

FR. GEORGIUS DE HUNGARIA, O.P.,  
AND THE *TRACTATUS DE MORIBUS  
CONDICIONIBUS ET NEQUICIA TURCORUM.*

By J. A. B. PALMER, B.A.

THE *Tractatus de Moribus Condicionibus et Nequicia Turcorum* is the most valuable account of life and institutions among the Ottoman Turks in the fifteenth century which we possess, superior in that connexion to the better known works of Schiltberger and Bertrandon de la Brocquière. It records the experiences of an educated and intelligent native of the province of Siebenbürgen who was captured by the Turks in 1438 and remained as a slave in the Turkish dominions until 1458, when he regained his liberty, returned to Christian realms, and eventually entered the Dominican Order. His account may not have been written until some twenty years after the end of his captivity; this interval, however, did not cloud the freshness or accuracy of his recollections. Between 1480 and 1550 the book was printed in numerous Latin editions with slightly varying titles, and in 1530-1531 a number of German versions of it were put out, of which there were further examples in 1560 and 1596; at that period, either in its own editions or by way of quotations in other writers, it was an important source of European knowledge of the Ottoman Turks. The identity of the author is not recorded in any of the editions and was not known even to some of the earliest users of the work. There is, however, as we shall see, strong evidence establishing that his name in religion was Frater Georgius de Hungaria. This name remained unknown to many writers who quote from the work, and variously describe the author as *Septemcastrensis Captivus* or *Monachus*, or *Mühlenbacher* (from the place where he was captured). This has given rise to confusion regarding his identity, which was aggravated by the resemblance of the name Georgius de Hungaria and of the title of the work to those of the better known but much later writer

Bartholomaeus Georgevicz, who likewise is counted as from Hungary ; indeed, the works of these two different writers have sometimes been confused in library catalogues. In a work by F. W. Hasluck, posthumously published in 1929, fresh attention was drawn to the *Tractatus* but with only a very limited indication of its importance and an inadequate note on the authorship.<sup>1</sup> In 1939 an article on the subject was published over the signature of Florio Banfi in the periodical *Memorie Domenicane* at Florence.<sup>2</sup> This was a far fuller study than previously existed but it does not exhaust all the points which arise and in some particulars the author seems to have gone astray ; moreover, the review in which this article appeared is difficult of access in England. I offer, therefore, in these pages a fuller study than Banfi's, dealing with the author's biography and identity, with the contents of the *Tractatus*, with the use of it by later writers, and with the bibliography of its editions and versions.

The biographical details which we possess concerning the author are mainly found in the book itself, particularly in the sections entitled *Prologus* and *Ratio Testimonialis*.

He was a native of the Siebenbürgen. An old manuscript gloss is recorded which gives his birthplace as Ramocz (Romocz, Rumes) in the Bröserstuhl, and this is possibly true. He was born c. 1422, for he tells us that at the time of his capture by the Turks he was aged about 16 years and was a student at (Szász) Sebes-Mühlenbach. Banfi has pointed out that the only school there at that date was a Dominican institution and this no doubt accounts for his ultimately joining the Order of Preachers.<sup>3</sup> Sebes was captured by a Turkish raiding force in August, 1438 ; the author himself says the event occurred after the death of the Emperor Sigismund, which happened in 1437, but then, evidently by a slip of memory, he dates his

<sup>1</sup> F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, II, pp. 494 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Florio Banfi, *Fra Giorgio di Settecastelli, O.P.* in *Memorie Domenicane* (Firenze, Convento S. Maria Novella), May-June, 1939, pp. 130-142 ; July-October, 1939, pp. 202-210. I am indebted for access to this article to the kindness of Father Thomas Kaeppli, O.P., head of the Istituto Storico Domenicano at S. Sabina in Rome.

<sup>3</sup> Banfi, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

capture in 1436.<sup>1</sup> He remained in captivity in Turkey until 1458. Sold to the slave-merchants accompanying the army, he was re-sold in Adrianople, shipped to Burgama (Pergamum), and sold to a farmer. He effected eight escapes, of which the last five were collusive, i.e. with the aid of Christian slave-dealers who re-sold the escaping slave in a distant part of the country and after making sufficient profit finally assisted him to return home. In this way the author returned to Christian realms in 1458.

In the *Ratio Testimonialis* he mentions his *sacerdotium*, and he also refers in Cap. xxi to his hearing confessions, so that we can infer his ordination as a priest. In Cap. xvii of his work he mentions the conversion of infidels *sicut legitur de sancto Vincentio ordinis nostri qui plures saracenorum converterit*, a clear reference to Saint Vincent Ferrer; it follows that the author joined the Order of Preachers. He seems to have composed his book some considerable time after his escape. He says in the *Prohemium* that he is writing "in old age" (*me senem*), which seems to indicate a date nearer 1480 than 1470. He refers in Cap. xxi to the dispatch of legates *in primis annis Sixti Quarti*, which Banfi has correctly identified as a reference to the naval expedition under Cardinal Oliviero Carafa in 1472.<sup>2</sup> Since this event is regarded by the author as already some time past (*in primis annis*), he must be writing nearer 1480 than 1470.

In the *Prohemium*, when referring to his own advanced age, he gives as his reason for writing, the desire to instruct others who may become captives and also to record his recollections for his own use if captured again; it is, therefore, possible that he actually wrote in Siebenbürgen or Hungary and not in Rome, and that when he came to Rome in the latter part of the decade 1470-1480 he brought his manuscript with him.

<sup>1</sup> Fr. Bartholomaeus de Jano, O.F.M., *Epistola de crudelitate Turcarum*, Migne, P.G., 158, coll. 1055-1067, writing from Constantinople in December, 1438, describes a raid into Siebenbürgen (*Septemsolia*) in August of that year and another into the country of the *Siculi* (Szekels) further east in September, and mentions a report of a third in October. The Wall-Chronicle of Kronstadt gives the capture of Sebes in 1438: Schwandtner, *Script. rer. Hung.*, Tom. I, p. 886.

<sup>2</sup> Banfi, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

There is one other piece of independent evidence which may, I think, be adduced in support of the view that the author was not in Rome much before 1480.

There is another almost contemporary *Tractatus* emanating from Dominican circles known by the title *Tractatus quidam de Turcis prout ad praesens ecclesia ab eis affligitur collectus diligenti discussione Scripturarum a quibusdam fratribus predicatorum ordinis, etc.*<sup>1</sup> This is a discussion of prophecies (especially those of St. Methodius) in relation to the Turkish menace. The text informs us that it was composed in 1474; it was printed in that year in Rome by Schurener de Bopardia, and must be presumed to have been composed there. Almost the only piece of historical information contained in it is that the authors, being uncertain of the date when the wars with the Turks had commenced in the reign of Murad II, caused enquiry to be made in 1472 by one of their brethren in Győr (Raab) from the *frater carnalis* of Mehmed II. As Mehmed II murdered his only surviving brother on his accession, this personage appears to be an impostor and his answer to the enquiry was as vague as might be expected. The point, however, is that if the author of the *Tractatus de Moribus* had been in a Dominican convent in Rome as early as 1474, he could have answered this question almost from personal experience. One cannot believe he was in Rome when the *Tractatus quidam* was composed.

