. Lajos királyunk 1375. évi havasalföldi hadjárata és "török" háborúja [The Wallachian campaign in 1375 and the "Turkish" war of King Louis]', *Századok* 117 (1983) 919–979. It is not the subject of this paper to define which ethnic group was meant by the collective name Turk, since in Latin all Turkic, Seljuk, and Ottoman Turkish groups are simply called *Turcus*.

2 See Reinhart Koselleck, 'Zur historisch-politischen Semantik asymmetrischer Gegenbegriffe', in Idem, *Vergangene Zukunft. Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten*. Frankfurt am Main, 1979, 211–259. With special regard to the methodological aspect, see *ibid.*, 211–218, 218–243.

Turks and/or Trojans – The History of a Fashionable Name  
in Fifteenth-Century Europe and Hungary

Calling the Turks Trojans and presuming the Trojan origin of the Turks is not a humanist invention.<sup>3</sup> It was fashionable from the late middle ages to retrace the origins of aristocratic families or ethnicities to the Trojans – legends of the Trojan origin of the French and the Italians are familiar,<sup>4</sup> but it is less widely known that the English also boasted of Trojan ancestry in the seventh century,<sup>5</sup> as did the Icelanders,<sup>6</sup> Castilians,<sup>7</sup> and Germans. The French myth of origin, which survives in *Gesta regum Francorum* under Fredegar's name became the source of all medieval compilations.<sup>8</sup>

*The Turco-Franco theory.* The French myth of Trojan origin has its roots in Gallic times: the Galls of the Roman province, notably the inhabitants of

- 
- 3 Cf. Robert Schwoebel, *The Shadow of the Crescent. The Renaissance Image of the Turk (1453–1517)*. Nieuwkoop, 1967, 148. In Latin, Trojan might also be called *Troianus*, the *Teucer* ethnonym is typical for Vergil's *Aeneis*, since Teucer being the ancestor of the Trojans, the name of the people is derived from him, see *Aeneid*, I. 235. See also Michael J. Heath, 'Renaissance Scholars and the Origins of the Turks', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 41:3 (1979) 453–471. I would like to thank Pál Fodor for drawing my attention to this article.
- 4 The main source from which medieval texts took the Trojan origin of the Italians is Vergil's *Aeneid*, but summaries of the *Aeneid* and works written upon the influence of the *Aeneid*, for instance Benoît de Sainte-Maure's *Roman de Troie* must also be accounted with. Sándor Eckhardt thinks that the author of *Gesta Francorum*, too, only knew the names of Aeneas, Priamus and Antenor from a summary of *Aeneid*: Sándor Eckhardt, *Sicambria. Egy középkori monda életrajza* [Sicambria. The biography of a medieval legend]. Budapest, 1928, 9. On the knowledge of the Troy narrative, first of all the *Aeneid* in Hungary, and the parallel fates of Trojans and Hungarians that evolved in the sixteenth century, see Gábor Kecskeméti, 'Alapítók. A trójai menekülés motívumainak hazai ismeretéhez [Founders. How motifs of the Trojan flight came to be known in Hungary]', *Publicationes Universitatis Miskolciensis, Sectio Philosophica* 9:4 (2004) 101–118.
- 5 Around 630 the dynasty of King Dagobert claims to be *ex nobilissimo et antiquo Trojanorum sanguine nati* or "from the highly noble and ancient blood of the Trojans". Charles the Bald also professed to issue from the Trojans. Cf. Steven Runciman, 'Teucric and Turci', in Semi A. Hanna (ed.), *Medieval and Middle Eastern Studies in Honor of Aziz Suryal Atiya*. Leiden, 1972, 346.
- 6 *Ibid.*, 347.
- 7 Cf. James Hankins, 'Renaissance Crusaders. Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 49 (1995) 139.
- 8 For the spread of the Trojan-Frank myth in France, see Eckhardt, *Sicambria*, 16–20. Cf. Levente Seláf, 'Nagy Sándor és a trójaiak a burgundi irodalomban [Alexander the Great and the Trojans in Burgundian literature]', *Aetas* 4:3 (1999) 95–122.

Alverni (today Auvergne) prided themselves on Trojan origin.<sup>9</sup> Adopting this legend, the Franks also professed Trojan ancestry, elements of which can be found in the mentioned *Gesta regum Francorum* by Fredegar. It claims that after the burning of Troy, the Trojans fled westward and split into two groups. One group became Macedonians, the other Phrygian group moved more to the west under the leadership of King *Francio* and became the forefathers of the Franks: “It is said that the Turks came about from a third group”.<sup>10</sup> Thus, the French myth of origin – unlike that of other successor groups – mentions kindred peoples as well. The Trojan origin of the Turks was also known in twelfth-century France, several literary works being written on its basis. In the fourteenth century, Jean de Paris reiterates the origins of the Turkish-French kinship and refers to Baldicus’ *Historia Hierosolymitana*, which reveals that during the crusades the Turks also learnt about their Trojan origin and from then on they also reckoned with it.<sup>11</sup> Though this view held several inherent contradictions, there are quite a lot of sources reiterating it. The theory went its rounds of Europe gradually expanding with kinship of one group after another. Let me only cite a later, but highly typical example: in his *Illustrations de Gaule et Antiquitez de Troyes* (1512), Jean Lemaire de Belges writes that the Turks, Hungarians, French and English are relatives with the difference that the Turks are pagans, and the English and French are of nobler birth than the rest.<sup>12</sup>

One of the theories of the Trojan origin of the Turks claims that the fleeing Trojans split into two groups, one branch headed by king *Francio-Francus* pushing westward – to become the ancestors of the French – and the other group led by King *Torquotus* or *Torcoth* remaining east of the Danube and becoming the ancestor of the Turks.<sup>13</sup> Etymologies being in fashion since Isidorus of Seville, the ethnonym *Turcus* also became popularly derived from

---

9 Eckhardt, *Sicambria*, 3: refers to Sidonius Apollinaris and Propertius among the Romans, see Sid. Apoll. *Ep.* VII. 7, 2. Prop. II. 13, 48 ff.

10 *Tercia ex eadem origine gentem Torcorum fuisse fama confirmat.* Cap. VII, quoted and translated Eckhardt, *Sicambria*, 7.

11 Sándor Eckhardt, ‘La legende de l’origine troyenne des Turcs’, *Kőrösi Csoma Archivum* 2 (1927) 429–430. In Jean de Paris’ writing the Turks defend themselves with reference to their Christian origin. In Runciman’s view, the Turks learnt about their common Trojan origin from the Varangians (i. e. Vikings) fighting in the first crusade, which is also perpetuated by the *Poetic Edda*. Runciman, ‘Teucric’, 347.

