

SÁNDOR BENE

THEOLOGY AND POLITICS
IN ANDREAS PANNONIUS' MIRRORS FOR PRINCES*1. *Theology and politics: the problems of the "Renaissance paradigm"*

Andreas Pannonius (1420?–1472?) was a Hungarian Carthusian monk who spent most of his life in Italy. His surviving works—two mirrors for princes, one dedicated to Matthias Hunyadi (Matthias Corvinus), the other to Ercole d'Este and a commentary on the *Song of Songs*—discuss questions of theology and political theory.¹ This should suffice to explain why he has been considered until most recently as an author of marginal significance. The medievalists, especially given Andreas's humanist connections, considered him as a late, Renaissance phenomenon while in the eyes of scholars of Humanism, his political works, no matter how many classical citations they contained, were theological texts that could be adequately interpreted within the frameworks of the history of scholastic (perhaps mystical) theology and did not belong to the history of political theory or intellectual history. This study is not an attempt to "rehabilitate" Andreas Pan-

* This paper is an expanded and improved version of my earlier work, *Where Paradigms Meet: The Theology of Political Virtues in Andreas Pannonius's Mirrors for Princes*, which is to be published in the volume *Italy and Hungary: Humanism and Art in the Early Renaissance*, eds. Péter FARBAKY, Louis WALDMAN, Firenze, Villa I Tatti–The Harvard Renaissance Center (forthcoming). I extend my thanks to Gianni Venturi, the director of the Istituto di Studi Rinascimentali of Ferrara who besides supporting my researches, drew my attention to the significance of the Ferrara context also in this special issue; to John Monfasani for his helpful suggestions regarding the theological problems raised by Andreas's princely mirrors; to Luisa Pesavento for her transcription of the Bornio da Sala manuscript; to Alison Frazier for the transcription of Candiano Bollani's tract on the *Song of Songs*; to Mons. Enrico Pedeverada who helped my researches in the Ferrara archives, and to Dániel Pócs for providing me with a lot of precious information about his researches into the Andreas Pannonius codices and their illuminator Guglielmo Giralaldi.

¹ Manuscripts: *De regiis virtutibus ad Matthiam Hungarie regem* (title landed by the Vatican Library catalogue which was accepted by the literature), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Vat. Lat. 3186; *Ad illustrissimum principem dominum dominum Herculem, ducem preclarissimum floride civitatis Ferrariensis, Mutine ac Regii, marchionem Estensem, Rodigiique comitem etc. libellus per fratrem Andream Pannonium ordinis Chartusiensis editus*, 1471, Biblioteca Estense di Modena, á. Q. 9. 12; *Super Cantica Canticorum Salomonis Expositio devotissima una cum brevi et morali Beati Gregorii Pape expositione que in marginibus ponitur*, National Széchényi Library, Budapest, Cod. Lat. 443. The two mirrors for princes are published: Andreas PANNONIUS, *Libellus de virtutibus Matthiae Corvino dedicatus; Libellus de virtutibus Herculi Estensi dedicatus*, in: *Két magyarországi egyházi író a XV. századból: Andreas Pannonius, Nicolaus de Mirabilibus* (Two ecclesiastical writers from the 15th century: Andreas Pannonius, Nicolaus de Mirabilibus), eds. FRANKÓI Vilmos, ÁBEL Jenő, Budapest, 1886, 1–133 and 137–283, respectively. (Henceforth I will refer to the work dedicated to Matthias as *De regiis virtutibus*, to that of addressed to Ercole d'Este as *Ad Herculem*, from the cited edition, and to the commentary on the *Song of Songs* as *Expositio* from the Budapest codex.)

nonius. It is not my purpose to argue that the Hungarian Carthusian was an outstanding thinker of his day, either from the perspective of the history of theology or from the perspective of the history of political ideas. For me, the fascination with his life's work lies in the fact that a close reading of the texts and their inner interrelations seem to be a real test for the strength of the usual paradigms of interpretation. An exploration of the intellectual history context may reveal that what had earlier appeared as a marginal phenomenon, might actually take centre stage in the necessarily reconfigured area of research paradigms and gain importance, perhaps not on its own intrinsic values but on the strength of the place it occupies.

The traditional paradigms in question were based in the mostly tacit, evolutionist assumptions of 20th century Renaissance scholarship. According to one of these, Renaissance Humanism, generally speaking, is "more developed" than medieval scholastic thought. According to another, a republic as a political system is "more developed" than a monarchy. The history of scholarly reception of the political works of Andreas Pannonius is the story of "demotion" within the sub-categories of these prejudices. When they were discovered in the late 1870s, the mirrors for princes were unproblematically slotted into the period of Renaissance literature and qualified as permeated by humanist spirit and the same interpretative tradition regarded the commentary on the *Song of Songs*, discovered a few decades later, as a product of "Christian Humanism".² Later however, a position taken by a single respected scholar—János Horváth Jr. who had worked on the critical edition of the *Song of Songs* commentary—was sufficient to have the *entire* body of works reclassified as a late product of medieval literature.³ The medievalist Horváth actually attempted to "salvage" Andreas's prestige by removing him from the humanist paradigm. It is rather ironic that it was on the basis of this thesis that Andreas Pannonius came to be evaluated in the manual of Hungarian literature recapitulating the tenets and findings of Marxist literary scholarship in the following way: "It was with Andreas Pannonius that Hungarian religious scholarship reached the level at which it might have been capable of significantly contributing to international theological literature—but it was by then too late in the day, the time for medieval theology was over, and it was not its development but its critique and destruction that became the order of the day."⁴

Mutatis mutandis the political works of Andreas came to be regarded as "medieval" as well—both were declared "mirrors for princes in the scholastic spirit, theological tracts on the virtues of kings."⁵ There is further irony in the fact that this evolutionist, Marxist

² On the political writings see Vilmos FRAKNÓI's introduction: *Két magyarországi egyházi író...*, *op. cit.*, X–XI; on the *Expositio*: József HUSZTI, *Andrae Pannonii Expositio super Cantica Canticorum*, *Studi e documenti italo-ungheresi della Reale Accademia d'Ungheria di Roma*, 4(1940–1941), 93–101.

³ Ifj. HORVÁTH János, *Andreas Pannonius Cantica Canticorum kommentárjának forrásai* (The sources of Andreas Pannonius' commentary on *Song of Songs*), *Egyetemes Philológiai Közlöny*, 66(1942), 257–287.

⁴ *A magyar irodalom története 1600-ig* (The history of Hungarian literature until 1600), ed. KLANICZAY Tibor, Budapest, 1964, 110. The author of the relevant chapter—"The Latin-language ecclesiastical (theological and liturgical) literature"—is the same as the editor.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 110.

interpretation adopted quite naturally a large part of Hans Baron's "civic Humanism" thesis which in its original form had given historical legitimacy to arguments directed against the tyrannies of the day, be they Nazi or Soviet.⁶ However, in the light of recent research findings and debates on interpretation, the basics of Baron's thesis are becoming more and more indefensible—and let us not even mention the "orders of the day" of Marxist intellectual historiography. The rigid contradistinction between republican and monarchical political thought—similarly to the distinction between bourgeois vs. courtly political culture—seems to be an obsolete perspective.⁷

However, the persuasive critique of Baron's thesis only proved that preference of the active life to the contemplative one or of republic to monarchy is not a criterion of the modernity of political thinking.⁸ Nevertheless, it is indisputable that in the literature of political theory spanning the half a century before Machiavelli, Andreas's approach (which again included the three theological virtues along the four cardinal or political virtues in the list of princely virtues) appears doubtlessly archaic. The well-known political authors of the day, Bartolomeo Platina, Giovanni Pontano, Aurelio Lippo Brandolini, even if they touched upon the importance of faith, still regarded the comparison of forms of government and the public practice of purely political virtues as their primary topics.⁹ Andreas's project, however, was the systematic development of the theological background of these same virtues. Given that the Hungarian Carthusian lived most of his life in a humanist environment in continuous contact with humanists, we must regard his archaic approach as a conscious and somewhat provocative gesture, which is definitely an anomaly in need of an explanation. But what kind of framework are we to employ for the explanation? If we accept that the disengagement of politics from theology (i.e. theologically-based moral philosophy) is indeed a sign of evolving toward modernity, then the works of Andreas are *conservative* texts in the broad sense of the term. If, however,

⁶ The basic autobiographical essay: Hans BARON, *A Defense of the View of the Quattrocento First Offered in The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance* (1970), in: ID., *In Search of Florentine Civic Humanism: Essays on the Transition from Medieval to Modern Thought*, Princeton, 1988, I, 194–211; on the intellectual background and motivations see Riccardo FUBINI, *Una carriera di storico del Rinascimento: Hans Baron*, in: ID., *L'Umanesimo italiano e i suoi storici: Origini rinascimentali – critica moderna*, Milan, 2001, 277–316; for a historiographic approach of the civic Humanism concept see Willam J. CONNELL, *The Republican Idea*, in: *Renaissance Civic Humanism: Reappraisals and Reflections*, ed. James HANKINS, Cambridge–New York, 2000, 14–29.

⁷ For a critical appraisal: James HANKINS, *The 'Baron Thesis' after Forty Years*, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 56(1995), 309–338; see also his *Introduction to Renaissance Civic Humanism*, *op. cit.* (see previous note), 1–13.

⁸ James HANKINS, *De republica: Civic Humanism in Renaissance Milan (and Other Renaissance Signories)*, in: *I Decembrio e la tradizione della Repubblica di Platone tra Medioevo e Umanesimo*, eds. Mario VEGETTI, Paolo PISSAVINO, Naples, 2005, 484–508. (My paper is largely indebted to this study not only for the ideas raised by it but also for its interpretive suggestions concerning authors—such as Michele Savonarola, Borno da Sala and others—I will discuss later.)

⁹ See Giacomo FERRAÙ, *Introduzione*, in: Bartolomeo PLATINA, *De principe*, ed. Giacomo FERRAÙ, Messina, 1979, 5–33; and especially Cesare VASOLI, *Riflessioni sugli umanisti e il principe: Il modello platonico dell'«ottimo governante»*, in: ID., *Immagini umanistiche*, Naples, 1983, 151–187.

we take into consideration the fact that politics never fully disengaged from theology during the 16th and 17th centuries—indeed we can even speak of a re-theologization along with re-confessionalization¹⁰—the question that emerges is exactly *what kind* of theological solutions are proposed in Andreas's works? Do they exhibit scholastic or monastic influences? Around what core issues of moral philosophy are the theologizing political reflections arranged? These nodes can only be mapped out if we try to illuminate the portrait of the Hungarian Carthusian which has hitherto been visible only in a silhouette and if we furnish his works with the context which earlier scholarship tried to replace with prefabricated paradigms of interpretation.

2. *Life and works*

Andreas of Hungary was probably born around 1420,¹¹ in a region of Hungary that is yet to be identified, but his ethnic and linguistic identity can be established on the basis of Hungarian words and phrases woven into his works. Fraknói assumes that he came from a “high and noble ancestry,”¹² and indeed, one is drawn to this conclusion by the style of his writing, his familiarity with Hungary's aristocracy (he came to make János Vitéz's acquaintance before he became primate) and his surprising self-awareness in suppressing the excesses of humanist adulation—but no actual information has been uncovered with regards to the social standing of his family. In his youth, he served in the army of János Hunyadi for five years. His recollections are based on personal experiences: he relates the Governor's nightly prayers, relationship to his relatives, arbitration practices and governance habits as one who had witnessed Hunyadi and his acts from up close. He acquired the fundamentals of his learning in the circles associated with the Governor (perhaps by the side of János Vitéz). He participated in the Battle of Varna (he lists a number of the fallen by their names) and was present in Kolozsvár (today Cluj-Napoca, Romania) at the Christening of Matthias Hunyadi in 1443. It was immediately after this that he left his native country for some unknown reason—perhaps with the intention of making the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, from where he never returned. In his work dedicated to Matthias, he recollects his pilgrimage and even makes a note of the name of one of János Hunyadi's soldier, Jakab Fancslaki, whom he met on Mount Sion. He is likely to

¹⁰ I use the concept of ‘confessionalization’ in the sense ascribed to it by Heinz SCHILLING, cf. his *Confessionalization: Historical and Scholarly Perspectives of a Comparative and Interdisciplinary Paradigm*, in: *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700*, eds. John M. HEADLEY, Hans J. HILLERBRAND, Anthony J. PALAS, Aldershot, 2004, 21–35; on the theological aspects of modern (and postmodern) politics see the essays collected in: *Politeia biblica* (thematic number of Il pensiero politico, XXXV), eds. Lea CAMPOS BORALEVI, Diego QUAGLIONI, Bologna, 2002.

¹¹ He was born presumably earlier than 1430 as suggested by the *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, III, Rome, 1961, 109–110 (author of the entry was Edit PÁSZTOR); probably about 1420. If the source is not indicated, the biographic data is drawn from the indications given by the same Andreas in his works, summarized by the introductory essay of FRAKNÓI to his edition, *op. cit.* (see note 1).

¹² See FRAKNÓI's introduction, *op. cit.*, VIII.

have joined the Carthusians in Venice in 1445 before setting out for Jerusalem.¹³ Over two decades later, in 1467 he recollected the event, somewhat laconically, “nearly twenty-two years have gone by since I donned the garb of the Carthusians in Venice, having scorned the pomp of this vain and perfidious world.”¹⁴

It is not known whether he had already made his decision before departing for foreign lands or whether he came to it in the city of lagoons, but he certainly did not travel to Italy as a novice from a Hungarian Carthusian convent. The scrapping of a military career in favour of a spiritual one could have come about as a result of a sudden revelation or other religious experience—though Andreas, who was never averse to talking about himself is likely to have mentioned this in one of his works, therefore the lack of such narrative makes one suspect one of the usual reasons (lack of money, disappointments, or maybe an impulsive act of an illegal nature), but perhaps we should not increase the number of existing conjectures, many of which has been put forward by Vilmos Fraknói. Much more important is the choice of the religious order he applied to be admitted to. Franciscan presence around János Hunyadi was rather strong so it would have seemed more logical for Andreas to embark on a spiritual career as one of their number. There are indeed, a number of signs suggesting that he had links with the Franciscans, such as the historical-theological perspective emerging from his works, the perceptible presence of Joachimite expectations focusing on the renewal of the world, the mentions of Bonaventura and Scotus, the use of the epithet *seraphicus* as the highest form of praise (e.g. for Janus Pannonius). He speaks of the Carthusians in the mirror for princes dedicated to Matthias as follows: “Among the orders that from the earliest times ... [Jesus Christ] ... has chosen for the greater glory of his sublime name, the most excellent appear to be those that follow the Carthusian regulations—whom the nation of the Pannons call by the name of the order of mute friars [in Hungarian in the original: “néma barat szerzete” – S. B.] and who reside next to heaven through contemplating divine dignity and all things heavenly.”¹⁵

Andreas’s decision may have been influenced by the consciousness of his noble origins or by the fact that the Carthusian rule was much stricter than the Franciscan one—one was expected to refrain from meat and wine, from speaking at all except in extraordinary circumstances and to celebrate Mass in silence without singing or music—though it is just as possible that he was influenced by a love of learning and felt attracted to the intellectual way of life.

The Carthusian order originated in France and was founded in 1048 by Saint Bruno.¹⁶ Its prosperity was due to affluent patrons who were attracted by their dignified ascetism and who believed that the Carthusians’ prayers were more efficacious in attaining spiri-

¹³ Cf. *ibid.*, VIII–X.

¹⁴ *De regis virtutibus*, *op. cit.*, 66.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 60.

¹⁶ Cf. Charles M. ROSENBERG, “Per il bene di ... nostra città”: Borso d’Este and the Certosa of Ferrara, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 29(1976), 329–340; Giovanni LEONCINI, *Le certose della «Provincia Tusciae»*, I, Salzburg, 1989 (*Analecta Cartusiana*, 60), 7–18.

tual salvation than those of other monks or lay priests. Unlike other (especially mendicant) orders, the Carthusians were never weakened by corruption and the waning of discipline: at the time, this was the only religious order which, since its foundation, never needed to be reformed.¹⁷ (In 1521, while other religious orders were in a decline, the Carthusians had 206 monasteries all over Europe.) Their abstinence and rigor, however, was in stark contrast with their love of learning. Carthusian monasteries were centres of expert collection, protection and duplication of codices and other works of art. Besides France, it was in Italy that the worldly aristocratic patronage of the order was strongest: Charles of Anjou founded the monastery of Saint Martin in Naples, the Saint Jerome in Bologna and the San Lorenzo near Florence were established by two Florentine aristocrats, Alberto and Niccolò Acciaiuoli while the grand Certosa of Pavia, the Santa Maria delle Grazie owed its foundation to a vow by the Duke of Milan, Gian Galeazzo Visconti. The Venetian monastery Saint Andrew was one of the smaller establishments of its kind but played an important part in the religious and cultural life of the city.¹⁸ The curious situation in Venice was that no higher education institution could be opened in the city because the Republic made all efforts to preserve the privileges of the University of Padova, located in its territory. There were only two state-run schools (one opened in 1446, the other in 1461 in San Marco) in the city which served as preparation for those intending to embark on university education while the Rialto school (Scuola di Rialto) provided an opportunity for the children of merchants to acquire thorough, though not university level, education from the early 15th century on. Therefore the monastery schools of the city came to fill a vacuum and the monks educated here went on to become private tutors at patrician families, which job, if all went well, was often augmented by the post of confessor.¹⁹

Andreas of Hungary is likely to have traversed this trajectory. According to the annals of the order,²⁰ he lived in Venice until 1459 which gave him ample time to pursue his studies. I have already indicated that he might have been subject to Franciscan influences, both from his readings and his involvement with the Franciscan monks around

¹⁷ “Cartusia nunquam reformata, quia nunquam deformata”—the origin of the saying is unknown, in a written form it can be found in a breve of Pope Innocentius IX dated 27 March 1688 which begins with *Iniunctum nobis* besides the confirmation of the new statutes of the Carthusian order, see *Bullarum diplomatarum et privilegiorum sanctorum Romanorum pontificum Taurinensis editio*, XIX, Augustae Tauricorum, Marietti, 1870, 787–914, the citation: 788.

¹⁸ Dario CANZAN, Donato GALLO, *Cistercensi e Certosini nell'Italia nord-orientale*, in: *Certosini e cistercensi in Italia (secoli XII–XV)*, eds. Rinaldo COMBA, Grado D. MERLO, Cuneo, 2000, 462–463; LEONCINI, *op. cit.*, II, 276–288; Elena BASSI, *Tracce di chiese veneziane*, Venice, 1997, 177–182.

¹⁹ See Bruno NARDI, *La Scuola di Rialto e l'umanesimo veneziano*, in: *Umanesimo europeo e umanesimo veneziano*, ed. Vittore BRANCA, Florence, Sansoni, 1963, 93–139; Fernando LEPORI, *La scuola di Rialto dalla fondazione alla metà del Cinquecento*, in: *Storia della cultura veneta*, 3/II, *Dal primo Quattrocento al concilio di Trento*, eds. Girolamo ARNALDI, Manlio PASTORE STOCCHI, Vicenza, 1980, 539–605. Cf. also Margaret L. KING, *Umanesimo e patriziato a Venezia nel Quattrocento*, Venice–Rome, 1989, I, 48–54.

