

Máté János Bibor

University in Budapest, Hungary. Faculty of Humanities

e-mail: bibor.mate@btk.elte.hu

ORCID: 0000-0002-1062-3813

L

Lestár Gyulaffi's Manuscripts and the Fragmentation of a Magnum Opus*

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/FT.2021.001>



The text is available under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0).

Received: 5 V 2021

Accepted: 9 VIII 2021

Ph.D. Máté Bibor is a librarian and literary historian who obtained his M.A. in library and information science at the Eötvös Loránd University (further: ELU) in 2001. He received his Ph.D. in literary history at the same university in 2011. Between 2003 and 2014, he worked at the ELU University Library (further: ELU UB) as a specialist in old books. Since 2004, he has been teaching courses at the Faculty of Humanities of ELU, where in 2014 he became a full-time teaching assistant at the Institute of Library and Information Science, Department of Library Science. His fields of expertise are the medieval and early modern history of books, libraries, and typography, the history and incunabula of Zirc Abbey Library, and the life and records of Lestár Gyulaffi, a 16th-century Transylvanian memoirist.

K

Keywords: 16th century; humanists; Lestár Gyulaffi; István Szamosközy; Transylvanian Principality; diplomacy; records/notes; manuscripts; letters; text edition; historiography

A

Abstract: Lestár Gyulaffi (1556–1606?) was a secretary of the Greater Chancery of the Transylvanian Principality. Today, he is best-known as a writer of historical notes and commentaries. These records are considered an excellent source and, therefore, used by scholars researching the 16th century. As the texts have not been recently published, researchers usually use the 19th-century text editions. However, looking at the original documents preserved at the ELTE University Library in Budapest, one realizes that Gyulaffi's writings do not form a compact work, the 19th-century edition is largely a constructed text. In this paper, I will present what additional information can be obtained from the examination of the manuscripts.

Introduction

Looking at the 19th-century edition of the writings of Lestár Gyulaffi, a 16th-century humanist, the text creates an impression of a fragmentary, though more or less unified, historiographical work. However, having the opportunity to study his

* I would like to thank Margit Sárdi, Emőke Szilágyi, and the librarians of the University Library of the ELU for their generous help.

original manuscripts, one realizes that his writings do not form a compact work, the 19th-century edition is largely a constructed text. In this paper, I will present what additional information can be obtained from the examination of the manuscripts. I will start from the schematic image transmitted and canonized by generations of literary historians and present the narrative constructed in the 18th and 19th centuries, then, going through the original texts, I will point out the inconsistencies of this narrative.

Nowadays, it is considered natural for librarians, archivists, and researchers to use mostly the 18–20th-century editions of old texts even when the original manuscripts or earlier editions have survived and are available in a digital form. Nevertheless, they should be aware that such editions, especially the older ones are often misleading: they sometimes published the often incomplete, partially preserved texts in a heavily edited, completed or even linguistically and orthographically modernised form. It also happened that they occasionally shortened the texts or even omitted certain parts.

Some text types are especially problematic from this perspective. The numerous notes or records of the last five hundred years are an especially good example, though other documents were also often dealt with arbitrarily by editors in the past centuries. It is questionable whether such records can be regarded as a “work” at all. A sufficiently old document or one connected to an important personage is important regardless; however, their literary role and value is subject to theoretical debates. The task of librarians and archivists is to preserve, describe, and publish such documents. However, even researchers should consider returning to the original sources or their hopefully digitalized versions at least to check them as a precaution when no up-to-date editions are available. The variety of the documents may nuance the often-simplifying view suggested by editions enabling the reinterpretation of an author’s oeuvre¹.