12 Eckhardt, ‘La legende’, 431. Cf. Heath, ‘Renaissance Scholars’, 455.

13 Eckhardt, ‘La legende’, 423.

various words including *truculentus* (“rough, savage”), which might also have contributed to the strengthening of the stereotypic image of the Turks as “cruelty incarnate”.<sup>14</sup>

There is, however, another theory of the Turkish-French fraternity datable to the tenth century, possibly connected to the work surviving under the name of Dares Phrygius.<sup>15</sup> This theory traces the Turks to the son of Trojan Troilus, Turcus, and the Franks to Francio, the son of Hector.<sup>16</sup>

*The Turks as the lawful avengers of the Trojans.* More popular than the Turco-Franco theory was another view (sometimes related to, sometimes independently of the former): it held that the Turks were the rightful avengers of Troy. For those who were averse to the Greeks in medieval and renaissance Europe this theory came in handy, for in the Trojan War the ravagers were the Greeks, and that was the grievance for which the Turks allegedly took revenge two and a half millennia later.<sup>17</sup> In the mid-fifteenth century, the Greeks were judged unfavourably owing to the failure of the Florentine Union, and although the Turkish peril was recognized, it was thought that the contemporary Greeks were the degenerate descendants of the ancient heroes and so did not deserve help.<sup>18</sup> The derivation of the Turks from Troy was unavoidable, partly because the Turks, like the Trojans of antiquity lived in Asia Minor, and partly because the similarity of the names (Turci-Teuceri) inspired the pun and

14 Cf. Otto Prinz (ed.), *Die Kosmographie des Aethicus*. Munich, 1993, 120.

15 *De excidio Trojae historia* surviving under the name of Dares Phrygius meant to be the continuation of the *Iliad*, and although Cornelius Nepos translated it into Latin from an alleged Greek work, it is usually dated to the fifth century AD on account of its language. Hector and Troilus were brothers or half-brothers in the myth of Troy.

16 The definition given by Vincent de Beauvais who lived in the thirteenth century is included in Eckhardt, ‘La legende’, 427–428.

17 Innumerable sources try to find analogies between the destruction of Troy and that of Constantinople; one example is Filippo da Rimini’s account, which parallels the raping of a Greek virgin in Hagia Sophia with the violation of Cassandra. Cf. Hankins, ‘Renaissance Crusaders’, 139. See also Pál Fodor’s paper (note 68) in the present volume.

18 Cf. Terence Spencer, ‘Turks and Trojans in the Renaissance’, *The Modern Language Review* 47 (1952) 330. Schwoebel, *The Shadow*, 148. In his letter to Nicholas V, the bishop of Mytilene, Leonardus blames the pope, and mainly the Greeks, who breached the terms of the Union: *Non ergo unio facta, sed unio ficta, ad fatale urbem trahebat excidium* (It was not the union itself, but the falseness of the union that ushered the city to its doom). Agostino Pertusi, *La caduta di Constantinopoli. Le testimonianze dei contemporanei*. Vol. I, Milano, 1990, 128. Apart from the breaching of the oath and their pride, the Greeks probably looked with less antipathy or hatred upon the Turkish turban than the Roman tiara. Schwoebel, *The Shadow*, 16.

unfounded etymology and lastly, it was based on the statements of certain medieval chronicles.<sup>19</sup> Thus, there is a play with words and a deliberate use of names at issue here, rather than a lapsus calami or accidental mixing of words. Although it gave rise to further contradictions, this designation of topographic and etymological derivation became fashionable and prevalent, a real commonplace, over the fifteenth century.

### “Trojan Turks” in Fifteenth-Century Latin Works With Relevance to Central and Eastern Europe

The “Trojan Turks” – that is, the custom to write Trojan (*Teucer/Teucus*) for Turk (*Turcus*) – can be found in two types of sources. One group signifies the main means of information dissemination at that time, “the ancestor of modern-time newspaper”: a wide variety correspondence.<sup>20</sup> There is an observable tendency that certain authors regularly use *Teucer* in their mutual exchange of letters, while others, or the same letter-writers writing to a third party, do not necessarily use this term. To an extent this tendency can be plotted both in time and space, though caution needs to be administered here. Two major events divide the fifteenth century into three segments: the battle of Varna (1444) and the fall of Constantinople (1453). While Trojan Turks appear sporadically from their first occurrence (1420) until the battle of Varna, from the latter event the data multiplies, the Trojan name of the Turks becoming a household word. The fall of Constantinople then came as a sobering blow; from then on the evidence decrease in number, only to disappear from the correspondence of the chanceries by the 1470s. But at the same time it comes to appear in other, more popular genres (chronicles, sermons, epitaphs, hymns). The authors of the fifteenth-century sources to be presented below are either Hungarian rulers, politicians, high priests, war lords, and noblemen, or foreigners mostly from Central Europe who took up the pen at the time because of the Ottoman threat and offensive against Hungary and Central and Eastern Europe.<sup>21</sup>

19 Spencer, ‘Turks’, 331. Runciman, ‘Teucris’, 345. Heath, ‘Renaissance Scholars’, 455.

20 Margit Waczulik, *A török korszak kezdetének nyugati történetirodalma a 16. században* [16th-century Western historiography on the beginnings of the Ottoman age]. Budapest, 1937, 3–4.

21 I herewith express my thanks to Kornél Szovák, who kindly helped me with collecting the sources.

*Correspondence (1420–1470)*. The first sources date from the time of Sigismund of Luxemburg. The writers include the Polish King Vladislav Jagiello II, Sigismund and not least Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, the later Pope Pius II. In the letter of Vladislav II to Sigismund, and in those by Sigismund to Cardinals Castiglione da Branda and Henry Beaufort the fight against the Porte is positioned parallel to the struggle against heretics. A typical example is Sigismund's letter to Cardinal Cartiglione da Branda: "We shall have no claim to glory if we do not want to annihilate the followers of Wycliffe and Huss, the worst kinds of all heretics, when after the Christian Church has been united we have often beaten back the *Trojans* too (who are the enemies of the Christians and frequently incur upon Christian territories)."<sup>22</sup>

There are several kindred traits in the letters of Sigismund and Vladislav, but Piccolomini's letter on this occasion addresses the town of Siena with a new theme: he asks the municipality to send armed assistance to Constantinople in case there were a clash with the Ottomans there. The letter is evidence of great foresight in 1436, as we realise with knowledge of later developments.

