

PUBLIKATIONEN DER UNGARISCHEN
GESCHICHTSFORSCHUNG IN WIEN

— BD. XVII. —

NICOLAUS OLAHUS 450

Tagungsband der internationalen Konferenz
zum 450. Todestag von Nicolaus Olahus

Herausgegeben von
EMŐKE RITA SZILÁGYI



WIEN 2019

Nicolaus Olahus 450

PUBLIKATIONEN DER UNGARISCHEN
GESCHICHTSFORSCHUNG IN WIEN

BD. XVII.

NICOLAUS OLAHUS 450

Proceedings of the International Conference
on the 450th Anniversary of Nicolaus Olahus' Death

Edited by EMŐKE RITA SZILÁGYI

VIENNA 2019

PUBLIKATIONEN DER UNGARISCHEN
GESCHICHTSFORSCHUNG IN WIEN

BD. XVII.

NICOLAUS OLAHUS 450

Tagungsband der internationalen Konferenz
zum 450. Todestag von Nicolaus Olahus

Herausgegeben von EMŐKE RITA SZILÁGYI

WIEN 2019

Publikationen der ungarischen Geschichtsforschung in Wien

Herausgeber
Institut für Ungarische Geschichtsforschung in Wien
Balassi Institut – Collegium Hungaricum Wien
Archivdelegation beim Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Wien

Redaktionskollegium
DR. IVÁN BERTÉNYI, DR. CSABA SZABÓ, DR. GÁBOR UJVÁRY,
DR. ISTVÁN FAZEKAS, DR. ANDRÁS OROSS, DR. PÉTER TUSOR

Der Band wurde mit der Unterstützung der Ungarischen Akademie der
Wissenschaften und des Projekts „MTA Premium Forschungsstipendium
für Postdoktoranden“ veröffentlicht



© die Verfasser / Herausgeber, 2019

Sprachredaktion: István Fazekas d. J., Réka Futász
Übersetzungen: Regina Goda, Ferenc Vincze

<http://www.collegium-hungaricum.at>

ISSN 2073-3054
ISBN 978-963-631-280-0

Herausgeber:
Dr. Iván Bertényi
Institut für Ungarische Geschichtsforschung in Wien
Prof. Dr. Gábor Kecskeméti
Institut für Literaturwissenschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliches Forschungszentrum
der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,
Budapest

Layout: Zsuzsa Szilágyi N.
Illustration: Géza Xantus
Druck: Kódex Könyvgyártó Kft.
Direktor: Attila Marosi



Grabstein von Nicolaus Olahus in Trnava/Nagyszombat/Tyrnau (1568)

Foto: Kornél Divald (1927)

MIKLÓS OLÁH'S TESTIMONY GIVEN DURING THE INVESTIGATION OF THE MURDER OF GYÖRGY FRÁTER

THE MURDER OF GYÖRGY FRÁTER AND THE INVESTIGATION OF THE HOLY SEE

On the night of 16–17 December, 1551, the soldiers of Sforza Pallavicini and Giovanni Battista Castaldo brutally killed Primate György (Martinuzzi or Utyeszenovics) Fráter,¹ archbishop of Esztergom and voivode of Transylvania.² The soldiers of Ferdinand I murdered him, fearing he would betray them and the Christian army to the Ottomans. This controversial act, although it was not unprecedented in the history of contemporary Europe, created a stir throughout the Christian world.³

The news of the murder soon reached Rome. When Pope Julius III heard that the Pauline monk, who had been appointed a cardinal not long before on the recommendation of Ferdinand I, had been murdered by the monarch's soldiers, was enraged. On hearing about the incident, the pope excommunicated the perpetrators of the murder, Marquis Giovanni Battista Castaldo and Chief Sergeant Sforza Pallavicini by virtue of canon law; Ferdinand I only received a temporary absolution.⁴ In March 1552, the pope ordered the establishment of a body of four cardinals to investigate the case.⁵ An often halting, detailed and complex inquiry process started, which lasted until 1554. The case rested upon articles of law collected by

^{*} Viktor Kanász is Research Assistant at the MTA–PPKE Vilmos Fraknói Vatican Historical Research Group and a PhD-student at the University of Pécs. His research is supported by MTA TKI.

¹ He can be identified under the names Frater Georgius, Friar George, György Utissenius/Utješenić, and György Martinuzzi.

² The latest on the life of György Fráter: OBORNI, 2017a; NEMETH PAPO – PAPO, 2017.

³ The cardinal became a popular literary character and has captured the attention of historians, writers and artists both in Hungary and abroad. KANÁSZ, 2017, 173; KANÁSZ, 2018; OBORNI, 2017a, 11–12.

⁴ TUSOR – NEMES, 2011. 105. On the canonical background of this: SZUROMI, 2010, 120–122.