²⁰ *The Chartae of the Carthusian General Chapter*, Paris, Bibliothèque National, MS Latin 10888, I, 1457–65, eds. Michael SARGENT, James HOGG, Salzburg, 1985, 73. I owe special thanks to Dániel Pócs who drew my attention to this volume and to the on-going edition of the Carthusian papers.

János Hunyadi. His works, however, also exude a strong Thomist learning, an influence to which he could only have been subjected in schools, therefore it is likely that he acquired his thorough theological learning in the Venetian or Padovan schools of the Dominicans. At any rate, he had to attend a monastery school in order to gain theological learning as in Italy, universities even in such centres of learning as Padova or Bologna had no theological faculties, which is why universities endeavoured to fill this gap by having Dominican or Franciscan monks of the city who would teach the metaphysics and theology of Duns Scotus or Thomas Aquinas.²¹ Both great scholastic philosophers leaned heavily on Aristotle and it was this peculiarly theologized Aristotelian learning that Andreas acquired. It is highly likely that Andreas was at some point in Padova for he himself mentions his personal acquaintance with István Várdai, an alumnus of Vitéz, the later Primate of Kalocsa and Cardinal,²² who begun his studies in Vienna, continued them in the late forties in Padova and completed them in Ferrara in the company of Janus Pannonius.²³

Venice in this era was an important meeting point of the scholastic and mystic traditions and humanist culture.²⁴ Even the foundation of a Carthusian monastery could be regarded as a symptom of a kind of religious renewal: according to the tradition, it was S. Bernardine of Siena, the celebrated monk-preacher of the day, who convinced the Senate that hosting the order would contribute to the spiritual purification of the city and provide the Republic with heavenly protection.²⁵ The order owed its popularity in Venice to the *devotio moderna*, which, spreading from the Low Countries, was also sweeping through Northern Italy by then. As Andreas Pannonius himself recalled, “imitating me, many a noble gentlemen of the fair city of Venice, deploring the impermanence of this miserable world chose to don the habit of the Carthusians and as a magister and a spiritual father, I was their superior.”²⁶

In plain speech, this means that he was a confessor or tutor to members of affluent patrician and merchant families and helped those who joined the order. Of these people, he mentions Giorgio Calordano by name, who, on the basis of the narrative, was probably a

²¹ On this issue see Antonio POPPI, *La teologia nell'università e nelle scuole*, in: *Storia della cultura veneta*, 2/III, *op. cit.*, 1–33; as well as Paul O. KRISTELLER, *Thomism and the Italian Thought of the Renaissance*, in: ID., *Medieval Aspects of Renaissance Learning: Three Essays*, ed. E. P. MAHONEY, Durham, 1974, 45–46; John MONFASANI, *Aristotelians, Platonists, and the Missing Ockhamists: Philosophical Liberty in Pre-Reformation Italy*, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 1993, 253–256; Paul F. GRENDLER, *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance*, Baltimore–London, 2002, 353–357.

²² *De regis virtutibus*, *op. cit.*, 88.

²³ Cf. LUKSICS Pál, *Várdai István ferrarai diák levelei (1448–1449)* (Correspondance of István Várdai, student in Ferrara 1448–1449), *Történelmi Szemle*, 1929, 124–136.

²⁴ On the coexistence of the monastic tendencies and Humanism in Venice: Gregorio PENCO, *Vita monastica e società nel Quattrocento italiano*, in: *Riforma della Chiesa, cultura e spiritualità nel Quattrocento veneto*, ed. Giovanni B. Francesco TROLESE, Cesena, 1984, 3–41.

²⁵ See LEONCINI, *op. cit.*, I, 10–12; Francesco SORELLI, *Predicatori a Venezia (fine secolo XIV–metà secolo XV)*, in: *Predicazione francescana e società veneta nel Quattrocento: Committenza, ascolto, ricezione*, Padova, 1995, 119–144 (esp. 129–135).

²⁶ *De regis virtutibus*, *op. cit.*, 66.

merchant and travelled as far as Syria.²⁷ No further information on him could be found, but it seems more important that Andreas made the acquaintance of an aristocrat who took no vows but cultivated theology as a lay person. This man was Candiano Bollani, the Venetian patrician (1413–1480), a high state official and the military commander first of Crete then of Verona who collaborated on the fortification of the defensive lines of Isonzo with Giovanni Emo (who later aided Matthias at the siege of Jajce). Andreas was a frequent visitor to the Palazzo Bollani on the Canal Grande (which, come the next century, would be the home of Pietro Aretino for decades) and obviously played a part in turning a lay patrician toward theological studies. Candiano²⁸ also studied rhetoric, physics, and astrology. He completed his lengthy commentary on the *Hexameron*²⁹ only in the 1460s and he sent it to Andreas, who by this time was living in Ferrara, affixing a letter by way of dedication to the manuscript. Both the fact of sending the letter as well as its tone indicated that Candiano liked and highly respected the Hungarian Carthusian³⁰ as a theologian and that the ties between Andreas and Bollani family were maintained for years after the Hungarian moved away from Venice. This will also be significant later as Candiano's son, Domenico Bollani, was also known as a lay author of a theological tractate and the Serenissima might have recalled the Hungarian connection when in 1490, Bollani was nominated to head a Venetian delegation to Matthias. This was the last embassy which Matthias was to receive before his death and on April 4, and among much pomp and circumstance, he made Bollani a knight.³¹

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ For his biography see Giovanni degli AGOSTINI, *Notizie istorico-critiche intorno la vite e le opere degli scrittori viniziani*, II, Venezia, 1754, 157–167. Works known by titles: *Oratio de laudibus Francisci Sphortiae Mediolanensis Ducis*; *De signis Coelestibus*; *De invidia*; *Scholia in Librum de meteoris Aristotelis*; *In rhetoricorum novorum Ciceronis librum primum commentum*.

²⁹ Candiano BOLLANI, *Libellus super principium genesis editus per Candianum Bolani patricium civitatis Melite Venetiarum ad dominum Andream Pannonium sacri ordinis Karthusiensium*, Biblioteca Marciana, Venice, Cod. Lat. I. 44 (2038). See *Bibliotheca manuscripta ad S. Marci Venetiarum*, digessit Joseph VALENTINELLI praefectus, *Codices Mss Latini*, tom. I, Venetiis, 1868, 213.

³⁰ The letter was written by Candiano before he set out for Crete. The actual missive can be read before the first part, attached to the front cover of the codex (i.e. Andreas Pannonius received it together with the book and pasted it in himself, though this could also have been done by Bollani). The address (on the back cover): Venerabili patri suo in christo fratri andree cartusiensi. Ferrarie. The text: "Patri suo ac domino fratri andree [inserted over the line but in the same hand: pannonio] cartusiensi: Candianus bolanus salutem pt. Nuntius iste tuus letificavit animam meam, cum iam te ex hac vita migrasse ex nonnullorum relatu crederem, quamquam et in christo letus essem: qui te crederem ex hac mortali vita ad perpetuam illam hierusalem avolasse. Sed rogo te: ut ores pro me: qui ad preturam cretensem vocatus sum: ut dominus nos custodiat: et bonorum operum finem largiatur. Librum super genesim ad litteram propter te, ac nomini tuo dedicatum, manique mea conscriptum per latorem presentium tui ordinis virum ad te mitto. Interim rogo, ora pro me peccatorem. Vale. Proficiscar usque ad dies octo, decemve ad plus ad preturam cretensem. Ex urbe die xiiij martii 1466." On the dedication, more recently: Luciano GARGAN, *Un' antica biblioteca domenicana ritrovata: A proposito di un recente catalogo di manoscritti*, Medioevo e Rinascimento, 21, n. s. 18(2007), 321–342; mention of the Bollani manuscript and the dedication to Andreas: 332.

³¹ Giovanni degli AGOSTINI, *Notizie istorico-critiche intorno la vite e le opere degli scrittori viniziani*, I, Venezia, 1752, 521–532.

In 1452 the Order transferred Andreas to the Saint Jerome Carthusian monastery in Bologna, where he must have carried on with writing his theological works. These are listed in an entry in the annals of the charterhouse pertaining to him:³² various speeches, a treatise on the Trinity and three commentaries, on the *Book of Psalms*, on the *Song of Songs*, and on the *Sententiae* of Petrus Lombardus. It is obvious that some of these must have been completed during his stay in Venice. By this time then, Andreas was a mature and respected theologian who obviously lived no hermit's life, moved in university circles, was informed, during his perambulations, of the issues dividing the city and of European political events, for Bologna was not only a scholarly but a political centre as well, where the students and professors were forever conveying news and information. Bologna at this time, after 1458, the conclusion of the rule of Cardinal Bessarion who implemented university reforms and quelled the confrontations of the city factions, was governed by a new legate, Cardinal Angelo Capranica. The world of the monasteries also participated in the intellectual life (we have no information on the Carthusians apart from the fact that the Prior at the time of the arrival of Andreas was called Giovanni Montefortino),³³ but the library of the General Chapter, the San Salvatore, the library of San Francesco, and especially the still world-famous library of the San Domenico (whose new halls were constructed at the time of Andreas's stay in Bologna) which contained works of contemporary humanist authors as well as classical or medieval texts of theology and medicine—these monastery libraries gave opportunities for the exchange of

³² The fact that this short note can be found in the collection of obituaries in the Certosa of Bologna (*Necrologium Patrum Cartusiae Bononiensis*) caused no end of confusion in the scholarly literature. See, for instance, DÁM Ince, *Andreas Pannonius ferrarai priorságának viszontagságai* (The tribulations of the Ferrara Priory of Andreas Pannonius), *Civitas Dei*, 1956, 107–108, which lists local and church historians whose only difference of opinion was in fixing the year of his death at 1460 or 1464. Dám himself also accepts that towards the end of his life, Andreas returned to the charterhouse St Jerome in Bologna. But the passage in question only says: “P. Andreas Ungarus Prior Cartusiae Ferrariensis dudum excitatae, suis etiam virtutibus illustrabat et studiis, e quibus supersunt Paraphrasis in librum Sententiarum, in Psalterium, in Canticos [!] canticorum, Tractatus de Spirito Sancto, Varii sermones.” That is, “Father Andreas of Hungary became the prior of the recently erected Carthusian monastery in Ferrara, he excelled through his personal virtues and through his learning, attesting to which there are such of his works as his commentary to the *Sententiae*, the *Book of Psalms* and the *Song of Songs*, his treatise on the Trinity and his various speeches.” This allows us to suppose—until the original manuscript is found since everyone cites an indirect source Giovanni FANTUZZI, *Notizie degli scrittori bolognesi*, Bologna, 1789, VII, 257—that the “Necrologium” was the record of not only deaths but was more like an annals, containing the significant events of the year, in this case, the Ferrara appointment of Andreas. The two versions for the date (1464 and 1460) are easy to explain: the number 1469 (which is the year of Andreas's election to prior) can be misread in manuscripts difficult to decipher in two ways, either as 1460 or 1464. The monks in the Bologna monastery, the closest to Ferrara, probably kept track of the career of their former fellow and an election to prior is a significant enough event to merit an entry in the annals.

³³ Archivio di Stato, Bologna, Corporazioni religiose (Fondo demaniale), Certosini, Busta 24/5869, n. 1. Catalogo de' Priori della Certosa di Bologna; according to the entry found here “D. Giovanni da Monte Fortino” was Prior between 1458 and 1463 but nothing further is known about him (“Di questo parimenti non trovasi alcuna memoria de suoi fatti”).

ideas between church and lay scholars and the Hungarian monk arriving at the city must have visited some of them.³⁴

With regards to the Bolognese ties of Andreas, we are left to conjectures. A later letter of his indicates that he knew the physician Geronimo Ranuzzi,³⁵ a close associate and confidante of Governor Capranica, therefore it is likely that through his mediation, Andreas met the governor himself. There are two reasons underlying this assumption: the governing legate, supporting Bessarion, played a key role in the anti-Turkish politics of popes Nicholas V and Pius II (in 1471, he still is the *legatus a latere* appointed by Sixtus IV to organize the war-chest contributions from the Italian princes) and Andreas, on the part of the Hungarians, appeared to be working for the same ends, furthermore, Capranica was the Cardinal Protector at the Holy See who represented the interests of the Carthusian order.³⁶ Andreas probably knew a number of the *natio Ungarica* at the university, since following the reforms of Bessarion, more started arriving and some 20 of them gained their doctorate before 1473. In 1461, a certain “János of Hungary” taught at the faculty of medicine and if Andreas was still in town in 1465 or at least frequently returned to the city, he could have met the two youngsters who enrolled at the university in that academic year: Tamás Bakócz and Péter Váradi.³⁷

The year of Andreas’s arrival, 1459, also marked a highly significant event in the life of the city, when local politics met international politics in Bologna. The meeting is to be understood literally: on May 9, the humanist Pope, Pius II, travelled through the university town with his full entourage (some 70 bishops, among them Cardinal Bessarion and the Hungarian Ambassador, Albert Vetési, the Bishop of Veszprém) on his way to the Mantova congress where decisions were reached the following year to launch a war against the Turks. City authorities asked the renowned professor of law, Bornio da Sala, who was reputed to be a great orator, to greet the delegation. Bornio, who was famous for his humanist learning, staunch misogyny, moral rigor, and religious zeal, opened with a few well-oiled commonplaces on the clemency of the climate of Bologna and the importance of the university, then launched a terrifying invective against the spread of cor-

³⁴ On the Certosa of Bologna, see LEONCINI, *op. cit.*, I, 45–74. On the general features of the cultural development of the city and the university, see the fundamental study of Ezio RAIMONDI: *Umanesimo e università nel Quattrocento bolognese*, Studi e memorie per la storia dell’Università di Bologna, n. s. 1(1956), 325–356; and his monograph: *Codro e l’Umanesimo a Bologna*, Bologna, 1987².

³⁵ On him, see G. B. COMELLI, *Di Girolamo Ranuzzi, secondo conte della Porretta*, Bologna, 1900; more recently *Ranuzzi: Storia, genealogia, iconografia*, ed. Giuliano MALVEZZI CAMPEGGI, Bologna, 2000, 36–37. Ranuzzi was a key figure of the diplomacy of his day, his activities are awaiting exploration. More documents pertaining to Andreas may be found among his papers which have since been transferred to the US; cf. *The Ranuzzi Manuscripts*, ed. Maria Xenia ZEVELECHI WELLS, Austin (Texas), 1980, 1–7. On the network of relationships in the Capranica–Ranuzzi–Bornio da Sala–Bessarion circle, cf. the correspondence of Iacopo AMMANNATI PICCOLOMINI which has many hidden Hungarian allusions: *Lettere (1444–1479)*, ed. Paolo CHERUBINI, I, Rome, 1997 (Pubblicazioni degli Archivi di Stato, Fonti XXV), 389–390 (missives to Bornio da Sala), 601–603 (to Janus), 604–607 (to Vitéz), 962–965, 1186 (to Ranuzzi).

³⁶ For the above see DÁM, *op. cit.*, 108–110.

³⁷ Cf. GERÉZDI Rabán, *Bologna és a magyar humanizmus* (Bologna and Hungarian Humanism), Irodalomtörténet, 1940, 146–158.

ruption and the partisan hate engulfing the city and begged the Pope to intervene personally and restore good governance and civic peace. Pius was surprised by the professor's courage (as he wrote in his memoirs, with unsurpassable irony, "he spoke as raging flood, fearlessly and audaciously, which gave great excitement to the citizens present and a surprise to the visitors")³⁸—then hastened to save the professor from the clutches of the enraged citizenry who branded him a traitor. The Pope took Bornio with him to Mantova and only let him return to his university chair months later, after the indignation had died down.³⁹ Bornio da Sala is important for us as the only person who is documented beyond doubt to have been in personal contact with Andreas Pannonius.⁴⁰ Their relationship reached the point, probably in the late 1460s after his return to Bologna, at which Bornio dedicated one of his important theological works on the impiety of the Jews and the possibilities of their conversion (*Adversus perfidiam Judeorum*) "with great respect to the pious Andreas Pannonius, a member of the holy order of Carthusians." The text of the dedication goes beyond mere niceties: "Since long I have placed my trust in you and found strength in your weighty and wise advice. Now of this work, which I have writ versus the impiety of the Jews, I would like you to be a critical judge. So bright you are in your rigor of life, sanctity of morals, literary learning and theological scholarship that you outshine nearly everybody. As a learned man, you will find it easy to correct and set right my work if you find it worthy of reading."⁴¹

³⁸ PIUS SECUNDUS, *Commentarii*, eds. Ibolya BELLUS, Iván BORONKAI, Budapest, 1993, 129. (Comm. II, 37.)

³⁹ See Antonio Ivan PINI, «Non tam studiorum mater quam seditionum alitrix»: Pio II e Bologna, in: *Il sogno di Pio II e il viaggio da Roma a Mantova: Atti del Convegno internazionale, Mantova, 13–15 aprile 2000*, eds. Arturo CALZONA, Francesco Paolo FIORE, Alberto TENENTI, Cesare VASOLI, Florence, 2003, 194–198; and the literature referenced here.

⁴⁰ On him, see the entry by Gianni BALLISTRIERI, *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, XII, Rome, 1970, 801–803; as well as Bianca BIANCHI, *Ein bologneser Jurist und Humanist Bornio da Sala*, Wiesbaden, 1976 (Untersuchungen zur Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte der romanischen Völker, 9); Luisa PESAVENTO, *Bornio da Sala: cultura umanistica e impegno politico nella Bologna quattrocentesca*, Studi di storia medioevale, 9(1987), 135–164.

⁴¹ University Library of Bologna, Cod. Lat. 2663. The text of the dedication is published in an incomplete form by the discoverer of the codex, RÉVÉSZ Mária, *Andreas Pannonius és Bornio da Sala* (Andreas Pannonius and Bornio da Sala), *Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny*, 1935, 81. A brief summary of the work is given in PESAVENTO, *op. cit.*, 154–155. The full text of the dedication: "Religiosissimo patri Andree Panonio sacri ordinis Cartusiensis Bornius de Sala cum deuocione se ipsum. Jam pridem omnia in te reposui consilia mea tuo gravissimo atque optimo consilio confirmatus. Nunc huius quoque studij mei quod adversus perfidiam Judeorum suscepi volo sis censor et iudex, quem tanti facio, ut et seueritate uite et sanctimonia morum et optimarum artium studio ac sacrarum literarum doctrina omnibus ferme alijs existimeris precel[l]ere. Breuiter autem ego processsi cum ex silua scripturarum infinite amplificari potuisset. Constat enim pro confutatione eorum ut sum[m]atim dicam de Christo secundum prophetias. Primo de precursore eius Johanne Baptista, Malachie iij. Ecce ego mit[t]am angelum meum etc. De conceptione Isaia vij. Ecce uirgo concipiet. De loco paratus Michee v. Et tu Betheleem Efrata. Quod natus inter duo animalia Abachuc iij. In medio duorum animalium. Et ne opinionem protraham, de natiuitate Isaia ix. De adoratione magorum Isaia ix. De interfectione puerorum Jeremias xxxi. De fuga in Egiptum habetur Osee xj. De conuersatione eius in mundum Baruch iij. De miraculis eius in mondo. Isaia xxxv. De eius despectione in Iudea Isaia primo. Filios enutriui et exaltaui, ipsi autem spreuerunt me. De electione apostolorum psalmo xliij. Pro patribus tuis etc. De eius baptismo Isaia lij. De sessione super asinam Zacharias c. viij. De eius passione Jeremias xj. De eius venditione Za-

One should not read too much into these words of praise, but in the intellectual environment in which Bornio moved, such a dedication letter constituted a symbolic exchange value which bound and qualified both the writer and the recipient. If we take a look at the list of correspondents of the Bolognese law professor (which includes such names as Filelfo, Ambrogio Traversari, Poggio Bracciolini, Giovanni Aurispa, Jacopo Ammanati),⁴² and if we consider the opinion passed on him by the great Aeneas Sylvius (i.e. that he is thought of even more highly as a philosopher than as a rhetor),⁴³ it is easy to see that the intellectual currency of Andreas was rated rather high if such an esteemed scholar requested him to be the judge (*censor et iudex*) of his work. A further indication of this is that Bornio's dedication is the first source which calls the Hungarian Carthusian—who has hitherto been known as “*Andreas Ungarus*” by all—by his humanist name.

