

DZSENER EMÍLIA BAKOS

University of Szeged

On Two Annals of the Long Turkish War¹

The Long Turkish War proved to be the most devastating warfare in the until-then history of Hungary. Its history has been dealt with by numerous contemporary writers of Hungarian Neolatin historiography; however, the majority of their works do not have any critical edition or modern Hungarian translation. The present study focuses on two such texts. After presenting an outline of the war and the contemporary Neolatin historiography, first I will discuss some characteristics that the two texts have in common, such as the fact that the copies we have are truncated and deal with the year 1597. In the third part, I will emphasise the differences between the two texts, for example, the intentions of the authors, and the fact that in one text, the ruling dynasty is heavily criticised (with carefully chosen words) for their inefficiency against the Ottomans, while in the other, they are hardly mentioned (although this text is heavily truncated).

Keywords: János Joó, 16th-century, Neolatin historiography, manuscript, Fifteen Years' War, Pápa

The Long Turkish War, also referred to as the Fifteen Years' War (1591–1606), was the most destructive war in Hungary's history up to that time.² A number of the consequences of the era in question (for example, the change in the country's ethnic relations) have persisted to the present day. Consequently, the examination of sources pertaining to this

¹ Supported by the ÚNKP-23-3 New National Excellence Program of the Ministry for Culture and Innovation from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund.

² Some reviews: TÓTH (2000); BAGI (2000: 527–547); BAGI (2015: 79–95).

period is of paramount importance.³ In this study, I first provide a concise overview of the war and the salient elements of contemporary Latin historiography related to it. Thereafter, I deal with two Latin texts that have been neglected by research so far.

Following the defeat suffered by the Ottoman Empire at Mohács in 1526, Hungary⁴ became part of two empires: its northern and western regions, that is, the remaining parts of the Hungarian-Croatian Kingdom, joined a newly formed composite state, the Habsburg Monarchy. Meanwhile, its central part was annexed by the Ottoman Empire, and the eastern region – known as the Principality of Transylvania from the 1570s – became a tributary vassal state of the latter Empire. The Fifteen Years' War was an ongoing conflict between the Habsburg Monarchy and the Ottoman Empire, fought on the territories of both powers. At times, the Principality of Transylvania and Moldavia entered a state of alliance with the Habsburg Monarchy, which received support from the Holy Roman Empire, the Court of Madrid, and the Papal States. The most significant and the most memorable military encounter of the war was the battle fought at Keresztes in October 1596, which ultimately led to the dissolution of the Christian forces. The war was finally concluded in 1606 with the Peace of Zsitvatorok.

The war and the Ottoman threat prompted significant reflection in Latin, both within Hungary and abroad. A notable example from the former is Miklós Istvánffi's⁵ monumental history,⁶ which provides an overview of events in Hungary between 1490 and 1607. To date, no critical edition of this work has been published, nor does a modern translation

³ For an example, see: LOVAS (2021: 143–157).

⁴ PÁLFFY (2022).

⁵ On the life of Miklós Istvánffi (1538–1615), the humanist historian, see: NAGY (2018: 103–123).

⁶ The first edition: ISTHVANFFIUS (1622).

exist.⁷ Among the surviving items from Istvánffy's library of books and manuscripts is the collection entitled *Apparatus Historicus*,⁸ now preserved in the National Széchényi Library. The first volume of this collection contains the historical notes of János Joó, of which the account dealing with the military events of 1597 constitutes the first subject of the present study.