The evidence for the identity or name of the author (at least in religion) consists of the following :

Bernardus de Lutzemburgo, also a Dominican, who spent most of his career in Cologne, where the *Tractatus de Moribus* was twice printed in his lifetime, writes as follows in his *Catalogus Haereticorum*, 2nd edition, Cologne, 1523 (the passage is not in the *editio princeps* of 1522), *Lib. II, s.v. Mahometus : Et Iohan de Turrecremata fecit tractatum contra Mahometum*,

<sup>1</sup> There are three editions, Rome (Schurener de Bopardia) 1474 (?), Hain 15680; Nürnberg (Anton Koberger) 1475 (?), Hain 15679; and Nürnberg (Conrad Zeninger) 1481 (?), Hain 15681. The work is erroneously placed by Quétif-Echard in the fourteenth century: *Script. Ord. Predic.*, Vol. I, pp. 475-476. I learn by the courtesy of the State Librarian in Leipzig that the Leipzig volume mentioned by Quétif-Echard is a copy of Hain 15681.

*similiter Frater Georgius de Ungaria ordinis nostri fecit librum de ritibus Turcorum continentem 23 capite. Romae habetur super Minervam.* The title of the work given by Bernardus does not exactly correspond to that of any of the editions of the *Tractatus*, but it resembles the titles of the two Cologne editions; as we shall see, the number of chapters is correct for the actually numbered chapters, omitting the unnumbered sections.

The British Museum copy of the *editio princeps* of the *Tractatus* contains a manuscript gloss, added at the end of the *Incipit*, which (with abbreviations expanded) reads as follows: *Editum per fratrem Georgium de Ungaria ordinis predicatorum qui obiit Romae et claret miraculis in ecclesia S. Marie supra Minervam.* By the courtesy of the authorities of the British Museum I am informed that this gloss is in an Italian humanistic hand of the early sixteenth century, so that it is contemporary with the statement of Bernardus de Lutzemburgo.

The foregoing evidence has been known for some time, but through the kindness of Fr. Thomas Kaeppli, O.P., and Fr. Angelicus Iszak, O.P., I am able to draw attention to a fresh piece of evidence which escaped even Banfi's notice in 1939. This is nothing less than a reference in the chronicle of Fr. Sebastiani de Olmeda, O.P., to the death and burial of Fr. Georgius de Hungaria. This refers to Fr. Georgius as one of those *viri vitae sanctimonia et ingenii acrimonia praecepsi* who were found in the Order of Preachers under Vincenzo Bandello, Master-General from the 30th May, 1501, to the 27th August, 1506. The date of the death of Fr. Georgius is given and proves to be the 3rd July, 1502, when he would have been 80 years of age. His body was exposed for three days in the church of S. Maria sopra Minerva *cum maxima populi frequentia*, which accords with the words of the British Museum gloss *claret miraculis*. He was buried near *Joannes de Foessulis (Fesulis)*, who is no other than Fra Angelico; the painter's tomb in S. Maria sopra Minerva has merited preservation, our author's has undeservedly been lost.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Father Sebastiani de Olmeda, O.P., *Chronica Ord. Praedic. ab initio Ordinis usque ad annum 1550 et ultra, nunc primo edita cura M. Canal Gomez O.P. (Ex Analectis Sac. Ord. Praed. Ann. 41-43)*, 1936, Roma, p. 183, where we read

The evidence as to authorship derived from Bernardus de Lutzemburgo and the British Museum gloss is much strengthened when it is thus shown, by Olmeda's chronicle, to date within about twenty years of the death of Fr. Georgius. The terms, moreover, in which Olmeda speaks of Fr. Georgius make of him a much less shadowy figure than he had otherwise been and accord well with Bernardus and the British Museum gloss. One is inclined to hold that there is irrefragable evidence that Fr. Georgius de Hungaria was the author of the *Tractatus*.

Yet there remains to be mentioned one record which leaves a shadow of doubt in one's mind. F. Toldy, the historian of Hungarian literature, distinguishes between a writer whom he calls the *Anonymous of Szászsebes* and a writer whom he calls *Magyar Györgyi* (*Georgius Ungarus*, as his translator Kolbenheyer puts it). According to Toldy, this Anonymous was the author of the *Tractatus* and Georgius Ungarus was the author of a book *De ritibus Turcarum* [*sic*]. As regards the *Tractatus*, Toldy refers to it under the title *Tractatus de Ritu Moribus Nequitia et Multiplicatione Turcorum*, which is really the title of the fourth Latin edition of 1508, as will be shown below. Of this, he had seen a copy which he correctly says is *sine loco et anno*, but which he dates (wrongly as to that edition) between 1478-1481. He adds that the book was reprinted at Paris in 1511, i.e. the sixth Latin edition, of which there is a copy in the University Library there, and at Basel in 1543, i.e. the tenth Latin edition. As to Georgius Ungarus and the *De ritibus Turcarum*, he says that the work existed in manuscript in *Coll. S. Mariae ad Minervam*. It looks as if Toldy had really seen the copies of the *Tractatus* which he mentions. Did he also see the *De ritibus Turcarum*? Toldy obtained this particular piece of

as follows: *Sub Vincentio denique florere in Ordine viri vitae sanctimonia et ingenii acrimonia praecelesi . . . inter quos non silentio praetereundus existit Georgius de Hungaria qui Romae v. Nonis Junii migrans, secundo Vincentii anno, cum maxima populi frequentia per triduum insepultus mansit, corruscantibus signis, intra ecclesiam Minervae juxta Joannem de Foessulis conditus.* Fr. Thomas Kaeppli explains as follows: there are only IV Nones in June and Junii is an error in the MS. XIV 26, f. iii r, from which the printed text is taken: another MS. XIV 27, f. 92 r, reads *Julii*, which must be correct: *Vincentius* is Vincenzo Baudello: thus the date is 3rd July, 1502.

information between 1852 and 1862, the dates of the second and third editions of his work, in the latter of which it first appears. The library of S. Maria sopra Minerva remained intact until the seizure of Rome in 1870. It was then scattered and the MS. has now disappeared. The possibility remains that Toldy saw the MS. and found that it was not the same work as the *Tractatus*. It would even then be possible that Fr. Georgius wrote both books. It seems a pity, almost, to raise this doubt when the contemporary evidence is to all appearances so strong, but it would not be right to ignore entirely a statement by one who may have been the last outsider actually to see the Minerva MS.<sup>1</sup>

Before leaving the problem of authorship, one further question may be asked. Was Fr. Georgius by origin a Saxon or a Hungarian? No certain answer is perhaps possible. Local historians of the Siebenbürger Saxons hold him to be a Saxon. Banfi, though a Hungarian, agrees with them, but on the insufficient grounds that he calls his native district *Septem-castra* instead of *Transilvania* and that he spells Sebes in the German manner Schebesch.<sup>2</sup> As to these arguments, it is true that Hungarian writers tend to use the name Transilvania, but as a rule in a wider sense and this argument is inconclusive; as to Schebesch, he gives the Hungarian name first and the German name (Mühlenbach) second, instead of *vice versa* as one might have expected from a Saxon, while as to the spelling employed in that case, regard must also be had to his system of spelling of the many Turkish words in the text, including the *Duo Sermones* or Turkish poems mentioned below.