⁵ FRANKÓI, 1903, 81; BARTA, 1988, 47.

the lawyers of Ferdinand and the pope, the main purpose of which was to prove the friar's betrayal or innocence by examining the legitimacy of the murder.⁶

In this delicate and confusing diplomatic situation, which resounded with the Valois–Habsburg conflict, the inner struggles of Charles V's empire, and the battle sounds of religious wars, until 7 February, 1554 the inquiry was led by Count Abbot Girolamo Martinengo, the papal nuncio to the court of King Ferdinand.⁷ His main task was to summon and hear the witnesses associated with Fráter and collected by Ferdinand's people; to take down their statements; to collect the letters and extracts that could be used as evidence, and to prepare an authentic copy and a translation, if necessary. To support this work, he received help from his staff; however, these lawyers, secretaries, or councillors were mainly appointed by Ferdinand.⁸

During the investigation, there were altogether 139 statements recorded, given by members of smaller nobility, civilians, ecclesiastical and secular leaders, and numerous letters and letter extracts were attached as evidence. The majority of these survived in the Vatican Secret Archives and in the Haus-, Hof-, und Staatsarchiv of Vienna.⁹ In the end, on 13 July, 1554 the investigation was closed by Nuncio Zaccaria Delfino, Martinengo's successor, and the statements were sent to Rome.¹⁰ The pope made his decision on the basis of these documents, according to which in 1555 he absolved King Ferdinand and his soldiers of excommunication once and for all.¹¹

THE TESTIMONY OF MIKLÓS OLÁH

Miklós Oláh was also among the witnesses. His testimony can be found in the Vatican Secret Archives. Although the source is known and used by Hungarian historiography, its full-text publication has not been prepared yet.¹² A lot of valuable information on the history of the Kingdom of Hungary and on György Fráter's life can be found in the source; moreover, one can see what

⁶ On the investigation of the Holy See and its sources: BARTA, 1988; KANÁSZ, 2017.

⁷ On Girolamo's activities: GOETZ, 1965.

⁸ FRÁKNÓI, 1903. 82; BARTA, 1988, 59–62; KANÁSZ, 2019, 97–99.

⁹ KANÁSZ, 2017, 177–180. Part of the sources survived in the collections of the Hungarian National Archives (MNL OL), the National Széchényi Library, and of the Eötvös Loránd University Library. OBORNI, 2017a, 279–280.

¹⁰ BARTA, 1988. 84. On the activities of Delfino: GOETZ, 1970.

¹¹ UTJEŠINOVIĆ, 1881. (Urkundenbuch) n. XVII, 73–75; BARTA, 1988, 194.

¹² Extract: PODHRADCZKY, 1855, 235–266 and 248–249; BARTA, 1988, *passim*; OBORNI, 2017a, 101 and 193; PAPO, 2011, 348–349.

a pro-Habsburg Hungarian church leader thought of his fellow bishop, and which channels of information he used to gain the knowledge and data based on which he formed his opinion.

Although the murder had happened in December 1551, the hearings only began in the spring of 1553, due to the rather eventful national and international developments that were taking place at the time. On 14 March, 1553, the lawyers of Ferdinand I visited Nuncio Martinengo in Graz and named the first witnesses: Chancellor Miklós Oláh, Pál Bornemissza, the bishop of Veszprém, Ferenc Pesty, Heinrich Wolfgang Kneissl, and Farkas Schreiber.¹³ All of them were granted an exemption from their oath of allegiance. On 15 March, Martinengo summoned the persons in question, and the hearings started. After Farkas Schreiber, Ferenc Pesty and Pál Bornemissza, on 21 March Miklós Oláh also visited the nuncio in Graz and testified in front of him.

During the hearing, the nuncio questioned Oláh with the help of an 87-point questionnaire.¹⁴ He did not ask all the questions, he combined many of them instead. Martinengo first asked about the relationship between Oláh and Fráter, then he went through Fráter's life and the most important life events related to him. He combed through the reign of János Szapolyai, the occupation of Buda, the exile of Queen Isabella and his son Zsigmond János in Transylvania, up until the events of 1551. He was particularly interested in the monk's economic and judicial activity in Transylvania, as well as his negotiations with the Ottomans, in tax remittances, and other cases.

In his testimony, Oláh painted a negative picture of György Fráter.¹⁵ In his view, King János reconciled with the Ottomans as a result of Monk György's contrivances, and he prevented the widow of King János Szapolyai, Isabella Jagiellon from handing the castle of Buda over to Ferdinand I when Buda was occupied by the Ottomans in 1541.¹⁶ Moreover, just like Péter Pálczán,

¹³ BARTA, 1988, 77. It should be noted here that later, on 2 May, 1553, Miklós Oláh's vassal, Ferenc Bornemissza of Aszód also gave evidence in Sopron. *Archivio Segreto Vaticano Misc. Arm. II*, vol. 61. fol. 150r–152v.

¹⁴ UTJEŠINOVIĆ, 1881, (Urkundenbuch) n. XVI, 62–73, The points in Latin and in Hungarian translation: BESSENYEI, 2002, 210–233.

¹⁵ FRAKNÓI, 1903, 75, 79. Apart from the above-mentioned testimony, Oláh's negative opinion of Fráter is also shown by his letter of 6 January, 1552, addressed to his chief supporter, Queen Mary, the sister of Ferdinand I and the widow of Louis II. In this letter he mentions the death of the Monk and remarks that although Ferdinand I endeavoured to make Fráter a cardinal and obliged him by many benefices, he could not "call him away from his guilty character; therefore he found the destiny that he had searched with his deeds and that he deserved". HATVANI, 1858, 315; KISS, 2018, 222.