Little is known about the life of János Joó;⁹ the precise dates of his birth and death remain unknown. His father, Balázs Joó, served as legal director of the Treasury. His administrative career earned the family a noble title, which enabled János Joó to enter the aristocratic circle. From 1587 onwards, he was a member of the Supreme Court,¹⁰ i.e. he was also one of the grand judges of the kingdom. His diplomatic activities included participation in the 1594 Regensburg Imperial Diet, involvement as one of the preparers of the Treaty of Prague,¹¹ and membership in Rudolf's Polish embassy in 1596. In 1603, following a complaint lodged by another aristocrat, István Illésházy, he was arrested on charges of *lèse-majesté* and could only escape the death penalty by surrendering his entire estate. Although he was later acquitted, he died while in the process of recovering his property during the reign of Matthias II. Joó recorded notes on the events of the Long War. The first volume of the aforementioned Istvánffy-colligatum preserves six such texts, which cover the period between 1593 and 1597.¹² It should be noted that this

⁷ Hungarian translations of the *Historia*: ISTVÁNFY (1867); ISTVÁNFY (1962).; BENITS (2001–2009).

⁸ OSzK Fol. Lat. 3606.

⁹ János Joó (*? – † before February 1610) chief justice from 1587, on his life, see: NAGY (2009: 471–514); his notes: NAGY (2004: 151–170).

¹⁰ He was one of the grand judges of the country and head of the lower house of parliament.

¹¹ On 28 January 1595, the contract was signed, whereby Rudolf II and Zsigmond Báthory formed a military-political alliance against the Ottoman Empire. TÓTH (2008: 165–166).

¹² Each year has its own text, with the exception of 1594, which has two accounts: one discussing the recapture of Nógrád, and the other focusing on the sieges of Esztergom and Győr.

volume also originally contained an account for the year 1598; however, this section has been torn out.¹³ An other text in the second volume of the collection is also presumed to be by János Joó; it deals with the events of 1605. No critical edition exists for most of these manuscript notes,¹⁴ and, naturally, no translation has been produced for any of them.

Given that the financial burden of defending Hungary was primarily borne by the Holy Roman Empire, and the protection of the kingdom also ensured the security of the German territories against the Ottoman threat, it is unsurprising that the war aroused considerable interest within the Empire. An illustrative example of this is the collection of texts published by Nicolaus Reusner in Frankfurt in 1603,¹⁵ which comprises fifteen accounts covering the various years of the war, some of which are attributed to unknown authors.

Another focus of the present study is an unknown manuscript¹⁶ preserved in the Cathedral Library of Esztergom, which also belongs to the previously unexamined Latin narrative sources¹⁷ of the Long War. According to the brief note on the cover,¹⁸ this text concerns the events of 1597 in Pápa. The memory of the year 1597 is of particular significance, on the one hand, because it follows the aforementioned Battle of Keresztes (October 1596), and on the other hand due to the recapture of Tata and Pápa by Christian forces. Since the subject of my doctoral research is the life and

¹³ NAGY (2009: 486).

¹⁴ The sole exception is the note on the recapture of Nógrád in 1594, published by: NAGY (2009: 497–509).

¹⁵ REUSNER (1603).

¹⁶ B.E.M.S. Cat. X. Manuscripta historica, Tit. III. Manuscripta praelo iam expressa, g.

¹⁷ At least the ones who do not mention: KRUPPA (2021: 91–107); NAGY-L. (2021: 67–91); PÁLFFY (1997: 7–81); PÁLFFY (2022).

¹⁸ „E* paragraphus 3. 4. 5. 6. & 7^{mus} /: etsi is mancus sit /: authoris incerti de anno 1597. – Expugnationem arcis Papae adumbrantes. – Ex quo authore desumptum sit, non liquet, neque comportandi tempus aderat – Caeterum authoris cuius opus hoc typis excusum sit, vix dubium est.”.

notes of János Joó – including the text dealing with the year 1597¹⁹ – the comparison and examination of these two sources is therefore natural.