There is no surviving evidence for other personal relations but it is almost certain that Andreas knew Galeotto Marzio who spend three years (1463–65) in the rhetoric chair at Bologna University and he was known for his controversial philological debates (he confronted Filelfo and Giorgio Merula with unusual vehemence) of which Andreas would learn, if not from someone else, then from Bornio da Sala. In the 1470s, he returned from Hungary to collaborate with Cola Montano and Beroaldo Sr. in the publication of Ptolemy's cosmography.⁴⁴ (In my opinion, the identity of “magister Marchus, clarus philosophus,” mentioned at the end of the Matthias mirror for princes, via whose agency Andreas wants to place the manuscript into the King's hands, continues to be an open question. It may not be Mark, the Bishop of Knin, but rather Martius Galeottus, misspelled by a slip of the quill, who was really both a *magister* and a *philosophus* indeed.)⁴⁵

charias xj. De fuga vero apostolorum Zacharias xiiij. Percutiam pastorem. De eius percussione et irrisione Isaías liij. Corpus meum etc. De missione spiritus sancti Isaías c. xliiij. Et fundam spiritum meum super omnem carnem. Ut et habetur Joel secundo. Facile erit tibi viro doctissimo emendare et cor[r]igere si hec legere non aspernaberis. Vale et orationibus Bornium tuum adiuva.” Andreas Pannonius was indeed “iudex et censor”: he annotated the text with attention marks and notes on the margin.

⁴² List compiled by PESAVENTO, *op. cit.*, 136–138. See also Paul Oskar KRISTELLER, *Un opuscolo sconosciuto di Cencio de' Rustici dedicato a Bornio da Sala: La traduzione del dialogo 'De virtute' attribuito a Platone*, in: *Miscellanea Augusto Campana*, eds. Dino AVESANI, Mirella FERRARI, I, Padova, 1981, 355–376.

⁴³ *Commentarii*, *op. cit.*, 130.

⁴⁴ See RAIMONDI, *Codro e l'Umanesimo*, *op. cit.*, 38–42.

⁴⁵ See BRUCKNER Győző, *Galeotto Marzio De egregie, sapienter et iocose dictis ac factis Matthiae regis című műve mint művelődéstörténeti kútforrás* (The work titled *De egregie, sapienter et iocose dictis ac factis Matthiae regis* by Galeotto Marzio as a wellspring of cultural history), Budapest, 1901, 79–80. The notes of Iván Boronkai refer to Mark of Fiume, among his notes on the translation of the Matthias mirror for princes, with no citation noted: Andreas PANNONIUS, *Könyvecske az erényekről Korvin Mátyásnak ajánlva (1467)* (A booklet on the virtues dedicated to Matthias Korvin), in: *A magyar középkor irodalma* (Literature of the Hungarian Middle Ages), ed. V. KOVÁCS Sándor, transl. BORONKAI Iván, Budapest, 1984, 1132. At the same time, the fact remains that in early 1467, Mark was dead and Matthias appointed Miklós Nyújtódi to take his place, the same man who also figured in the works of Andreas (the author recommends him as one of the possible readers and interpreters of the work) and who returned from his embassy in Rome to Hungary via Ferrara at the time of the writing of the *libellus*. Cf. FRANKÓI Vilmos, *Mátyás király magyar diplomatái* (The Hungarian diplomats of King Matthias), Századok, 1899, 6.

During these years, Galeotto shared lodgings with János Vitéz Jr.⁴⁶—and this fact makes it highly probable that the Carthusian, who knew the Primate of Esztergom also knew Vitéz's roommate.

The number of years Andreas spent in Bologna is not known. In the annals of the General Chapter of the Carthusians, after 1459 his name can only be found in 1464, at which time the Order is considering transferring him from Ferrara to Florence. He might have travelled there but he certainly did not settle in Tuscany but returned to the city of the d'Estes.⁴⁷ If he indeed returned there—which remains questionable. In the annals of the General Chapter, an entry says that the Prior of the St Jerome charterhouse in Bologna will be relieved of his duties and transferred, as a vicar, to the Carthusian monastery Saint Cristopher recently opened in Ferrara.⁴⁸ The previously mentioned letter of Candiano Bollani reached Ferrara in March 1466. To resolve these difficulties, further archive research is necessary, for want of which I can only assume the most probable scenario: the General Chapter was often simply chasing the decisions made locally by the patrons maintaining the monastery and by the community of monks. Andreas may have moved to Ferrara in the early 1460s, from where he moved to Florence in 1464 (probably not on his own volition) and after this detour he gained the Priory of the Bologna monastery which was his due on account of his age and experience. His predecessor the former Bolognese Prior, Giovanni Montefortino was made in 1465 the Prior of the Ferrara charterhouse and it was probably at his request that Andreas accepted, in the same year, the post of a vicar, which, from a career point of view, was a step down for him—this was the decision retroactively approved by the General Chapter—but given the proximity of the court of the prince, this offered a much more promising perspective for him. What is certain that on 1 September 1467, he signed his mirror for princes to Matthias as the vicar of Ferrara.

At this time, Borso d'Este was in power in the city. Borso was a more down-to-earth character, a more realistic phenomenon and a more rational ruler than his humanist older brother, Leonello, who was raised by Guarino.⁴⁹ He was also generous to artists but was aware that one cannot govern through mere symbolic forms. He competed with Cardinal Bessarion in sponsoring the illumination of the codices containing chorals, originally intended for the Franciscans of Constantinople and now preserved in Cesena. This was a strange and early example of the current practice of shared sponsorship—the third person in the “joint venture” was Sigismondo Pandolfo Malatesta. Furthermore, he negotiated slyly with Bessarion about the fate of the lavish library of Aurispa who died in 1461. But when he had to send his galleons to sail under the common Christian flag, he could not

⁴⁶ See GERÉZDI, *op. cit.*, 150.

⁴⁷ *The Chartae of the Carthusian General Chapter, I, op. cit.*, 133.

⁴⁸ *The Chartae of the Carthusian General Chapter, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Latin 10888, II, 1466–74*, eds. Michael SARGENT, James HOGG, Salzburg, 1985, 25.

⁴⁹ In summary of the below, see Werner L. GUNDERSHEIMER, *Ferrara estense: Lo stile del potere*, Ferrara–Modena, 1988, 57–72; contemporary description of Borso: PIUS SECUNDUS, *Commentarii*, II, 40, *op. cit.*, 132–133.

receive enough assurances from the Pope. The troops from Ferrara managed to arrive late enough to Ancona in the summer of 1464 to find that Pius had died in the meantime and they returned home instead of going off to war. In his princely representation, a special place was given to *iustitia*, the virtue of justice and he was not content to merely have himself immortalized as a just arbiter among the frescoes of the Schifanoia palace or on the square before Castello but took care that the people really perceived the effects of his stern but fair administration. His learning was not as extensive as that of Leonello since he originally intended to become a soldier and his talents in politics and diplomacy only began to show after he came to power. A certain inner trait of his, however, made it possible for his natural inclinations to fit perfectly with the need of princely representation. Borso was a religious ruler and built his princely propaganda around the religious feeling of his subjects and himself. Patronizing the church and a selected order was justified from the point of view of his natural inclination and it was even indispensable for the point of view of propaganda. Borso's father, Niccolò III and his brother, Leonello, extended such support to the Dominicans (Niccolò had the Santa Maria degli Angeli Observant⁵⁰ Dominican monastery built and he had himself interred there). Borso resolved to undertake something similar, an act befitting a prince. He introduced a new order of monks into the city, the Carthusians. Already in 1438 at the Florence–Ferrara Union Council (which tried to reconcile the Greek and Roman rites and where delegates from the Eastern Church turned up in significant numbers and essentially all neo-Platonic initiatives in 15th century Italy can be tracked back to this point), the Carthusian Niccolò Albergati, who held the post of the presidency of the Ferrara section of the Council made a lasting impression on Borso by his impeccable morals and personal aura.⁵¹ The other motivating factor was princely propaganda: he did not want to be shown up by the Visconti of Milan, long-time associates of Ferrara, who built the grandiose Certosa in Pavia for the monks of Saint Bruno. After his accession to power, one of the first things Borso attended to was the foundation of a Carthusian church and charterhouse named after Saint Christopher. According to Michele Savonarola, too, the Duca “has held it in his heart for long that he build a grand Carthusian residence” and upon his election, he made this intention of his “known to everyone and took great care that the construction, which he was at the forefront of, be begun in haste—and the church was so large and so was its grounds and so luxurious the building intended for the monks that they are not completed even today.” Savonarola wrote these lines between 1454 and 1460.⁵² Borso laid the foundation stone on 23 April 1452 and inaugurated the grounds amid much pomp on the

⁵⁰ The Conventual Dominicans, insistent on the old regulations, had a different monastery in Ferrara, the St Domenico since the early 13th century. The St Maria degli Angeli belonged to the reformed branch of the Dominicans, see Thomas KAEPPEL, *Tommaso dai Liuti di Ferrara e il suo «Declaratorio»*, Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1(1950), 194.

⁵¹ Benedetto TROMBY, *Storia critica-cronologica diplomatica del patriarca S. Brunone e del suo ordine Cartusiano*, VIII, Napoli, 1779, 205.

⁵² Cf. Maria Aurelia MASTRONARDI, *La «scrittura» in corte*, in: Michele SAVONAROLA, *Del felice progresso di Borso d'Este*, ed. M. A. MASTRONARDI, Bari, 1996, 41, 157.

day of St John the Baptist, 24 June 1461. By this time a number of monks resided in the charterhouse, most of them having moved here from the nearby Bologna, under their Prior, Filippo Rosatti, the former Prior of Bologna.⁵³

The Hungarian Carthusian was probably among the first who made the move. The Saint Christopher monastery attracted scholarly monks not just by its new and modern conveniences. To lay the foundations of the monastery's library, Borso donated to the Carthusians the fine library of the humanist manuscript collector Aurispa, including great many rare codices and Greek manuscripts.⁵⁴ A *scriptorium* operated in the monastery where copying was carried out not only for the prince but for the monks' own needs as well. Outstanding amongst the miniators was Guglielmo Giraldi, whose significance was only realized by art history research in the recent years. In the early 1460s, Andreas Pannonius was not the only Hungarian in town. His compatriot Master Michael of Hungary (Michele Ungaro or Michele Pannonio), contributed to the decoration of Leonello's *studiolo* by a Muse depiction, but his masterpiece was probably the no longer extant cycle of frescoes in the princely quarters in the Certosa. For Borso had separate quarters constructed in the complex for his personal use, the walls of which were adorned with scenes from the lives of the three hermit saints, Anthony, Paul, and Makarios—and as the payment slips prove, Michael used expensive material such as *azzurro fino* and gold for the frescoes (and naturally, he borrowed the biographies of the saints from the Este library). The frescoes of the Certosa were destroyed and no description of them survived—it can be taken for certain though that Borso's quarters were used not only for private devotion and pious purposes but formed part of the princely propaganda as well. In the summer of 1469 when Andreas was Prior, the King of Portugal visited Ferrara and wished to see three places: Belfiore, Schifanoia, and the Certosa.⁵⁵

In 1467, Andreas Pannonius noted the names of Hungarians who were staying in Bologna contemporaneously with him (but not that of Tamás Bakócz who only arrived in 1469 and for some as yet unknown reason, not that of Péter Garázda, who studied there along with László Vetési from 1465 to 1468).⁵⁶ At the end of the apocalyptic vision concluding the mirror for princes dedicated to Matthias, the harbingers of the post-judgement *renovatio mundi* are Hungarian youths studying in Ferrara (László Vingárti

⁵³ LEONCINI, *op. cit.*, II, 315–347.

⁵⁴ Adriano FRANCESCHINI, *Giovanni Aurispa e la sua biblioteca*, Padova, 1976, 24–25; HUSZTI, *Andreae Pannonii Expositio*, *op. cit.* (see note 2), 99.

⁵⁵ On the above (with ample literature) see Fabrizio LOLLINI, *Bologna, Ferrara, Cesena: I corali del Besarione tra circuiti umanistici e percorsi di artisti*, in: *Corali miniati del Quattrocento nella Biblioteca Malatestiana*, ed. Piero LUCCHI, Milan, 1989, 19–36. From the payment slips of the works carried out at the Certosa we know who painted what on the walls of the cell of Andreas: “Maestro Bonzohanne de Zumigan contrascripto de havere havere adi ultimo de dexembre libre 450, soldi dui marchesani per havere depinto in la Certoxa li infrascripti lavoreri, videlicet: Per fare bianca la cella de don Andrea monaco et per depinzere in quella uno tabernaculo et uno Crucifixo, Nostra Dona et Sancto Zohanne Evangelista... L. 4.” Adriano FRANCESCHINI, *Artisti a Ferrara in età umanistica e rinascimentale: Testimonianze archivistiche*, I, Ferrara–Rome, 1993, 688.

⁵⁶ Vö. GERÉZDI, *op. cit.*

Geréb, Zsigmond Pálóczi, Miklós Perényi) who are “nearly God’s angels on earth” and the town is presented as a place where “not only Latin rhetoric flourishes but Greek speech as well, as if it were a second Athens”⁵⁷ and it is not without good reason that Andreas applies this well-known epithet to Ferrara (though it was usually said of Bologna). The city of Borso d’Este, all its parvenu grandstanding notwithstanding, had risen to an important cultural centre of contemporary Europe and managed to remain one after the era of Guarino and Leonello. The truly grand personalities (Theodoros Gaza, Manuel Khrysoloras, the elder Guarino, Aurispa, and the participants of the Union Council, Gemisthos Plethon, Trapezuntios, and Bessarion) have either died by this time or lived far from the city. It was still some years until the arrival of Rudolf Agricola, but the Ferrara of the 1460s was also home to outstanding personalities and serious scholars—Michele Savonarola, Tommaso Liuti, the young Giorgio Benigni Salviati, the university professor Giovanni Gatto were all well-known personalities who influenced Andreas’s mirrors for princes.

The key issues of the politics of Ferrara were the maintenance of the Alliance of Milan, the upkeep of the balance between nurturing good relations with but keeping a distance from the papal state—at the same time, the central issue of international politics was the forging of a European alliance fit to launch a war against the Turks. In both areas, the Kingdom of Hungary played a key role. After the 1460 Congress of Mantova mentioned above, the Pope sent the consecrated flag to Matthias who was to become the supreme general of the Christian armies⁵⁸—and Borso, with all his practical sensibilities was quite well aware that if there was no direct benefit to be gained from the Hungarians, the elites of Buda and Esztergom with their many close ties to Ferrara, were interested in enhancing the reputation of their country in international diplomacy as well as having the potential to play serious roles in the complex political games of the Holy See. So from this perspective, Andreas Pannonius was plausibly at the right place at the right time—it is sufficient to recall that a personal acquaintance of his, István Várdai, student in Ferrara and Padova, later Archbishop of Kalocsa, was appointed a Cardinal in Rome in September 1467. The head of the Certosa was regarded as having the confidence of Borso d’Este, so the series of conflicts that broke out here is especially worthy of our attention.

The Hungarian Carthusian was elected Prior by the residents of the Saint Christopher charterhouse. The election cannot have taken place without the approval of the patron prince who had close ties with the order and the monastery. Andreas, however, came into conflict with the central authorities of the Carthusians in the meantime. He was accused of having denigrated the name of his order before the Cardinal Protector and he was supposed to have denounced certain of his superiors. In retaliation, the General Chapter

⁵⁷ “...in hac florida civitate Ferrariensi, quae non solum Latina eloquentia, sed etiam Graeca ut altera Athena floret.” *De regis virtutibus*, *op. cit.*, 132.

⁵⁸ See FRAKNÓI Vilmos, *Magyarország egyházi és politikai összeköttetései a római szent-székkal, II, A konstanci zsinattól a mohácsi vészig 1418–1526* (The ecclesiastical and political relations between Hungary and the Holy See of Rome, II, From the Council of Constance till the battle of Mohács), Budapest, 1902, 135–137; ID., *Mátyás király élete* (The life of King Matthias), Budapest, 1890, 147–150.

refused to confirm his election and insisted on choosing another Prior. What was it that Andreas had done? We have no precise information on this. The annals of the General Chapter reveal that as early as 1467, discord broke out among the residents of the Saint Christopher and the superiors of the order dispatched a committee of three to deal with the situation. (The priors of Naples, Bologna, and Padova were to travel to Ferrara, free three imprisoned monks and then report back to the Grand Chartreux in Grenoble.) One of the three friars, a certain “Constantinus” makes an appearance in the sources a year later: the General Chapter relieves the Prior of Ferrara and puts Constantinus in his place. Or rather, they meant to, but according to the “group portrait”⁵⁹ of the priors once kept in the Carthusian church, now in the city gallery, the monks elected Giovanni Montefortino again to head the charterhouse in this period, in other words, they defied the will of the central authorities.

An edict of the General Chapter in 1468 admonishes “signore Andreas Pannonius” to show obedience toward the order’s leadership—and the following year, Andreas is nominated by his fellows for the post of Prior. It may be supposed that Andreas’s “denunciation” to Cardinal Capranica must have arrived during the above-mentioned upheaval and was probably directed against either friar Constantin who was remotely supported from the Order’s centre, or against the Head of the Order himself. We will not be able to determine the exact circumstances until further archival research into the issue is conducted.⁶⁰ Ince Dám published the letter of Borso d’Este to Angelo Capranica dated 1470, in which the prince intervenes on the behalf of Andreas at the Cardinal Protector. It relates that the Hungarian monk was elected Prior after the death of Montefortino and that the prince “approved of the election on account of his virtues.” Borso wrote to the Head of the Order for confirmation of the election, but he relieved the Hungarian Carthusian from his post “to the astonishment of us and the monastery in question.” Borso asked the Cardinal to send him the letter written by Andreas so that the deposed Prior can take it, along with other documents proving his innocence, to the meeting of the General Chapter. The entire letter of the prince exudes confidence in the innocence of his protégé and of course, a hurt princely pride (how dare a remotely residing head of order override him in the affairs of a charterhouse that he founded and financed, even if he is within his formal rights to do so?).⁶¹ Even more interesting is the letter of Andreas, sent simultaneously with Borso’s missive to the confidante of Capranica, Geronimo Ranuzzi. As he says “Please have His Excellency the Cardinal know that I would not endeavour to have my Priory reinstated if I was not compelled to do this by my obedience and if my Lord,

⁵⁹ Detailed description of the painting: DÁM, *op. cit.*, 106. Currently in the city gallery (Pinacoteca nazionale). See also Carlo BRISIGHELLA, *Descrizione dell pitture e sculture della città di Ferrara*, a cura di Maria ANGELI NOVELLI, Ferrara, 1991, 176–183.