This system was described by K. Foy, in his philological study of the Turkish poems, words and phrases in the *Tractatus*, as "confused, arbitrary and surprising". That, however, is

<sup>1</sup> The references are F. Toldy, *A magyar nemzeti irodalom története*, 3rd edition, 1862, Vol. II, p. 57 and the German translation by M. Kolbenheyer under the title *Geschichte der ungrischen Literatur im Mittelalter*, 1865, p. 217. As mentioned in the text, the passage is not in Toldy's 2nd edition of 1852 and first appears in his 3rd edition of 1862. Kolbenheyer in his German translation makes a mistake and gives Schässburg (Segesvár) instead of Mühlenbach (Szászsebes), but Toldy gives the latter name correctly in Hungarian. Toldy also briefly mentions this Anonymous in connexion with the school at Szászsebes (*op. cit.*, 2nd edn., Vol. I, p. 151).

<sup>2</sup> Banfi, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

unjust, because Foy does not seem to have realised that the printed text is full of undoubted misprints and that in the author's manuscript the spelling of Turkish words was certainly consistent. Incidentally, the failure to allow for or to amend correctly these misprints has occasionally led Foy into errors of interpretation. Foy goes on to say that the essential foundation of the system is German, and points to the frequent use of *sch* and *tsch* for English *sh* and *ch*: he admits, however, that English *sh* is sometimes represented by *s* or by *ss*, which is Hungarian usage. Most remarkable of all is that the ordinary *s* sound is usually represented in Turkish words by *cz*, which is, as Foy remarks, *vom Standpunkte der deutschen Schrift befremdlich*. It is surely Hungarian, for *cz* (or *c*) in Hungarian represents a sibilant transcribed in English as *ts*, which is appropriate here. The author may have been bi-lingual in Hungarian and German but his choice of *cz* for *s* is surely so distinctively Hungarian as to incline the balance in favour of Hungarian rather than German origin.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, I would note that neither the author nor the work is mentioned by Sigismundus Ferrarius in the *Hist. Prov. Hung. Ord. Predic.*, published in 1637. It seems, moreover, to have been customary in the Order to distinguish individuals by *cognomina* derived, as Quétif-Echard say in regard to our author, from their native country or their province of the Order. It is therefore possible to find in Dominican records a number of persons bearing the name *Georgius de Hungaria*.<sup>2</sup> On the

<sup>1</sup> K. Foy, *Die ältesten osmanischen Transcriptionstexte in gothischen Lettern*, in *Mittheil. des Seminar für orient. Spr.*, Berlin, Vol. IV, 1901, pp. 231-277; Vol. V, 1902, pp. 233-293. As examples of the Hungarian *s* (*sh*) one can point to *Mentesse* (*Menteshe*), *tamsmani* (misprint for *talisman*, i.e. *danishmend*), *passa* (*pasha*). Examples of the *cz* (*s*) are *czolaclar* (*solaklar*), *czubaschi* (*subashi*) *erczullah* (*al-rasulu'llahi*), *czofilar* (*sufiler*), *czilar aitmach* (misprint for *czikar aitmach*, i.e. *zikr aitmak*), *czunetsz* (*sünnetsiz*). The most remarkable misprint is the word *dervishler* which is only once printed (Cap. xvii) *derivischler* as the author certainly wrote it and elsewhere is always misprinted *dermschler*. A misprint which misled Foy is *czilar aitmach* (see above), where he took the misprinted letter to be 'r' for 't' and made *czilat* (as he read) into *şalāt*, instead of correcting 'l' to 'k' (or possibly 'c') and reading *czikar* = *zikr*.

<sup>2</sup> See for instance E. Veress, *Monumenta Hungariae Italica III: Matricula et Acta Hungarorum in Universitatibus Italiae studentium 1221-1864*, Budapest, 1941, pp. 88-89.



other hand, *Magister Georgius de Hungaria*, a writer on Mathematics at the end of the fifteenth century, is not a Dominican and has nothing to do with the author of the *Tractatus*.<sup>1</sup> The Dominican Friar styled B. Giovanni Unghero is Fr. Johannes Teutonicus, Master-General of the Order from 1241-1252.<sup>2</sup>

I have referred in the above account of the biographical data to portions of the *Tractatus* and turn now to describe its contents more fully.

Originally, the book consisted of the following sections: (i) *Prohemium*, (ii) *Prologus*, (iii) 23 numbered *capita* or chapters, with title headings, (iv) *Ratio Testimonialis*, (v) *Duo Sermones in vulgari Turchorum*, (vi) *Interpretatio Sermonum Predictorum in Latino*, (vii) *Opinio Abbatis Joachim de Secta Mechometi*. The *Duo Sermones* are two Turkish poems which the translators of the German versions convert into *Zwo Predigt*. The *Opinio Abbatis Joachim* is, of course, from Joachim of Flora, from whom the author makes quite a number of quotations; apart from that, his quotations are few and come from Scripture or from Saint Augustine.<sup>3</sup>

In the edition of 1508 (Latin No. 4 below) there was added at the end of the above sub-divisions a section on Christian sects, *De decem nationibus Christianorum*, which then appears in all the subsequent Latin editions or German versions. This section is borrowed from the *Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum* of Johannes de Hees. The British Museum copy of the edition of 1500 (Latin No. 3 below) has, curiously enough, some MS. notes on the title page, described in the British Museum *Catalogue of Early Printed Books* as an "old list of contents"; these include the work of Johannes de Hees from which in the next

<sup>1</sup> He belonged to the Canons of Schoonhoven in the Netherlands. See C. v. Szily und Aug. Heller, *Die Arithmetik des Magisters Georgius de Hungaria aus dem Jahre 1499*, in *Math. und Naturw. Ber. aus Ungarn*, Bd. XII, 1894, Berlin and Budapest.

<sup>2</sup> This personage is stated by Armellini, *Le Chiese di Roma*, 1942, Vol. I, p. 596, to be depicted in a picture in the cloister of S. Maria sopra Minerva. He is called Unghero because once bishop of Diacovar in Bosnia and is given the title of Beatus by Dominican writers. I owe this information again to Father Thomas Kaeppli, O.P.

<sup>3</sup> For reasons of space I do not give a list of the headings of the 23 *capite*; such a list is given by Banfi, *op. cit.*, pp. 134-135.

edition of 1508 a section was borrowed and also the work of Victor de Carben which was combined with the *Tractatus* in the Paris edition of 1511.<sup>1</sup>

The *Tractatus* is the work of a religious and, as mentioned already, the author intended it as an aide-mémoire for himself and others exposed to the physical, but still more to the spiritual, dangers of captivity among non-Christians. It is only to be expected that quite considerable portions of it should be taken up with lamentations over the fate of captives and apostates or with religious disquisition. These portions are not without appeal and even those who do not share the author's faith might not remain quite unmoved by them, for they are written with much sincerity and also simplicity—*sermo barbarus*, Gessner calls the style, but at least it is lively and unaffected. Apart from this, there is much in the book which is of very great value for students of early Ottoman history. I propose to note the principal matters of this description.