In consideration of the partial overlap in the subject matter of these two sources, it is advisable to begin a detailed presentation of both by examining their shared characteristics. Both sources are written entirely in latin and are truncated. Joó's note preserves the beginning, and its title is known, but the ending is missing. However, the remnants of pages at the end of the volume suggest that an additional eight pages may originally have belonged to this note.²⁰ As for the other, anonymous text, both its beginning and end are missing; it begins at section III and concludes in the midst of section VII. The precise number of missing pages at the end remains unknown. The original title of the work is also uncertain, as the title appearing on the manuscript's cover must have been assigned at a later date.²¹ While this provides limited information regarding the exact content, a six-line note beneath the title indicates that it deals with the recapture of the stronghold of Pápa in 1597. On this basis, it is plausible that the subject of the two texts is the same.

Corrections can be seen in both manuscripts. In Joó's account, they appear in two ways: at times, a necessary word that had been omitted from the sentence is inserted above the line.²² Several instances can also be observed in which the first syllable of a word is separated from the

¹⁹ OSzK Fol. Lat. 3606/I. ff. 73r–84v. *Res gestae anni millesimi quingentesimi nonagesimi septimi*.

²⁰ The last intact page of the colligate is 84v; the following pages initially show the same hand, then on 88v the text ends at three-quarters of the page, and on 89r a different hand appears.

²¹ „Fragmentum historicum de rebus Mohacsianam”. The first line of the text (“Durus hic annus, et post cladem Mohácsianam ...” 484) indicates that the title is an expression taken from here.

²² „...ut vel assignatam sibi ditionem ita tueri et defendere posset, [quin] ad praesens usque tempus singulis ferme armis aliquid de ipso regno, seu fraude dolone seu aper-to marte hostis Thurca ac vicini principes non adimerent, avellerentque.” (OSzK Fol. Lat. 3606/I. ff. 73r).

rest, as if it were a preposition or another word. Some of these were later contracted.²³ The unknown manuscript exhibits corrections,²⁴ deletions,²⁵ and, in one instance, traces of shading.²⁶ Despite these amendments, both texts remain fully legible. It is known that Joó's account is a copy, and presumably so is the *Fragmentum historicum*.... I shall return to the evidence for this below in the context of the intelligibility of the texts. The autograph manuscripts, as well as the identities of the copyists, remain unknown.

Having outlined the similarities, we now turn to the differences. The first and most evident distinction is that the author of one text is known (János Joó), while the authorship and origin of the other is unknown. The person who inscribed the note on the cover was unaware of the original author, and the date of compilation is also unknown. According to this note, the text had been printed, although I have not yet been able to identify the publication.²⁷

The outer margins of the Esztergom-manuscript are notably wide, whereas in Joó's text, the inner margin on the recto pages is confined, and the outer margin on the verso pages are broad. Joó's text comprises

²³ In the case of „Thurcae tamen impavidi nihil minus faciunt, ...” (OSzK Fol. Lat. 3606/I. ff. 79r) “impavidi” originally stood separately as “im pavidii”.

²⁴ An example can be seen right on the first page: „Tunc demum advertere coeperunt vicini Austrii Styriique, quantum finibus suis detractum sit securitatis”. (484) The word “quantum” was originally written as “quantam” before correction.

²⁵ An example: „Cum vero in itinere, non procul Papa abesset”. (491) The manuscript originally read “Papam” with the “m” subsequently crossed out. It also occurs that a whole line is crossed out: „Cuius nec opinato casu, nostri irritati potius ~~usque ad oppidi portas, cedenda et contrucidando insequuntur~~ quam animis fracti, cohortante Nadasdio, Gallos fortiter retundunt, et usque ad oppidi portas, cedendo et contrucidando insequuntur; multos praeterea eorum sauciatos capiunt.” (492).

²⁶ „tormentorum ictibus eum in modum procubisset, ut aditus ad adsultum sufficere posse videretur”. (485) Most of “tormentorum” was written with a darker ink; faint traces underneath suggest it may have originally been another word.