⁶⁰ On the above see *The Chartae of the Carthusian General Chapter*, II, *op. cit.*, 50, 78, 152.

⁶¹ The Jacopo Trotti mentioned in Borso’s letter was the ambassador of Ferrara at the Holy See and his correspondence with Borso is of fundamental importance for the political history of the age—the material to be studied is currently in Modena: Archivio di Stato, Modena, Archivio segreto estense, Cancelleria, Estero, Ambasciatori esteri, Roma, busta 1 (9-IV, Giacomo Trotti, Dispacci, 1468–1470).

His Excellency the Prince would not insist on it. I joined the order not for the post of a Prior but for the salvation of my soul and I prefer the consolation offered by solitude. I act and pray in this matter to have the truth known so that not the slightest blemish should fall on His Excellency the Prince on my account, especially as he wrote such a generous recommendation to the General Chapter on my behalf. And mostly for the reason that Augustine put so delicately '*Neglecting reputation is a way of being cruel to others.*' God be with you."⁶²

The letter demonstrates a fundamental characteristic of Andreas's personality: a proud aloofness and a hint of some repressed emotions and impulsivity. The series of conflicts came to an end in 1471 and indeed, the death of his patron helped in bringing it about. Andreas did attend the Grand Chartreux in Grenoble and managed to clear his name of the accusations there. In the meantime, however, on 20 August 1471, Borso d'Este died and this did away with or at least reduced his worldly support. It is not known when the news of Borso's death reached the Grand Chartreux, but it must have done so for the Chapter made a Solomon's decision: it ordered Andreas to make a compulsory move to the Certosa in Pavia. In fact, they had him escorted there from Grenoble by the Prior of Pavia and forbade him to return to Ferrara. At the same time, they permitted that "those who also want to leave the Ferrara charterhouse in question, may do so and move to his charterhouse"—in other words, the series of conflicts was concluded by the general retreat of one of the parties and Andreas and his followers were removed from Ferrara.⁶³ The leadership in Pavia took such care to follow instructions to the letter that Borso's one-time confidante was not permitted to attend the spectacular funeral of his former patron. The lines in the mirror for princes dedicated to Ercole clearly refer to the situation: "Brightest of all the princes, love dictates that I be present at the funeral of signore Borso who left this life behind and deliver to you in person all the tidings that I am penning in my letter and give you in person my heartfelt good wishes for your glory (which, if your Excellency remembers, I predicted a year ago) and I would do all this had obedience, with its shackles of love, not bound me to the Carthusian house in Pavia."⁶⁴

The Franciscan Francesco della Rovere ascended to the papal throne as Sixtus IV in 1471. He might well have been a personal acquaintance of Andreas, since the famous theologian was at the head of the Franciscan *studium generale* in Bologna at the time that Andreas was living there.⁶⁵ Rovere, like Andreas, was committed to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. He was, in fact, a militant advocate.⁶⁶ Their shared commitments might be the reason that as early as March of the next year (1472) the Pope tried to

⁶² The files are published by DAM, *op. cit.*, 102–103.

⁶³ The above is supported by a hitherto unknown source, the documents for 1469–1470 in collection volume *Consuetudini dell'ordine della Certosa* (Biblioteca Comunale Ariostea di Ferrara, Cod. classe II, 210). These excerpt the resolutions of the General Chapter and make a number of allusions to the bad example of Ferrara and pass judgment on those monks who reveal the secrets of the order to outsiders (45v–47r).

⁶⁴ *Ad Herculem*, *op. cit.*, 139.

⁶⁵ See Concetta BIANCA, *Francesco della Rovere, un francescano tra teologia e potere*, in: *Un pontificato ed una città: Sisto IV (1471–1484). Atti del Convegno, Roma 3–7 dicembre 1984*, Rome, 1986, 19–55.

⁶⁶ Cf. Francesco DELLA ROVERE, *L'orazione della Immacolata*, ed. Dino CORTESE, Padua, 1985.

intervene, in a personal missive, on the behalf of Andreas with the General Chapter of the Carthusians asking it to remedy the situation of the falsely accused Hungarian monk.⁶⁷ The outcome of this intervention is unknown to us, since this is the last we hear of Andreas. He may well have moved to Southern Italy (since the manuscript of his commentary on the *Song of Songs* was probably transferred from the library of the Carthusian charterhouse at Padua to the private collection where it was discovered in the early 20th century),⁶⁸ but we possess no actual data to support this hypothesis.

What is certain is that after this, we hear no more of Andreas. The most probable scenario is that after completing his last work, the mirror for princes dedicated to Ercole d'Este, he died in Pavia. Perhaps it is a fateful coincidence, but his tracks fade away at the same time that his Hungarian patrons, István Várdai, the Cardinal-Archbishop of Kalocsa, János Vitéz, the Archbishop of Esztergom, the author of a conspiracy against Matthias and Janus Pannonius, the Bishop of Pécs all exit the stage of politics.

A majority of Andreas Pannonius' works have been lost or at least have not emerged from the archives yet. The annals of the Bologna Carthusians associates five books with his name:

Paraphrasis in librum sententiarum—Commentary on a cornerstone of medieval theological scholarship, the *Sententiarum liber* by Petrus Lombardus (1095–1160), lost.

Paraphrasis in Psalterium—Exegesis on the *Book of Psalms*, lost.

Super cantica canticorum Salomonis expositio devotissima—a commentary on the *Song of Songs*; survived.

Tractatus de spiritu sancto—sections of this treatise on the Holy Spirit were included in other works of his (in the *Song of Songs* commentary and in his mirrors for princes)⁶⁹ but the entire work did not survive. On the basis of the fragments known to us today, we can surmise that in this work, the Carthusian treated the grand issue of the Union Council of Florence–Ferrara, the so-called *Filioque* controversy, following Augustine's work *De trinitate*. As is well known, Western theologians held that the Holy Spirit emanated (*procedit*) from the Father and the Son, while the Eastern scholars accepted only the Father as the cause. The Westerners tried to support their arguments by Patristic works in Greek, but their opponents claimed they were forgeries. The controversy was one of the reasons

⁶⁷ "Dilectis filiis priori Charthusiensis ordinis et Capitulo generali eiusdem ordinis. Dilecti filij: salutem etc. Cum dilectus filius Andreas Pannonius monachus professus domus Charthusien. Ferrarie frugi et deum timens: ut fidedigno percepimus testimonio, vobis notas Ferrarie velut certas vexationes et calumnias sibi iniuste: ut similiter accepimus illatas, hortamur vos paterna in domino caritate: ut eum benigne audiat, ac super huiusmodi calumnijs secundum formam statutorum vestrorum Justitiam administretis: et ad domum sue professionis de Justitia vestra contentum remittatis. Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum etc. die xxijij Martij 1472 pontificatus nostri anno primo." Archivio Segreto del Vaticano, Arm. 39, vol. 14, f. 198r.

⁶⁸ On this possibility see L. RAY, *Andreas Pannonius*, in: *Dictionnaire de la spiritualité ascétique et mystique doctrine et histoire*, éd. M. VILLER SJ, I, Paris, 1933, 555.

⁶⁹ See HORVÁTH, *op. cit.* (see note 3).

for the failure of conciliation and in later decades, whenever the issue of the war against the Turk emerged it was accompanied by the *Filioque* controversy.⁷⁰

Varii sermones—Their one-time existence indicates that Andreas was also involved in delivering sermons. (Bornio da Sala also makes a mention of his “preachings.”) Apparently lost.⁷¹

The dates of these lost works can be estimated at best, since I assume that the entry in the Bologna annals could date from 1469, shortly before Andreas’s death. It is nevertheless more probable that these were written before the completion of the mirror for princes dedicated to Matthias (1467), since the Necrologium does not mention that work. Some of them might have been written in Venice but the commentary on the *Song of Songs* was probably prepared during Andreas’s first years in Ferrara. In the *Expositio* Andreas attempted to prove that not only was Mary a virgin when conceiving Christ, but she herself was conceived in an immaculate way, in other words, through an act of special grace, her soul entered her body free of the original sin. It was the great scholastic, the Franciscan Duns Scotus (1265–1308) who first tried to construct a philosophical foundation and proof of the time-honoured thesis of the immaculate conception (*conceptio immaculata*), an integral part of the cult of Mary in many places. The significance of Andreas’s work from the point of view of the history of theology was that he realized the suitability of the *Cantica* commentary to support this thesis. Others before him had used the motif of the ‘brideship’ in their *Cantica* commentary but he was probably the first to systematically investigate its interrelation with the *Immaculata* concept.⁷²

Besides the *Expositio*, two further works can be associated with the Ferrara period:

6. *De regiis virtutibus ad Matthiam Hungariae regem*—This is his best-known work, which he completed, according to his own words at the end of the codex, on 1 September 1467 in the St Christopher charterhouse in Ferrara. The codex, which is the first in the series of the Hungarian *Corvinas*, was illuminated by the celebrated miniator of Ferrara,

⁷⁰ Cf. Joseph GILL, *The Council of Florence*, Cambridge, 1959; Cesare VASOLI, *Le dottrine teologiche e i primi inizi della crisi religiosa*, in: *Le filosofie del Rinascimento*, ed. Paolo Costantino PISSAVINO, Milan, 2002, 167–169; Dániel PÓCS, *Mátyás király hatalmi reprezentációja és Firenze az 1480-as években: A Didymus-Corvina címlapjának értelmezése és a kódex helye a királyi könyvtár tematikájában* (The interpretation of the title page of the Didymus-Corvina and the place of the codex in the royal library), PhD thesis, Budapest, 2003, 203–222.

⁷¹ A bibliographic mistake has kept hopes alive for the work to be found. Older Carthusian writers, reiterating the reports of the Bologna Necrologium gave an account of it: Camillus TUTINUS, *Prospectus historiae ordinis Carthusiani*, Viterbii, s. a., 116; Carolus Josephus MOROTIUS, *Theatrum chronologicum sacri Cartusiensis ordinis*, Taurini, 1681, 85; TROMBY, *Storia critico-cronologica*, op. cit., IX, 1779, 23–24. Later, a piece of information emerged in the well-informed Migne bibliography: Fr. PÉRENNES, *Dictionnaire de la bibliographie catholique*, publié par MIGNE, tome XII, Paris, 1859, col. 230: “Exhortationes spiritales [sic!] Andreae Carthusiensis, 1698, 1 vol. pet. in folio.” This however—at least according to my information so far—refers to a non-existing volume.

⁷² HORVÁTH, op. cit., 260–268; Ann W. ASTELL, *The Song of Songs in the Middle Ages*, Ithaca–London, 1990, 60–72; on the role of A. Pannonius in the fight for the Immaculate dogma see DÁM Ince, *A szeplőtelen fogantatás védelme Magyarországon a Hunyadiak és Jagellók korában* (The defence of the Immaculate concept in Hungary in the age of Hunyadis and Jagiellons), Rome, 1955, 39–46, 103–105.

Guglielmo Giraldi.⁷³ The lengthy text of the *De regiis virtutibus* was divided into 37 chapters. The first major unit (chapters 1–27) was structured along the three theological and four cardinal virtues (piety, faith, and love; prudence, temperance, courage, and justice) that must be present in a perfect sovereign. These were interspersed time and again with digressions of varying length (e.g. courage was complemented by descriptions of meekness, graciousness, and generosity, and the author expounded on the activities of judges and the blessings of peace while describing justice). As suggested by Andreas, Matthias ascended to the throne after the execution of his brother through direct divine *electio* and God had great plans for him in stopping the infidels and the true believers even of other nations voluntarily wish to be ruled by him when they hear of his virtues. His rule was aided by the advice offered by trained humanist advisers—i.e. János Vitéz, Archbishop of Esztergom and István Várdai, Archbishop of Kalocsa, to whom he devoted short but separate laudations as he did for Prince Borso. The true aim of the wars of Matthias, who inherited his father’s martial virtues, was of course the establishment of peace; however, to achieve this, he had not only to eliminate the enemies of true faith within the country, but also to defeat the Turks who were threatening the whole of Christendom and to re-conquer the holy city of Jerusalem. He was aided in his struggle by monks, especially Carthusians. The first part concluded with a paean to the peace that would follow war. The second and shorter unit (chapters 28–37) treated the “ultimate things” that a ruler must contemplate so as to achieve moral perfection and happiness demanded by the great task: death, judgment, damnation, and eternal glory. At the end of the *De regiis virtutibus* Andreas summarized the lessons of the two parts in the form of advice extended to the ruler: “Be pious, merciful, compassionate, courageous, clean, just, magnanimous, and noble in spirit so that in every way you shall be found fit for the office of the Holy Emperor!”⁷⁴ This reference could be meant to indicate both Matthias’s ambitious plan or the concept of *iustus et pius imperator* which could be found in the anti-papal branch of the pseudo-Joachimite traditions. In his lengthy letter, Andreas never pens the word “pope,” not once, not by accident and with one exception he makes no mention of the role of the clergy (and even in that case he only mentions bishops as political advisers). The Mother Church is mentioned only in general terms, as the body to under whose jurisdiction Matthias returns the peoples conquered by the infidel. The purpose of sublime warfare is not the regeneration of the Church, but the salvation of the warring people and their sovereign as well as the purging of the world of the unbelievers who are Christ’s enemies. “Read the Apocalypse!” is the zealous command of the Car-

⁷³ Ilona BERKOVITS, *La miniatura nella corte di Mattia Corvino: Ferrara ed il Rinascimento ungherese*, Corvina: Rassegna italo-ungherese, 4(1941), 13; on Giraldi see Giordana MARIANI CANOVA, *Guglielmo Giraldi, miniatore estense: Catalogo delle opere*, ed. Federica TONIOLO, Modena, 1995. Recently: Dániel PÓCS, *Mirror for Princes by Andreas Pannonius, Dedicated to Matthias Corvinus*, in: *Matthias Corvinus, the King: Tradition and Renewal in the Hungarian Royal Court 1458–1490*, ed. Péter FARBAKY, Budapest, 2008, 486–488 (cat. no. 11.21).

⁷⁴ *De regiis virtutibus*, 130.

thusian by which he wishes to place in the sovereign's hand the manual he needs to have in order to fulfil his role.⁷⁵

7. *Res gestae virtutesque praeclarae divi Borsii Ducis*—encomiastic history, probably composed before 1470. In his mirror for princes dedicated to Ercole d'Este, the Carthusian mentions that during his stay in Ferrara, he wrote a lengthy, laudatory (“ad memoriam eius immortalem laudesque ipsius immortalitate dignas”)⁷⁶ book on the acts and great works of Borso d'Este, which he could not complete, but wishes to do so if his problems are resolved and with Ercole's support he could return to the monastery in Ferrara.

Finally, Andreas wrote the last of his works known today during his “exile” in Pavia.

8. *Ad illustrissimum principem dominum dominum Herculem, ducem preclarissimum floride civitatis Ferrariensis, Mutine ac Regii, marchionem Estensem, Rodigiique comitem etc. libellus per fratrem Andream Pannonium ordinis Chartusiensis editus* (cca. 1471). The work exhibits a bi-directional change vis-à-vis the mirror for princes dedicated to Matthias. On the one hand, its humanist literary character is stronger—one could cite as examples of this the laudation of the Este family and of Ercole, the growing number of classical allusions and even tiny modifications (he consistently cites Augustine's *Civitas Dei* as *Caelestis civitas* or he exhorts Ercole to the conquest of Jerusalem by the example of Bouillon Godefroy and not by eschatological contemplation.) On the other hand, though the perfecting of the virtues of the sovereign is held necessary for the holy struggle against the Turks, war itself is presented rather in the *Realpolitik* sense: the taking of the earthly Jerusalem assumes precedence over the taking of the heavenly Jerusalem and instead of the orations of Carthusian monks who are already halfway to heaven, Ercole's enterprise would be better helped by an alliance of Venice, the king of Hungary and Pope Sixtus IV.

All in all, we have eight (perhaps nine) works, three of which are known today: the *Expositio* prepared for the *Song of Songs*, the *De regiis virtutibus* dedicated to Matthias, and its somewhat edited version, the *Ad Herculem*. Of this last title, many scholars believed for a long time that it actually contained two works and mentioned it as such (i.e. as a mirror for princes to Hercules and a contemplation of the death of Borso—even Vilmos Fraknói, who published the text, refers to this in his preface),⁷⁷ even though it is clear from both the codex title and from the text that Andreas divided his text into two books. He or a copyist provided a separate title for the second book (*Super decessu divi Borsii ducis*) which must have misled researchers, while by inserting a separate title, he only made explicit the thematic division already existing in the Matthias mirror for princes. Just as there, the exhortative detailing of the King's virtues and tasks is followed by a *meditatio* on the Last Judgement and beholding the face of God, here we can read a reflection, elicited by Borso's death, on the nature and origins of the human soul, and of the “ultimate things”—i.e. death and salvation, in the framework of an *epistola consolatoria*.

⁷⁵ “Lege librum Apocalipsis!” *De regiis virtutibus*, 124.

⁷⁶ *Ad Herculem*, op. cit., 267.

⁷⁷ *Két magyarországi egyházi író*, op. cit., XIX–XX.

toria. The two political texts were published in 1886 by Jenő Ábel and Vilmos Fraknói, while the third work of Andreas Pannonius known today, the commentary to the *Song of Songs* surfaced only in 1929 in a private collection in Italy and was donated to the state of Hungary in 1938, after Mussolini's personal intervention as the gift of the Italian state. The critical edition of the work which many (József Huszti, János Horváth Jr., Tibor Klaniczay, Ince Dám) held to be an important document in the history of theology, was about to be printed in 1942⁷⁸—but the printing never took place and the finalized manuscript disappeared during the war.

Before discussing the philosophical and theological influences on these works, it is worthwhile to explore the political context in which they were written. Pope Pius II and the Greek Cardinal Bessarion proclaimed throughout the 1450s, with tireless zeal, the necessity of a Christian cooperation to stem the expanding power of the Ottoman Turks. After the fall of Constantinople (1453) the Pope was successful at the congress of Mantova (1460) in organizing the diplomatic, financial, and military aspects of the Crusade to be launched against the Turks, but he died before it could be undertaken (1464).⁷⁹ Because he had sent the consecrated flag to Matthias who was to be the general supreme of the Christian armies, many looked to the Hungarian king for a decisive move following the Pope's death, but none was forthcoming. It is still a controversial question of the history of the 1460s–1470s which has not been satisfactorily resolved to this day, whether the anti-Turkish war of the Hungarian king was foiled by the lateness and insufficiency of the papal financial aid or by the feebleness of the Venetian Pope, Paul II who followed Pius II on the papal throne—or perhaps by Matthias himself who wanted to avoid a showdown with the Ottomans whose power was growing and concentrated instead on his Western interests. When the first princely mirror was penned in the spring and summer of 1467, relations between Matthias and the Holy See were at an all-time low.⁸⁰ Leaders of the Church in Hungary continued to be committed to the war against the Turks, but they also felt they had to convince the irresolute Pope and the reluctant king of the merit of their position. The possible elevation of Janus Pannonius to the Cardinalate could have served this purpose and the work of Andreas Pannonius did serve this purpose with its veiled criticism addressed to the Pope.⁸¹ (It is no accident that Andreas omitted the Pope and the Holy See from the *adhortatio*.)