For Hungary, the years 1443–1444 were the years of the Long Campaign in the Balkans. The dates are important in the correspondence of the chancery as well: from 1442 Piccolomini was the private secretary of German King Frederick III and he wrote several letters about diplomatic matters on behalf of Frederick and Chancellor Kaspar Schlick between 1443 and 1445, and he also wrote personal letters, thus he had an extensive circle of correspondence partners. They include Giuliano Cesarini, Cardinal of Sant'Angelo, who died later in the battle of Varna; Lőrinc Hédervári, Palatine of Hungary; Pope Eugene IV; Archbishop of Esztergom Dénes Szécsi; Giovanni Campisio, Piccolomini's best friend; Kaspar Schlick; and not least Filippo Maria Visconti, Duke of Milan – only to name the most prominent ones. In the letters to the above named partners, Piccolomini always calls the Turks *Trojans*, and since he kept a close watch on the military events in Hungary, many of his letters are highly informative sources of these years. However, it is also characteristic of his letters that factual information is overshadowed by the personal messages

---

22 *Quam gloriam reportare possemus, si, unione ecclesie Christianorum facta Teucrisque (inimicis Christifidelium, intransibus crebro Christianorum partes) repulsis sepissime, Wiklephistarum et Hussitarum pessimum omnium hereticorum genus nollemus destruere?* Dietrich Kerler (Hrsg.), *Deutsche Reichstagsakten unter Kaiser Sigmund*. Bd. 2. 1421–1426, Gotha, 1883, 77 (Ep. 63).

and comments. It is still discernible in his letters that during the Long Campaign there was fear of a Turkish offensive but no sense of panic yet.

After the battle of Varna was lost on 10 December 1444, the general atmosphere changed.<sup>23</sup> Several authors perpetuated the battle in their works, and there are three letters or reports for the years 1444–1445, the first (in time as well) being Piccolomini's.<sup>24</sup> In his letter to the Duke of Milan Filippo Maria Visconti he forwards the information available to him possibly unbiased, in a sober tone; perhaps the most interesting part of the letter reveals that the Long Campaign – the military victories of Vladislav I and János Hunyadi – kindled fears in the west lest the Hungarians, intoxicated by their victories, should turn their arms westwards. Piccolomini does not name a scapegoat, does not blame any single person, attributing the defeat to the numeric superiority of the Ottomans: “Then they recovered their strength, their enthusiasm returned and they continued the battle, but eventually the *Trojans* were victorious through valiance, good fortune, or simply because they had numeric superiority.”<sup>25</sup>

Next in importance is the letter written by Andreas de Palatio of San Lorenzo in Damaso in May 1445.<sup>26</sup> Having participated in the fighting, Andreas de Palatio could report on it with the authenticity of an eye-witness. He touches on special details such as the illness of King Vladislav (an ulcer developed on his left leg), which would have kept him from the battle, had he not fought with superhuman courage. Unlike Piccolomini and János Vitéz, he mentions the camels of the Turks that frightened the horses of the crusading army. He ridicules the pitiable bishop of Várad (today Oradea, Romania), who fled to a nearby lake and drowned, nor does he spare the bishop of Eger who wanted to flee from the battle, but since he was not admitted into Varna at the gate, he turned back and fought valiantly until he was killed. In the overall neutral tone of the report, his bias toward the Poles is conspicuous; it is also striking that he does not show János Hunyadi as a positive actor. At several loci he mentions the Tatars: he does not equate the Tatars with the Turks

23 On the battle of Varna in more detail, see Tamás Pálosfalvi, *Nikápolytól Mohácsig. 1396–1526* [From Nicopolis to Mohács]. Budapest, 2005, 84–96.

24 For Piccolomini's correspondence, see Rudolf Wolkan (Hrsg.), *Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*. (Fontes rerum Austriacarum, 61–62, 67–68.) Vienna, 1907–1918, with the quoted passage in 61, 487–490 (Ep. 167).

25 *Donec resumptis viribus ac spiritibus redeuntibus instauratum est prelium, in quo vicit ad extremum Teucrorum, sive virtus fuit sive fatum, sive quod numero plures erant.*

26 For the letter, see Andreas de Palatio, *Litterae de clade Varnensi ad Ludovicum cardinalem datae*. Ed. by Antoni Prochaska. Lviv, 1882.



explicitly, but uses the ethnonym almost synonymously.<sup>27</sup> Although the authenticity of Palatio's account can be doubted at several points, for instance in the description of the battle array,<sup>28</sup> the minute details and formal elaboration of the letter make it an entertaining reading.

In his notes to the collected letters of János Vitéz, Pál Ivanich remarks that although Vitéz refers to an earlier letter, it is missing and this one was written in May 1445.<sup>29</sup> In his letter to Pope Eugene IV written on behalf of János Hunyadi,<sup>30</sup> he is far from being as verbose as Palatio, and instead of writing about the details of the battle, his main purpose is to call on the Pope and ask for his help, even though Vitéz had first-hand experience of the details of the battle. Further information is revealed by Ivanich's comments to the letter. In the name of Hunyadi, Vitéz attributed the defeat to the sins of the Christians, to divine will, and consequently, he is optimistic about the future, provided that the Christians learn from the consequences of their sins and joining forces, clash again with the Turks: "Possibly, the current events have not been caused either by our enervation or the valiance of the *Trojans*, for in the battlefield nearly deserted by people and arms it was not the enemy troops but the divine judgement that has placed a blow on us, and the barbarians only remained stronger for our sins."<sup>31</sup> Another one followed this letter half a year later, in which the request was repeated.<sup>32</sup> There are innumerable recollections of the battle of Varna, traces of it detectable even a decade later.