²⁷ According to the catalog of the Cathedral Library of Esztergom, the manuscript was classified among historical manuscripts, among already printed sources: BEKE (1991: 119–120). All texts in this category could be identified except the *Fragmentum historicum*....

twenty-four pages (73r–84v) and is not divided into sections or paragraphs. The Esztergom-text is considerably shorter, spanning ten and a quarter page; it is not divided into paragraphs, but it is organized into sections averaging two and a half pages in length.²⁸ A marginal note in the *Fragmentum historicum...* refers to a passage in the first edition of Miklós Istvánffy's history.²⁹ This provides a *terminus post quem* for the copy, which can therefore be dated to 1622. In the case of the Joó-text, I have not managed to determine this yet. Although it cannot be claimed based on a single word, the marginal note in the *Fragmentum* appears to be in the same hand as the main text, suggesting that a single scribe executed the entire copy. By contrast, Joó's manuscript shows evidence of two hands: one from 73r–76v, and the other starting from 77r.³⁰

Furthermore, a divergence in content is observable between the texts. János Joó commences his account of 1597 with a strong opening, criticising the dynasty for several pages. Among other points, he complains that Hungary is the sole country that ruled by foreigners who are unacquainted with the customs and laws of the country. Thereafter, he transitions to describe the events that transpired during the year: he outlines the aims of the year and reports the appointment of Archduke Maximilian III as general. The author describes the events surrounding the siege of Tata in May, subsequently addressing the occurrences in Pápa (78r–80r), where the content of the two texts temporarily aligns. The extant version of the *Fragmentum historicum...* makes no mention of the spring events; following a brief introduction, it moves directly to the events in Pápa, thus sug-

²⁸ Based on this, the first and second paragraphs may have spanned approximately five pages.

²⁹ „Istvanffy XXX p. 708 seq.” An asterisk appears at the beginning of the marginal note, with no corresponding mark in the main text.

³⁰ This is not an unusual phenomenon; Joó's other notes also feature alternating hands within a manuscript. In the OSzK Fol. Lat. 3606/I. ff. 19r–44r. *Historia earum rerum, quae in oppugnatione Strigoniensi et expugnatione Iauriensi Anno Domini 1594 actae sunt.*, at least two different hands can be distinguished (19r–26v and 27r–44r).

gesting that the two initial sections that are absent may have addressed other matters. The author describes the court-martial at Óvár, followed by a concise description of the castle itself, and then narrates the siege: the Ottomans ultimately surrendered the castle in exchange for guaranteed safe passage. However, as the author notes, the Italians brutally killed three hundred of the Turks as they left the castle. Although the text, according to the note on cover, ostensibly concerns only the events of 1597 in Pápa, it extends beyond that year. In the opening sentence of the fifth section, the author alludes to the continuation of events: *'This turn of Pápa, although it was favourable for Christian affairs, had been the beginning of another more harmful one, which was caused by the betrayal of the Gauls and Walloons two years later'*.³¹ He then goes on to describe the rebellion of the mercenaries from Pápa in the summer of 1600 (489–494), whose dissatisfaction, according to the author, stemmed from a lack of pay and provisions.³² From the final lines, we learn that the suppression of the rebels was led by Ferenc Nádasdy,³³ followed by Melchior von Redern,³⁴ who died soon afterwards. We can therefore infer the terminus post quem of the text itself, which may therefore be placed in the autumn of 1600. In accordance with this, the text can be divided into two parts, with the shared content of both texts consisting of the events in Pápa.

In Joó's note, following the account of the events in Pápa, the manuscript also documents the occurrences of the autumn, including the unsuccessful siege of Győr, the capture of Tata by the Ottomans, and the events in Vác. The intact part of the manuscript ends while describing the latter. The last-mentioned event can be dated to the beginning of November, when the castle eventually fell into Turkish hands. No

³¹ „Papae haec conversio, tametsi rebus Christianis opportuna accidit; tamen praelusit calamitosiori alteri, quam Gallorum, Vallonumque perfidia, biennio post, procuravit.” (489).

³² On the rebellion of the mercenaries: TÓTH (2000: 309–312).

³³ Ferenc Nádasdy (1555–1604), general, known as the “Black Bey”.