Lestár Gyulaffi

Gyulaffi’s “oeuvre” is a good example of the issue stated above. Before embarking on the discussion of the literary construction generated by literary historians and text editions, the author of the records ought to be shortly introduced, especially to the non-Hungarian readers. Lestár Gyulaffi (1556–1606?) was the secretary of the Greater Chancery of the Principality of Transylvania, who made historical records beside performing his official duties. He spent his childhood in Transdanubia, the western part of the Hungarian Kingdom. This territory was incorporated into the Habsburg Monarchy after the country had been divided into three parts in the mid-16th century². The central region of the medieval Hungarian Kingdom became the part of the Ottoman Empire and remained within its confines

¹ See such a reinterpretation in the studies of Zsombor Tóth on Mihály Cserei: Zs. Tóth, *Kézírtos nyilvánosság a kora újkori magyar nyelvű íráshasználatban: medialitás és kulturális másság*, Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények, vol. 119: 2015, pp. 625–650; idem, *Cserei másol... A kora újkori íráshasználat mellőzött kontextusairól*, [in:] Zs. Tóth, *A kora újkori könyv antropológiája: Kézírtos irodalmi nyilvánosság Cserei Mihály (1667–1756) írás- és szöveghasználatában*, Budapest 2017, pp. 277–303.

² G. Pálffy, *The Kingdom of Hungary and the Habsburg Monarchy in the Sixteenth Century*, transl. by Th. J. and H. D. DeKornfeld, Boulder, Colo.–Wayne, N. J.;– Budapest 2009.

until the end of the 17th century. Eastern Hungary was transformed into a separate state, the Principality of Transylvania, existing until the end of the 17th century³. After his father's death, Lestár Gyulaffi was taken into the care of his uncle, the renowned anti-Turkish warrior, László Gyulaffi. Thanks to his uncle's influence, the young Lestár was admitted into the Viennese Lower-Austrian Provincial School (*Niederösterreichische Landschaftsschule*).

After graduating from there (1574), his uncle must have obtained him a position at the princely court of Transylvania. Lestár Gyulaffi was a well-educated diplomat who could be entrusted with the handling of sensitive matters. He formulated charters, letters, orations, managed state affairs, and represented his country abroad. However, he did not make political decisions; his task was only to carry out the decisions of the reigning prince and his councillors. He was, therefore, almost irrespective of the person of the ruler, a constantly employed, highly positioned civil servant. Most of his records deal with the internal and external policies of the Transylvanian Principality, a great emphasis being placed on the "Polish affairs", since the relations of the two countries were especially close in these decades, having a common ruler between 1576 and 1586 in the person of István Báthory (Stefan Batory in the Polish language, 1533–1586).

As far as it is presently known, Gyulaffi went in embassy in Poland seventeen times. His writings reveal a humanist striving for objectivity. His objective views have thus far made it impossible to determine to which religious denomination he belonged. Three Latin poems by him and a part of his correspondence is known mainly from later copies. 26 bibliographical units of his library have been thus far identified. He stands out from among his contemporaries on account of his thorough education spanning from Herodotus to the 16th-century Bodin. His connections to the humanist circle operating at the princely court of Transylvania, his relations with István Szamosközy (Stephanus Zamosius, d. 1612), and the historical accuracy of his records also give him prominence⁴.

³ *History of Transylvania: From the Beginnings to 1606*, eds. L. Makkai and A. Mócsy, transl. by A. Chambers-Makkai et al. Boulder, Colo., – Highland Lakes, N.J.2001; T. Oborni, *The Country Nobody Wanted: Some Aspects of the History of Transylvanian Principality*, Specimina nova. Pars prima, Sectio mediaevalis: dissertationes historicae collectae per Cathedra Historiae Medii Aevi Modernorumque Temporum Universitatis Quinqueecclesiensis, vol. 2: 2003, pp. 101–107; idem, *State and Governance in the Principality of Transylvania*, Hungarian Studies, vol. 27: 2013, subvol. 2, pp. 313–324; *Between Vienna and Constantinople: Notes on the Legal Status of the Principality of Transylvania*, [in:] *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, eds. G. Kármán and L. Kunčević, Leiden – Boston 2013, pp. 67–89.