In the *Prologus* the author gives a full description of the capture of Sebes by the Ottoman forces. Fr. Georgius states that the *dux Valachorum* accompanied this expedition and that he persuaded the citizens to make terms, under which the notables would accompany him to Wallachia and remain there or return as they chose, while the mass of the people would go with the Ottomans into Ottoman territory and would there receive lands, and could remain there in peace or return as they wished. These terms were evidently intended to win over the notables by giving them a reasonable certainty of return (perhaps subject to ransom), as the Christian *dux Valachorum* would have them in charge, while the mass of the inhabitants, once on Turkish soil, would be left at their captors' mercy; the arrangement illustrates the perpetual "man-hunger" of the Ottomans.

<sup>1</sup> The last item in the list, in a later hand, is *Revelaciones Methodii*, which might possibly mean the *Tractatus quidam*. On the first page of one of the British Museum copies of the latter (Hain 15679) are scrawled the words *Revelaciones de Turcis Methodii martyris* (abbreviated); the B.M. *Catalogue of Early Printed Books* regards this as a mistaken reference to Walter Aytinger's later printed book, but in fact the *Tractatus quidam* is so very largely taken up with the prophecies of S. Methodius that these words could serve equally well as a note of contents and even a short title for the *Tractatus quidam*.

The terms were accepted by all but a handful, who, led by a certain noble and his brother, barricaded themselves in a tower during the night; the author was among these. The Turks ultimately set fire to the tower and, when it collapsed, dragged the survivors, including our author, from the smoking ruins, and he thus passed into captivity.

In Cap. i he gives a very remarkable account of the origin of the Ottoman power. He says that about the year 1280 the *Soldanus Magnus* (i.e. the Mamluk Sultan of Egypt) invaded the East (*Oriens*) and conquered it. He then divided it into seven parts, which he conferred, with hereditary rights, on seven princes, Othmanbeg, Ermenbeg, Germenbeg, Czarchanbeg, Andinbeg, Mentessebeg, and Karamanbeg. By degrees the Othmanbeg (Osman and his successors) overcame the others and absorbed their territories, except the Karamanbeg; the latter still in the author's time exists, and unless at peace with him the Othmanbeg dare not make war elsewhere. The former territories of these princes still retained their names, as Othmaneli, Ermeneli, Germeneli, etc. Now, in the latter part of the thirteenth century the later Seljuks of Rum had fallen under Mongol influence, and were under the immediate domination of a powerful vice-regent known as Muin-ud-din Suleiman Parwana (Pervane). In 1277 Baibars, the Mamluk Sultan of Egypt, invaded Asia Minor and captured Kaisariye; he soon retired but the event was an important incident in the final extinction of the Seljuk dynasty of Rum. Our author is clearly referring to this expedition of Baibars. Shortly afterwards the Seljuks did finally disappear, and by about 1280 or soon after a number of principedoms were emerging in Asia Minor, of which the author correctly (misprints apart) gives the names of six, Othman, Germian, Saruhan, Aidin, Mentеше, and Karaman; the seventh, Ermen, may perhaps also be a misprint for Ertena.

In Cap. viii there is a very important description of the Janissaries, spelt *Gingitscheri* by the author. He refers to their recruitment from prisoners of war and to their use of a peculiar white cap, which is confined to those attached to the Sultan's court or person. In these respects, this account exactly confirms

what is stated in the earliest Turkish sources (certain fifteenth-century chronicles embodying fourteenth-century material) in regard to the origin of the Janissaries and their head-dress.

Still more important is the fact that Fr. Georgius mentions the levy of Christian children, usually called the *devshirme*, as also in his time a regular mode of recruitment. Scholars now generally are agreed that the *devshirme* was not part of the original institution of the Janissaries, when these were created in the fourteenth century. It is not mentioned in any Turkish source earlier than the *Hesht Bihisht* of Idris-al-Bitlisi, composed in the first decade of the sixteenth century. It is, however, mentioned by Bartholomaeus de Jano as newly instituted in 1438 and it was probably actually first introduced in that year.<sup>1</sup> Bartholomaeus does not indicate that it was intended to be repeated and in another letter written in February, 1443, he does not mention it.<sup>2</sup> The statement of Fr. Georgius is therefore our real evidence for the fact that after its introduction in 1438 the *devshirme* did become forthwith an established institution.

Fr. Georgius further gives the original periodicity of the *devshirme* as five years, the earliest and best evidence on this point. He also states that the levy was taken from the Christian inhabitants of towns, etc. under the direct dominion of the Sultan and not of other lords. This information is important in its bearing (which I cannot here discuss) on the juridical basis found for an institution which is contrary to the sacred law of Islam.

Such are the points of outstanding historical interest in the *Tractatus*, but there are others to which a very brief reference may be made. Cap. v contains a lengthy description of a force called by the author a *particularis exercitus* of the Sultan; it is evident that this is in fact the *Akinjis*, and the very full

<sup>1</sup> Fr. Bartholomaeus de Jano, *op. cit.*, col. 1066.

<sup>2</sup> This second letter is printed by Mlle. Dupont in her edition of the *Chronicles of Wavrin* (Paris, 1859). It is preserved in old French in MS. Français 1278 in the Bibliothèque Nationale. In this MS. the subscription is *Berthelemy de Jennes*, taken by the editor as *Barthélemy de Gênes*, under which name it has sometimes been quoted, a confusion of Jano (Giano, near Spoleto) with Janua (Genoa).

details of their training and methods of operation are extremely interesting. A description of the Anatolian nomads, Yuruks and the like, contained in Cap. x may also be mentioned. Lastly in Cap. xxii there are two long anecdotes, in themselves mere popular tales, regarding Murad II's close relations with Dervishes; it is generally recognised that these relations did exist but this passage affords interesting confirmation and contemporary record of the fact.

As regards the manners and customs of his captors the author gives on the whole a very moderate and fair account. He denounces the growing thirst for slaves and luxury and gives a distinct impression of a society turning from primitive austerity to a luxurious mode of life, which is of some interest. As for private morals, female modesty, family life and so forth, his account is favourable, a fact which had a curious influence on the future of this book. He wrote, as we have seen, with the idea of helping others who became captives. No doubt, however, the first Roman edition of his work was printed with a view to rousing the feelings of Christians in regard to the Turkish menace, particularly threatening about 1480, and the subsequent Latin editions prior to 1530 had the same object. The Latin editions in Germany in 1530-1531 and the German versions had a different (or at least an additional) object, which appears clearly in the preface written by Luther for one of these later Latin editions. Fastening on the favourable account of Moslem morals and manners, Luther uses this to draw unfavourable comparisons with his Catholic opponents and with the Catholic priesthood and monastic orders, while maintaining the superiority of Christianity according to his own version of it; Sebastian Frank, in the German versions due to him, pushes the argument further with the aim of showing the equal value (or lack of value) of all religious institutions. Thus the *Tractatus* is carried by a side-wind into the controversial literature of the Protestant movement.

As regards religious life among the Ottomans, the author records a great deal of interesting information. He acquired an intimate knowledge of Moslem beliefs, rites, and even, to some extent, of theology. He has a great deal to say about

local and popular devotions to holy men, their tombs, and various superstitions. Some of this information containing references to Haji Bektash was translated by Hasluck.<sup>1</sup> In Cap. xiii he described different types, or even perhaps orders, of Dervishes whom it would be interesting and probably feasible to identify. In Cap. xiv he gives what must be the earliest extant description of the "dancing" of the Mevlevi Dervishes; it is detailed and accurate and differs very little from what could be seen in a Mevlevi *tekke* twenty-five years ago and equally no doubt to-day.