¹⁶ Point 1–2. On this: DOMOKOS – MÁTYUS, 2016; OBORNI, 2017b; OBORNI, 2017a, 89–109.

the former town crier of Buda, he thought that Fráter had claimed he would rather serve the Ottomans than the Roman king. He remarked that Isabella had answered Fráter that she would rather be among Christians no matter in how deep a poverty than under the rule of the Ottomans.¹⁷ Oláh expressed this concisely by saying that he understood that Fráter had not acted in good faith but in order to keep his position in governance forever by referring to the interests of the queen and the country.¹⁸

Fráter's commercial and judiciary activity also received negative feedback. According to Oláh, Fráter oppressed the people through public collections and via private blackmail and profiteering, and he also practiced these in various ways during jurisdiction.¹⁹ However, when Martinengo asked him to provide more detail, he answered that he had heard a lot about the damaged persons, although he could not recall them specifically, since this had been an open complaint against him. He also expressed this opinion in no uncertain terms: Fráter not only possessed more than anyone else, he possessed everything, and his income was higher than that of any other voivode.²⁰

In Oláh's view, Fráter's independence and obstinacy generated further problems, and he also opposed the will of Ferdinand I. Oláh also shared his own experience: once he heard in the royal council that Fráter did not write to the sultan and the pasha what he had been instructed to by the king, instead he wrote what he wanted.²¹ His continuous delays during the Ottoman attack of 1551 belong to these problems. Although Castaldo and András Báthory had asked for the Monk's help, according to Oláh, Fráter's delay was the reason why the Ottomans were able to cross the Danube and the Tisza so easily.²²

His regular contact with Istanbul and the Ottoman leaders of the Balkan territories and the Hungarian territories under Turkish rule, as well as welcoming envoys and chiausues was the cause of one of the most important problems with Fráter, i.e. the distrust towards him.²³ When Martinengo asked him

¹⁷ Point 1–2, in Péter Pálczán's testimony: Archivio Segreto Vaticano Misc. Arm. II, vol. 61. fol. 148r.

¹⁸ Point 7.

¹⁹ Point 3–4. The latest on Fráter's commercial and economic activity: OBORNI, 2017a, 258–264.

²⁰ Point 9–12.

²¹ Point 15–16.

²² Point 31–34.

²³ It is interesting that while Fráter's relationship with the Ottomans played a key role in the Habsburg court's distrust, in Istanbul it was his relationship with Ferdinand I that caused suspicion. In 1548, the following information was passed to the sultan from one of the henchmen of the beylerbey of Buda: "The envoys of Fráter frequently visit Ferdinand; they inform him [the monarch] about every step of the blessed Padishah. The Monk is building and strengthening a castle day and night. Along with Ferdinand, his envoy at-

about this, Oláh confirmed that this was the case; moreover, he stated that he had heard this from reliable people, and that the information was well-known throughout Transylvania. He also spoke about this connection with the Ottomans in other parts of his testimony, namely, he had heard that Fráter sent and welcomed envoys from the Ottoman Empire, and there was also a *chiaus* in his residence when he was murdered.²⁴ What is more, Oláh levelled even more grave accusations against the monk. Among others, when describing the depth of his relationship with the Ottomans, he brought up Fráter's relationship with Bey Uliman, and he stated that during the siege of Lipova (Lippa), Fráter also sent rifles to Uliman's escorts. He also heard that when Buda was handed over to the Ottomans in 1541, Fráter was detained in the camp, along with Bálint Török and other Hungarians, and he was freed through Bey Uliman's intervention; therefore they swore an oath of brotherhood to each other.²⁵ Finally, he did not describe Castaldo, the main executor of the murder, in such detail: he only noted that he knew him as a good Christian.²⁶

After all these, one must touch upon Oláh's sources on Fráter. At the beginning of the hearing, Martinengo asks him how long he had known Fráter, and he answers that he did not know him personally; however, he had often corresponded with him in the previous eight years, and he had never experienced injustice from him and did not hate Fráter.²⁷ Therefore, in Oláh's case we can exclude the possibility that he formed his impressions after a personal meeting.

Beyond their correspondence, there were three ways for him to gather information. On the one hand, he gained information during the meetings of the royal council. During these meetings he was included among those best-informed about the affairs of the country, and as such we have to consider both what was being said during the meetings and the various letters repeat-

tends the negotiations with Charles to inform the Monk immediately about any decisions that are made. I have heard that the Monk had all of his soldiers be on the alert with the intention that if the monarch and his brother, Charles launched a war, he could fly to their assistance. He did not hand the castle of Becse [Bečej] over to the blessed Padishah for the simple reason that if the monarch came with a massive army, he would also rise up and aid him. If the monarch did not come, presumable he would have to give it [the castle of Becse] over. DÁVID – FODOR, 1999, 197–202.

²⁴ Point 24.

²⁵ Point 71–72.