⁴ For further details on Lestár Gyulaffi's life and works see my previously published papers: M. J. Bibor, *Gyulaffi Lestár lengyelországi követjárásai*, Annales Bibliothecae Universitatis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae, vol. 12: 2005, pp. 121–144; idem, *Gyulaffi Lestár Erdélyben*, [in:] *Emlékezet és devóció a régi magyar irodalomban*, eds. M. Balázs and Cs. Gábor, Kolozsvár, 2007 (Egyetemi Füzetek, 3) pp. 495–507; idem, „Meg-írta a' maga ideje-béli Erdélyi dolgokat” *Gyulaffi Lestár főljegyzéseinek, levelezésének és naplójának ma ismert töredékei*, [in:] *Stephanus noster: Tanulmányok Bartók István 60. születésnapjára*, eds. J. Jankovics et al., Budapest, 2015, pp. 127–140; idem, *Gyulaffi Lestár született... de mikor is? Avagy az információkészítés buktatói*, [in:] *Információkövetítés és közösségépítés – multifunkciós könyvtári hálózatok*, eds. P. Kiszl and K. Németh, Budapest, 2020, pp. 31–39; idem, *Gyulaffi Lestár diákévei*, in: *Valóságos könyvtár – könyvtári valóság 2020*, eds. P. Kiszl and N. Köntös, Budapest 2021, pp. 207–217.

History of reception and editions

Neither Gyulaffi's person nor his records were completely forgotten after his death. From among his contemporaries who mentioned him or referred to his texts István Szamosközy, the distinguished Transylvanian humanist, archivist, and historiographer, is not accidentally considered the “father of Transylvanian historiography”⁵. His writings are—almost always—historical works in the modern sense of the word. The greatest part of his oeuvre has been preserved in a manuscript form, most of his works having been printed only in the 19th century⁶. The historical work of the humanist historiographer, jurist, and poet János Baranyai Decsi (Johannes Decius Barovius Csimor, d. 1601) fared the same⁷. The opus of Farkas Bethlen (1639–1679), historiographer and chancellor, started to be published a short time after his death, however, the edition remained incomplete because of the ravages of war in the late 17th and early 18th century⁸. The first complete edition was issued only in the 18th century⁹.

As far as we know, the earliest literary historical work to mention Gyulaffi is the first lexicon of literature in Hungarian, the *Magyar Athenas* (Hungarian Athenas) compiled by the Transylvanian Calvinist parson Péter Bod (1712–1769). “Lestár Eustachius Gyulafi. Councillor under Prince Sigismund Báthori, great scholar and a good patriot, who was in embassy both to the Christian kings and to the Turkish Porte several times. He wrote down the Transylvanian events of his time, which history was used and often quoted by Farkas Bethlen in his writing”¹⁰. The concluding part of the entry, which we have not quoted here, alludes to an economic note by Gyulaffi that has been lost since then. Bod's statements (as well as the mistakes found in his publications) shaped the literature on Gyulaffi for more than a century. Already the historian and bibliographer Károly Szabó (1824–1890) stated that Gyulaffi had never been a councillor¹¹. It is also certain that he never went either “to the Turkish Porte” or “to the Christian kings” in general. It is true, however, that he “was in embassy [...] several times” but always in Poland, a country especially important to Transylvania at that time. It is also a fact that he “wrote down the Transylvanian events of his time”; however, it is more than questionable that these records took the form of some historical opus. Nevertheless, his notes were “used and often quoted by Farkas Bethlen in his writing.” The sentence about the wine and wheat prices quoted by Bod at the end of his entry does indeed figure in Bethlen's work, which refers to some records of Gyulaffi that are today unknown—whom he believes to have been a magnate(!)—and of others¹².

⁵ T. Oborni, “...quem historiae Transilvanicae patrem merito dixeris...”: Az erdélyi történetírás atyja: Szamosközy István, Korunk, 3rd series, vol. 22: 2011, subvol. 5, pp. 16–21.

⁶ I. Szamosközy *Történeti maradványai*, Vol. I–IV, ed. S. Szilágyi, Budapest, 1876–1880.

⁷ J. Baranyai Decsi *Magyar históriája 1592–1598*, intr., ed. F. Toldy, Pest, 1866.

⁸ W. de Bethlen *Historiarum Pannonico-Dacicarum libri X*. [Keresd, 1684–1690].

⁹ Idem, *Historia de rebus Transsylvanicis*, T. I–VI, ed. J. Benkő, Cibinii, 1782–1793.

¹⁰ P. Bod, *Magyar Athenas*, [Nagyszeben], 1766 [1767], p. 95.

¹¹ K. Szabó, *Gyulafi Lestár élete és munkái: Bevezetésül*, [in:] *Magyar történelmi emlékek és naplók a XVI–XVIII. századokból*, Budapest 1881, p. 4.