The bishop of Várad killed in the battle of Varna was replaced by János Vitéz, who was the private secretary of János Hunyadi between 1441 and 1452. The book of his collected letters published and annotated by Pál Ivanich contains his correspondence between 1445 and 1451 pursued on behalf of Governor János Hunyadi and himself. This is undoubtedly the most valuable collection among the Hungarian sources. In the name of János Hunyadi, he wrote letters to Pope Nicholas V, congratulating him on his election and ensuring him that Hunyadi would support him, provided that in return, he

27 Palatio, *Litterae*, 32–33.

28 See Pálosfalvi, *Nikápolytól*, 92.

29 Iohannes Vitéz de Zredna, *Opera quae supersunt*. Ed. by Iván Boronkai. Budapest, 1980, 43.

30 For the whole letter, see Ep. 3. Vitéz de Zredna, *Opera*, 43–46.

31 *Quamquam et id, quod nunc accidit, neque mollicia nostra, neque Teucrorum virtus effecerit, dum pene vacuefacto viris et armis campo non hostilis milicie, sed iudicii divini plagam retulimus, nostrisque peccatis barbari tunc mansere forciores.*

32 Ep. 4, tit. Vitéz de Zredna, *Opera*, 47.

would give support against the Turks.<sup>33</sup> He reiterates the request in his own name – as wished by Governor Hunyadi – in 1449. In this letter, he gives an account of the conditions of the country and the governor, including the external perils (Turks, Hussites) and the internal difficulties (beginnings of a domestic strife).<sup>34</sup> Vitéz names the Turks Trojans in his letter to Pál, the notary of the royal chancery, too.<sup>35</sup> Boronkai's edition of Vitéz's letters contains pieces of dubious authorship in addition to the above collection. There is a letter written allegedly by Vitéz to the Byzantine emperor Constantine Palaiologos in the name of Ladislaus V,<sup>36</sup> and a speech delivered on behalf of the Hungarian estates in honour of Ladislaus V in 1452.<sup>37</sup>

Ladislaus V praised the merits of János Hunyadi in several letters some of which can be found in the tenth tome of József Teleki's monumental work, *A Hunyadiak kora Magyarországon*.<sup>38</sup> This volume contains the diploma by which Ladislaus V grants the right to mint golden florins to the town of Ragusa (today Dubrovnik), and a deed by which he corroborates the deed of gift issued by Sigismund in 1398 to his relative, Palatine László Garai, the son of the Ban and Palatine Miklós Garai. It is common to all letters that the Turks are called Trojans, and the style of the long, sophisticated periodic sentences also suggests Vitéz's hand.

Most of the information on this period can be gleaned from the letters of Vitéz; apart from him several facts can be learnt from Piccolomini, Poggio Bracciolini,<sup>39</sup> and also Nicolò Barbaro's diary and letters to the Senate of Venice, although these sources are not necessarily reliable.<sup>40</sup> What is safe to

33 Ep. 36, 10. Vitéz de Zredna, *Opera*, 88. Ep. 37, 5. 37, 24, Vitéz de Zredna, *Opera*, 90, 92.

34 Ep. 51, 5. Vitéz de Zredna, *Opera*, 112.

35 Ep. 2, 38. Vitéz de Zredna, *Opera*, 39.

36 Ep. var. 6, 1. Vitéz de Zredna, *Opera*, 177.

37 The letters dated later than 1451 are of dubious origin in Boronkai's collection. However, it cannot be questioned that after 1451 Vitéz took the side of Ladislaus V, so it is not unfounded to presume that the next letters were authentic. When in 1452 Vitéz stood up for the released young king, Hunyadi threatened him, in vain. Vitéz remained on the side of Ladislaus V. Cf. István Draskóczy, *A tizenötödik század története* [History of the fifteenth century]. Budapest, 2000, 198.

38 József Teleki, *A Hunyadiak kora Magyarországon* [The age of the Hunyadis in Hungary]. Vol. X, Pest, 1853, 349–350, 352–353, 358–362, 404, 466, 468, 520.

39 For example, Poggio Bracciolini, *Epistolae. Opera omnia I–III*. Ed. coll et emend. by Thomas de Tonellis. Torino, 1963, Vol. II, 310, 353–354. I am grateful to Klára Pajorin for pointing this source out to me.

40 Nicolò Barbaro, *Giornale dell' assedio di Costantinopoli 1453, corredato de note e documenti*. (Monumenta Hungariae Historica, XXII.) Ed. by Enrico Corne. Vienna, 1856,

state is that after the shock caused by the battle of Varna the “Trojan Turks” appeared more frequently in both the diplomatic documents and the letters.

On 29 May 1453 the Ottomans conquered Constantinople and crushed the power of the Byzantine Empire. Both the West and the East had been aware of the danger, yet the shock and fright caused was boundless. The West was informed of the fall of Constantinople by numberless letters and eye-witnesses.<sup>41</sup> The first eyewitness, a pilgrim from Basle, arrived in Venice on 12 June, followed by many in the summer, and refugees kept arriving until November. That was also when Cardinal Isidorus of Kiev – who had taken part in the declaration of the Union as the papal legate in 1452 – arrived in Venice. He was accompanied by his friend Leonardus, Archbishop of Mytilene, whom he had possibly made the acquaintance of at the Council of Florence discussing the Union.<sup>42</sup> Obviously, the more valuable and authentic information on the fall of Constantinople comes from the eyewitnesses. Such are the notes of Angelo Giovanni Lomellino, the account of Jacobo Tedaldi, the report of delegate Nicola Sagundino, and that of Leonardus of Chiosi, Archbishop of Mytilene, and Cardinal Isidorus of Kiev to be presented briefly below.<sup>43</sup>

Cardinal Isidorus’ famous report *Audite, omnes gentes...* was written on Crete on 8 July 1453.<sup>44</sup> It is among the earliest accounts, rather short without meticulous descriptions and, whenever possible, the writer resorts to the poetic device of conspiracy of silence to hold the reader in suspense, and uses naturalistic details to inspire shock and awe. Although in Migne’s *Patrologia Graeca* and the more recent Pertusi edition *Turcus* is the ethnonym throughout, in Bzovius’ collection of ecclesiastic works the name *Teucer* is included.<sup>45</sup>

---

S. l., s. a, 855–859. *Teucer*: 855, 857–859. XV. Documenti, 8. In the Pertusi-edition Nicolò Barbaro’s *Giornale* is only given in Italian. See Pertusi, *La caduta*, Vol. I, 8–38.

41 On the fall of Constantinople and the works about it, see Marios Philippides, ‘The Fall of Constantinople 1453. Bishop Leonardo Giustiniani and His Italian Followers’, *Viator* 29 (1998) 192.

42 *Ibid.*, 199.

43 For the works on the fall of Constantinople, see Pertusi, *La caduta*. Another collection on the theme: J. Melville Jones, *The Siege of Constantinople 1453. Seven Contemporary Accounts*. Amsterdam, 1972.

44 Leonardi Chiensis, ‘Historia Constantinopolitinae urbis a Mahumete II captae’, in Pertusi, *La caduta*, Vol. I, 124–171. Isidorus, ‘Universis Christifidelibus’, in Pertusi, *La caduta*, Vol. I, 80–90 and *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. CLIX, 923–944, 953–956. Since the editions of Pertusi and Migne differ at several points, it is necessary to use both text variants.