²⁶ Point 86. On Castaldo's activities: KROPF, 1895–1896; SZEKFÜ, 1914; RITOÓKNÉ SZALAY, 2012; ARDELEAN, 2017.

²⁷ It obviously contributed to the lack of a personal meeting that Miklós Oláh stayed in the Low Countries until 1539, and György Fráter had never been to Vienna, nor did he visit Ferdinand I personally. FAZEKAS, 2005, 42; OBORNI, 2017a, 62. Fráter was in correspondence not only with Oláh but also with their ancestor, Pál Várday. LACZLAVIK, 2014, 59.

edly mentioned by Oláh that could also be read by the future archbishop. On the other hand, he could have gained information on Fráter in the course of other conversations. In his statement he occasionally also indicates his sources more precisely: for instance, concerning the siege of Buda in 1541, he refers to the verbal communication of the burghers of Buda who were there in person.²⁸ Furthermore, together with many other witnesses, he often identifies common knowledge as his source.²⁹

Miklós Oláh was one of the most reliable people of the House of Habsburg in the Kingdom of Hungary. He was heard before being appointed archbishop of Esztergom; therefore, the Habsburg administration that assigned him witness likely was not afraid that his testimony would hurt Ferdinand I. This was further strengthened by the fact that Oláh had never met Fráter in person. As a result, during the hearing the bishop of Eger had to depend on information from the royal council, on the letters that he had read, and public rumours (*publica fama*). As a result, compared to other statements, Oláh's testimony does not provide new or important information concerning Fráter's life; however, it clearly shows what a prelate, the later archbishop of Esztergom thought of his predecessor, and how he had gained the information on the basis of which he formed his opinion, which is also likely to have represented the opinion of the pro-Habsburg Hungarian clergy.

VIKTOR KANÁSZ

²⁸ Point 1–2.

²⁹ E.g.: 1–2., 13–14., 22., 23., 37–39., 55. Cf.: Slíz, 2004.

APPENDIX

*Graz, 21 March, 1553.**The testimony of Miklós Oláh*(Archivio Segreto Vaticano Misc. Arm. II, vol. 61. fol. 105v–108v)³⁰

Actum die XXI. Martii 1553. in Gratz.

Reverendissimus Dominus Nicolaus Olahus episcopus Agriensis et cancellarius regiae maiestatis Hungaricus etc., interrogatus quamdiu noverit Fratrem Georgium respondit se eum de facie non nosse, sed ad se testem saepe scripsisse ab octo annis citra, neque iniuria unquam ab eo affectus, nec se eum odio prosequi.

Super p^o, 2^o articulo dixit: cum Ioannes vayvoda,³¹ postea rex, non satis firmus esset in regno, adhaesit Turcis consilio Fratris Georgii, praticamque [!] cum eis tenuit, et Ioanne rege mortuo, cum Buda³² obsideretur a Romanorum rege, et regina vidua presente et consentiente oratore regis Poloniae voluisset credere Buda[m] in favorem regis Romanorum, cumque hanc cessionem impediret Frater Georgius cum suis factiosus, praefata regina voluit una cum filio et aliquot puellis sola, relicta urbe et bonis suis omnibus, excedere, et se Romanorum regi³³ tanquam patri tradere, quod ipsum quoque a Fratre Georgio et suis impeditum fuit, idque dixit: se audivisse a pluribus civibus Budensibus, qui huic rei interfuerunt et publica alioqui fama, deinde accedente Turca ad Budam cum evocasset ad se reginam et filium cum Fratre Georgio, Petrovitk³⁴ et Valentinum Torock,³⁵ qui erant principales apud reginam praedictam, ipsisque ad Turcam, tanquam ad amicum exeuntibus, Turca separatim promiserat administrationem regni Hungariae, unicuique seorsum ab aliis, et capta hoc dolo Buda reginam misit in Transylvaniam et adiunxit illi Fratrem Georgium et Petrovitk, ut essent apud reginam in administratione Regni Transylvaniae, tanquam subditi et fideles Turcis. Interrogatus, an id impulsu Fratris Georgii factum fuerit, respondit: ego nescio, sed audivi, quod ipse frater dicebat se malle Turcis servire quam regi Romanorum, et quod regina dixit: quod in quavis paupertate mallet esse cum Christianis, quam subesse Turcarum imperio, idque fuit publicum et notorium.

Super 3^o, 4^o articulo dixit: omnia ista sunt clara et notoria subdens, quod non solum gravabat subditos cum exactionibus publicis, sed etiam in privatis extorsioni-

³⁰ The source has been transcribed with punctuation according to humanist Latin grammar. I did not indicate the resolution of the unambiguous abbreviations. I thank Péter Tumor and Attila Tuhári for their help with palaeographic questions.

³¹ John Szapolyai (I).

³² Buda (Ofen).

³³ Ferdinand I (Habsburg).

³⁴ Péter Petrovics.

³⁵ Bálint Török.

bus et mercantiis, quas exercebat multis modis, ac etiam in iudiciis. Interrogatus, [106r] an particulariter sciret, referre de istis gravaminibus respondit se multa audivisse a querelantibus, sed nunc specialiter eorum non recordari, dicens ista fuit querela publica contra ipsum.