¹² W. de Bethlen, *Historia de...*, t. II, p. 158.

One decade after Bod, Elek Horányi (1736–1809), the learned Piarist teacher, repeated Bod's data in a somewhat abbreviated manner in his Latin literary historical work¹³. The Transylvanian Saxon Lutheran minister, teacher, and historian Johann Seivert (1735–1785) did the same in his German-language work but he also published important additional data. He referred to the work of an author unknown to him entitled *Gesta Sigismundi Bathori, Principis Transilvaniae*, which narrated the events of 1593 and 1594. He did not believe this to be the work of Gyulaffi because it spoke with so much praise about him that it would have been too immodest on the part of any author. Indeed, such a phrase as “vir amplissimae prosapiae, bene litteratus, et in obediundis legationibus prudens et industrius”, that is “a man from a distinguished family, well-learned and experienced and diligent in embassies” is somewhat overflattering for self-characterization¹⁴. Already Károly Szabó was of the opinion that the work quoted by Seivert was a part of Szamosközy's oeuvre which he, Szabó did not know¹⁵. This hypothesis was proved by historian Gyula Szekfű (1883–1955) in an early study of his¹⁶. The passage about Gyulaffi quoted by Seivert appears almost word for word in the work of Bethlen, who used the notes of Szamosközy, among other sources¹⁷.

The 19th century brought a significant change with regard to Gyulaffi's texts, as most of his writings were made available in print. At first, only fragments of various length were published by the editor and Maecenas István Kultsár (1760–1828)¹⁸ and the historiographer Elek Jakab (1820–1897)¹⁹, respectively. By the end of the century, almost all the texts connected to Gyulaffi had come forth, though in several instalments. In 1880, the already mentioned Károly Szabó published the Gyulaffi manuscripts of the University Library in Budapest in the 31st volume of the *Monumenta Hungariae Historica* series, *Scriptores* subseries (further: MHH-S), adding to the Library's autographs, texts from other collections referring to Gyulaffi and copies from the so-called *Bánfi Codex*²⁰. The so-called *Wenzel Codex* came to the University Library in 1891, one year after Szabó's death. The rest of Gyulaffi's notes were issued a few years later by the historian Sándor Szilágyi (1827–1899) first in the *Történelmi Tár*²¹, then with some small corrections in the 33rd volume of the MHH-S²². The preparations of the planned edition of Gyulaffi's oeuvre and of the University Library's manuscript catalogue²³ must have already been ongoing,

¹³ A. Horányi, *Memoria Hvngarorum et provincialium scriptis editis notorum [...] Pars II.*, Viennae 1776, pp. 63–64.

¹⁴ Quoted by: J. Seivert, *Sechster Beitrag zur Gelehrten-Geschichte der Siebenbürgischen Unger und Szekler*, Siebenbürgische Quartalschrift, vol. 7: 1801, subvol. 1, pp. 14–15.

¹⁵ K. Szabó, *Gyulafi...*, p. 9.

¹⁶ Gy. Szekfű, *Szamosközy műve az 1594 év eseményeiről*, Századok, vol. 42: 1908, pp. 217–244.

¹⁷ W. de Bethlen, *Historia de...*, t. III, pp. 61–62.

¹⁸ I. Kultsár, *Krónika A' mohátsi veszedelemtől a' bétsi békülésig Magyar országban, Erdélyben, Havasalföldön, és Moldovában történt dolgokról*, Pest, Trattner, 1805, pp. 31–35, 43–47, 51–67.

¹⁹ *Gyulafy [sic!] Léstár [sic!] följegyzése Dávid Ferencz fogsága s halála körülményeiről*, ed. E. Jakab, *Keresztény Magvető*, vol. 16: 1876, pp. 193–195.

²⁰ L. Gyulafi, *Följegyzései*, intr., ed. K. Szabó, in: *Magyar történelmi emlékek és naplók a XVI–XVIII. századokból*, Budapest 1881, pp. 1–124.

²¹ L. Gyulaffi, *Történeti maradványai*, intr., ed. S. Szilágyi, *Történelmi Tár*, 1893, pp. 109–145, 193–231.