⁷⁸ HUSZTI József, *Andreas Pannoniusnak egy ismeretlen kéziratok munkájáról* (On an unknown manuscript of Andreas Pannonius), Magyar Könyvszemle, 1929, 137–138. *A magyar irodalom története 1600-ig*, op. cit., 110. In his study on the sources of the *Expositio*, János Horváth Jr. cites page numbers of the printed copy, so at least galley proofs must have existed. Currently Csilla BÍRÓ (National Széchényi Library) is working on the new critical edition of the *Expositio*—see, earlier by her, *Das Leben und das Werk von Andreas Pannonius*, Acta Classica Scientiarum Debreceniensis, 37(2001), 109–123.

⁷⁹ On the vicissitudes around the Mantova congress and the efforts for the crusade see the recent essays collected in the volume *Il sogno di Pio II e il viaggio da Roma a Mantova*, op. cit.

⁸⁰ FRAKNÓI, *Magyarország egyházi és politikai összeköttetései...*, op. cit., 135–137.

⁸¹ On the project of the promotion of Janus to the Cardinalate see Concetta BIANCA, *Come avvalersi dei nemici: Giano Pannonio e Plutarco*, Camoenae Hungaricae, 2(2005), 67–72. The eulogy of Janus at the end of the *De regis virtutibus* (131), with its unequivocal terminology, also attests this intention.

There is another important detail that suggests a concerted action. It was also in 1467 that Janus Pannonius translated into Latin Plutarch's mirror for princes, dedicated to Trajan, titled *Dicta regum et imperatorum*. The translation was dedicated to Matthias in an unusual style that went beyond the adulation demanded by the genre. It actually set conditions for the King of Hungary: if he listened to the advice of the "good people" (i.e. Vitéz, Janus, and their circle), if he aspired to perform the grand deeds expected of him—primarily to lead the Christian war of liberation against the Turks—and finally if he aspired to merit the grace of God through his virtues and blameless life, then and only then would he deserve the praise of posterity that would liken him to Trajan who rejuvenated an ailing and failing Empire.⁸² Andreas's *De regiis virtutibus*, speaking to Matthias, articulated the same moral criteria which Janus recommended to the king speaking through Plutarch.

For a few years after the 1471 election of Sixtus IV to the papal throne, fervent preparation for military action against the Turks was the order of the day and it is this atmosphere that produced the *Libellus* version of 1471 dedicated to Ercole d'Este—it is also at this time that Andreas's former supporters were being excluded from political positions of control in Hungary.

3. *Beatitudo politica? (Problems and sources)*

Beyond certain self-referential elements (Andreas included verbatim excerpts from the *Expositio* in the *De regiis virtutibus*)⁸³ the three surviving works are also linked by a common problematic. All three revolved around the issue of happiness (*beatitudo*). It is well known how Scholasticism re-coded and still retained the Aristotelian tension between the concepts of happiness arising out of the practical virtues on the one hand and out of speculative virtues that come about through the practice of philosophy on the other hand—through the conceptual dichotomy of *imperfecta* (political) and *perfecta* (vision of God) *beatitudo*.⁸⁴ It is a commonplace that the two leading authorities of Scholasticism,

⁸² "...tibi, qui idem et rex es et imperator. Rex dignitate, imperator assidua rerum bellicarum tractatione [...] sic nostris temporibus Christiana res publica paene iam a perfidis hostibus prostrata, tuis sese iterum erexit auspiciis. Quod si bonorum apud te consilia maxime valuerint, si minimum aetati suae indulseris, si summae omnium de te expectationi servies, et favori numinis instando successus tuos urgebis, potes adhuc esse plane Traianus." The dedicatory letter (dated two weeks later respect of A. Pannonius' dedication to Matthias) was published in *Adalékok a humanismus történetéhez Magyarországon* (Addenda to the history of Humanism in Hungary), ed. ÁBEL Jenő, Budapest, 1880, 31–32. Between 1464 and 1468 Janus and Várdai were the most influential politicians in the Hunyadi establishment, cf. KUBINYI András, *Vitéz János és Janus Pannonius politikája Mátyás uralkodása idején* (The politics of János Vitéz and Janus Pannonius during the reign of Matthias), in: *Humanista műveltség Pannóniában* (Humanist culture in Pannonia), eds. BARTÓK István, JANKOVITS László, KECSKEMÉTI Gábor, Pécs, 2000, 16–17.

⁸³ HORVÁTH, *op. cit.* (see note 3), 259.

⁸⁴ Georg WIELAND, *Happiness: The Perfection of Man*, in: *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy (1100–1600)*, eds. Norman KRETZMANN, Anthony KENNY, Jan PINBORG, Cambridge, 1982, 673–686.

Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus had different opinions on the potentials of the soul connecting these levels. Aquinas regarded the intellect as the component ensuring the attainment of *visio beatifica* while for Scotus, it was the will.⁸⁵

From this particular perspective—i.e. that of *beatitudo politica*—the study of Carthusian spiritualism, which was originally indifferent to worldly virtues, can be rather revealing especially in an Italian context, partly because of the humanist connections of the Carthusians partly because they were situated on the middle ground between the two scholastic conceptions of *beatitudo*. Their Platonizing hierarchy of virtues and contemplative ideal of life placed the Carthusian mystics closer to the Thomist view of theological happiness, while their own theology, built on *affectus* rather than *intellectus*, was more open to the Franciscans' cult of *caritas* and *voluntas* and the resulting concept of happiness.⁸⁶

Andreas continued for a long time to think of these issues in a Thomist framework. In his commentary to the *Song of Songs* he defined law as an instrument necessary to reach happiness but said that “human laws cannot lead one to [happiness] only to a political happiness which is nothing but a peaceful and comfortable existence in the temporary life in this world—but it is the law of the Gospels that reveals the way to eternal blessedness.”⁸⁷ He returned to this idea later in the commentary, when discussing the relationship between theology and philosophy and said that the wisdom of the philosophers of old “was directed at a goal in this world because the practical sciences (*scientiae practicae*) that they bequeathed to us were directed at political happiness, in the sense of this-worldly politics. This is why they are dwarfed by the science of the Holy Scriptures which is directed at the attainment of eternal blessedness which had been ignored by the philosophers.”⁸⁸

⁸⁵ Paul Oskar KRISTELLER, *A Thomist Critique of Marsilio Ficino's Theory of Will and Intellect*, in: Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume, English Section, II, Jerusalem, 1965, 463–494; ID., *Thomism and the Italian Thought of the Renaissance*, op. cit. (see note 21); recently Tamara ALBERTINI, *Intellect and Will in Marsilio Ficino: Two Correlatives of a Renaissance Concept of the Mind*, in: *Marsilio Ficino: His Theology, His Philosophy, His Legacy*, eds. Michael J. B. ALLEN, Valery REES, Leiden, 2002, 203–225 (esp. 204–207).

⁸⁶ About the “real” monastic Carthusian spirituality as opposed to the worldly-minded openness and to the scholastic philosophical speculations: Denis D. MARTIN, *Fifteenth-century Carthusian Reform: The World of Nicholas Kempf*, Leiden, 1992, 12–15, 181–188. For the Thomism of the other trend, represented by the great theologian Denys the Carthusian (Denyse de Ryckel, 1402–1471), see Kent EMERY Jr., *Introduction*, in: DIONYSII CARTUSIENSIS *Opera selecta*, I, Turnholt, 1991, 22–23; and the monographic treatment by Dirk WASSERMANN, *Dionysius der Karthäuser: Einführung in Werk und Gedankenwelt*, Salzburg, 1996. On his views on the *unio mystica*, based chiefly on the teaching of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, with critical tone towards Aquinas see Kent EMERY Jr., *Twofold Wisdom and Contemplation in Denys of Ryckel*, *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 18(1988), 99–134.

⁸⁷ “...ad legem pertinet homines ad felicitatem inducere: ad quam lex humana nusquam inducit nisi ad politicam que est pacificus et tranquillus status in vita hac mortali. Lex autem evangelica inducit ad perpetuam felicitatem.” *Expositio*, 6v.

⁸⁸ “...ordinantur ad finem consequendum in praesenti vita: quia scientie practice ab eis tradite ordinantur ad felicitatem politicam, loquendo de politica presentis vitae. Et ideo scientia sacre scripture his eminet quia ordinatur ad eternam felicitatem quam philosophi ignorantur.” *Expositio*, 21v.

The issue of *beatitudo* becomes problematic in his political works. The addressees of these works (Matthias Hunyadi and Ercole d'Este) and their ideal heroes to be imitated (János Hunyadi and Borso d'Este) were politicians who in order to attain *beatitudo perfecta*, would have to deny (in the sense of mystic theology) their political virtues, power, courage, moderation, justice, and prudence, or at least surpass them (in the sense of scholastic theology) in order to attain the theological virtues that make *fruitio Dei* possible.⁸⁹ Can one progress from the level of *virtutes politicae* (which are within the domain of the will) to the beatific vision of God accessible through intellectual contemplation—and if so, which way? Thomist philosophy and theology did not provide a clear-cut answer to this question. According to the strict argumentation of the *Summa* there was no direct passage from the side of political virtues over to the other one.⁹⁰ The practice of cardinal virtues was but a preparation for heavenly glory for felicity in this world “was somewhat similar to true happiness”⁹¹ but in its progress towards God, the soul must discard with the pragmatic, political forms of these virtues. In his mirror for princes, *De regno ad regem Cypri* written at a later date, Aquinas struck a more conciliatory tone: “...through virtuous living man is further ordained to a higher end, which consists in the possession of God [...]. Consequently, since society must have the same end as the individual man, it is not the ultimate end of an assembled multitude to live virtuously, but through virtuous living to attain to the possession of God.”⁹² In this more pragmatic and less tightly argued text, the forces ensuring the peace and cohesion of the society, i.e. friendship and love (i.e. *amicitia* and *caritas*, the manifestations of *voluntas*) were given a dominant position.⁹³ This construction became a commonplace in political thinking after Aquinas.⁹⁴

In the *De regis virtutibus* dedicated to Matthias, Andreas Pannonius employed this accepted model. According to this work, the purpose of the exercise of political power (*regimen*) was to ensure the peace of the state and of the subjects (*pax et tranquillitas*). The basis for peace and tranquillity was the same on earth as it was in heaven, namely,

⁸⁹ The unavoidable gradualness of the *reversio*, relying on the Neo-Platonic scale of virtues and the hierarchical ecclesiology of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, became a solid thesis also in the platonizing humanist tradition, from Lorenzo Pisano onward, cf. Arthur FIELD, *The Origins of the Platonic Academy of Florence*, Princeton, 1988, 162 sqq. This approach settled also the well-known debates on the priority of the active or contemplative ways of life; see the surveys of Paul Oskar KRISTELLER, *The Active and Contemplative Life in Renaissance Humanism*, in: ID., *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, IV, Rome, 1996, 199–213. On the Neo-Platonic background (with regards to the role and value of the political virtues) see Dominic J. O'MEARA, *Platonopolis: Platonic Political Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 2003.

⁹⁰ See Wolfgang KLUXEN, *L'etica filosofica di Tommaso d'Aquino*, ed. Carmelo VIGNA, Milan, 2005, 236–242.

⁹¹ *Summa theologiae*, I–II, 5, 3 ad 3 (quoted by KLUXEN, *op. cit.*, 235).

⁹² *De regno ad regem Cypri*, I, 15 [107]. (Transl. G. B. PHELAN.)

⁹³ See Péter MOLNÁR, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin et les traditions de la pensée politique*, Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge, 69(2002), 67–114.

⁹⁴ Also among the leading Carthusians, cf. e.g. DIONYSIUS CARTHUSIANUS, *Contra Alchoranum et sectam Machometicam libri quinque [...] eiusdem De instituendo bello adversus Turcas et de generali celebrando concilio*, Cologne, 1533, 567.

concord: “The peace of the people is the ordered concord of the people with regards to instructing and obeying—the peace of the heavens is the most ordered and harmonious union that we can have in order to enjoy the presence of God and of each other in God.”⁹⁵ Concord was attained by the practice of two virtues. One of them was love (“spare no labour to bring the tranquillity of peace to your country, to light the fire of peace, and to make stronger the bonds of concord”)⁹⁶ the other was justice (“happiness is your due and so is eternal bliss [...] if you are to rule justly”). If the two virtues met and the rule of the prince was motivated in this world by the theological virtue of love, he would acquire “true happiness now as well as in eternity.”⁹⁷ His discussion of the virtue of justice was the only point at which he spoke on the issue of the priority of forms of government and he took no stance, thereby indicating that his discussion was situated not on the level of political theory but on the level of moral theology. His main objective was to make *iustitia* a primary criterion: as long as it was observed, a *res publica* would truly be a *res populi* but if the prince, the aristocrats or even the people exercised power in an unjust way (*iniuste*) one could not even speak of a state.⁹⁸

The influence of Thomist thinking is unmistakable: by perfecting the four cardinal virtues, especially that of justice, the prince was to carry out an Aristotelian-Thomist “program.” But the direct source for Andreas—at least for the previously cited passages that determined the entirety of the work—was not Aquinas but the *Civitas Dei* of Augustine.⁹⁹ Another closely followed—and sometimes, as in the *iustitia* chapter, verbatim copied—source was the *De regimine principum* by Aegidius Romanus.¹⁰⁰ It is also quite likely that Andreas knew of and used the *De quatuor virtutibus cardinalibus pro eruditione principum* by the 14th century author Michael the Carthusian of Prague which compiled works of Aegidius and Aquinas¹⁰¹—like Michael, when he discussed the cardinal virtues, he placed *temperantia* before *iustitia* and his subcategories of sins and virtues under *temperantia* (impurity, drunkenness, gluttony vs. virginity and purity of conjugal life) were also reminiscent of Michael’s categorization. At the same time it is revealing that Michael already viewed the separate treatment of theological issues in a work on politics and virtues as obsolete. There are very few political works known to us from Andreas’s own age and circle that reflect the provocatively archaïcising approach of the *De regiis*

⁹⁵ “Pax hominum ordinata imperandi atque oboediendi concordia civium. Pax caelestis civitatis ordinatissima et concordissima societas fruendi deo invicem deo.” *De regiis virtutibus*, 90.

⁹⁶ “...totis viribus elabora, ut pacis tranquillitas vigeat fervorque caritatis exaustet invalescatque semper in regno tuo concordiae unitas.” Ibid.

⁹⁷ “Felix igitur es et felicitatem aeternam consequeris [...] si iuste imperaveris [...] tunc vere felix es et eris in aevum.” *De regiis virtutibus*, 80.

⁹⁸ *De regiis virtutibus*, 79–80.

⁹⁹ The passages quoted above are all taken from the *De civitate Dei*: XIX, 13 (see notes 95 and 96); V, 24 (see note 97).

¹⁰⁰ See about the different kinds of justice (*iustitia distributiva*, *iustitia commutativa*): *De regimine principum*, I, 2, xi; cf. *De regiis virtutibus*, 75–79. (Without any alteration also in *Ad Herculem*, 224–227.)

¹⁰¹ William George STOREY, *The ‘De quatuor virtutibus cardinalibus pro eruditione principum’ of Michael the Carthusian of Prague: A Critical Text and Study*, Salzburg, 1972. (On its sources: 37–56.)

virtutibus, the conjoining of theological and cardinal virtues. One of these few is the trilogy (*De virtutibus moralibus et theologicis*; *De oeconomia*; *De praestantia Venetae politiae*, 1463) by a Venetian philosopher, Giovanni Caldiera who has been largely forgotten nowadays. According to Caldiera's thesis the transcendent happiness (*beatitudo*) available to the individual was equivalent to the welfare and "political happiness" (*supremai rei publicae foelicitas*) of the state and it was love (*caritas*) and justice (*iustitia*) linking the two which were equally important from both the perspective of personal salvation and the salvation of the state.¹⁰² It can be neither proved or disproved that Andreas Pannonius had access to a copy of the *De virtutibus*, but he did spend a long time in Venice (1445–1459) and frequented some of the same circles as Caldiera. He made a personal acquaintance of the above-mentioned Candiano Bollani and his theologically-minded humanist circle. The Bollani connection is noteworthy for other reasons as well. For instance, the main thesis of his *Genesis* commentary, was the Immaculate Conception of Mary. Bollani's rather pessimistic, Augustinian anthropology is offset by the hope invested in the cult of Mary: in her sinlessness, the Lord had shown that man may be reshaped in the image of God.¹⁰³ Of course, the concept might originate with Bollani himself, but it is more likely to be a product of his conversation with his Hungarian spiritual father.

Earlier research had already emphasized Andreas's Augustinism and that the objective of the *Song of Songs* commentary was to prove the thesis of *conceptio immaculata*. But it is by no means certain that his thinking had been influenced exclusively by scholastic theology with regards to the issues of Immaculate Conception or the happiness attainable through political virtues. A well-known Venetian source of Carthusian mysticism was the work *Columba: Tractatus asceticus* by Giovanni di Venezia (Giovanni Corner?) which specified the conjoinment of the three theological and four cardinal virtues as a basic requirement for the practice of meditation—in fact the symbol of the dove was a *unified* manifestation of the seven virtues—and he prescribed in the thematic order of meditation the contemplation on the six days of creation and the lives of Christ and Mary.¹⁰⁴ Carthusian spiritualism then is just as important a "source" for the *De regiis virtutibus* as Thomist theology and political doctrine. When weighing the chances and conditions for the Crusade to be led by Matthias, Andreas gave his prince two pieces of advice. One was to call on the help of the Holy Virgin "the patroness of the country of the Pannons." The other was to select and take with him monks who would always be by his side and

¹⁰² On Caldiera and his trilogy see Margaret L. KING, *Umanesimo e patriziato a Venezia nel Quattrocento*, Venice–Rome, 1989, I, 144–166 (on the conjunction of the personal and public felicity esp. 153–154).

¹⁰³ *Libellus super principium genesis*, op. cit. (see note 29), 110v–112r. Bollani was a committed adherent of the Immaculate Conception years before: in his tract on the *Song of Songs*, dedicated to Pope Eugene IV is to be found the nucleus of the ideas developed in Andreas's *Expositio*; see Candianus BOLANUS, *Tractatus super canticum gloriosissimae virginis Mariae*, British Library, MS Harl. 2508, 24v–39r (esp. 28v–29r).