Super 5^o articulo dixit: Petrus Petrovitk semper fovit reginam cumque vellent resistere libidini Fratris Georgii, quia omnia contra reginam agebat omnia sibi usurpans sub praetextu nominis reginae et filii, ut praevalerent iuribus Fratris Georgii, coacta fuit regina implorare auxilium Bassae Budensis, cui Frater Georgius restitit, ut permanere posset in gubernatione subdens ipse testis, quod iudicio suo si Turcae intrassent, totam illam provinciam in suam potestatem redegerent, licet praetenderent ferre auxilium reginae.

Super 6^o, 7^o articulo dixit: contenta in articulis esse vera. De protestatione autem de qua in articulo 7^o, dixit se nescire. Interrogatus de causa scientiae respondit: non novi animum illius Fratris, quia varius erat, sed intellexi ex eius litteris et nuntiis ad regiam maiestatem scriptis non animo, quod videretur fovere rebus regis, sed ut semper posset permanere in gubernatione praetendens utilitatem reginae et regni.

Super 8^o articulo dixit referendo se ad articulum superiorem.

Super 9^o, 10., 11., 12. articulo dixit: omnia ista sunt vera. Interrogatus de causa scientiae respondit: ego fui in tractatu cum regia maiestate. Interrogatus de quantitate salarii respondit, non solum plus, quam quisque alius habuit, sed totum habuit, et tempore suae administrationis regi, quod ipse sciret, nihil dedit subdens. Scio bene, quod illi nominatim maius salarium constitutum fuit, quam ceteris vayvodis, sed nunc non recordor.

Super 13., 14. articulo dixit: verum est. Interrogatus de causa scientiae respondit: tota Transylvania scit hoc et hoc notorium est, et audivi a fidedignis. [106v]

Super 15., 16. articulo dixit: primo illud recordor semel me audivisse, quod non ea scripsit principi Turcarum et Bassae, quae maiestas regia mandaverat, sed quae ipse voluit. Interrogatus de causa scientiae dixit: ego audivi in tractatu negotiorum regis, et in eodem tractatu intellexi, ut in articulo 16.

Super 17. articulo dicit: ita est, istud ego video ex copiis litterarum ipsius, quas ipsemet transmiserat huc ad nos, si recte memini.

Super 18. articulo dixit: ita est, quia novi hoc ex ipsa tractatione rerum.

Super 19. articulo dixit: ita est, quia litteras legi, audivi.

Super 20. articulo dixit: ita est, ut in articulo ponitur, et hoc audivi postea, quia scriptum est regi, et nobis ita factum fuisse, et hoc fuit apertum et notum in Transylvania. Interrogatus an certo sciat, cuius nomine tributum miserit, respondit: hoc certe arbitror, quod regiae maiestatis nomine non miserit, quia ego nunquam illo tempore a rege hoc audivi.

Super 21. articulo dixit: ita factum est.

Super 22. articulo dixit: hoc certum est. Interrogatus de causa scientiae respondit: vidi litteras publicas principis Turcarum et bassae ad status Transylvaniae et hoc fuit notorium.

Super 23. articulo dixit: ita fuit, quia copias earum litterarum vidi, quas puto esse autenticas et veras, et hoc fuit notorium, quia scripserat etiam ad regnicolas, ut parerent Fratri Georgio, quod reginae preceperit, ut in articulo nescio.

Super 24. articulo dixit: ita audivi, quod semper habuerit nuncios euntes et redeuntes a Turca, et etiam cum fuit interfectum, habuit chiaussium secum.

Super 25. articulo dixit: ego audivi a multis, et etiam ex copiis litterarum suarum vidi, si bene recordor, quod ipse ad principem Turcarum et bassae scripsit, quod ipsi non sint solliciti, quod Germani sint in provincia, quia bene inveniet modum eiciendi ipsos. Interrogatus de publica fama respondit se non aliter scire, quam dixit.

Super 26. articulo dixit: ita est, scio ex copiis litterarum, quas vidi et audivi, legi in tractatione regis, nescio tamen, a quo missae fuerint.

Super 27. articulo dixit: ita est, quia audivi, legi copias litteras in tractatione rerum apud regem. [107r]

Super 28. articulo dixit: ita fuit, quia ego in tractatione et conclusione huius negotii fui cum regia maiestate.

Super 29. articulo dixit: ita audivi et credo, quomodo alteros impediverit alter, non scio. Interrogatus de publica fama dixit se nescire.

Super 30. articulo dixit: recordor, quod huiusmodi saepe ad regiam maiestatem et me testem scripsit.

Sup 31., 32., 33., 34. articulo dixit: contenta in articulis vera esse dicens, omnes vocaverunt eum, ut subveniret, tam regia maiestas, quam Castaldus,³⁶ Bathori³⁷ et alii suae maiestatis capitanei, et interea Beglerbegus, dum Frater Georgius cunctatur, traiecit, ut in articulo ponitur. Interrogatus de causa scientiae respondit: scio, quod maiestas regia scripsit, et quia ipse Bathori scripsit ad me se admonuisse Fratrem, ut veniret, ut in articulis.