45 Abraham Bzowski (Bzovius), *Annalium ecclesiasticorum post illustrissimum et reverendissimum dominum D. Caesarem Baronium S. R. E. Cardinalem Bibliothecarium*

Walter Röll has proven that a day before the famous letter of 8 July, Isidorus had written another report to Bologna on 7 July.<sup>46</sup> In it he uses *Theucer* for the Ottomans; although the tone is calmer than that of the letter sent a day later, he gives no more details about the disaster of the city: “But now, alas, this dignified city has been defeated by the *Trojan* Mehmed, the basest servant of the Antichrist, at the cost of such sins, it is not with human power but with the permission of God that it came into his power.”<sup>47</sup> The Pertusi edition also includes other letters attributed to Isidorus, from both 1453 and later, in which he calls the Turks Trojans. It is therefore presumable that he always called the Ottomans *Teucer* and only later editors “corrected” the word usage.<sup>48</sup>

The letter of 16 August 1453 by the Archbishop of Mytilene, Leonardus, contains more details about the siege and is far longer than Isidorus’. The letter starting with *Flere mihi magis placet...* and is known by the title *Historia Constantinopolitanae Urbis a Mahumete II captae* gives a detailed account of the precedents to the siege including the Union and the siege itself. Leonardus addresses the letter to Pope Nicholas V, so as to be the first to inform him of the details of the grievous event. In the letter he calls the Turks *Teucer*. Although he includes a parable of Troy in it, he does not find it contradictory to call a contemporary enemy and the actors of a legend by the same name. The news gave rise to several works, including Ubertino Pusculo’s *Constantinopolis* with its contradictory dedication, written around 1455–1456.<sup>49</sup>

After the fall of Constantinople the humanist authors felt an urge to clarify the origins of the Turks. There were still several works to be written in support of their Trojan origin – an amusing example being Giovanni Mario Filelfo’s epic *Amyris*<sup>50</sup> – or even in defence of the Turks, as exemplified by a letter to

---

*Tomus XVII. Rerum in orbe Christiano ab anno Domini 1447. usque ad annum 1471. gestarum narrationem complectens.* Köln, 1625.

46 The text is given in transliteration: Walter Röll, ‘Ein zweiter Brief Isidors von Kiew über die Eroberung Konstantinopels’, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 69 (1976) 13–16.

47 *Sed nunc prochdolor urbs illa dignissima sic cogentibus peccatis ab illo iniquissimo precursore antichristi Theucro Machmet debellata non humana potencia sed sic permittente deo iam tandem sub potestate sua reducta est.*

48 Pertusi, *La caduta*, Vol. I, 100, 106, 108.

49 Pertusi, *La caduta*, Vol. I, 202, 204, 210, 212.

50 In his bravura epic *Amyris* (1478) Giovanni Mario Filelfo perpetuated the life of Mehmed II from the beginnings (*ab infantia*) upon the request of Othman Lillo Ferducci. Apart from its stunning intertextual references, it is outstanding in that it was first dedicated to Mehmed II, then to Galeotto Mario Sforza, Duke of Milan with an encouragement for a crusade. Cf.

Pius II written in the name of Mehmed II.<sup>51</sup> Although the name *Teucer* was still often applied to them, a growing number of writings condemned this “misunderstanding”. A consistent user of *Teucer* till then, Piccolomini was ordained in 1446, and when he reconsidered his secular life, he realized how much harm this fashionable word usage caused to the organisation of a crusade. Most regrettably, this recognition came too late, after the fall of Constantinople.<sup>52</sup> In a letter written between 1447 and 1450, in which he reminisces on the late pope and sums up Eugene IV’s efforts, he still calls the Turks Trojan.<sup>53</sup> From then on, Piccolomini not only refrains from using this pun, but also indignantly rejects it, launching into tirades whenever the name comes up. When Constantinople fell, he was the bishop of Siena. In a letter he writes about the event to Nicolaus Cusanus: “For they are not *Trojans* – or Persians – who are called Turks today. This barbarous people is one of the Scythian groups who are said to have had their native land beyond the Euxinus and the Pirricheus Mountains, by the Eastern Sea, as wise Aethicus thinks.”<sup>54</sup>

---

Schwobel, *The Shadow*, 148–149 and Hankins, ‘Renaissance Crusaders’, 141. In the first canto of the epic there are several allusions to the origin of Mehmed II from the Trojan rulers, although the Trojans are called *Trojanus* and not *Teucer* here, see J. Mar. Philelfī, *Amyris*. (Monumenta Hungariae Historica, XXII/1.) Ed. by C. Hopfio – Ph. A. Dèthier. S. l., s. a. For the approach of Mehmed II to Troy, see Robert Osterhout, ‘The East, the West, and the Appropriation of the Past in Early Ottoman Architecture’, *Gesta* 43:2 (2004) 165–176. I would like to thank Pál Fodor for drawing my attention to this article.

- 51 ‘Epistola Morbisani magni Turcae ad Pium papam II’, in Pio II (Enea Silvio Piccolomini), *Lettera a Maometto II (Epistola ad Mahumetem)*. Trad., ed. by Giuseppe Toffanin. Napoli, 1953. Cf. Heath, ‘Renaissance Scholars’, 455: “Ironically, this work was usually published as a letter to Pope Pius (Aeneas Sylvius himself), although it had been addressed originally to his predecessor Nicolas V.”
- 52 He officially admitted the aberrations of his secular works in his papal bull entitled *In minoribus agentes* dated 26 April 1463. By aberrations, his *Euryalus and Lucretia* are usually mentioned, but it is justified to presume that he also meant his use of *Teucer* when declaring: “Our writings are not ours, they got to many hands and have been read widely. If only those we published had remained in obscurity.” For the bull, see Aeneae Silvii Piccolominei, *Opera quae extant Omnia*. Basel, 1571, 2r.
- 53 *Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*, 67, 253.
- 54 *Non enim, ut quidam rentur, Teuceri sunt neque Perse, qui nunc Turchi dicuntur. Scitharum ex media barbarie genus profectum est, quod ultra Euxinum Pirricheosque montes ad oceanum septentrionalem sedes prius habuisse traditur, ut ethico philosopho placet. Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*, 68, 209.