²² Idem, *Történelmi maradványai*, intr., ed. S. Szilágyi, in: *Magyar történelmi emlékek és naplók a XVI–XVIII. századokból*, Vol. II. Budapest 1894, pp. 1–80.

²³ S. Szilágyi ed., *Catalogus manuseriptorum Bibliothecae Reg. Scient. Universitatis Budapestinensis*, Vol. I–II, Budapest, 1881–1910.

when somebody—most probably Szabó or Szilágyi—published a record by Gyulaffi²⁴ that was left out from both editions in the end.

These editions spell Lestár Gyulaffi's family name inconsistently. The title page of the 31st and the 33rd *Monumenta* volumes, which contain most of his surviving writings, have it as "Gyulafy". At the same time, the inner title page introducing Gyulaffi's works (the volumes contain the works of other authors as well) in Szabó's edition has the form "Gyulafi"²⁵, while Szilágyi's publication prefers the spelling "Gyulaffi"²⁶. They use these respective spellings consistently in their introductions as well²⁷, Szilágyi having already used his preferred form of the name in the preface of his text edition in the *Történelmi Tár*²⁸. The difference between the two may have been caused by Szabó's use of the name in the form generally accepted in the secondary literature, while Szilágyi must have adopted the spelling with -ffi that Lestár Gyulaffi himself invariably used when writing down his family name. Szilágyi must have observed as well that one of the documents published by Szabó in the Appendix of his edition contains Gyulaffi's handwritten signature spelled with -ffi²⁹. This spelling also appears in the lately discovered autograph owner's notes that figure in the books once owned by Gyulaffi³⁰.

Unfortunately, the texts published by Szabó and Szilágyi are not devoid of the habitual deficiencies that characterize the editing practice of the *Monumenta...* and the *Történelmi Tár* series. They are incomplete to a varying degree, there are many passages in them that would have needed clarification, their orthography is inconsistent, moreover, the original text was considerably revised with respect to its structure. Nevertheless, they are indispensable as no other, newer and better edition has been made as of yet, and especially because the main text and the *Appendix* published by Szabó contains several documents that have been lost since³¹.

Gyulaffi's image dominating the research until the end of the 20th century was formed gradually in the second half of the 19th century. In an 1858 paper written in connection with a book review, Szilágyi, the later editor of Gyulaffi's texts, repeated the mistaken facts first published by Bod³². Iván Nagy (1824–1898) did the same in his genealogical compendium³³. They cannot be reproached for doing so at that time. However, all those who wrote about Gyulaffi's councillorship or embassy to Constantinople, etc. after the publication of Szabó's introductory paper in the 1881 edition³⁴, may justly be criticised for having worked superficially, as this introduc-

²⁴ [L. Gyulaffi], *Egy régi pestis recept.*, [ed. K. Szabó/S. Szilágyi], Századok, 13: 1879, p. 442, manuscript: ELU UB, Litterae et epistolae originales (further: LEO) 273, fol. 4v.

²⁵ L. Gyulafi, *Főjegyzései*, p. 1.

²⁶ L. Gyulaffi, *Történelmi maradványai*, p. 1.

²⁷ K. Szabó, *Gyulafi...*, pp. 3–11; S. Szilágyi, *Előszó*, [in:] *Magyar történelmi emlékek és naplók a XVI–XVIII. századokból*, Vol. II. Budapest 1894, pp. 3–4.

²⁸ S. Szilágyi, *[Előszó]*, [in:] L. Gyulaffi *Történelmi maradványai*, pp. 109–110.

²⁹ L. Gyulafi, *Főjegyzései*, p. 119, manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 1523/8, fol. 1r.

³⁰ E.g. P. Gherardi, *In foedus et victoriam contra turcas*, Venetiis, 1572. MTA Könyvtár és Információs Központ, Kézirattár és Régi Könyvek Gyűjteménye / Library and Information Centre of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Department of Manuscripts and Old Books [further: MTA KIK KRKGy], 542.282.

³¹ L. Gyulafi, *Főjegyzései*, pp. 22–23, 48–124.

³² S. Szilágyi, *Erdély irodalomtörténete különös tekintettel történelmi irodalmára*, Budapesti Szemle, 2nd series, vol. 1: 1858, p. 182.