A point which may be of great interest arises in Cap. xx where the varying opinions on certain points of four different religious classes or groups are discussed. The first three of these classes are the orthodox religious officials (*'ulemā* as we say, but in those days among the Turks *danishmendler*, Europeanised as *talismans*), the Dervishes, and the Sufis; as to the fourth, the text says that *horife dicitur quod heresim sonat*. Foy in the work mentioned above made *horife* into *'urefā* "knowers", "initiates". There are several reasons for questioning this interpretation. *'Urefā* is here the plural of a word *'ārif*, which does have this meaning; while, however, the terms *danishmendler*, *dervishler* and *sufiler* are used to describe well-known and recognised classes or categories of religious, *'urefā* is not used in a comparable manner. Further, those to whom the word *'urefā* might be applied would almost always fall within the previously mentioned categories of Dervishes or Sufis. Moreover, although an *'ārif* would have views which might not be generally accepted, those views would not deserve the pointed and emphatic description of "heresy", which the author gives to them. I do not, therefore, believe that Foy has correctly interpreted *horife*, and I think that it has another and much more interesting significance.

I suggest that the word *horife* really represents *Hurūfī*; this sect or order did profess esoteric doctrines of a most extreme kind, which were generally regarded as beyond the limit of permissible deviation. Their history is obscure and such evidence as this to show that they were openly known and

fairly widespread in the Ottoman realms at that period would be of very great interest indeed. The misprinting of Turkish words in the *Tractatus*, already referred to, would sufficiently account for the orthography *Horife*.<sup>1</sup>

The author of the *Tractatus* treats with remarkable humanity and naturalness the problem of apostasy among Christian captives. He observes in Cap. xx that they can be put into three classes. The first are the quite uneducated who take no interest in their Moslem surroundings and therefore suffer no attraction towards Islam and on the whole escape unscathed in faith. The second are those whose curiosity impels them to examine Moslem beliefs and customs but whose intelligence suffices in the end to preserve them from the danger of apostasy. The third are those whose curiosity exceeds their good sense and intelligence and who are overborne by their own enquiries and perhaps by worldly ambition; these apostatise and often gain great advantage thereby. Fr. Georgius himself belonged to the second class. He confesses that he was drawn into a very close and far-reaching study of Moslem tenets, frequenting mosques and Dervish teachers and reaching the brink of apostasy, and his description of how at the very last moment grace was given to him to draw back and then for fifteen more years of captivity to hold firmly to the true Faith is really touching. In all these passages of his work there is a personal and human tone of a quite uncommon kind.

I have avoided extensive quotation, for reasons of space, but I will close these notes on the manifold points of interest in the *Tractatus* by quoting from Cap. ix one brief but singular anecdote, as follows :

*Fratres in Pera dixerunt eum [sc. Magnum Turcum] intrasse ecclesiam eorum et sedisse in choro ad videndum cerimonias et modum officii unde etiam ipsi missam coram eo ipso sic volenti celebraverunt et hostiam non consecratam elevatione demonstraverunt, volentes eius curiositati satisfacere nec tamen margaritas porcis prodere.*

<sup>1</sup> For the vowel in the first syllable, 'o' instead of 'u', we find a parallel in the text in *czofilar (sufiler)*; for the vowel in the second syllable, 'i' instead of 'u', we can find a similar parallel where (in Cap. xxii) we read *Mirathbeg* (Murat Beg).

The *Magnus Turcus* is the Sultan and he must here be Mehmed II, the conqueror of Constantinople. The *fratres in Pera* must surely be the friars of the author's own Order, the Dominicans. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the Dominicans possessed in Galata-Pera the church and convent of St. Paul, which were forcibly taken from them in 1535 by refugee Spanish Moriscos (*Grenatini*), after which the Dominicans held the church of St. Peter. The building known as the Church of St. Paul was supposed to have been originally, before coming into Christian hands, the mosque built by Maslama, the Arab commander in the siege of A.D. 717, and is now known as *Arab Jami* (the Arab Mosque). If this were true, it would be in the Mosque built by the Arab besieger of 717 that the Turkish conqueror of 1453 witnessed the Christian mysteries—*salvo arcano*.<sup>1</sup>

From examining the value of the *Tractatus* as a historical source, one turns naturally to consider by what later writers it has been so used, and which of these later writers was aware of the author's identity; moreover, it becomes possible in this way to determine whether knowledge of the author's identity depends in all cases ultimately on the statement of Bernardus de Lutzemburgo or whether there is any trace of some other source of information on this point. I may state (and the following paragraphs will prove) that every mention of the author's identity goes back ultimately to the statement in Bernardus de Lutzemburgo, and there is no trace of any other source or evidence on the point; except to Hasluck and Banfi in very recent times, the British Museum gloss has not been known.

The numerous Latin editions of the *Tractatus* from 1480 to 1550 testify to the fact that its value was then highly appreciated and that it was used by many students who may have left no express record of such use, and the same is true of the German versions, allowing for the special motives which affected the appearance and use of these. It is, however, possible to make

<sup>1</sup>On the Dominican Order and the church of St. Paul in Galata see B. Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen des xiii Jahrhunderts*, pp. 12-14. and M. A. Belin, *Histoire de la Latinité de Constantinople*, p. 215.



a long and interesting catalogue of writers who do quote from or expressly mention or refer to the *Tractatus*.<sup>1</sup>

The earliest writer in question is the Austrian humanist and diplomat Johannes Cuspinianus; although the work in which Cuspinian's quotations are contained did not appear in print until 1541, he himself had died in 1529 so that his use of the *Tractatus* is contemporaneous with that of Bernardus de Lutzemburgo.<sup>2</sup> However, Cuspinian treats the author of the *Tractatus* as anonymous though he observed that he was a religious (*frater quidam*). His quotations are fairly numerous; the first of them is the interesting passage on the origin of the Ottoman principedom, referred to above, but there are many others scattered through his pages. He usually acknowledges his source but not always; thus, he summarises the account of the Akinjis without acknowledgment. Christophe Richier, whose work in French was printed contemporaneously with Cuspinian's work, also uses the *Tractatus* extensively but entirely without acknowledgment.<sup>3</sup> Conrad Gessner at the same period lists a copy of the Latin edition of 1508, *Septemcastrensi quodam auctore incerto*; he mentions the reference to St. Vincent Ferrer but without stating that the author was a Dominican.<sup>4</sup> Georgius Fabricius, also at this period, mentions *Sibenburgii captivi librum*.<sup>5</sup>

In the seventeenth century G. J. Vossius saw a copy of the edition of 1508 at Amsterdam but lists the author as anonymous.<sup>6</sup> Later, J. H. Hottinger quotes or abbreviates from the *Tractatus*, but not very extensively: he noticed that the author was a religious (*Septemcastrensis Monachus*).<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Strictly speaking, the earliest instance of the use of the *Tractatus* is by the compiler of the work entitled *De Captivis Christianis*, but I have included this as the last item in my list of the Latin editions below, as it is a case of much more than quotation or citation.

<sup>2</sup> Johannes Cuspinianus, *De Origine Turcorum*, first printed as part of his *De Caesaribus et Imperatoribus opus insigne* at Strasburg, 1540, then separately at Antwerp, 1541.