The same is included in his *Cosmographia* written during his papacy.<sup>55</sup> Thus, from 1453 he consistently used *Turcus*, even though his corresponding partners and contemporaries might call the Ottoman *Teucer* for some more time. That applies to the students at the school of Guarino of Verona, as for example the Hungarian Simon and Georgius Augustinus Zagabriensis. All we know of them is what they reveal in their letters. Simon discloses that he is a friend and pupil of Guarino of Verona and writes his letter to János Vitéz in September 1453, from his sojourn in Ferrara. (Simon was one of the young men whose studies abroad were supported by Vitéz.)<sup>56</sup> The letter narrates his meeting with Pál Ivanich, who tells his story from when he left Vitéz's court and tried his luck in Rome. When the topic is the Ottomans, he quotes Ivanich as saying: "Since I had stayed here long and could safely declare that I was well versed in the matters of the *Trojans* and even had learnt their script well, news of it – he said – got to the pope, who backed me up for my knowledge with an admiring affection and I understood that he was not merely kindly disposed toward me but also thought of some benefit for me."<sup>57</sup> Georgius Augustinus Zagabriensis' name is only known from a published letter; it reveals that he studied in Guarino's school in Ferrara from where he wrote a letter to his patron the Grand Provost of Esztergom, Miklós Ostffy, calling the Turks Trojans.<sup>58</sup>

Nicholaus V was followed by Callixtus III on the papal throne; he managed to organise a united European army for the battle of Nándorfehérvár (Belgrade). He was thus successful in his purposeful activity, though in his writings he is not so consistent, sometimes using the term *Teucer* too.<sup>59</sup> After

---

55 Piccolominei, *Opera*, 383 (*Cosmographia*, Europa, cap. 100), as well as 383 and 384–385 (*Asia*, cap. 4.).

56 On Simon in more detail, see József Huszti, 'Magyar humanista mint török tudós V. Miklós pápa udvarában [A Hungarian humanist as Turkish scholar in the court of Pope Nicholas V]', *Századok* 61 (1927) 344–350. Cf. Vilmos Fraknói, 'Mátyás király magyar diplomatái [The Hungarian diplomats of King Matthias]', *Századok* 32 (1898) 1–14.

57 *Cumque ibi diutius stetissem et me inter Teucros satis longo temporis intervallo versatum profiterer, notitiam quoque litterarum illius gentis me peroptime tenere, subito, inquit, res est ad summum pontificem delata, ob cuius quidem rei studium mirifico me amore est complexus et eum non solum ex animo bene velle mihi intellego, sed etiam alicuius beneficii opem brevi praestitutum.* Nicolaus Barius – Georgius Polycarpus de Kostolan – Simon Hungarus – Georgius Augustinus Zagabriensis, *Reliquiae*. Ed. by Ladislaus Juhász. Leipzig, 1932, 14.

58 Juhász (ed.), *Reliquiae*, 20.

59 Philip Joshua Jacks – William Caferro, *The Spinelli of Florence. Fortunes of a Renaissance*

the siege of Nándorfehérvár the danger that loomed large over Europe seemed to be relieved. Callixtus III was succeeded by Pius II (1458–1464), the former Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, who exerted all his efforts to organise a crusade against the Ottomans in vain. Fed up with the tarrying, in 1464 he set out to take command of the papal fleet against the Ottomans, but he died on the way.

In Hungary, Matthias Corvinus ascended to the throne in 1458; his high priority diplomatic and military goals included the Turkish question during his whole reign, though with varying weight. In his diplomatic and private correspondence he was consistent concerning the Turks, never putting down *Teucer* but always calling them *Turcus*. In his correspondence there is a letter written to him by Pope Paul II (1464–1471) in 1470 in which, ignoring his predecessor's warning, he returns to a now fairly outmoded usage and calls the Turks Trojans.<sup>60</sup> There are some other diplomatic documents from the time of King Matthias that also name the Turks Trojans.<sup>61</sup>

The above letter terminates the block of sources gleaned from correspondence. One reason may be that Vitéz, from whom the highest number of Hungarian sources derive, died in 1472. Though Pius II's anti-Ottoman politics failed, his fight against the "Trojan Turks" was successful: this usage went out of fashion in Europe, at least in the correspondence of the chancelleries. In Europe, the authors who insisted on using *Teuceri* were branded as "old-fashioned and ill-informed" from the 1480s, as Hankins points out.<sup>62</sup>

*The fad permeates other genres too (1470–1499).* There is a work by an anonymous author from this period, usually dated to the 1470s. It is the *Song on St Ladislaus*, excerpts of which survive in the *Gyöngyösi* and *Peer Codices*. After collation and philological correction, the two fragments were published in volume I of the *Collection of Old Hungarian Literature*, edited by Áron Szilády in 1877.<sup>63</sup> This edition was rectified in several places by Cyrill Horváth for the revised edition of the book in 1921, then Rabán Gerézdi, among

---

*Merchant Family*. Pennsylvania, 2001, 298.

60 Vilmos Fraknói (ed.), *Matthiae Corvini Hungariae regis epistolae ad Romanos pontifices datae et ab eis acceptae 1458–1490*. Budapest, 1891, 81 (Ep. 61).

61 Iván Nagy – Albert B. Nyáry (eds.), *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek Mátyás király korából 1458–1490* [Monuments of Hungarian diplomacy from the age of King Matthias]. Vol. I, Budapest, 1875, 213.

62 Hankins, 'Renaissance Crusaders', 139.

63 *Szent László-ének* [Song on St Ladislaus], in Áron Szilády (ed.), *Régi magyar költők tára. Vol. I* [henceforth RMKT I.]: *Középkori magyar költői maradványok* [Collection of old Hungarian literature. Remains of medieval Hungarian poetry]. Budapest, 1877, 277–279.

others, added important commentaries to the text.<sup>64</sup> The poem is unique and has generated several arguments for and against translation versus originality.<sup>65</sup> It eulogizes King St Ladislaus as the champion of Christianity, which is – in Gerézdi’s view – “proven”, or illustrated by stanza 16, only included in the *Gyöngyösi Codex*:

Tu tartarorum terror eorum,  
crebro debellans in alpihus eos,  
tu bassarum pavor eorum,  
tu metus orbis *Theucris* vocabaris.<sup>66</sup>

When taken literally, Ladislaus was the enemy of Tatars, pashas and Trojans. By *tartarus* used for ‘Tatar’ Cumans are to be understood, as Szilády rightly pointed out; *bassanus* is a clerical error for Pechenegs, so up to that point there is no anachronism.<sup>67</sup> But *Theucris* is problematic: first Szilády identifies them with the Turks, citing a Pelbárt of Temesvár excerpt to prove that in the fifteenth century it was customary to call the Turks Trojans.<sup>68</sup> It is quoted by Cyrill Horváth, but he is wrong in presuming that the name usage was the invention of the humanists. He adds that the line is most probably anachronistic, for in St Ladislaus’ time Hungary cannot have had the slightest notion of the Turks.<sup>69</sup> Gerézdi tries to resolve this anachronism in two ways: *Theucris* is either derived from the misspelling of *terre* – which, in my opinion, is quite unfounded –, or it is used to designate the Saracens, and he refers to a

64 *De sancto Ladislao*, in Cyrill Horváth (ed.), *Régi magyar költők tára. Vol. I<sup>2</sup>* [henceforth RMKT I<sup>2</sup>]: *Középkori magyar verseink* [Medieval Hungarian poems]. Budapest, 1921, 220–234. Rabán Gerézdi, *A magyar világi líra kezdetei* [Beginnings of the Hungarian secular poetry]. Budapest, 1962, 140–192.