Super 35. articulo dixit: hoc ex litteris Bathori intellexit, quod ipse Bathori tanquam supremus capitaneus regni convocaverat omnes ad occurrendum Beglerbego ne penetrare posset in regnum, et Frater Georgius scribebat ad illos, qui ex comitatibus vocati fuerant, ne irent ad Bathori, sed potius ipsum audirent et expectarent provisionem a se. De publica fama dixit se nescire, sed ut supra, audivisse.

Super 36. articulo dixit: hoc idem audivi in aula ex fidedignis auctoribus, quorum nomina non memini. Interrogatus de publica fama respondit se nescire, quia tum secreto scriptum fuit.

Super 37., 38., 39. articulo dixit: haec vera sunt et publica atque notoria.

Super 40. articulo dixit: verum est, et etiam ille praefectus insuper respondit: Castaldo dominus meus fratrem Georgium significans dedit mihi informationem, et hoc intellexi ex litteris et veridicis hominibus, qui ab ipso praefecto se hoc audivisse dicebant.

Super 41. articulo dixit: nescio, cuius litteris fuit confirmatus Beglerbegus, hoc

³⁶ Marques Giovanni Battista Castaldo.

³⁷ András Báthory of Ecsed.

tamen intellexi, quod continuo litterae veniebant ad Fratrem Georgium a Beglerbego, et etiam et etiam chiausii, sive nuntii, et ipse Frater scribebat, et mittebat ad illum, bene verum est articulatas arces captas fuisse. Interrogatus de scientia respondit: istud constabat omnibus. [107v]

Super 42. articulo dixit: ita factum est, ut in articulo, et hoc intellexi a fidedignis auctoribus.

Super 43., 44., 45. dixit: contenta in articulis esse vera, sicut ipse intellexisset a fidedignis hominibus.

Super 46. articulo dixit: ita fuit, quia ipse Frater Georgius ex Transylvania voluit se movere, et hoc scio, quia ita fuit publice scriptum ad regiam maiestatem et ad me etiam.

Super 47., 48. articulo dixit: contenta in articulis esse vera, et hoc a domino Petheu³⁸, qui fuit ibi capitaneus, intellexi, cum narraret haec et regi et mihi, qui Petheu fuerat ibi in Lyppa³⁹ a Bathori relictus cum aliquot equitibus usque ad adventum hostium, ut postea illam desererent si forte, tam potentes essent, ut illis resistere non posset, postquam ipse Bathori, nec precibus, nec lachrimis continere potuit, milites quin dilaberentur.

Super 49., 50., 51. articulo dixit: hoc verum est, ita ex litteris huc missis per Castaldum et alios ex Transylvania intellexi ex fidedigna relatione intellexisse ita, ut in articulis ponitur factum fuisse.

Super 52., 53., 54. articulo dixit fuisse. Interrogatus de publica voce et fama respondit: hoc nescio.

Super 55. articulo: ita est publica fama.

Super 56. articulo dixit: nescio ipsius pra[c]ticas et cogitatus, sed hoc ita factum fuisse audivi ex litteris huc publice ad aulam scriptis.

Super 57. articulo dixit: verum est hoc, quod regia maiestas mandavit, ut in articulo ponitur.

Super 58. articulo dixit: ita fuit.

Super 59., 60. articulo dixit: ita certe audivi ab illis, qui fuerunt in exercitu regis, et cqui scripserunt.

Super 61. articulo dixit: nescio istam distinctionem, quomodo prius dedere se voluerint, neque an mutaverint sententiam, sed ut in articulo ponitur intellexi, ut stat in articulo 59.

Super 62., 63., 64., 65. Ita intellexi ex litteris eorum, qui ibi fuerunt, et qui postea etiam narrarunt. [108r]

Super 66. articulo dixit: hoc certum est, quod Frater Georgius non subministravit militibus regis victualia necessaria, cum tamen ipse posset, quia omnibus rebus praeerat, prout relatatum est huc ad nos. Quod autem victualia Turcis subministraverit, eodem modo sicut alia intellexi, sed quanta quoties, nescio.

³⁸ János Pethő.

³⁹ Lipova (Lippa).

Super 67. articulo dixit: ita audivi modo, quo supra.

Super 68. articulo dixit: ita audivi modo, quo supra.

Super 69. articulo dixit: ita audivi modo, quo supra.

Super 71., 72. articulo dixit se audivisse modo, quo supra, hoc addens Fratrem Georgium praeter pixides misisse etiam comites, qui comitarentur Ulyman begum, subdens ipse testis, ego audivi, quod cum Buda fuit tradita Turcis, Frater Georgius fuit retentus in castris cum Valentino Torock et aliis Hungaris, et opera ipsius Ulyman begi⁴⁰ fuit dimissus liber et relictus cum regina Isabella,⁴¹ et tunc ipsi ambo fraternitatem inter se iurarant.

Super 73., 74., 75., 76., 77., 78., 79. [articulo] dixit se ita audivisse intellexisse ex litteris et nuntiis modo, quo super, contenta in articulis omnia esse vera. Interrogatus de voce et fama respondit: existimo, quod ibi in Transylvania fuerit publica fama de his.