<sup>3</sup> Christophe Richier (or Richier), *De Turcorum Origine*, Paris, 1541.

<sup>4</sup> Conrad Gessner *Pandectarum . . . libri xxi*, Zurich, 1538, Liber XII, Titulus X.

<sup>5</sup> Georgius Fabricius in his poem to *Georgii Agricolae Oratio de Bello adversus Turcam suscipiendo*, Basel, 1538.

<sup>6</sup> Gebhard Johann Vossius, *De Historicis Latinis*, 1627, p. 516, 1654, p. 564.

<sup>7</sup> J. H. Hottinger, *Historia Orientalis*, 1651, pp. 270, 305.

In 1719, Quétif-Echard republished the passage from Bernardus de Lutzemburgo.<sup>1</sup> From their note the author's identity was recognised by several eighteenth-century writers who mention or quote from the *Tractatus*, viz.: Joecher,<sup>2</sup> J. A. Fabricius,<sup>3</sup> A. Horanyi,<sup>4</sup> and Christian Carl am Ende.<sup>5</sup> Other writers of the same period refer to the work but are ignorant of the passage in Quétif-Echard and of the author's identity: such are C. W. Luedecke<sup>6</sup> and A. L. von Schloezer,<sup>7</sup> the latter of whom had not even seen the *Tractatus* but merely "sub-quotes" from Cuspinian the passage on Ottoman origins and coins for the author the inaccurate description of *Mühlenbacher*.

In the nineteenth century, the author's name was picked up from Christian Carl am Ende by J. G. Meusel<sup>8</sup> and by writers on Sebastian Frank such as H. Bischof<sup>9</sup> and C. A. Hase.<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, the great historian of the Ottoman Empire, Josef von Hammer, remained ignorant of the author's name though he used the *Tractatus* and expresses a high opinion of its value.<sup>11</sup>

Local historians of the Siebenbürgen in the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries are well-acquainted with the work but

<sup>1</sup> Quétif-Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Predicatorum*, 1719, Vol. I, p. 901a.

<sup>2</sup> C. J. Joecher, *Gelehrten Lexicon*, 1752, s.n. *Georgius de Ungaria*.

<sup>3</sup> J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina mediae et infimae aetatis*, s.n. *Georgius de Ungaria*. I have referred to the *editio prima Italica*, of 1754.

<sup>4</sup> A. Horanyi, *Memoria Hungarorum*, etc., 1776, Vol. II, p. 172.

<sup>5</sup> Christian Carl am Ende, *Beschluss seiner Nachlese von Sebastian Franks Leben und Schriften*, Erlangen, 1789, p. 7. A most difficult reference to verify. I must acknowledge the help of the University or State Librarians at Bonn, Erlangen, Göttingen and (with ultimate success) Munich.

<sup>6</sup> C. W. Luedecke, *Beschreibung des türkischen Reiches*, 1778, Vol. II, p. 101.

<sup>7</sup> A. L. von Schloezer, *Kritisch-historische Neben Stunden*, 1798, p. 91.

<sup>8</sup> J. G. Meusel's enlarged edition of B. G. Struve's *Bibliotheca Historica*, 1802, Vol. X, Part II, p. 169.

<sup>9</sup> H. Bischof, *Sebastian Frank und deutsche Geschichtsschreibung*, 1857, p. 33. He calls the author Gregorius by a slip.

<sup>10</sup> C. A. Hase, *Sebastian Frank von Wörd*, 1869, pp. 4-6.

<sup>11</sup> Josef von Hammer, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, 2<sup>te</sup> Auflage, 1834-1835, Vol. I, pp. 23, 344. In the French translation Hellert mentions in his notes the quotation in von Schloezer, *ubi sup.*

ignorant of the author's name. Such are Johann Seivert,<sup>1</sup> F. Trausch,<sup>2</sup> and G. D. Teutsch.<sup>3</sup> It is Seivert who records for us the marginal gloss as to the author's birthplace, Ramocz ; it was in Seivert's copy of Bibliander's work, which contains the Latin editions of 1543 and 1550.

Some Hungarian writers (including bibliographers, to be mentioned later) of the nineteenth century likewise know the work but not the author's name, e.g., J. Kemény<sup>4</sup> and Graf. J. Mailáth.<sup>5</sup> The ambiguous but rather important reference in the work of another nineteenth-century Hungarian, F. Toldy, has been discussed above.<sup>6</sup>

In 1896, Charles Schefer translated a number of passages from the *Tractatus* in his introduction to a reprint of the French version of Spandugino, including the curious passage about the Sultan's attendance at a Mass, in which he wrongly took the *fratres* to be Franciscans ; he missed the reference to St. Vincent Ferrer and remained ignorant of the author's identity or of his connexion with the Order of Preachers.<sup>7</sup> In 1902, a study of the Turkish poems, phrases and words used in the *Tractatus* was published by K. Foy, which is exhaustive and of the highest value, though in a few details correction is required ; he, again, did not know who the author was.<sup>8</sup> In 1907 N. Iorga knew only the last of the German versions (1596), and accepted the otherwise unsupported statement on the title-page of that version that the author was a Transylvanian nobleman named Johann Lasski.<sup>9</sup>

Within very recent times, we have F. W. Hasluck,<sup>10</sup> W.

<sup>1</sup> Johann Seivert, *Nachrichten von siebenbürgischen Gelehrten*, Pressburg, 1785, p. 457.

<sup>2</sup> F. Trausch, *Schriftsteller-Lexicon der siebenbürger Deutschen*, 1875, Vol. III, pp. 431-439.

<sup>3</sup> G. D. Teutsch, *Geschichte der siebenbürger Sachsen*, 2nd edition, 1899, p. 212.

<sup>4</sup> J. Kemény, *Történelmi és irodalmi kálászatok*, 1861, p. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Graf. J. Mailáth, *Geschichte der Magyaren*, Vol. II, p. 189.

<sup>6</sup> F. Toldy, *op. cit.*

<sup>7</sup> Charles Schefer, *Petit Traité de l'Origine des Turcz par Théodore Spandouyn Cantacassin*, 1896, Introduction *passim*.

<sup>8</sup> K. Foy, *op. cit.*, cf. note 1, p. 51.

<sup>9</sup> N. Iorga, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, 1908, Vol. I, p. 420. As to the name Lasski, see note 2, p. 65.

<sup>10</sup> F. W. Hasluck, *op. cit.*

Stammler,<sup>1</sup> F. Banfi,<sup>2</sup> and E. Veress,<sup>3</sup> all of whom have discussed and recognised the author's identity. The works of Hasluck and Banfi have been already referred to. Veress has a note based on Banfi and Apponyi (see below), placing the arrival of Fr. Georgius in Rome in 1473: here, he seems to follow Banfi, but, as I think, mistakenly. Stammler's article contains minor inaccuracies.<sup>4</sup>

Numerous copies of the various Latin editions or German versions are noticed in standard bibliographical works such as those of Mattaire,<sup>5</sup> Denis,<sup>6</sup> Panzer,<sup>7</sup> Kertbeny,<sup>8</sup> Szabó,<sup>9</sup> and Apponyi.<sup>10</sup> None of them is aware of the author's identity, though Denis, Mattaire and Panzer already noticed that he was a Dominican; Apponyi follows Denis in this, but quite mistakenly conjectures that he was identical with Ricoldus de Montecrucis, referring on this to the editions of 1509 and 1511, mentioned below.