³³ I. Nagy, *Magyarország családai czimerekkel és nemzékrendi táblákkal*, Vol. IV, Pest 1858, p. 483.

³⁴ K. Szabó, *Gyulafi...*, pp. 3–11.

tion outlined the Gyulaffi image still more or less valid today requiring only small additions or specifications. A good decade later, Szilágyi accompanied his edition of Gyulaffi's texts preserved in the manuscript volume called by him the *Wenzel Codex* by a short *Preface*³⁵. In this, he did not even mention his most important biographical discovery, namely that Gyulaffi lived at least one year longer than it was conjectured based on the texts published earlier by Szabó. He did not die "shortly after" 15–17th of May 1605 but sometime after 10th of June 1606. This new date was overlooked by the bibliographer József Szinnyei (1830–1913) who mentioned both of Szilágyi's editions; however, he compiled his long-winded summary³⁶ on the basis of Szabó's introduction. As the fourteen volumes of Szinnyei's lexicon of Hungarian writers³⁷ were reprinted in the 1980s³⁸, then issued on CD-ROM³⁹, and moreover, made freely available on the Internet⁴⁰, the impact of this work can hardly be overestimated. It is probably its effect that 1605 appears even nowadays as the date of Gyulaffi's death.

The compendia of eminent literary historians such as Cyrill Horváth (1865–1941)⁴¹ and Jenő Pintér (1881–1940)⁴² or the relevant chapter in the handbook series compiled under the aegis of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences⁴³, merely mention Gyulaffi. No breakthrough was made either by the booklet on Gyulaffi written by the elementary school teacher Józsa Sebestyén⁴⁴, or by the relevant part in the historian Emma Bartoniek's posthumously published overview⁴⁵. The Transylvanian Saxon archivist, Gernot Nussbächer (1939–2018), on the other hand, revealed some quite important data⁴⁶. A paper by Lajos Geccsényi (*1942) must also be mentioned as it communicated new details about Lestár Gyulaffi's schoolyears⁴⁷.

Gyulaffi's writings

It seems that Gyulaffi's image thus fashioned and passed on can only be altered or refined by turning to new sources and by re-examining the old ones. Apart from research activity in libraries and archives, a renewed interest in the manuscripts is the most important for this. In order to offer an overview of Gyulaffi's writings, it is best to group these "works" into three clusters. The first consists of the mostly auto-graph manuscripts, the second of texts preserved in later copies or in their printed editions; while the final one of the works known only from mentions and references.

³⁵ S. Szilágyi, *[Előszó]*, pp. 109–110; idem, *Előszó*, pp. 3–4.

³⁶ J. Szinnyei, *Gyulafi Lestár*, [in:] idem, *Magyar írók élete és munkái*, Vol. IV, Budapest 1896, col. 130–134.

³⁷ Idem, *Magyar írók élete és munkái*, Vol. I–XIV, Budapest 1891–1914.

³⁸ Idem, *Magyar írók élete és munkái*, Vol. I–XIV, Budapest 1980–1981.

³⁹ Idem, *Magyar írók élete és munkái*, CD-ROM, Budapest 2000.

⁴⁰ Idem, *Magyar írók élete és munkái*, Hungarian Electronic Library [online], [available 30 IV 2021]. Available on the World Wide Web: <http://mek.oszk.hu/03600/03630/html/index.htm>.

⁴¹ C. Horváth, *A régi magyar irodalom története*, Budapest 1899, p. 665.

⁴² J. Pintér, *A magyar irodalom a XVI. században*, Budapest 1930, p. 151.

⁴³ *A magyar irodalom története 1600-ig*, ed. T. Klaniczay, Budapest 1964, p. 429.

⁴⁴ J. Sebestyén, *Gyulafi Lestár történeti maradványainak művelődéstörténeti vonatkozásai*, Budapest 1905.

⁴⁵ E. Bartoniek, *Fejezetek a XVI–XVII. századi magyarországi történetírás történetéből*, intr. T. Klaniczay, ed. Á. Ritoók[-Szalay], Budapest 1975, pp. 541–542.