Super 80. articulo dixit: ita est, ego tunc ita audivi a rege.

Super 81. articulo dixit: ita audivi modo, quo supra.

Super 82., 83. articulo dixit: ita audivi, sicut alia super. Interrogatus de publica fama respondit: ego nescio, quomodo fuerit ibi, quia non fui in Transylvania, sed hic apud nos, qui scimus negotia, erat publicum de iis, qui ibi fuerunt. Ego nescio, tamen credo, quod boni omnes amantes rei publicae Christianae exceptis multis, qui sui servitores erant hoc de eo iudicaverunt, ut in articulo ponitur, sed nos omnes, qui conscii eramus illius pra[c]ticae et rerum a Fratre factarum, hoc de illo existimavimus, prout positum est. [108v]

Super 84., 85. articulo dixit: de sublatione illius e medio, vel de nece et morte nihil ego scivi, neque dicere possum, nam sum ecclesiasticus, neque in huiusmodi consiliis et factis me ingressi aut ingero, neque de hac morte scivi nisi post factum, sed procul dubio nisi his malis aliquibus bonis mediis obviam itum fuisset, vereor, ne magnum detrimentum respublica Christiana et Hungaria passa fuisset. Interrogatus an alio modo, quam caede potuisset his malis mederi, respondit: ego me non intromitto in hisce rebus, credo tamen, quod non sine tumultu potuisset capi, nec vocatus ad aulam venisset.

Super 86. articulo dixit: ego illum tantummodo novi in aula imperatoris et hic postea, et puto eum bonum et Christianum virum esse.

Super ultimo articulo dixit se referre ad ea, quae in precedentibus dixit.

⁴⁰ Bey Ulimán.

⁴¹ Isabella Jagiellon.

LITERATURE

- ARDELEAN, 2017: Florin-Nicolae ARDELEAN, *On the Foreign Mercenaries and Early Modern Military Innovations in East Central Europe. Castaldo's Army in Transsylvania and the Banat*, in: Györgyi BUJDOSÓNÉ PAP – Ingrid FEJÉR – Ágota H. SZILASI (eds.), *Mozgó frontvonalak. Háború és diplomácia a várháborúk időszakában. 1552–1568* [Moving frontlines. War and diplomacy during the warriors of the Hungarian frontier. 1552–1568], Eger, 2017, 117–128.
- BARTA, 1988: Gábor BARTA, *Vajon kié az ország?* [Who Posseses the Country?], Budapest, 1988.
- BESSENYEI, 2002: József BESSENYEI (ed.): *Lettere di principi. Fejedelmi levelek a pápának (1518–1578)* [Princely Letters to the Pope (1518–1578)], Rome – Budapest, 2002.
- DÁVID – FODOR, 1999: Géza DÁVID – Pál FODOR, *Oszmán hírszerzés Magyarországon* [Ottoman Intelligence in Hungary], in: Tivadar PETERCSÁK – Mátyás BERCZ (eds.): *Információáramlás a magyar és török végvári rendszerben* [Information flow in the Hungarian and Turkish frontier system], Eger, 1999, 197–202.
- DOMOKOS – MÁTYUS, 2016: György DOMOKOS – Norbert MÁTYUS, *Antonio Mazza és Buda ostromáról írott jelentése* [The Report on Antonio Mazza and the Siege of Buda], in: Lymbus, 2016, 37–75.
- DRASKÓCZY, 2018: István DRASKÓCZY, *A magyarországi kőszó bányászata és kereskedelme (1440–1530-as évek)* [The Mining and Trade of Hungarian Salt (1440–1530s)], Budapest, 2018.
- FAZEKAS, 2005: István FAZEKAS: *Oláh Miklós, Mária királyné titkára (1526–1539)* [Miklós Oláh, Secretary of Queen Mary (1526–1539)], in: Orsolya RÉTHELYI – Beatrix F. ROMHÁNYI – Enikő SPEKNER – András VÉGH (eds.): *Habsburg Mária, Mohács özvegye. A királyné és udvara 1521–1531* [Mary of Habsburg, the widow of Mohács. The Queen and her court between 1521–1531], Budapest, 2005, 37–43.
- FRAKNÓI, 1903: Vilmos FRAKNÓI, *Magyarország egyházi és politikai összeköttetései a római szentszékekkel, A mohácsi véstől Magyarországnak a török járom alól fölszabadításáig, 1526–1689* [The Church and Political Relations of Hungary with the Holy See in Rome], tom. 3., Budapest, 1903.
- GOETZ, 1965: Helmut GOETZ, *Nuntiatur des Girolamo Martinengo 1550–1554*, Tübingen, 1965.
- GOETZ, 1970: Helmut GOETZ, *Nuntiatur Delfinos, Legation Morones, Sendung Lippomanes (1554–1559)*, Tübingen, 1970.
- HATVANI, 1858: Mihály HATVANI (ed.), *Monumenta Hungariae Historica I. Diplomataria. 2.: Okmánytár, a Brüsseli Országos Levéltárból és a Burgundi Könyvtárból*, tom. 2., 1538–1553, Pest, 1858, 314–316.
- KANÁSZ, 2017: Viktor KANÁSZ, *Fráter György gyilkossági perének forrásai a vatikáni levéltárban* [The Sources of the Trial of György Fráter's Murder in the Vatican Secret Archives], in: Péter TUSOR – Kornél SZOVÁK – Tamás FEDELES (eds.), *Magyarország és a római Szentszék II. Vatikáni magyar kutatások a 21. században* [Hungary and the Holy See. Vol. II. Hungarian research in the 21st century in Vatican], Budapest – Rome, 2017, 173–185.
- KANÁSZ, 2018: Viktor KANÁSZ, *Fráter György meggyilkolásának ikonográfiai megjelenítése* [Iconographical Visualization of György Fráter's Murder], in: *Studia Theologica Transsylvaniensia*, 21/2 (2018), 141–164.