¹⁰⁴ On the *Columba* see Giordana MARIANI CANOVA, *La miniatura nei manoscritti liturgici delle certose venete nel Quattrocento*, in: *La certosa di Veduggia: Storia, cultura e arte in un ambiente delle Prealpi bellunesi*, eds. Lucilla Sandra MAGOGA, Francesco MARIN, Florence, 1998, 159–181.

pray for his victory—particularly Carthusians, who “are halfway to Heaven through the sublime contemplation of the majesty of God and all things heavenly.”¹⁰⁵

In the second, structurally separate section of the work, when discussing contemplation of the ultimate things, he combined scholastic and mystic elements. Regarding resurrection, Andreas stressed that his argumentation was a theological and not a philosophical one and attempted to situate it midway between the extremes: “In the present case I make no effort to discuss my topic in a *sophistic* way, nor through *subtle* arguments but I will do it canonically on the strength of the holy scriptures.”¹⁰⁶ The word “sophistic” (*sophistice*) may be referring to the logician known as Richardus Sophista (and thus, indirectly, perhaps to Ockhamism spreading in Venice)¹⁰⁷ while the word “subtle” (*subtiliter*) is a clear allusion to the Doctor Subtilis, i.e. Duns Scotus. Thus, perhaps Andreas was trying to indicate his being equidistant from the extremes of the *via moderna* vs. *via antiqua* debates, but his meaning may be simpler: he was discussing theology instead of philosophy, and within theology he was following Aquinas. And indeed, the main source for the second part of the *De regiis virtutibus* was Aquinas and his commentary on the fourth book of the *Sententiae* of Petrus Lombardus. He expanded this with medieval *institutio* texts, such as the *Formulae honestae vitae ad Mironem regem Galliciae* written by St Martin, bishop of Braga, a mirror for princes also known as *De quattuor virtutibus* and which Andreas believed was authored by Seneca.¹⁰⁸

The direct sources then were scholastic ones—but the generic model was at least as important. Matthias Hunyadi could realize his goal of attaining first earthly, then heavenly happiness through contemplation of the four ultimate things: death, the Final Judgment, damnation, and heavenly glory. The “meditatio de quatuor novissimis” was a popular genre of contemplative, religious literature of the day, whose most successful practitioner was Andreas’s contemporary and fellow order-member, Denys the Carthu-

¹⁰⁵ “Sanctam quoque illibatam virginem Mariam, matrem filii dei omnipotentis et domini nostri Jesu Christi, quae Pannoniorum regno patrona est, in adiutricem tibi pro mentis affectu invoca. [...] Inter religiones tamen alias [...] illi quasi praecipui esse videntur [...] quorum iam conversatio per altissimam contemplationem divinae maiestatis et speculationem rerum caelestium est in caelis.” *De regiis virtutibus*, 58–59, 60.

¹⁰⁶ “Neque cura est mihi ad praesens, ut sophistice aut subtiliter aliquid de hac disseram, sed solum canonicè, scripturis scilicet sanctis...” *De regiis virtutibus*, 112.

¹⁰⁷ The Ockhamist logic was present in Venice via the teaching of Paolo Pergola, a former student of Paulus Venetus; cf. LEPORI, *La scuola di Rialto*, op. cit. (see note 19); the cultural area of Ferrara was also penetrated by the Ockhamism, as attested by the codices of the Este Library, Modena: cod. á. W. 5. 11 (Lat. 323) which contains Venetus’ *Liber de anima*, and cod. á. W. 8. 1. 2 (Lat. 763) containing a *De anima* commentary of Paolo Pergola (the copying of first was finished in 1448, the second is datable to the 1460s). See also MONFASANI, *Aristotelians, Platonists, and the Missing Ockhamists*, op. cit. (see note 21), 256–257.

¹⁰⁸ It is characteristic of his method, how he compiles the chapter on the coming of the Antichrist (“De adventu Antichristi,” in *De regiis virtutibus*, 104–110), borrowing excerpts from Augustine (*De civitate Dei*, XX, 19, 4; XV, 23, 1) and from Aquinas’ *Summa* (I, LI, iii, 6), enriching his basic text (verbatim copied): Nicolaus Lyra’s “De vita et morte Antichristi” (in Nicolaus LYRA, *Preceptorium sive expositio tripharia in Decalogum legis divinae, cum multis pulcerrimis tractatulis ac additionibus cunctis Christi fidelibus scitu dignissimis*, Cologne, 1504).

sian (1402–1471), also known as Doctor Ecstaticus.¹⁰⁹ However, its application in a political function was a novelty and the Hungarian monk was ingenious enough to transform gradualness into mutual equivalence. For meditation on sin, repentance, purification, and the knowledge of the ultimate things were important not only from the perspective of the personal salvation of the sovereign, but they also reinforced his political virtues and through perfecting them, they contributed to the salvation of the state as well.

Andreas, however, was not a slave to his sources and did not insist on prefabricated models. Neither can his work easily be fitted in the trend which is well exemplified by the pamphlet mixing exhortations to war on the Turks with discussions on political theory, the *De instituendo bello adversus Turcas et de generali celebrando concilio* by Denys the Carthusian.¹¹⁰ The work of the Hungarian Carthusian was not part of the “conciliatory” trend: he was not involved in theological polemics against the Turks, he did not make the success of the Holy War contingent on the great renewal of the church—his objective was to bring a worldly prince closer to the sphere of sanctity and looked to his success for the “renewal” of the world. A further difference from the mainstream of mirror-for-princes literature of the day was his ultimate rejection of theological eclecticism and the possibility for attainment of political *beatitudo* as proposed by *De regno*—since whatever he wrote earlier on *iustitia* and *caritas* as the virtues linking the earthly and heavenly spheres, at the end of his work, in the concluding chapter (*On the happiness of saints*), Andreas returned to the “stricter” fundamentals of Thomist theology. It was only after his death that the prince, who prepared for *beatitudo* with his life on earth “could come face to face with the truth which he now can see only dimly, as if reflected in the mirror, through the practice of contemplative life.”¹¹¹ On the one hand, this signified that a clear vision of God in heaven became possible only through the intellectual potential of the soul, because that was what corresponded to faith. On the other hand, a more serious consequence was that God left the practitioner of political virtues in doubt as to whether the virtues of active life were necessary at all or whether they were altogether omissible on the way to *perfecta beatitudo*.

In Thomist terminology, the core of the problem was the following. All four political/moral virtues—but at least *temperantia* and *fortitudo*—belonged to the perceiving part of the soul (*potentia sensitivae*) which in turn was part of the irrational soul which one must

¹⁰⁹ I used the edition: DIONYSIUS CARTHUSIANUS, *Liber utilissimus de quatuor hominis novissimis, nempe morte, iudicio, inferni poenis, gaudiis coeli*, Lugduni, 1579. Cf. also Jörg LAUSTER, *Marsilio Ficino as a Christian Thinker: Theological Aspects of his Platonism*, in: *Marsilio Ficino: His Theology, His Philosophy, His Legacy*, op. cit. (see note 85), 64.

¹¹⁰ See note 94.

¹¹¹ “Ibi ipsam veritatem facie ad faciem videbis, quem nunc in speculo et aenigmate per studium contemplativae vitae cernis.” *De regis virtutibus*, 124. Cf. also in the same chapter: “Quanto enim intellectus altior est sensu, tanto etiam illud bonum, in quo delectaberis in vita aeterna, per visionem dei maius erit omni sensibili bono [...]. Tua Regia Maiestas habebit in caelesti patria perfectam et claram visionem dei, et hoc pertinet ad intellectum...” (125, 126).

abandon after the separation of body and soul.¹¹² (That is why Andreas said “it was impossible to see God with the eyes of the body or experience him with some sense or faculty of the perceiving soul, either in this life or in the future.”)¹¹³ The problem of immortality—more precisely, the mechanics of this immortality—became a fundamental issue of political philosophy at this point. But the argument of Aquinas was somewhat permissive. He conceded that since the cardinal virtues were gifts of God (*virtutes infusae*) and one only learned the rules of their application (*quaedam applicationes*) in this world, it was conceivable that while the acts were left behind, the essence of virtues, as potentialities, would be retained by the soul separated from the body (*anima separata*).¹¹⁴ It is obvious that Aquinas was pushing the boundaries of his own system here. This is why the question arises whether it is worthwhile to examine political *beatitudo* in this very framework.

In his second mirror for princes, the *Libellus* dedicated to Ercole d’Este, Andreas looked for another possible way to provide a basis for the theology of power. In the fourth chapter of *Ad Herculem ducem*, Andreas, following Macrobius, proclaimed it as a thesis, that “The opinion of Plotinus confirms that it is possible to find happiness not only through the purifying virtues and the virtues of the already purified soul, but also through the help of political virtues.”¹¹⁵ He, however, was not satisfied with the solution proposed by Macrobius (i.e. Porphyry’s fourfold hierarchy of virtues),¹¹⁶ but by following the soul of Borso d’Este into the other world, he attempted to theologially sketch out the relationship between *virtutes politicae* and *beatitudo*, relinquishing his earlier ideas about gradualness.

In the second part of the *Ad Herculem* (*Super decessu divi Borsii ducis*) Andreas recalled the famous thesis of the *Somnium Scipionis* (“all those who have in any way conduced to the preservation, defence, and enlargement of their native country, there is a certain place in heaven, where they shall enjoy an eternity of happiness”) and posed the

¹¹² “...quaedam virtutes cardinales, scilicet temperantia et fortitudo, sunt in potentiis animae sensitivis: sunt enim irrationabilium partium animae, ut patet per philosophum in III Ethic. Sed partes animae sensitivae neque sunt in Angelis, neque in animalibus separatis.” *Quaestiones disputates de virtutibus*, q. 5. a. 4. arg. 13.

¹¹³ “Haec autem visio nec fiet per oculos corporales, quia impossibile est deum videri oculo corporali nec in vita praesenti nec in futura aut alio sensu vel potentia sensitivae partis.” *De regis virtutibus*, 126.

¹¹⁴ See *Quaestiones disputates de virtutibus*, q. 5. a. 4. corp. The derivatives (the actual political virtues) do not rest with us in the afterlife; but the cardinal virtues, from which the former are derived, “secundum quod sunt gratituae et infusae, prout de eis nunc loquimur, perficiunt hominem in vita praesenti in ordine ad caelestem gloriam.” Cf. also: “Unde oportet dicere, quod actus sensitivarum potentiarum nullo modo maneat in anima separata, nisi forte sicut in radice remota.” *Super Sent.*, lib. 4. d. 44. q. 3 a. 3 (“Utrum in anima separata remaneant potentiae sensitivae”).

¹¹⁵ “Constat ergo iuxta Plotini sententiam non purgatis modo purgatique iam animi, sed politicis quoque virtutibus beatum fieri posse.” *Ad Herculem*, 149. The formula is the exact opposite of Aquinas’ view (*Quaestiones disputates de virtutibus*, q. 5. a. 4. ad 7).

¹¹⁶ On each of the moral/political, the purificatory, the theoretical, and the theurgical levels of perfection there are all the four cardinal virtues in various actual forms; one may have access to the higher levels only if has already reached—and then left—the lower ones; cf. Dominic O’MEARA, *Patterns of Perfection in Damascius’ Life of Isidore*, *Phronesis*, 51(2006), 74–90, esp. 76–77.

question: “So if faith, hope, love, intelligence, temperance, courage, justice, and the other moral virtues which I refrain from enumerating here lest my missive be overly prolonged, that adorned our Borso in his earthly existence, if they pave the road to heaven, if the final and eternal home of good souls and soul created for good is up in the heavens, why then should we doubt that our noble Borso will ascend there? [...] Once we know the manifold virtues that adorned our leader so brightly why should we not believe in our hearts that he shall ascend to some stage of happiness in the kingdom of heaven?”¹¹⁷

But which stage shall that be? Andreas choose not to contrast the virtues of the contemplative life with those of the active, political life, but he equated the contemplative and other virtues of the *beati* admitted to the presence of God (patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, virgins, church fathers and so on) with the political virtues Borso practiced in his life, without proposing a hierarchical relationship and presenting them as analogous. Both series of virtues might lead to *visio beatifica*. For instance the second order of the *beati* was composed of the prophets (David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel) whose main virtue was a peaceful nature (“blessed are the peacemakers for they will be called sons of God”). He compared this to Borso’s efforts at peacemaking, with his doing away with the warring political factions. The third order was that of the precursors of Christ (Simeon, Zechariah, John the Baptist) whose main attribute was justice. In the same vein, Borso was well aware that no state could prosper without the distributive justice of the prince therefore he handed out goods and offices profusely. The apostles were characterized by their meekness—and Borso too was humble and meek in tolerating the intrigue and machinations of many an evil competitor.

In this manner Andreas enumerated all nine orders of the *beati* all the way down to the penitents with whom Borso had been unable to “catch up” in his lifetime, but through that short passage that his soul still needed to traverse to its ultimate goal, he would be helped by the prayers of the Carthusian monks that he set up in Ferrara. “Thanks to their public and private entreaties, he will no doubt reach the fount of wisdom, the inextinguishable and inexhaustible light [...]. He will see and praise his God there. In the light he shall see the light of God since the source of all life is in God. What is that light like? It is an immense light, immaterial and incomprehensible, eternal and uncreated light, the light of justice that fills the angels and all *beati* with light.”¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷ “Si igitur fides, si spes, si caritas, si prudentia, si temperantia, si fortitudo, si iustitia ceteraeque virtutes morales quas hic enumerare omitto, ne modus epistolae excedam, quibus Borsius noster refulgere in vita hac visus est, viam sternunt ad superos, si bonis et bene creatis spiritibus sedes ultima et aeterna caelum est, illuc ducem nostrum Borsium ascendisse cur ambigimus? [...] Cum igitur ducem nostrum sciamus tantis hic enituisse virtutibus, cur non pie credamus caelesti in regno ad aliquem gradum beatitudinis ipsum ascendisse?” *Ad Herculem*, 266–267.

¹¹⁸ “Quorum [i.e. Carthusiensium] precibus publicis et privatis non est ambiguum pervenire ipsum ad fontem sapientiae, lumen indeficiens et lucem inextinguibilem [...]. Ibi videt et laudat deum suum. Ibi videt in lumine dei sui lumen, quoniam apud ipsum est fons vitae. Qualem autem lumen? Lumen immensum, lumen incorporeum et incomprehensibile, lumen increatum, lumen veridicum, quod illuminat angelos et omnes beatos.” *Ad Herculem*, 280.

We do not need to quote more to illustrate the Platonizing turn of Andreas, at which point he drifted away from the Aristotelian-Thomist spirit of the *De regis virtutibus*. The inspiration for this spectacular construction may be traced back to Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, who was very popular in Platonist circles, and the work he wrote on the heavenly hierarchy (*De caelesti hierarchia*) but this would only have provided the structural blueprint as well as its divulgators like Hugo Ripelin.¹¹⁹ Another possible influence could well have been that of the mysterious Alcidus or Altiividus who became very popular among 15th-century Platonists. Like Andreas, he unfolded the concept of the immortality of the soul in the form of a consolation (*consolatio*), to those who survived and he, too, was profuse in his praise of the political virtues (*Liber Alcidi de immortalitate animorum*).¹²⁰ The influence of Cicero can be confidently detected throughout—mostly that of the *De officiis*. The paradigmatic example of the politician saved by the prayers is that of Trajan's salvation due to Gregory's compassion for his soul: probably the motif which links Janus Pannonius' political allusions addressed to Matthias with Andreas Pannonius' theological argumentations.¹²¹ The idea that the soul may return to its creator from all levels of the virtues was inspired by the Platonizing light-mysticism of the Franciscan Bonaventure.¹²² But the starting point for the conception of the soul which laid the groundwork for salvation through political virtues was provided by the 12th-century mystic treatise *De spiritu et anima* which showed the strong influence of Augustine. (Andreas knew of it as an original work of Augustine and used it probably by the mediation of the well-known Franciscan encyclopaedist Bartholomew the Englishman.)¹²³ It is the same *De spiritu et anima* which was the most frequently cited source of Bonaventure's

¹¹⁹ Cf. "Et sic ordines beatorum in caelis iuxta novem ordines angelorum peroptime disponuntur." *Ad Herculem*, 272. See O'MEARA, *Platonopolis*, op. cit. (see note 89), 159–184. Ripelin's *Compendium* was published in modern edition among the works of Albertus Magnus: *Compendium theologiae veritatis in septem libros digestum*, in: B. ALBERTI MAGNI *Opera omnia*, cura Stephano C. A. BORGNET, XXXIV, Parisiis, 1895.

¹²⁰ See Eugenio GARIN, *Un dialogo sull'immortalità dell'anima: Il Liber Alcidi*, in: ID., *Studi sul platonismo medievale*, Florence, 1958, 89–151.

¹²¹ "De anima autem Traiani, quae erat in inferno, hoc modo probabiliter potest existimari, quod precibus beati Gregorii papae ad vitam praesentem fuerit Traianus revocatus et hic gratiam consecutus per quam remissionis peccatorum habuerit et per consequens immunitatem a poena." *Ad Herculem*, 279. On the 15th-century humanist cult of St Gregory the Great see Alison K. FRAZIER, *Possible Lives: Authors and Saints in Renaissance Italy*, New York, 2005, 204.

¹²² On the rehabilitation of the cardinal virtues see Kent EMERY Jr., *Reading the World Rightly and Squarely: Bonaventure's Doctrine of Cardinal Virtues*, *Traditio*, 89(1983), 183–218. On the differences of the scholastic appropriations of a hierarchy of virtues see Joshua P. HOCHSCHILD, *Porphyry, Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas: A Neoplatonic Hierarchy of Virtues and Two Christian Appropriations*, in: *Medieval Philosophy and the Classical Tradition in Islam, Judaism and Christianity*, ed. John INGLIS, Richmond, 2002, 245–259.

¹²³ The Pseudo-Augustinian text is published in MIGNE, *PL*, XL, cc. 779–830. Cf. *Ad Herculem*, 243–247. Basic overview: Leo NORPOTH, *Der pseudo-augustinische Traktat „De spiritu et anima“: Philosophische Dissertation*, Köln, 1971. On Bartholomew see Hans MEYER, *Bartolomaeus Anglicus 'De proprietatibus rerum': Selbstverständnis und Rezeption*, *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 117(1988), 237–274. I used the following edition: BARTHOLOMEUS ANGLICUS, *De proprietatibus rerum*, Heidelberg, 1488. (Budapest University Library, Inc. 328.)

*Quaestio de anima*¹²⁴ and which Aquinas referred to when he employed a “permissive” argument on the possibility of ascension through political virtues.¹²⁵ Its author—presumably the Cistercian monk Alcherus—proposed the integrity of the soul after death, arguing that after death, the soul retained all of its faculties, including memory and imagination into its bodiless existence. This was an important line of thought for Andreas because it constituted the basis from which he could Christianize the vision in the *Somnium Scipionis* of the “beatific” politicians in the heavenly sphere recalling their earthly deeds. He resolved the starting dilemma—namely how one can attain happiness directly through the practice of political virtues—through modifying the conception of the soul by involving Alcherus, i.e. the current of mysticism that reinterpreted Augustine.¹²⁶ But Andreas did not stop here.

The most important novelty in the princely mirror dedicated to Ercole d’Este was that Andreas used arguments with a growing number of references to and quotations from Duns Scotus, he tied the virtue of *caritas* to *voluntas*—in the manner of Scotus and the Franciscans—and assigned to it a central role in both maintaining the social peace and in attaining *beatitudo*.¹²⁷ At the end of his work, Andreas, following Scotus, gave a lengthy discussion on *voluntas* and said that it was a more noble faculty of the soul than *intellectus* therefore, as opposed to the Thomists, “those people were right in their opinion who derived happiness from the will.”¹²⁸ The moral philosophical “surface” of his work dedicated to Ercole d’Este—i.e. the catalog of virtues expected of a prince and requisite for salvation and the happiness of the subjects—remained practically unchanged as compared to the version dedicated to Matthias Hunyadi, while the theological foundation of the earlier work was completely transformed.