The British Museum *Catalogue of Early Printed Books* recognises Georgius de Hungaria as the author.

I turn finally, with a word on the author's MS., to the attempt to give a correct and full list of the Latin editions and German versions. In this, I have been much assisted by the fact that the British Museum possesses a remarkably rich collection of these: it is chiefly due to this that I shall have to suggest a correction of Banfi's list, which was compiled at a distance and without the advantage of direct access to the

<sup>1</sup> W. Stammler, *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters, Verfasser-Lexicon*, 1931, Vol. I, p. 381, s.n. *Chronica und Beschreibung der Türckey*. He gives a few additional references which I have not had the opportunity to verify, notably *Arch. des Ver. f. siebenbürgische Landeskunde*, III (1848), pp. 63-70.

<sup>2</sup> F. Banfi, *op. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> E. Veress, *op. cit.*

<sup>4</sup> He gives 1437, instead of 1438, for the fall of Sebes, and 1536, instead of 1596, as the date of the last German version, that published by Enustinus.

<sup>5</sup> Mattaire, *Ann. Typ.*, ed. Amsterdam, 1733, pp. 341, 426.

<sup>6</sup> Denis, *Ann. Typ. Matt. Suppl.*, Part II, pp. 683-684, Nos. 6084, 6085.

<sup>7</sup> Panzer, *Ann. Typ.*, II, 239, 375; IV, 203, 1238-1239; *Ann. Typ. Cont.*, VII, 268, 476; IX, 89, 210 and 338, 1239b.

<sup>8</sup> K. M. Kertbeny, *Ungarn betreffende deutsche Erstlings-Drücke, 1454-1600*, pp. 84-85, Nos. 398-404.

<sup>9</sup> K. Szabó, *Régi magyar könyvtár az 1473-1711*, Köt. 3, Resz 1, Nos. 81-86, 164, 173, 194, 283, 285-288.

<sup>10</sup> Graf Alexander Apponyi, *Hungarica*, No. 58.

British Museum material, concerning which, in consequence, he was on some points slightly misled.

Bernardus de Lutsemburgo seems to mean that the author's original MS. was at S. Maria sopra Minerva; perhaps this statement is not invalidated by the fact that the MS. does not figure in a surviving list of the books in that library, which was compiled late in the fifteenth century, though its absence is disappointing.<sup>1</sup> As mentioned above, Toldy may possibly have seen the MS. c. 1850-1860. It has now disappeared. When Rome was taken from the Pope in 1870, the Minerva library was scattered; the MS. is not now there, nor is it among the former Minerva books traceable in other Roman libraries.

### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

The following is my list of the Latin editions:—

1. Rome, Georgius Teutonicus (Lauer ?)—Sixtus Riessinger (Third Press), c. 1480: *Incipit Prohemium in Tractatum de Moribus Conditionibus [sic] et Nequicia Turcorum.* (Hain 15673.)

2. Urach, Conrad Fyner, c. 1481: *Incipit Prohemium in Tractatum de Moribus Conditionibus [sic] et Nequicia Turcorum.* (Hain 15672.)

3. Cologne, Johann Koelhoff, 1500: *Tractatus de Ritu Moribus et Nequicia Turcorum.* (Hain 15674.)

4. Cologne, Cornelis von Zierickzee, 1508: *De Ritu Moribus Nequitia et Multiplicatione Turcorum* (see further below as to the title-page of this edition).

5. Paris, Henricus Stephanus, 1509: *Contenta Ricoldi ordinis praedicatorum contra sectam Mahumeticam non indignus scitu libellus. Cuiusdam diu captivi Turcorum provinciae septemcastrensis de vita et moribus eorundem alius non minus necessarius.* The commencement reads *Prooemium de moribus conditionibus et nequicia Turcorum a quodam Christiano provinciae Septemcastrensis diu in manibus Turcorum captivo editum.*

6. Paris, Henricus Stephanus, 1511—as in No. 5, but in addition *Adjunctum est insuper libellus de vita et moribus Iudaeorum*, as to which a colophon adds the detail *Victore nunc Sacerdote Christiano olim Iudaeo* (i.e. Victor de Carben).

7. Paris, Le Marnef, 1514: *Thurcicę spurcitię et perfidiae sugillatio et confutatio*, etc., etc. (a verbose title which I need not reproduce in full).

8. Wittenberg, Johannes Lufft, 1530: *Libellus de ritu et moribus Turcorum ante LXX annos aeditus, cum praefatione Martini Luttheri.*

9. Nürnberg, Friedrich Peypus, March, 1530: as in No. 8.

10. A reprint included in Vol. ii of the collection of works on Mahomedan religion and history known as *Machumetis Sarracenorum Principis Vita ac*

<sup>1</sup> Gilles Meersseman, O.P., *La Bibliothèque des Frères Prêcheurs de la Minerve à la fin du XV<sup>e</sup> Siècle* in *Mélanges Auguste Pelzer*, Louvain, 1947, pp. 606-634. (University de L. *Rec. de Trav. d'Hist. et de Philol.*, 3<sup>ème</sup> Série, 26<sup>ème</sup> Fasc.)

*Doctrina*, which was edited by Theodore Bibliander and printed at Basel in 1543.

11. The second edition of No. 10 printed in 1550.

12. I would note further that in addition to these full Latin editions the treatise entitled *De Captivis Christianis* printed at Augsburg by Froschauer in 1498 consists mainly of abbreviated excerpts from the *Tractatus de Moribus*.

The following is my list of the German versions :—

(a) Strassburg, Christian Egenolph, January, 1530: *Chronica Glaube Gesetz usw. der Türcken von einem Sibenbürger so da in Türcki gefencklich bracht, und vil jar nachmals darinnen gewonet in MDCCCCXXXVI jar beschriben. Sed quacre*, whether the true date of this edition is January, 1531.

(b) Strassburg, Christian Egenolph, May, 1530: *Saracenisich, Türkisch, und Mahometisch Glaub, Gesetz usw. durch einem Sibenbürger umb das m, cccc und sechs und dreissiget jar selb erfahren und beschriben.*

(c) Nürnberg, Friedrich Peypus, 1530: *Chronica und Beschreibung der Türckey usw., von einen Sibenbürger xxii jar darinn gefangen gelegen yn Latein beschriben verteuscht mit eyner vorrhed D. Martini Luttheri.*

(d) Zwickau, Wolfgang Meyerpeck, 1530: *Chronica, Glaube, Gesetz der Türcken von einem Sibenbürger so da yn die Türckey gefencklich bracht usw.* With additions and *Beschluss* by Sebastian Franck.

(e) Augsburg, Hainrich Stainer [sic], December, 1530: *Cronica Abconterfayung und Entwerffung der Türckey usw.*, stating the translator to be Sebastian Franck.<sup>1</sup>

(f) Augsburg, Heynrich Steyner [sic], June, 1531: as (e) above.

(g) 1560, no printer or place: *Warrhaffrige Beschreibung der türkischen Krigsrustung usw.* This contains hardly more than scraps of the original work combined with other material.