- KANÁSZ, 2019: Viktor KANÁSZ: *Girolamo Martinengo apát, pápai nuncius élete és magyarországi tevékenysége* [The life and work in Hungary of the nuncio and abbot Girolamo Martinengo], in: Áron TÖTÖS – Aranka K. MARKALY – Gábor KOLOH – Illés HORVÁTH (eds.), *Ezerarcú Erdély. Politika, társadalom, kultúra, Kolozsvár*, 2019, 92–106.
- KISS, 2018: Farkas Gábor KISS: *Istvánffy Miklós Oláh-panegyricusa [Miklós Istvánffy's Oláh-panegyricus]*, in: Pál ÁCS – Gergely TÓTH (eds.), „A magyar történet folytatója”. *Tanulmányok Istvánffy Miklósról [Continuer of Hungarian history. Studies on Miklós Istvánffy]*, Budapest, 2018, 207–224.
- KROPF, 1895–1896: Lajos KROPF, *Castaldo Erdélyben [Castaldo in Transylvania]*, in: *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények*, 8 (1895/1), 350–366, 509–521; 9 (1896/1), 53–72, 161–186, 299–325, 465–483.
- LACZLAVIK, 2014: György LACZLAVIK, *Kettős pecsét alatt. Várday Pál esztergomi érsek, királyi helytartó (1483–1549) [Under the dual sigil. Pál Várday, archbishop of Esztergom and governor-general (1483–1549)]*, Pécs – Budapest, 2014.
- NEMETH PAPO – PAPO, 2017, Gizella NEMETH PAPO – Adriano PAPO: *Frate Giorgio Martinuzzi. Cardinale, soldato e statista dalmata agli albori del Principato di Transilvania*, Aracne, 2017.
- OBORNI, 2017a: Teréz OBORNI, *Az ördögös Barát. Fráter György (1482–1551) [The obsessed monk. György Fráter (1482–1551)]*, Pécs – Budapest, 2017.
- OBORNI, 2017b: Teréz OBORNI, *Fráter György és Buda eleste [György Fráter and the surrender of Buda]*, in: *Tanulmányok Budapest múltjából*, XLII (2017), 39–60.
- PAPO, 2011: Adriano PAPO, *Giorgio Martinuzzi. Figura e ruolo politico di un monaco-statista dalmata nella storia ungherese del cinquecento*, Szombathely, 2011.
- PODHRADCZYK, 1855: József PODHRADCZYK, *Martinúzianák*, in: *Magyar Történelmi Tár*, 1/1 (1855), 235–266.
- RITOÓKNÉ SZALAY, 2012: Ágnes RITOÓKNÉ SZALAY, *Egy olasz emlékiró Castaldo erdélyi kíséretében [An Italian chronicler in the Transylvanian escort of Castaldo]*, in: *Kutak. Tanulmányok a XV–XVI. századi magyarországi művelődés köréből*. Budapest, 2012, 174–178.
- SLÍZ, 2004: Mariann SLÍZ, *A pletyka mint történeti forrás [Gossip as a historical source]*, in: László Z. KARVALICS – Károly KIS (eds.), *Információáramlás a kora újkorban [Information flow in the early modern]*, Budapest, 2004, 82–107.
- SZEKFÜ, 1914: Gyula SZEKFÜ, *Két historiographus Castaldo erdélyi seregében [Two historiographers in the Transylvanian army of Castaldo]*, in: *Századok*, 48/1 (1914), 17–33.
- SZUROMI, 2010: Szabolcs Anzelm SZUROMI, *A püspök erőszakos halála kánonjogi szempontból. Megjegyzések Fráter György halálához [The violent death of the bishop regarding canon law. Remarks on the Death of György Fráter]*, in: *Iustum aequum salutare*, 6/1 (2010), 119–124.
- TUSOR – NEMES, 2011: Péter TUSOR – Gábor NEMES (eds.), *Consistorialia Documenta Pontificia de Regnis Sacrae Coronae Hungariae (1426–1605)*, Budapest – Rome, 2011.
- UTJEŠINOVIĆ, 1881: Ognjeslav UTJEŠINOVIĆ, *Lebensgeschichte Des Cardinals Georg Utiešenović Genannt Martinusius: Mit Dessen Bildniss, Familien-Wappen Und Einer Skizze Der Ruinen Seines Ahnenschlosses*, Wien, 1881.