We find some sporadic signs of this turn already in the *De regis virtutibus*. At the end of the work there is a place with no apparent function (under the heading “satiation without hunger” which is the tenth item on the list of the components of the happiness of saints) where Andreas inserted a scholastic argument into the text: “Seeing the holy and glorious human form of Christ, the eyes of the body delight and are sated since even the angels desire His sight. That is why Master Joannes Scotus opined that if man had not

¹²⁴ BONAVENTURA da Bagnoreggio, *Quaestio de existentia animae in corpore*, in: ID., *Collationes in Hexaëmeron et Bonaventuriana quaedam selecta*, ed. R. P. F. DELORME, Florence, 1934, 305–327.

¹²⁵ Cf. *Super Sent.*, lib. 4. d. 44. q. 3. a. 3. qc. 1. arg. 1; and *ibid.* qc. 2. ad 1. See also Pierre MICHAUD-QUANTINE, *Une division ‘augustinienne’ des puissances de l’âme au Moyen Âge*, *Revue des études augustiniennes*, 3(1957), 235–248.

¹²⁶ The Alcherus treatise was of crucial importance also in the thought of Denys the Carthusian who—representing the core of the mystical tradition—tried to leave open a possibility of *visio Dei* in this life, by means of the incorporeal vision of the soul, that is able to cognize the invisible forms. Cf. DIONYSIUS CARTHUSIANUS, *Summa fidei orthodoxae*, II, *De virtutibus tam theologicis, quam cardinalibus*, Venice, 1585, 321r.

¹²⁷ *Ad Herculem*, 154–155, 170, 238. (“Apud tamen doctores duplex est opinio, utrum videlicet in intellectu aut in voluntate summa consistat beatitudo. Sed praeclarius est opinio illorum qui in voluntate posuerunt beatitudinem, eo quod voluntas sit tam secundum sanctorum quam philosophorum opinionem dignissima ac perfectissima potentiarum animae.”)

¹²⁸ *Ad Herculem*, 280–282.

fallen into sin, the divine son of God still would have taken on a body to recreate our bodily aspect.”¹²⁹ It is conceivable that Andreas studied the works of Scotus directly, but his compiling method suggests that he used as an indirect source some other compilation of the works of the Doctor Subtilis. When I was searching after the scattered codices of the Certosa of Ferrara, I came across a codex, kept in the Biblioteca Ariostea, containing the commentaries that the greatest propagator of 14th-century Scotism, Petrus de Aquila OFM, wrote on Petrus Lombardus’ *Sententiae* as well as the commentary of the Carmelite theologian Giovanni Battista Panetti on the *De entium quidditate* of Aquinas. Both its bookhand and the person of its illustrator tie the codex to the *scriptorium* of Certosa—moreover the illustrator Guglielmo Giraldi took part not only in the production of the codex but also in its sale. The new owner bought the codex from Andreas Pannonius, through the mediation of Giraldi.¹³⁰

Aquila, who was not only called Scotellus but also Doctor Sufficiens on account of his strict adherence to Scotus, his eloquence, and the clarity of his style, structured his work polemically, carrying on an argument with Aquinas’ commentary on Lombardus. In the *corpus* of the previously mentioned chapter of Christ’s incarnation (*Utrum si homo non peccasset, Deus incarnatus fuisset?*) after presenting Aquinas’ opinion to the contrary, he argued that Christ would have been incarnated in any case, though not necessarily as the redeemer. For men are composed of two substances, an intellectual one and a perceiving one, and “can be made happy with regards to both” but this bodily, perceiving part cannot attain happiness through looking upon the divine essence because that is invisible. In this regard then, it has to attain blessedness through looking upon the human body of Christ. So had God not entered into a human body, man could not be capable of happiness with regards to both of his components, i.e. he could not attain perfect happiness—as Augustine himself says in *De spiritu et anima*, “God became human so as to bring salvation to the whole man in Himself.”¹³¹

¹²⁹ “Videndo etiam sanctissimam et gloriosissimam humanitatem Christi delectabitur et satiabitur etiam visus oculorum corporalium, in quem desiderant et angeli prospicere. Propter quod tenet magister Johannes Scotus quod etiam si homo non peccasset, deus dei filius incarnatus fuisset ad reficiendas personas exteriores.” *De regis virtutibus*, 129.

¹³⁰ Petrus de AQUILA ord. Min. Scotellus dictus, *Super quatuor libros Sententiarum*; accedit: *S. Thomae de Aquino de entium quidditate cum correctionibus fr. Baptistae Paneti Carmelitae*, Biblioteca Comunale Ariostea di Ferrara, Ms Classe II. cod. 362. At the end of the codex (161v) we find a note by the new owner, Panetti: “Emi ego frater Baptista Pannetus theologiae professor indignus hunc Petrum de Aquilam vulgo dictum Scotellum a priore sancti Christophori de Cartusia et pro ipso a Gulielmo miniatore Ferrariensi cive: precio inter me et ipsum convento mcccclxx die vero duodecima Februarij, dum essem prior Sancti Pauli Ferrariae ordinis Carmelij.” The illustrator of the codex was Guglielmo Giraldi, see MARIANI CANOVA, *op. cit.* (see note 73), 80, 97. Canova renders probable that the codex was made about 1468 (others date it to 1469). The note was published in Luigi N. CITTADELLA, *Documenti ed illustrazioni risguardanti la storia artistica ferrarese*, Ferrara, 1868, 180–181. The modern description of the codex: CLAUDIA ANDREASI, *La biblioteca di frate Giovanni Battista Panetti*, Medioevo e Rinascimento: Annuario del Dipartimento di Studi sul Medioevo e il Rinascimento dell’Università di Firenze, n. s. 11(2000), 210–211.

¹³¹ I used the modern edition: Fr. Petri de AQUILA, cognomento Scotelli B. Joannis Duns Scoti discipuli *Commentaria in quatuor libros sententiarum magistri Petri Lombardi*, ed. C. PAOLINO, I–IV, Genoa, 1907–

This idea—the theological foundation for political happiness through the salvation of the *totus homo*—opened the way for the basic thesis of the mirror for princes dedicated to Ercole d’Este (“it is then a fact [...] that man can attain happiness through the political virtues”) and it was perhaps the passage cited here that called Andreas’s attention to the importance of Alcherus and made him copy entire pages into the second section of his *Ad Herculem* treating the death of Borso d’Este. In the construction of the theological chapters of the thoroughly reworked first section of the *Ad Herculem*, he copied and summarized Scotellus (*Diffinitio fidei*; *Quod sit unus verus et summus deus*; *Quod in mente reperitur imago beatissimae trinitatis*; *Quomodo fidem incarnationi verbi divini et nativitatis eiusdem Tua Excellentia credere debeat*).¹³² Finally the 12th chapter (*De virtutibus cardinalibus*) is a veritable précis of the moral philosophical discussions of Scotellus. What is interesting here is what he chose not to copy. When discussing the link between moral and theological virtues (“*Utrum virtutes morales sint connexae [...] cum virtutibus theologicis?*”), Scotellus took no clear position and pointed out the possible veracity of other opinions. He said it was conceivable “that to develop the moral virtues it is sufficient to know the truth and to love the good and we can possess them without the possession of theological virtues—i.e. moral virtues can exist on their own, without theological virtues.”¹³³ It is very revealing that Andreas stopped copying Scotellus right before these words. He pulled up just at the point which can be regarded as one of the possible thresholds of modernity with regards to political ideas.

4. The significance of the Ferrara context

There are many ways to characterize the change Andreas Pannonius’ thought underwent in the four years that elapsed between the writing of his two mirrors for princes. It was a move away from Thomism and a move toward Scotism. It was a turning away from Aristotelian tradition and a turning toward the Platonist one. The influence of humanist literary canon became discernible in his style and citations. But all this did not constitute an abandonment of the theological fundamentals, nor an abandonment of the ultimate objective, namely, the Crusade. In order for us to assess the reasons and significance of this turn from the perspective of the history of political thinking, we first need to examine the cultural context where it had taken place.

1909. (Henceforth I will refer to the work by the number of the volume.) The quoted locus: *ibid.*, III, 21. (“...ergo, si Deus non fuisset incarnatus, homo non fuisset quantum ad utranque partem beatificabilis vel perfecte beatus, et hoc est quod dicit Augustinus lib. de spiritu et anima, ipse Deus factus est homo, ut totum hominem in se beatificaret.”)

¹³² The most important concordances are: *Ad Herculem*, 152–153, in: AQUILA, *op. cit.*, III, 170–172; *Ad Herculem*, 154–155, in: AQUILA, I, 55–56; *Ad Herculem*, 157, in: AQUILA, I, 190; *Ad Herculem*, 160–162, in: AQUILA, III, 9–10, 37–39; *Ad Herculem*, 168–171, in: AQUILA, III, 218; II, 355–357; II, 230, 234.

¹³³ “Praeterea, ad generationem virtutum moralium sufficiunt cognitio veri et dilectio boni; sed illa possunt haberi sine virtutibus theologicis; ergo virtutes morales possunt esse sine theologicis.” AQUILA, *op. cit.*, III, 238.

The city of the Estes, Ferrara, was an important scene of political theory development decades earlier. In his book *Politia litteraria*, Angelo Decembrio recorded the learned conversations that took place between Guarino of Verona and other leading humanists, discussions that were presided over by the much-adored *princeps*, Leonello d'Este. In one of these debates, Guarino spoke on the issue of the best form of government and unsurprisingly, he favoured monarchical rule. (The spirit and structure of the argument was conspicuously similar to the one adopted by Aurelio Lippo Brandolini in his treatise *De comparatione rei publicae et regni* published decades later.)¹³⁴ The best form of government, however, was to be found in Ferrara—as Guarino said with conviction, “we, the people of Ferrara, are living in a Golden Age, if I may use these words, under the exalting leadership of that most excellent of princes, Leonello and the magnificent Este family.”¹³⁵

Guarino's highly influential school and teaching practice enlarged the earlier definition of power (justice, observation of the law) and added the requirement of *civilitas*. In other words, it attempted to civilize power and shape the image of the prince through antique learning and languages (Greek and Latin)—and Guarino's disciple, Leonello, not only accepted but actually practiced this new type of governance. This was also demanded by the political situation of the day. His family had no hereditary authority, so the Estes were under constant pressure to legitimize their own formal and informal power. More than anybody else, Leonello became conscious that the secret of governing laid in the concealment of the true nature of power and that this was achieved by sublimating it, by granting autonomy to an intellectual elite raised above the executive bureaucracy, by creating a virtual playground where the prince and the representatives of culture could carry on complex coded dialogues on purely intellectual matters and find delight in sophisticated processes of decoding and recoding. If someone were to look for a political manual of the day, the *Politia litteraria* would be a good choice since it contains debates on rhetorical (self-)training, the compilation and placement of the ideal library and other discussions on what is ultimately a reshaping of the literary canon—but all the disputes, be they on problems of style, grammar or philology, ultimately served to shape the new style of the exercise of political power.¹³⁶

¹³⁴ The treatise of Brandolini (*De comparatione rei publicae et regni ad Laurentium Medicem Florentiae rei publicae principem libri III*) was published by ÁBEL Jenő and FRAKNÓI Vilmos, in: *Irodalomtörténeti emlékek* (Remains of literary history), II, Budapest, 1890, 77–183. See Lynn THORNDYKE, *Lippus Brandolinus De comparatione rei publicae et regni: An Unpublished Treatise of the Late Fifteenth Century in Comparative Political Science*, *Political Science Quarterly*, 41(1926), 413–435; Elisabetta MAYER, *Un umanista italiano della corte di re Mattia Corvino: Aurelio Brandolini Lippo*, *Annuario dell'Accademia d'Ungheria a Roma*, 2(1938), 120–168.

¹³⁵ “Uti nos quoque, Ferrariensis populus [...] si dici liceat, magis in aurea velut aetate degentes, sub optimo principe Leonello, illustrique Estensium genere felicissime gubernamur.” Angelus DECEMBRIUS, *Politiae litterariae ad summum pontificem Pium II. libri septem*, Augsburg, 1540, 132r.

¹³⁶ See recently Christopher S. CELENZA, *Creating Canons in Fifteenth-century Ferrara: Angelo Decembrio's De politia litteraria*, 1. 10, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 57(2004), 43–98. Cf. GUNDERSHEIMER, *op. cit.*, 43–55.

After the unexpected death of Leonello d'Este in 1450, his brother Borso, who had been brought up to be a soldier, took over Ferrara and it was this new style of governance that underwent significant changes. Borso did not break with the humanists and their intellectual heritage but at the same time, the new prince was forced to break with his brother's intellectual elitism and offset his less impressive learning by adopting a new element into the representation of power. This new element was religiosity.¹³⁷ Borso instinctively identified the need that manifested itself in the amazing boom of *devotio moderna* that swept not only Ferrara but all of Northern Italy. Caterina Vegri (the later St Caterina) and her followers, the members of the sisterhood "sorelle di vita comune" settled in the city, a wave of reforms swept over such orders as the Franciscans, Dominicans, Olivetans and Carmelites and this deepening spirituality left its imprint on all facets of intellectual life in the city.¹³⁸ Naturally, Borso took advantage of the tide of the "new devotion" but in his particular case, political interests and goals went hand-in-hand with his sincere and profound religiosity. Borso's most significant act of ecclesiastic patronage—he founded a Carthusian charterhouse and church and named them after St Christopher—made good sense from both perspectives.

All this makes it rather obvious that Andreas Pannonius, who in the Certosa was promoted to the post of Vicar then to that of Prior, was a confidant of Borso—Andreas himself alluded to this in the *Libellus* dedicated to Ercole¹³⁹ but it is also supported by the previously mentioned event when Borso personally tried to intervene on behalf of the Hungarian monk embroiled in internecine strife at the charterhouse. A look at the list of people that Borso and Andreas turned to for support in the 1470 conflict would map out Andreas's network of connections in Bologna: Geronimo Ranuzzi and Bornio da Sala were influential citizens of Bologna and members of the local intelligentsia, supporters of Cardinal Bessarion who governed Bologna for years as a papal legate; Angelo Capranica was the Cardinal Protector of the Order of the Carthusians and maintained good ties with Jacopo Ammannati, Cardinal of Pavia. If we include in the list Francesco della Rovere (who in 1471 became Pope Sixtus IV), a close collaborator of Cardinal Bessarion¹⁴⁰ whom Andreas is very likely to have known, we arrive at the circle that Borso d'Este could look to for support at the Holy See after the approaching death of Pope Paul II whose health was rapidly declining. At the same time, this was the same circle that the high clergy in Hungary—Vitéz, Várdai, and Janus Pannonius—expected to support them in the course of their anti-Turkish manoeuvrings.

¹³⁷ GUNDERSHEIMER, *op. cit.*, 68–69.

¹³⁸ See in general Antonio SAMARITANI, *Profilo di storia della spiritualità, pietà e devozione nelle chiese di Ferrara-Comacchio*, Reggio Emilia, 2004, 83–129. On the Ferrara period of the life of Santa Caterina Vegri see Cecilia FOLETTI, *Introduzione*, in: Caterina VEGRI, *Le sette armi spirituali*, ed. Cecilia FOLETTI, Padua, 1985, 41–76.

¹³⁹ *Ad Herculem*, 263, 265.

¹⁴⁰ About the close co-operation between Francesco della Rovere and Bessarion see Concetta BIANCA, *Francesco della Rovere*, *op. cit.*, 24–25 (esp. note 28).

I indicated earlier that this constellation of political and ecclesiastic interests provided more than sufficient reasons for the writing of the *De regiis virtutibus* dedicated to Matthias. But the final form that Andreas's work took can be fully understood only in the light of the cultural environment in Ferrara as it unfolded under the rule of Borso d'Este. For in the course of instructing and eulogizing Matthias, Andreas Pannonius used techniques of representation which he developed in the 1460s in Ferrara when he wrote his laudation of Duke Borso. It was due to the special situation of the legitimacy "deficit" of the *Duca* that these theological issues also surfaced in the political discourse on the representations of power. This is why the political aspects of *caritas* and faith were so heavily stressed and that is why justice, embracing and linking political/moral and theological virtues became so important in the shaping of the public image of Borso d'Este. This environment was a natural fit for *De regiis virtutibus*, by means of its cult of Iustitia and its structural novelty, the conjoining of the cardinal and theological virtues.¹⁴¹ These are not archaic gestures after all, but in this special context rather novel experiments to create a new kind of legitimization for power.

Throughout the 1450s and 1460s, a number of significant works of theory were produced in Ferrara and its intellectual environs, all of which paid special attention to the political dimensions of theology (as well as the theological background of politics) and focused on the theoretical foundations of justice and happiness with regards to both the state and the prince. The "traditional" Platonizing and rhetoric-centred humanist current focusing on the *institutio* of the prince was represented by the works of Michele Savonarola. His *De felici progressu*, singled out the construction of the Certosa from the deeds of Borso and included the texts of his investiture speeches—one oration to the Lord, one to the Blessed Virgin. The work offset the motifs of the humanist *educatio principis* with Thomist tradition and by closely following Aegidius Romanus.¹⁴² In his other political work, the *De vera re publica et digna saeculari militia*, Savonarola based his reform ideas on an utopian concept since he had no trust in the controlling function of the clergy. According to this concept, the prince was to set up a body of well-to-do and incorruptible citizens, whose main task would be to ensure social justice—the members were to take an oath to Iustitia and their office was to run parallel with the armed forces—albeit their power was to be exercised only in peacetime. The meticulous planner even designed their uniform of the members.¹⁴³ With all his humanist ideals, Michele also developed a strong

¹⁴¹ On Borso's cult of Iustitia see GUNDERSHEIMER, *op. cit.*, 61; and recently Laura TURCHI, *Liberalitas Estensis: Le declinazioni del linguaggio politico in un dominio signorile*, in: *Linguaggi politici nell'Italia del Rinascimento*, a cura di Andrea GAMBERINI, Giuseppe PETRALIA, Rome, 2007, 217–243. On the catalogues of princely virtue in his times see *Die Borsias des Tito Strozzi*, ed. Walter LUDWIG, Munich, 1977, 270–273.

¹⁴² E.g.: "Sunt itaque literarum studia a filiis principum non omittenda, cum litteris preediti in populo veluti fulgentia sidera in caelo habeantur." Michele SAVONAROLA, *De felici progressu illustrissimi Borsii Estensis ad marchionatum Ferrariae, Mutinae et Regii ducatum comitatumque Rodigii*, Biblioteca Estense, Modena, Ms á. W. 2. 15 (Lat. 215), 3v.