(h) Berlin, 1596: *Mahometische Genealogia durch. M. Henricum Enustinum von Hamburg und sonst einem siebenbürgischen Edelman Johannes Lasski genannt welcher 22 Jahr darin gefangen gelegen beschriben.* One of the earlier German versions incorporated in full in the middle of other material.<sup>2</sup>

The British Museum possesses copies of all the above except Nos. 5 and 8 of the Latin, and (a), (b) and (d) of the German. It has two copies of Nos. 2, 4 and 7; the Grenville copy of

<sup>1</sup> Stammeler, *op. cit.*, states that the first German version was published at Augsburg, but gives no grounds for this assertion and does not make it clear which of the Augsburg editions he means.

<sup>2</sup> The name of Johannes Lasski given on the title page seems to be an invention of Enustinus. Lasski (Laski, a Lasco) is a Polish name. It has been suggested that the choice was due to the exploits (in Transylvania and Turkey) of Jerome Laski, brother of John a Lasco, but he had been dead half a century and the suggestion seems rather wild. The Hungarian or Transylvanian names Laczkó and Laskai somewhat resemble Lasski. Could either of these have been the original name of Fr. Georgius of which an echo somehow reached Enustinus? Seivert's gloss is a precedent for the unaccountable transmission of a detail quite possibly true.

No. 2 lacks four leaves. All are catalogued (1951) under the name *Georgius*, with the cognomen *de Hungaria*, except Latin No. 6 which is catalogued only under the names *Ricoldus de Montecrucis* and *Victor de Carben*, and German (*h*) which is catalogued only under *Enustinus*.

Kertbeny refers to Latin editions of 1460 and 1478, but this is a mere mistake as to the dates of the earliest editions; he also mentions a Latin edition at Basel by Erasmus in 1530, but I find no other trace of this. He also has what he calls the third German edition entitled *Auss Rathschlage Eresmi v. Rotterdam, die Türken zu bekriegen*, etc. I cannot trace this, nor can I verify a reference which he gives to *Sabellicum im ix Buch Enneadis*.

A more important and different point arises over the Latin edition No. 4 with the title *De Ritu Moribus Nequitia et Multiplicatione Turcorum*.

This is ascribed at the British Museum to Cornelis von Zierickzee of Cologne, and the authority for this description is Proctor. The entry in Proctor is Part II, Section I, 10552, but this entry gives the title only as *De ritu et moribus Turcorum*, which is the title of Latin No. 3, the Koelhoff edition: this latter edition is dealt with by Proctor under Part I, Vol. 1, No. 1088, and the entry No. 10552 is evidently intended for our Latin No. 4. Banfi, at a distance from the British Museum and with only the actual wording of No. 10552 before him, took that entry to record an edition distinct both from Koelhoff's edition of 1500 and also from the edition of 1508 which has the title *De Ritu Moribus Nequitia et Multiplicatione Turcorum*: how Banfi dealt with this latter edition, we shall see below. Banfi's supposed separate edition entitled *De ritu et moribus Turcorum*, based on Proctor's entry 10552, is thus due to a misunderstanding and should be eliminated.

The title page of our Latin No. 4 is ornamented with two perpendicular and oblong panels containing floral decoration and below them a long narrow panel with an animal. Above the panels, the full wording on the title page is as follows:—*Tractatus De Ritu Moribus Nequitia et Multiplicatione Turcorum in quo si quispiam aliquid de secta Turcorum magna atque*

*admiranda scire desiderat pauca que hic sub compendio narrantur memoria resolvat namque si ea sane diligenterque inspexerit de multis inquisitionis veritatem agnoscet.* As we have seen, this is the edition which introduces the supplement *De decem nationibus Christianorum* borrowed from Johannes de Hees. The end sheet has the same panels as the title page, above them the words *Finiunt ritus et mores Thurcorum una cum oratione testimoniali eorundem*, and between them the words *Sermo in ideomate Thurcorum cum interpretatione latina*.

Panzer, Vol. 2, page 239, No. 375, following Denis 6084, described an edition with the above title and with *duo iconismi* on the title page; these would seem to be the floral panels but he does not mention the animal panel below. He says that between these two panels were printed the corrupted names of the first seven Turkish rulers (*duces*).<sup>1</sup> These names are not found so printed on the title page of Latin No. 4 in the British Museum, and the possibility therefore remains that the copy described by Denis and Panzer represents a separate edition or issue produced by von Zierickzee, the title pages differing as to these names between the panels, and perhaps the animal panel below.

The copy described by Denis and Panzer, moreover, ended with the words which conclude Cap. xxiii; it lacked, therefore, not only (as Banfi observes) the *Ratio Testimonialis*, *Duo Sermones*, etc., but also the addition of the *De decem nationibus*. On this ground, therefore, it may again be a separate edition or else it is a defective copy of our Latin No. 4.

The edition represented by this copy is ascribed by Denis *fortasse Conrad Zeniger Norimbergae*. Zeninger was at work about 1480. The British Museum does not support that description and the long title seems to indicate a later date. The description has, however, been adopted by Banfi, but once again, it seems, through a mistake caused by lack of direct access to the various copies. He takes this Denis copy to

<sup>1</sup> These are probably the names of the seven post-Seljuk princes given in Cap. i of the *Tractatus*. We count seven Ottoman Sultans from Osman to Mehmed II inclusive but early European writers usually added to that number one or more of the other sons of Bayezid I, e.g., Suleiman, or Calepinus (Musa Chelebi), in addition to Mehmed I.



represent the first German edition, by Zeninger in 1480; he mentions other copies with the same title but whether they have the same termination I do not feel sure. He then lists as a separate edition two copies at Szatmár and Halle with the same title and ending with the Latin translation of the Turkish poems, so that they lack (according to him) only the *Opinio Abbatis Joachim*; but they must also lack the *De decem nationibus*. These copies, however, have (according to him) the words *Finiunt ritus*, etc., at the end of the *Ratio Testimonialis*. Banfi is only quoting the description from Szabó and it seems as if this may be inaccurate and these copies are (as the Denis copy may be) defective copies of our Latin No. 4.

Banfi in this way, after the first edition at Rome, sets up two editions by Zeninger at Nürnberg, each defective, and only then a complete edition in Germany by Fyner at Urach; later he brings in the von Zierickzee edition in 1508 as distinct from the editions represented by the copies which he ascribes to Zeninger. I think there is no doubt that Banfi is wrong (misled by Denis) as to the supposed Zeninger editions; these are a myth, the first edition is Rome, the second is Fyner at Urach. On the other hand, it may be that von Zierickzee at Cologne, c. 1508, produced more than one edition or issue under the title *De Ritu Moribus Nequitia et Multiplicatione Turcorum* with slight differences on the title page and perhaps portions cut off at the end in some cases. This can only be determined by direct examination of the various copies bearing this title and alleged to display these differences, in order to see whether they are defective copies of one edition or something more.

I conclude with a word of warning as to the German versions. These are not true editions or translations. In all of them, the original text has been subjected to rearrangement, and in (g) only scraps of it remain combined with other material. The versions (a) to (f) and (h) are expanded by additional material on the history of the wars with the Turks and by controversial prefaces and epilogues. In using the *Tractatus* as a historical source for Ottoman history in the fifteenth century, the German versions should be eschewed and only the Latin editions employed.