³⁴ Melchior von Redern (1555–20 September 1600).

significant military events took place in this year after that; the Ottoman troops withdrew home in the late autumn.

The only shared content element of the two texts is thus the recapture of the castle of Pápa in 1597, which is narrated to the same extent in both. The comparison, however, reveals that, aside from this common subject, the texts do not show close identity. It is evident that there are common elements observable in a number of passages, although it is possible that this is simply a reflection of the fact that they recount the same events. Behold an example:

Res gestae...	Fragmentum historicum ...
'Capta vero Papa archidux cum exercitu septem adhuc dies illic mansit, ac purgatis fossis, et nonnullis aliis quae collapsa fuerant reparatis, pro praesidis Barone Hofkircherum ³⁵ et Michaelem Marotii ³⁶ cum certa militum Germanorum et Ungarorum manu ibi reliquit, sicque postea continuato itinere ultima die mensis Augusti in Altenburgensem insulam, in qua initio castra metatus fuerat rediit, ...' (80r)	'Maximilianus, mille <i>Germanis et Hungaris</i> in praesidio relictis, arcem <i>Andreae Hoffkirschio</i> tuendam reparandamque commisit, ... <i>in oppido vero commendante Francisco Nadasdio, Michael Marothius</i> , equitum suorum praefectus Hungaris <i>praeesse</i> iussus est, quibus rebus ad eum modum a duce instructis militi, quatuor dies, ad requietem dati sunt, postea (489) vero exercitus, in nupera ad <i>Ovarum</i> castra, incolumis reductus est.'

Beyond the content itself, a difference in authorial intention is also discernible. János Joó's critique³⁷ of the Austrian government in Hungary,

³⁵ Georg Andreas von Hofkirchen (1562–1623).

³⁶ Mihály Maróthy (?– † before May 18, 1601), captain-general of Pápa from 1598 until 1601.

³⁷ Some examples: „Sola Ungaria est, quae ab externis et peregrinis legumque et consuetudinum Ungariae minus peritis viris gubernatur et cum maxima Rei Publicae iniuria peregrinis et alienis legibus regitur.” (OSzK Fol. Lat. 3606/I. ff. 74r); „quae eo illos induxit ut neglectis Ungarorum consiliis exterorum hominum iudicia ac consilia

which extends over several pages, provides a vivid impression of the prevailing mood in the year following the defeat at Keresztes.³⁸ In the *Fragmentum historicum...*, no indication of the author's intent is given, nor is it possible to determine for whom or for what purpose it might have been composed. In the case of Joó, the task is facilitated by the existence of five additional extant texts. In these, the author interprets some terms on multiple occasions, a practice that would have been superfluous had he intended the texts solely for a domestic audience.³⁹

The last point of comparison concerns the comprehensibility of the texts. In Joó's notes, copying errors are infrequent, and are confined to the omission of a single letter, or to words written separately that should be joined.⁴⁰ Despite these errors, the text remains fully intelligible; they do not impede the reader's interpretation.

In contrast, the *Fragmentum historicum...* is replete with errors, eighty-four in total, averaging eight or nine per page, ranging from misspellings to unintelligible corruptions. Among the cases that can be readily solved is 'Ea tamen re factum fuisse, credidere multi, in primis disciplinae militaris tenaces ac veterarii milites...' (487). The copyist resolved the syllable *-ri* incorrectly, as *veterani* should be here. A more problematic case is 'Franciscus postea Nadasdius, atque Colonicusius, cum suis aliis et nobilitatis

sequerentur et semper plus in horum peregrina administratione quam in illorum patria experta usu firmata ac iam olim multorum Regum regimine approbata gubernatione positum esse arbitrarentur." (OSzK Fol. Lat. 3606/I. ff. 73v).