¹⁴³ *Ad illustrem equitem, Dnum Nicolaum Marchionem Estensem, Divi Leonelli Marchionis Estensis et Ferrariae dni olim primogenitum de vera re publica et digna saeculari militia*, Biblioteca Estense, Modena,

bond with Carthusian spirituality and even authored a confessional for the monks of San Cristoforo.¹⁴⁴

The vernacular tract *Trattato del modo di ben governare* (1452–1462) which his author, Tommaso dei Liuti, the head of the Dominican Order in the city dedicated to Borso, bore the marks of political Thomism. It is a beautiful little codex, illuminated by the same Guglielmo Giraldi who illustrated the mirrors for prince by Andreas. In other respects, too, the *Trattato* seems to be cut from the same cloth as the work of Andreas.¹⁴⁵ After enumerating the traditional arguments in support of the monarchy as a form of government and deriving the other princely virtues (*liberalità, clemenza, sapienza e dottrina, prudenza, sincerità, consiglio*) from *giustizia* or at least tying them to it, in the last part of the work, he turned to the treatment of happiness, also in the spirit of Thomism. This structuring reminiscent of Cicero's *De re publica* (the political salvation of the *beati* described at the end of the work) finds its parallels in both of Andreas's mirrors for princes. According to Tommaso, the "true and perfect happiness" (*vera at perfecta felicitate*) was rooted in the life of virtue—at least as far as the world of political virtues were considered. The brightest of the worldly virtues, respect for justice, could elevate the ruler even higher: "to the final and eternal home" described by Scipio the Elder in the *Somnium* and commended by Macrobius. This reveals, on the one hand, that the two authors addressed the same circle of issues (Andreas perhaps borrowed from Tommaso when he called, albeit rhetorically, *iustitia* the "fourth theological virtue") and on the other hand, that Tommaso, like Andreas in his first work dedicated to Matthias, tried to find a Thomist solution to the problem of *beatitudo/felicitas*.

Finally, I want to mention a work that was not produced in Ferrara, but certainly has ties to the city since it was dedicated to Borso d'Este and its author almost certainly made the personal acquaintance of Andreas. The work in question is the tract *De principe* written around 1463 by the Bolognese jurist Bornio da Sala.¹⁴⁶ Bornio's opus, divided into three books, followed the structural scheme of *ascensio*. After a dedication comparing Borso to Trajan, the first book treated the relationship of cardinal and theological virtues and concluded that of the political virtues it was justice and of the theological virtues it was love which made it possible to move between the two spheres. In the second book Bornio devoted most of his attention to the question of *beatitudo*. The goal of the virtues was happiness and happiness, at least as far as the prince was concerned "consisted principally of speculation." At this point Bornio was faced with a dilemma, namely, that if the virtues associated with the active life occupied a lower place

Ms. ú. W. 6. 6 (Lat. 114). See Antonio SAMARITANI, *Michele Savonarola riformatore cattolico nella corte Estense a metà del secolo XV*, Ferrara, 1976, 62–64.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 65 sqq.

¹⁴⁵ Tommaso da Ferrara (dei LIUTI), *Trattato del modo di ben governare*, Biblioteca Trivulziana, Milan, Cod. 86. See Alfredo ACITO, *Trattato del modo di ben governare: Opera inedita del sec. XV di Tommaso da Ferrara domenicano*, Milan, [1950].

¹⁴⁶ The manuscript: Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan, Cod. A 83. inf. For a detailed description and evaluation see Luisa PESAVENTO, «*Quaedam lex animata*»: *Il principe di Bornio da Sala*, Nuova rivista storica, 72(1988), 1–22.

in the hierarchy than those of the contemplative life, how was it possible to attain salvation through their agency? To resolve the paradox, he quoted a passage from Aquinas himself. Love, Thomas said, transformed and incorporated the lover into the loved one. Contemplation infused with love, if directed at God, would unify the contemplating person with God. Kristeller has already called attention to the significance of this passage: Aquinas, in his commentary on the third book of the *Sententiae* of Lombardus, wrote, "...amor est ipsa unio vel nexus vel transformatio qua amans in amatum transformatur et quodammodo convertitur in ipsum."¹⁴⁷ Kristeller theorized that perhaps Bornio did not find the *locus* himself but it was pointed out to him by a Dominican acquaintance of his.¹⁴⁸ It is a fact that after this quotation the third book provided a logical treatment of *caritas*, the theological and political virtue that linked the prince to God and the subjects to the prince. For Borso, this was the "root of all virtues" which provided perfection to the others and brought bliss to both *princeps* and *res publica*. The work closed with a long argument proving the immortality of the soul and offering refutations of counter-arguments, in a Platonist spirit.

A number of passages in Bornio's work are identical with passages in the mirrors for princes of Andreas Pannonius.¹⁴⁹ In other words: Andreas had Bornio's *De principe* at his disposal when writing both mirrors for princes. There are indications, however, suggesting a two-way traffic between the authors. Indeed, it is as if the two authors had divided the work between them: the first theological chapters of the version dedicated to Matthias appear to neatly complement the legal arguments of Bornio. It is my suspicion—which I base on the dedication of Bornio's *Adversus perfidiam Judeorum* to Andreas Pannonius—that the monk, whose background input was postulated by Kristeller, not a Dominican as Kristeller suggests, but a Carthusian, that is to say, none other than Andreas Pannonius. He could well have persuaded his Bolognese friend to author the work dedicated to Borso. According to the present state of research, Bornio had no connections whatsoever to Ferrara and had no motivation to move there. Still, he had kind words to say on the subject of Borso's "magnificent graciousness" which manifested

¹⁴⁷ *Super Sent.*, lib. III. d. 27. q. 1. a. 1. ad 2. Cf. *De principe*: "Amatio autem sive amor causa est similitudinis, cum amor habeat virtutem conversivam amantis in amatum; tertium apparet ex eo quod foelicitas que est finis ultimus hominis, per hunc attingitur quia, ut iam probatum est, agens secundum intellectum est Deo amantissimus." See Paul Oskar KRISTELLER, *Vita attiva e vita contemplativa in un brano inedito di Bornio da Sala e in San Tommaso d'Aquino*, in: *Id.*, *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, IV, *op. cit.* (see note 89), 185–196. (Kristeller refers to the Italian version of Bornio's treatise, held in Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin, Cod. Hamilton, 112.)

¹⁴⁸ KRISTELLER, *Vita attiva e vita contemplativa...*, *op. cit.*, 191.

¹⁴⁹ Parts of the dedication letter (*De principe*, 1r) appear in the Borso laudation of the version dedicated to Matthias (*De regiis virtutibus*, 44–45) and in chapter *Brevis epilogus de virtute iustitiae* (*ibid.*, 87; but the beginning of this chapter is borrowed from *De principe*, 34v–34bis-r); and parts of Bornio's chapter treating the relationship of cardinal and theological virtues (*De principe*, 2r–v) were incorporated in both of Andreas's mirrors for princes—the theoretical part into the Matthias version (*De regiis virtutibus*, 31–32), the passages on the destruction wrought by the Muslims and the necessity of the Crusade into chapter XXXIII of the Ercole version (*Ad Herculem*, 214–216).

itself most in the construction of the splendid charterhouse for the Carthusians.¹⁵⁰ Given Andreas's cult of *caritas* and the fact that he based the second part of his work on the *Sentences* commentary of Aquinas, Andreas might well have been the guide of the Bologna jurist in the maze of Thomist theology. And the Platonist influence detected in Pannonius might well have come from Bornio, who had been turned on to Platonist political philosophy decades earlier when in 1437 Cencius Romanus (Cencio dei Rustici) dedicated his Latin translation of the pseudo-Platonic dialog *De virtutibus* to him. In my opinion it is this text postulating a direct connection between divine providence and *beata civitas* and a divine provenance for political virtues whose distant influence is detectable in Bornio da Sala's Platonizing concept of politics focusing on the immortality of the soul as well as in the Platonizing "turn" of Andreas Pannonius.¹⁵¹

To sum up the preceding: the main features of *De regiis virtutibus*—Thomism, the cult of *iustitia*, the centrality of *beatitudo* and the immortality of the soul—can all be found in the immediate cultural context, i.e. in the image the court created of Borso d'Este. The devotional aspect of this image justified the heavy stress laid on the link between theological and moral/political virtues. Those features, however, that constitute the difference between Andreas Pannonius' two mirrors for princes—the concept of the soul based on the *De spiritu et anima* and the Scotist interpretation of political *beatitudo*—could not be found in the previously mentioned political works. The tract by Bornio da Sala is the only one of them which seems conscious of and reflects on the political problems arising out of the postulation of the superiority of the speculative virtues, but Bornio sought to resolve them solely on a Thomist basis.¹⁵² The originality of Andreas's *Ad Herculem* consists in his inclusion of Scotist theology—along with Thomist theology, against which he often argues—in his theory on the political happiness of the prince. This turn can be primarily explained by the unique cultural atmosphere of his environment. In the Ferrara of Borso d'Este there was simultaneously present not only a mostly lay, humanist and Platonist intellectual milieu that had been flourishing already for a decade, but also the *devotio moderna*, which, perhaps under the influence of the local humanist environment, did not stop at the ordinary practices of a life of grace but often erupted into heated theological debates dissecting finer points of doctrine.

The deeply religious Borso regularly took part in the debates of the city's monks and humanists and many times he was the one to propose the issue to be debated. The significance of these symposia has thus far been underestimated by scholarship. The debates on humanist literature held in the time of Leonello d'Este were recorded by Angelo Decembrio and were made widely known after the print publication of his *Politia litteraria*. The

¹⁵⁰ "Attestatur hanc eximiam animi tui beneficentiam et pietatem ac perpetue attestabitur sancta et gloriosa Cartusia tua nuper diligentia, opera, studio ac religione constructa, neque illud tue liberalitatis insigne preteritum fuit." *De principe*, 100r.

¹⁵¹ See KRISTELLER, *Un opuscolo sconosciuto di Cencio de' Rustici dedicato a Bornio da Sala*, *op. cit.* (see note 42), 355–376.

¹⁵² This explains that even if he quotes the same pseudo-Augustine treatise as Andreas, he does not attribute any crucial importance, see *De principe*, 73v.

theological disputes were recorded towards the end of Borso's reign in the Dominican Tommaso dai Liuti's *Declaratorio* (1470). But Liuti's work was never printed.¹⁵³ The debate topics included the *visio beatifica*, the faculties of resurrected bodies, the bodily sufferings of a soul condemned to damnation and of course, the faculties of perception in a soul separated from the body, which the Dominican Giovanni Gatti debated with two Franciscan theologians. The sources quoted are the very same that play such an important background role in Andreas's mirrors for princes, i.e. Aquinas' commentary on the fourth book of the *Sententiae* and the *De spiritu et anima* of Alcherus. At least according to the Dominican Liuti, Gatti "triumphed" in the debate¹⁵⁴—but for our present purposes it is more important to stress that apparently, the pseudo-Augustine text was of key significance in reconciling the views of the humanists and the theologians on the issue of the nature of the soul and in harmonizing the Thomist and Scotist views in the internal debate of the theologians of the day.

With regards to the latter, it is rather telling that both the Dominican Gatti and the young Franciscan Juraj Dragišić who was a student in Ferrara at the time,¹⁵⁵ entered the circle of Cardinal Bessarion at the end of the 1460s. The primary objective of this circle was to create some sort of harmony between the opposing camps of Aristotelians and Platonists, Thomists and Scotists, since such a reconciliation and the resulting unity would have contributed to the West's ability to launch a holy war against the Turks.¹⁵⁶ I do not know whether Andreas knew Bessarion personally, but as I pointed out earlier, he was acquainted with most everybody in the Cardinal's circle and it is perhaps reasonable to assume that his mirrors for princes were in line with the Cardinal's aspirations.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵³ The only surviving copy of the manuscript can be found in the Biblioteca Colombina in Sevilla, Cod. 7–7–5. A detailed description see in T. KAEPEL, *Tommaso dai Liuti di Ferrara e il suo Declaratorio*, *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum*, 20(1950), 201–212.

¹⁵⁴ KAEPEL, *op. cit.*, 204–205 (in the Siviglia codex 234v–235v). On Gatti see John MONFASANI, *Giovanni Gatti of Messina: a Profile and an Unedited Text*, in: *Filologia umanistica per Gianvito Resta*, eds. Vincenzo FERA, Giacomo FERRAÛ, II, Padua, 1997, 1315–1338.

¹⁵⁵ Cesare VASOLI, *Notizie su Giorgio Benigno Salviati (Juraj Dragišić)*, in: ID., *Profezia e ragione: Studi sulla cultura del Cinquecento e del Seicento*, Naples, 1974, 16–127. Soon he will write his fundamental dialogue on the preminency of *voluntas* (*De voluntate hominis eiusque praeeminentia et dominatione in anima*, ed. Z. ŠOJAT, Rome, 1972), surely relying on his studies at the Franciscan Studium in Ferrara; see Celestino PIANA, *Lo studio di S. Francesco a Ferrara nel Quattrocento*, *Archivum franciscanum historicum*, 61(1968), 99–175.

¹⁵⁶ A very good compass for orientation in the debates and reconciliatory efforts is Bessarion's listing of the differences between Thomists and Scotists, in Biblioteca Marciana, Venice, Ms Gr. 148 (488), 2v–3v. (I wish to thank Prof. John Monfasani for this reference and the transcription of the document. He is publishing this text in his forthcoming book *Bessarion Scholasticus* in the series "Venetia Orientalia" [Florence, 2009].) Obviously, also Bessarion possessed a copy of Aquila's commentary on the *Sententiae*, according to a list of his books donated to the Marciana in 1468: Lotte LABOWSKY, *Bessarion's Library and the Bibliotheca Marciana: Six Early Inventories*, Rome, 1979, 182: nr. 122–123 (erroneously identified with Scotus' works).

¹⁵⁷ It is not surprising that Andreas seems well informed in the current theological debates in and around the Bessarion circle. Towards the end of his *Ad Herculem* (252–253) he expound at length "qualiter deus cognoscit futurum contingens" (obviously in favour of the Scotist view), contemporaneously with the dispute

As for the contribution of Humanism, special attention should be paid to the stay in Ferrara in the late 1460s of Pier Candido Decembrio. Paul Oskar Kristeller pointed out the significance of Decembrio's treatise *De humani animae immortalitate* and the fact that Decembrio's most important and closely followed source was also *De spiritu et anima* of Alcherus.¹⁵⁸ Because Decembrio authored his work before arriving to Ferrara, I suspect that he took it with him to the city of the Estes. So it is possible that it was thanks to Decembrio that the Alcherus compilation, which was known to Scholasticism but little appreciated, came to play a key role in debates on the immortality of the soul.¹⁵⁹ These debates, as we have seen it in the case of Andreas, carried political consequences. At least the voluminous *De caelesti vita*, authored by the Platonizing Franciscan theologian, Johannes Ferrariensis, written before Decembrio's arrival and dedicated to Borso d'Este, made no special references to it.¹⁶⁰

5. Paradigms in motion

The final word on Andreas's mirrors for princes must be what Kristeller said of Decembrio's treatise: "it is a modest contribution to the history of a very important problem."¹⁶¹ The analysis of the sources and of the creation context of the *De regis virtutibus* and the *Ad Herculem* provides further proof that the interpretative paradigm of "civic Humanism" is becoming increasingly inadequate to explain the phenomena of Renaissance political theory. The texts composed on political theory in this period can be interpreted along the monarchy vs democracy (in fact: tyranny vs liberty) paradigm only through the violent application of anachronistic interpretative criteria and not just because their authors were fond of discussing subtle transitory forms between pure monarchy and democracy. Even the typical work of Aurelio Lippo Brandolini (*De comparatione regni et rei publicae*), analyzing the borderline between the two constitutional forms (and opting for the monarchical one) could not be sufficiently understood without an awareness of the Thomists theses present therein or by disregarding the author's ora-

in the Bessarion circle, see *De arcanis Dei: Card. Bessarion eiusque socii anno 1471 disputantes*, ed. Girard J. ETZKORN, Rome, 1997.

¹⁵⁸ Paul Oskar KRISTELLER, *Pier Candido Decembrio and His Unpublished Treatise on the Immortality of the Soul*, in: ID., *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters*, II, Rome, 1985, 281–300, and 567–584.

¹⁵⁹ One of the mediators between the humanists and the theologians could be the mentioned Giovanni Gatti who was called "theologie ac philosophie princeps" just by P. C. Decembrio in a letter addressed to the Dominican in 1467 published by MONFASANI, *Giovanni Gatti, op. cit.* (see note 154), 1321. Decembrio had some Carthusian connections too, at least in a missive he eulogized the library of the Ferrara Certosa (cf. Luciano GARGAN, *L'antica biblioteca della certosa di Pavia*, Rome, 1998, 1–2).

¹⁶⁰ Tommaso dei Liuti's predecessor in the professorship of theology, another humanist theologian (1409–1462); I used the exemplar of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences: Joannes FERRARIENSIS, *Liber noviter editus de caelesti vita*, Venice, 1494.

¹⁶¹ KRISTELLER, *Pier Candido Decembrio, op. cit.*, 297.

tion in praise of St Thomas.¹⁶² The problems breaking the surface of the discourses of the day—primacy of monarchy or republic, hierarchy of active and contemplative lifestyles—were derivatives. They can be studied more fruitfully if we look for their primary context in the theological and moral philosophical debates out of which they emerged. These debates are open to a number of topics from a number of research areas such as theology, philosophy, literary history. The primary question from the point of view of the history of political theory is the position people took in the question of the primacy of intellect vs will, in other words, their view on the possibility of attaining *beatitudo* (via political virtues) and the arguments they employed to prove the immortality of the soul (of the prince).

Today, many would argue that the boundary of modernity lies at the point where questions like these are (apparently) no longer entertained by the “science” of politics and that the precursors of political modernity were those who never believed in beholding the face of God or the immortality of the soul. It seems, however, that a different kind of categorization is possible, one that would focus on the point of separation of *rational politics* (with a rational theology in the background) and a *voluntarist concept of politics* that based the forms of political association (*consociatio*) on the will (with a *caritas*-centred federal theology in the background). It would appear that a major role has been played in this process of separation by the fifteenth-century Thomist and Scotist interpretations, cognizant of Aristotelian and Platonist traditions—controversies and efforts at harmonization alike.¹⁶³ One of the virtual scenes of these debates and experiments of interpretation—besides the Neo-Platonist Florence of a somewhat later date—was the Ferrarese “workshop” in the 1450s and 1460s.¹⁶⁴ It merits attention, if for no other reason, but because the two intellectual laboratories will meet a few decades later under tumultuous circumstances in the Florence of the grandchild of Michele Savonarola, fra’ Girolamo.

¹⁶² See John W. O’MALLEY, *Some Renaissance Panegyrics of Aquinas*, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 27(1974), 174–192.

¹⁶³ A rich survey on the issue is Cesare VASOLI, *Tracce scotiste nella cultura ‘platonica’ quattrocentesca*, in: ID., *Immagini umanistiche*, *op. cit.* (see note 9), 217–248.

¹⁶⁴ Prof. Monfasani pointed out the decisive role played by the Florentine Platonic humanists in the philosophical demonstration of the immortality of the soul, but mentioned also some earlier exceptions (as Joannes Ferrariensis e.g.), see MONFASANI, *Aristotelians, Platonists, and the Missing Ockhamists*, *op. cit.* (see note 21), 268. Now, these exceptions become more and more numerous: Bornio da Sala, Juraj Dragišić, Joannes Ferrariensis, Pier Candido Decembrio; in some—mediate or immediate—way each of them was linked to the Ferrara context under Borso’s era.