65 On the genre and verse form, see József Vekerdi, ‘Szent László-ének [Song on St Ladislaus]’, in Tibor Komlószi (ed.), *A régi magyar vers* [The old Hungarian verse]. Budapest, 1979, 11–21. For a summary of the question of primacy, see Adrienne Dömötör (ed.), *Gyöngyösi-kódex az 1500-as évek elejéről, a nyelvemlék hasonmása és betűhű átírata bevezetéssel és jegyzetekkel* [The Gyöngyösi Codex from the early 1500s, facsimile and transliteration, with introduction and notes]. Budapest, 2001, 24.

66 The letter-perfect transliteration of the Hungarian translation of the early 1500s from the *Gyöngyösi Codex*, see *ibid.*, 45: *Te thataroknak wag meg tereje / Magokath zagatad az hawas[on] / the poganoknak wag rethenetyk / therekek mondotak feld felelmen[ek]* (You are the terror of Tatars, / Who lost themselves on the snowy alps, / all pagans are frightened of you / the Turks regard you as the threat of the world).

67 RMKT I, 279. RMKT I<sup>2</sup>, 233. Gerézdi, *A magyar világi líra kezdetei*, 156–158.

68 RMKT I, 279.

69 RMKT I<sup>2</sup>, 233–234.



fifteenth-century German source in which the Turks are labelled Saracens. That, however, cannot be a decisive argument, for the designation works here in reverse order: true, there were several names in use to denote Turks – among others, Trojan, barbarous, pagan, Tatar – and Saracen would fit this list, too. It does not mean that *Theucris*, meaning primarily Trojans and only secondarily the Turks, could have been applied to the Saracens: it would suffice to write Turkish instead of Saracen. Gerézdi rightly notes at the end of his reasoning that the name *Teucer* is used with deliberate allusion to the present.<sup>70</sup> The unidentified author wrote a panegyric about the glory of St Ladislaus some 400 years later by bringing the saint king's enemies closer to the enemy image of his own age.

The *Dubnicz Chronicle* by an anonymous author appeared in 1479.<sup>71</sup> It relates the history of the Hungarians from the beginning to 1479 on the basis of several narratives.<sup>72</sup> Up to Louis I the *Buda Chronicle* of 1473 and a shorter version of the *Illustrated Chronicle* can be read, then he narrates the story of Louis I on the basis of János Küküllei, then his source is again the *Buda Chronicle* up to King Matthias.<sup>73</sup> He adds to it what has happened since, but not always in chronological order:<sup>74</sup> the massacre of the population of Várad, the burning down of the city (1474), and the battle of Kenyérmező (today Câmpul Pâinii, Romania) in 1479. The author of the *Dubnicz Chronicle* – Sándor Domanovszky claims – recorded events that showed King Matthias in a negative light, and consequently it is like a pamphlet pitted against the *Buda Chronicle*, which – on the other side of the coin – showed Matthias Corvinus in a favourable light.<sup>75</sup> The sad events of Várad are perpetuated in *caput* 228, followed by an epitaph in hexameter:

---

70 Gerézdi, *A magyar világi líra kezdetei*, 159.

71 Flórián Mátyás (ed.), *Chronica Dubnicense cum codicibus Sambuci, Acephalo et Vaticano Cronicisque Vindobinensi Picto et Budensi accurate collatum*. Budapest, 1884.

72 Cf. with the most recent description of the chronicle: Balázs Kertész, 'Dubnici Krónika' [Dubnicz Chronicle], in Ferenc Földesi (ed.), *Csillag a holló árnyékában. Vitéz János és a humanizmus kezdetei Magyarországon* [Star in the shadow of the raven. János Vitéz and the beginnings of humanism in Hungary]. Budapest, 2008, 78–79.

73 Although he relies on the *Buda Chronicle*, he is silent about the years between 1468 and 1474. Cf. Sándor Domanovszky, 'A Dubniczi krónika [The Dubnicz Chronicle]', *Századok* 33 (1899) 226–256, 342–355, 411–451.

74 For examples, see *ibid.*, 76.

75 Kertész says this is the first work in Hungarian historiography in which a still living ruler is criticized.

Dor febru sanctis succumbit plebs pia *teucris*  
 Peccatum populi plangit clades Varadini.<sup>76</sup>

Since this poem is in quantitative meter while the former is in qualitative meter, the question arises: was the choice of the word required by the number of syllables or the length?<sup>77</sup> Disregarding here the possibility of *metri causa*, the two examples show well that it makes no difference metrically whether the poet wrote *Teucris* or *Turcis*. In the epitaph the choice between the two words might have made a difference if it had been a chronogram, but this is not the case here. This is the only locus where the writer of the *Dubnicz Chronicle* calls the Turks *Teucer*: Why? The answer might perhaps be found in Várád. In Hungary, the keenest user of *Teucer* was Bishop of Várád János Vitéz, who was involved in the conspiracy against King Matthias in 1471 and died out of grace in 1472. If the writer of the *Dubnicz Chronicle* was indeed so deeply opposed to Matthias as Domanovszky claims he was, then applying the word usage of the former bishop of Várád and later conspirer against King Matthias was a tour de force to express his own political views.<sup>78</sup>

János Magyi's collection of formulae with additions by Tamás Nyírkállai (therefore often called *Magyi* or *Nyírkállai Codex*) also includes two *János Hunyadi epitaphs* which contain Teucer instead of Turcus.<sup>79</sup> One – a prosaic epitaph – is usually dated to 1476 and was written by a Franciscan monk of Ragusa, and the other datable to 1480–1490 is versified, but there is even less information of its author than the former. The versified epitaph displays close connections with the *Song on St Ladislaus*, probably it was written in knowledge of it.<sup>80</sup>

---

76 “This pious folk fell victim to the *Trojans* on 6 February, the day of St Dorothy. / This disaster is the outcome of the sins of the people of Várád.”