³⁸ Military leaders are also criticised in Joó's texts. On Hardegg Ferdinand, the captain-general of Győr, Joó makes the following note: „improvidus et ad segnitiem potius ac mollitiem, quam ad laborem et virtutem natus fuerat" (OSzK Fol. Lat. 3606/I. ff. 3r); regarding Hardegg in the following year: „Comes autem Hardekus, ... ebriosus, avarusque erat, ac exiguo iudicio pollebat, negligenter omnia agebat, nec an recte res circa militiam agerentur curabat." (OSzK Fol. Lat. 3606/I. ff. 20r).

³⁹ Some examples: „...Beghi quem nos praefectum dicere possumus..." (OSzK Fol. Lat. 3606/I. ff. 4r) vagy a „milites etiam, quos Nazadistas vocant; ..." (OSzK Fol. Lat. 3606/I. ff. 19v).

⁴⁰ In the case of „Thurcae tamen impavidi nihil minus faciunt, ..." (OSzK Fol. Lat. 3606/I. ff. 79r) "impavidi" originally stood separately as "im pavidi".

copiis accesse, qui obsidionem et consilio iuvarent et ope: ...' (492), in which the main clause lacks a predicate, and the form *accesse* is uninterpretable. The subordinating predicate (*iuvarent*) introduced by *qui* provides a clue: according to the *consecutio temporum*, the predicate of the main clause should be *accesserent*. It appears that the second half of the word was omitted during copying, likely due to an unresolved abbreviation.

There is only one passage that is not merely uninterpretable, but it is also not written in Latin: '*parum ducerent nisi foedissima quaeque loca, et quorum vel in sermone mentionem aucesamum pertentarent*' (486). The original meaning of the word *aucesamum* remains unclear. Notwithstanding these errors, the text remains intelligible throughout. Given the quantity and nature of the errors, it is evident that this text is a copy.

The two sources are therefore found to differ in a number of aspects. Their only point of connection is the account of the recapture of the castle of Pápa in 1597, yet, apart from this common object, these parts do not show a close match either. The situation regarding the missing parts remains unknown: the end of Joó's note is missing, the original extent of the *Fragmentum historicum...* is indeterminate, and the date of its composition cannot be defined. However, given the yearbook-like structure of Joó's writings, it is conceivable that he recorded events of the intervening years, including the year of 1600. In order to determine whether János Joó could have been the author of the *Fragmentum historicum...*, it will be necessary to undertake a comprehensive grammatical analysis of all extant texts by János Joó.

Despite the unknown text shows no clear congeniality with Joó's note, its sole marginal note refers to Isthvánffi's work, thereby making it evident that his history must be taken into consideration. A comparison of the corresponding sections of the two texts reveals that, in most instances the two texts align almost verbatim, with differing words often being mere synonyms. Here is an example (the deviations are marked in italics hereafter):

Historiae	Fragmentum historicum...
'Sed oppidum fossa plena profundioribus aquis, ac duplici vallo circumdatum, <i>munitumque</i> erat, et <i>ideo</i> difficiliorem habebat oppugnationem.' (708) ⁴¹	'Sed oppidum, fossa, profundioribus aquis plena, ac praeter aggeres validos, duplici vallo circumdatum, <i>communitumque</i> , difficiliorem habebat oppugnationem.' (485)
' <i>Supra haec</i> captivos Turcas, solutis <i>ergastulis</i> , et adapertis carceribus, liberos abire iusserunt; <i>scriptisque ad Albanos</i> Turcas literis, <i>se eis urbem arcemque tradituros significarunt</i> , siquae emeruerant stipendia, sibi <i>solverentur</i> .' (751)	' <i>Igitur</i> captivos Turcas, <i>vinculis</i> solutis, et adapertis carceribus, liberos abire iusserunt, <i>et datis ad Albae Regalis praesidiarios</i> Turcas litteris urbem <i>ipsis</i> arcemque tradituros, <i>nuntiarant</i> , si quae <i>apud Romanorum Imperatorem</i> emeruerant stipendia, sibi repraesentato arce Turcico, dissolverentur .' (490)