⁴⁶ G. Nussbächer, *Adatok Gyulafi Lestár utazásaihoz*, intr. B. K[eserű], *Acta Historiae Litterarum Hungaricarum*, vol. 10–11: 1971, pp. 37–42.

⁴⁷ L. Geccsényi, *Magyar diákok a bécsi tartományi iskolában a 16. század második felében*, *Történelmi Szemle*, vol. 34: 1992, pp. 95–106.

Autograph manuscripts

A significant portion of Gyulaffi's records were made in the form they are known today after the autumn of 1603 when their author retired from his public duties. This part of the notes, therefore, originates from the years when Gyulaffi, having served almost three decades in the court, was living in reduced circumstances in Kolozsvár (at present Cluj-Napoca, Romania) for approximately one and a half year until the spring of 1605. As a secretary in the chancery, he would have had opportunities to acquire an estate and some fortune, however, he did not avail himself of such possibilities. Thus, having lost his job, he had very meagre resources to live on. Studying Gyulaffi's autographs, one must never forget that these have been preserved among Szamosközy's manuscripts; therefore, they are extracts made for the latter's use or at least put at his disposal. (Of course, one can formulate this from the opposite angle: only those Gyulaffi manuscripts have survived the last more than four centuries which were included into Szamosközy's collection.) Many of Gyulaffi's still existing manuscripts contain observations made by Szamosközy, and on some, one can see notes addressed by the secretary specifically to the historiographer⁴⁸. Thus, it can be presumed that Gyulaffi made his records not only in collaboration with his learned colleague but in some cases especially to the latter's request. It cannot be excluded that Szamosközy, who himself was not very well off, remunerated in some form Gyulaffi's work aiding thus the impoverished secretary.

The smaller part of Gyulaffi's autographs arrived at the University Library as part of the collection of a Jesuit professor, György Pray (1723–1800). They were volumes LVIII and LIX of the *Collectio Prayana*. The majority of the autographs came to the institution in a volume of manuscripts discovered in the bequest of the jurist Gusztáv Wenzel (1812–1891). The already mentioned Sándor Szilágyi, director of the University Library from 1878 until his death, ordered the volumes to be dismembered and the extracted original documents and the relatively old copies to be placed into the newly formed *Litterae et epistolae originales* collection (abbreviated as Litt. Orig. or LEO). A century later, in 1988, Szamosközy's manuscript was reassembled from the parts situated under different LEO shelf marks, and it was given the shelf mark G 708⁴⁹. Its subsections G 708/A, G 708/B, G 708/C, and G 708/D contained Gyulaffi's autographs, among other documents. A good decade later, at the turn of the millennium, the dossier G 708 was again divided, and its components replaced under their former LEO shelf marks. In some cases, however, the original shelf marks could not be determined; these documents received the shelf mark LEO 1523.

It is worth presenting the main types into which these manuscripts belong. Gyulaffi listed miscellaneous historical events in a more or less chronological

⁴⁸ E. g. L. Gyulafi, *Főjegyzései*, pp. 14, 22, 37, 42, the manuscripts: ELU UB, LEO 188, fol. 13v; LEO 156, fol. 15v; LEO 1358, fol. 58r; LEO 188, fol. 21v.

⁴⁹ A. J. Fodor, *A Szamosközy-kézirat könyvtörténeti leírása*, [in:] *Magyar nyelvű kortársi feljegyzések Erdély múltjából: Szamosközy István történetíró kézirata: XVII. század eleje: A nyelvemlék betűhű átírata bevezetéssel és jegyzetekkel*, intr. E. E. Abaffy, A. J. Fodor, I. Sinkovics, notes, eds. E. E. Abaffy, S. Kozocsa, Budapest 1991, pp. 10–12.

order in Latin under the title *Annales*⁵⁰. It can be assumed that this—though it does not form a single physical unit—resulted from the partial copying together of data originating from different sources. A particularly interesting group of texts from the point of Gyulaffi's education figures under the title *Excerpta*⁵¹. He must have made these notes while reading. The records forming both the *Annales* and the *Excerpta* were collected together only in Szilágyi's edition, figuring in different places in the manuscripts.