77 The number of syllables and the word order are particularly intriguing as this is a cisiojanus poem, the anonymous poet indicating 6 February with the day of Dorothy. True, according to Gusztáv Heinrich's definition this poem does not belong to the cisiojanus poems, for a cisio is not identified by hexameter but by observing the principle of “*sillaba quaeque diem*”, the correspondence of syllable and day. Here, it is not satisfied, for the syllable *Dor* ought to be the sixth.

78 This hypothesis is supported by the fact that the work is supposed to have been written in Várád (based on the abundance of events taking place in and around Várád); cf. Kertész, ‘Dubnici Krónika’, 78.

79 M. G. Kovachich, *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum minores inediti*. Vol. II, Buda, 1798, 1, 7.

80 On the two epitaphs, see Gerézdi, *A magyar világi líra kezdetei*, 169–170.

More or less contemporaneous with the later epitaph is János Thuróczy's *Chronica Hungarorum* printed in 1488. As mentioned earlier, since the fall of Constantinople there was increasing demand for the clarification and dissemination of the origins of the Turks. Thuróczy tried to satisfy this demand by writing about their roots too; he ignores the Trojan fable and puts forth the Scythian origin of the Turks. He is writing about the inhabitants of Scythia when he remarks that the last people to derive from there were the Turks: "Besides, Scythia has nurtured and given to the world many other peoples, most recently the Turks. Though many believe that they are descendants of the Trojans and received their name from King Teucros, who went to the assistance of the threatened city during the devastations of the Trojan war, not in the form Turk, but *Teucrici* ('Trojan')." <sup>81</sup>

In the wake of Aeneas Silvius, he then describes the Scythian origin of the Turks citing Aethicus. <sup>82</sup> Eckhardt opines that Thuróczy combined the theories of Aethicus and Fredegar, that is, knowledge on geographic location and the legend of King Teucer were fused. Thuróczy was already among those who adopted the Scythian origin of the Turks. His work has source value for the present paper, indicating that the Turks were less and less called Trojans when it was written.

My latest source evidences that the word usage appears in yet another new genre: a sermon. Pelbárt of Temesvár wrote his sermon in which he calls the Turks Trojans for 6 August, the feast of the Transfiguration: "But in the next year, in the year 1456 of the Lord, when the disgusting *Trojan* beleaguered Nándorfehértúr [Belgrade] with his army so as to destroy Hungary whole and the entire Christian world afterwards, the crusading force withstood successfully, God gave the victory to the Christians by routing the *Trojans* on this day, the day of the Transfiguration of Our Lord." <sup>83</sup>

---

81 *Multas preter has Scitia gentes suo in gremio enutritas fudit, quarum novissimi Thurci esse perhibentur, quamvis nonnulli illos Troyano de genere propaginem ducere et nomen a Thewcro rege, qui Troyani belli in fervore ruiture urbi auxiliaturus venerat, nomen non Thurci, sed Thewcri recepisse putent.* Johannes de Thurocz, *Chronica Hungarorum*. Ed. by Erzsébet Galántai – Gyula Kristó. Vol. I, Budapest, 1985, 10. cap. De laude Scitarum et de gentibus de Scitia ortis, 89. sent., 31.

82 He must have received his knowledge of Aethicus from Piccolomini, who quotes Aethicus amply, cf. with the commentary to the text: Johannes de Thurocz, *Chronica Hungarorum*, 79–81. For Aethicus' text see *Die Kosmographie des Aethicus*, 119–120.

83 *Sed postea anno domini MCCCCLVI., cum fetidissimus theucus obsedisset exercitu validissimo castrum nandor alba dictum, ut exinde totam demoliretur vngariam ac*

Pelbárt is mistaken when he dates the routing of the Ottomans to 6 August, as it happened earlier: the victory is customarily put to 21 July. 6 August became notable because the news of the victory arrived in Rome by then and Pope Callixtus ordered the ringing of the noon bells to the glory of the Christian troops on that day, and it was only a year later, in 1457, that the day was declared to be the day of the Transfiguration of Jesus. Pelbárt's collected sermons, *Sermones pomerii de sanctis*, was published in 1499 in Hagenau, the third and fourth editions came out there in 1501.<sup>84</sup> These editions include *Teucer* in the cited passage, but the sixth edition of 1504 already has *Thurcus* here – a clear indication that the time of the Trojan Turks is over.

### Conclusion

Summing up the voluminous source material one can conclude that the role of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini had a salient role in both disseminating the studied word usage at first, and in prohibiting it later: until the 1450s the largest number of occurrences are covered in his oeuvre, while after the fall of Constantinople not only the Ottomans themselves, but also the word *Teucer/Teucrus* becomes a mortal enemy. Despite the prohibition, this word usage became fashionable in the more popular genres in the last third of the century, and since the authors of these works were not involved in the correspondence of the chancery, their attitude is attributable either to their protesting against the prohibition, or their ignorance of it. At any rate, this pun appears to be an intriguing phenomenon of the fifteenth century. The sixteenth is the century of the spread of vernacular literature, and since most languages, including Italian

---

*consequenter christianitatem totam, cruciferis ex adverso resistentibus, deus dedit victoriam christianis theucro turpiter effugato isto die transfigurationis.* Pelbartus de Themeswar, *De transfiguratione Domini IV. sermo*. Sermones pomerii de sanctis, pars. aest. s. XLV. Ed. by Johannes Rynmann. Hagenau, 1499. Károly Szabó – Árpád Hellebrant (eds.), *Régi Magyar Könyvtár. Magyar szerzőktől külföldön 1480-tól 1711-ig megjelent nem magyar nyelvű nyomtatványoknak könyvészeti kézikönyve* [Old Hungarian Literature. Bibliographic manual of printed works by Hungarian authors printed abroad between 1480 and 1711]. Budapest, 1896. The volume of 1499 (III. 49/2) is identical with that of 1501 (III. 93/2). The edition of 1504 presents *Thurcus* in the passage in question.

84 For editions of the works of Pelbárt of Temesvár, see Gedeon Borsa, 'Laskai Osvát és Temesvári Pelbárt műveinek megjelentetői [The publishers of the works of Osvát Laskai and Pelbárt of Temesvár]', *Magyar Könyvszemle* 121 (2005) 1–24.

which is closest to Latin, derives Trojan from *Troianus* and not from *Teucer*, the Turkish-Trojan (*Teuceri-Turci*) pun could not survive in any language.