Furthermore, there are also some passages that are barely verbatim. Here is an example of this: (the identical parts are underlined):

Historiae	Fragmentum historicum...
' <u>Postero die</u> , quo memoria Divi Stephani primi regis Ungariae colitur, concessa est edicto principis militibus cuius nationis oppugnandi oppidi facultas, non tamen ex aequo, sed <u>distinctis ordinibus</u> ita ut Germani et Vallones uno eodemque, agmine, Galli atque Itali, altero moenia invaderent, tertia pugna ab Ungaris iniretur.' (708)	' <u>Postero die</u> , qui memoriae S. Stephani erat sacer, errore animadverso, quod nationum delectus ille, intempestive fuisset habitus, universim omnibus, qui in castris fuerant, gentibus facultas ad adsiliendum promulgatur, ea tamen lege, ut totus oppugnationis labor, <u>distinctis</u> ac iustis <u>ordinibus</u> , auspiciato susciperetur, atque adeo agmen primum Germanorum et Vallonum, alterum Gallorum atque Itolorum, tertium denique Hungarorum esset.' (486)

⁴¹ The punctuation of quoted passages in this study is based on the 1622 edition.

It can be asserted that, although the *Fragmentum* occasionally utilises more verbose phrasing, it does not offer a greater quantity of information than Isthvánffi, and in certain instances, it even provides a lesser amount.⁴² Given this level of textual similarity, the question arises as to which one was written first. It is plausible that Isthvánffi used the unknown text and in some cases augmented it. Conversely, it is also possible that the unknown author excerpted from the *Historiae*. Moreover, it cannot be excluded that both drew upon a third source. However, as the original form of the *Fragmentum historicum...* is unknown, the extant evidence does not allow for a definitive determination of the relationship between the two texts.

In summary, an analysis of the two sources – the Joó-account and the *Fragmentum historicum...* – demonstrates that, while both partly recount the events of the same year, they differ in several aspects. It is noteworthy that both of these texts feature introductory sections that do not pertain to the year 1597: in the case of Joó's account, this is his critique of the House of Austria; and the introduction of the *Fragmentum* is absent, but it is certain that the text did not commence with the events of 1597. A closer relationship between the two manuscripts might be determined, but this would necessitate a comprehensive grammatical analysis. The *Fragmentum* shows a close textual connection with Isthvánffi's work, while its relationship to Joó's note remains uncertain. One point, however, is clear: in some way both can be linked with Miklós Isthvánffi.

⁴² Examples: In the description of Pápa's surroundings, both texts mention a certain "Tüzes-kapu", (for Pápa's city and its gates, see: MITHAY [1984: 319–332]). In Isthvánffy's work, this appears as "ignea porta", a gate that opens toward Sümeg and Lake Balaton (ISTHVANFFIUS [1622: 708]). Within the *Fragmentum historicum...* (485) the *Tózes kapu* is identified as the gateway to Veszprém. Furthermore, Isthvánffy provides figures with greater frequency than the anonymous author. For instance, the *Historiae* documents the arrival of six hundred carts loaded with bread and other provisions at the Pápa camp, and it also records that in June 1600, the castle was guarded by a thousand men (ISTHVANFFIUS [1622: 708–709 and 751]).

Bibliography

- BAGI 2000 BAGI Z. P.: *Előzmények. A hadseregellátás problémája a tizenöt éves háborúban.*, In: Történelmi szemle 62(4) 2000, 527–547.
- BAGI 2015 BAGI Z. P.: *Az időjárás, mint a tizenöt éves háború hadműveleteit befolyásoló tényező.* In: Végvár és mentalitás a kora újkori Európában, (szerk.): Berecz Mátyás, Bujdosóné Pap Györgyi, Petercsák Tivadar. Eger 2015, 79–95.
- BEKE 1991 BEKE M.: *Az Esztergomi Főszékesegyházi Könyvtár Batthyány-gyűjteményének katalógusa.* Budapest 1991, 119–120.
- BENITS 2001–2009 BENITS P. (szerk.): *Istvánffy Miklós magyarok dolgairól írt históriája Tállyai Pál XVII. századi fordításában, 1–3.* Történelmi források, Budapest 2001–2009.
- ISTHVANFFIUS 1622 N. ISTHVANFFIUS: *Historiarum de rebus Ungaricis libri XXXIV.* Coloniae Agrippinae 1622.
- ISTVÁNFFY 1867 ISTVÁNFFY M.: *Magyarország története 1490–1606;* ford. Vidovich György, Debrecen 1867.
- ISTVÁNFFY 1962 ISTVÁNFFY M.: *A magyarok történetéből; [ford. Juhász László], [vál., bev., jegyz. Székely György], Monumenta Hungarica,* Budapest 1962.
- KRUPPA 2021 KRUPPA T.: *Pápa és Pápaság. Gianfrancesco Aldobrandini generális és katonái a város alatt 1597-ben,* In: Európa elfeledett hadszíntere, A tizenöt éves háború és Magyarország (1591–1606), (szerk.): Kanász Viktor, Nagy-L. István, Budapest 2021, 91–107.
- LOVAS 2021 Lovas B.: *Panicus terror: A mezőkeresztesi csata korabeli forrásokban,* In: Textológia és interpretáció a régi magyar irodalomban, (szerkesztette): Kiss Farkas Gábor; Pesti Brigitta; Hajdu Ildikó, Budapest 2021, 143–157.
- MITHAY 1984 MITHAY S.: *Adalékok Pápa város építéstörténetéhez egykori ábrázolások alapján,* In: A Veszprém megyei múzeumok közleményei 17. 1984, 319–332.
- NAGY 2004 NAGY G.: *A váci püspök esete a személynökkel meg a nádori helytartóval (Adalék a hosszú háború korának történetírásához),* In: Lendvai L. Ferenc; Horváth Zita; Ádám Anetta; Hell Judit; Bessenyei József (szerk.) *Septuagesimo anno humanissime peracto: Tanulmányok Kulcsár Péter 70. születésnapjára,* Miskolc 2004, 151–170.
- NAGY 2009 NAGY G.: *„...nem vagyok én sem Istvánffi, sem mágnás...”. Források a kortörténet-író Joó János életéhez és korához,* In: Fons: Forráskutatás és történelmi segédtudományok 16(4) 2009, 471–514.
- NAGY 2018 NAGY G.: *„...non memoris disrumpe silentia lethas, in quibus Hungariae facta sepulta iacent.”: A Balásfi-életrajzról” in “A magyar törté-*

- net folytatója.” Tanulmányok Istvánffy Miklósról, szerkesztette: Ács Pál, Tóth Gergely. Magyar Történelmi Emlékek. Értekezések – Monumenta Hungariae Historica. Budapest 2018, 103–123.*
- NAGY-L. 2021 NAGY-L. I.: *A pápai vár a kutatási eredmények tükrében”, in: Európa elfeledett hadszíntere, A tizenöt éves háború és Magyarország (1591–1606), (szerk.): Kanász Viktor, Nagy-L. István, Budapest 2021, 67–91.*
- PÁLFFY 1997 PÁLFFY G.: *Pápa a hosszú török háborúban*, In: *A pápai vár felszabadításának négy száz évvel ezelőtti emlékezete, 1597–1997, szerkesztette: Hermann István, Pápa 1997, 7–81.*
- PÁLFFY 2022 PÁLFFY G.: *A Magyar Királyság és a Habsburg Monarchia a 16. században*. Budapest 2022.
- REUSNER 1603 REUSNER N.: *Rerum memorabilium in Pannonia ...*, Frankfurt 1603.
- TÓTH 2000 TÓTH S. L.: *A mezőkeresztesi csata és a tizenöt éves háború*. Szeged 2000.