Among Gyulaffi's notes, there are a few longer textual units which can be regarded as independent writings. They usually discuss a certain historical event in detail and outline its background. During the 20th century, two such texts were published with a modernized language and orthography for the use of the general public. One of them is a summary investigating how István Bocskay (1557–1606), Prince of Transylvania (1605–1606), obtained the support of the Szeklers⁵². This was published with its title unchanged (*Az székeltségnek Bocskai mellé való állásának bizonyos eredeti* [The real causes why the Szeklers sided with Bocskai]) but augmented with other different passages from Gyulaffi's other notes. Its structure was somewhat modified as well for the benefit of the "general public"⁵³. This anthology was reprinted more than fifty years after its original publication.⁵⁴ The other text to be published in a modernized version⁵⁵ is special because of its topic: it describes the devastation caused by the earthquake of 1590 in Vienna⁵⁶. The overview on the activity of István Báthory and Gáspár Bekes (d. 1579, in the Polish language: Kasper Bekiesz) is also such a longer text explaining the background of the historical events⁵⁷.

The third group of the manuscripts contains shorter notes commenting on diplomatic letters and orations, since Gyulaffi included several contemporary charters, letters, and speeches among his personal records in original, if possible, or if this was not practicable, in a copy sometimes made by himself. His observations added to these are of a special interest. For example, Gyulaffi wrote down the oration of the ambassador of the Swedish King and the one held by Farkas Kovacsóczy (d. 1594), the Chancellor of Transylvania at the 1587 Diet in Warsaw convoked to elect a new King. On the margins of these leaves and on a page left empty, the secretary narrated their journey to Poland, which was longer than usual, and commented on the events for Szamosközy's use⁵⁸. This report on their trip was also published in a Romanian translation though in a somewhat shortened form⁵⁹. Other similar documents are:

⁵⁰ L. Gyulaffi *Történelmi maradványai*, pp. 10–17, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 272b, fol. 71r–73r etc.

⁵¹ Idem, *Történelmi maradványai*, pp. 5–9, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 272b, fol. 45r–45v etc.

⁵² Idem, *Történelmi maradványai*, pp. 46–47, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 272b, fol. 7r–7v.

⁵³ L. Gyulaffi, *Az székeltségnek Bocskai mellé való állásának bizonyos eredeti*, [in:] *Tűzpróba 1603–1613*, intr. V. Biró, Budapest, [1941], pp. 46–64, 189–190.

⁵⁴ Ibidem [reprint edition], Budapest 1993, pp. 46–64, 189–190.

⁵⁵ L. Gyulaffi, *A bécsi földindulások: 1590. szeptember–október*, [in:] *Utazások a régi Európában: Peregrinációs levelek, útleírások és naplók (1580–1709)*, intr., notes P. Binder, Bukarest 1976, pp. 40–47, 184–185.

⁵⁶ L. Gyulaffi *Történelmi maradványai*, pp. 19–22, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 272b, fol. 46r–47v.

⁵⁷ L. Gyulaffi, *Főljegyzései*, pp. 12–14, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 188, fol. 12r–13v.

⁵⁸ Idem, *Főljegyzései*, pp. 20–22, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 156, fol. 1r–15v.

⁵⁹ Idem, [Călătoria prin Moldova], [in:] *Călătoria străini despre țările Române*, Vol. III, ed. M. Holban, M. M. Alexanderescu-Dersca Bulgaru, P. Cernovodeanu, București 1971, pp. 206–209.

- The letter of Sigismund Báthory (1527–1613, Prince of Transylvania between 1588 and 1599, respectively between 1601 and 1602, nephew of the Polish king István Báthory) to Jan Zamoyski (1542–1605, Polish Great Chancellor from 1578 to his death); in fact the ambassador’s letter of commission, dated from Gyulafehérvár (at present: Alba Iulia, Romania), on 2nd April 1591, copy made by Gyulaffi⁶⁰.
- Gyulaffi’s oration held before Zamoyski, Zamość, 18th April 1591, Gyulaffi’s autograph draft with his later annotations⁶¹.
- Gyulaffi’s oration held before Zamoyski, Krasnystaw (?), 16th October 1591, Gyulaffi’s autograph with his later commentaries⁶².
- The letter of Sigismund III (in Polish: Zygmunt III Waza, 1566–1632, King of Poland from 1587 until his death) to Sigismund Báthory, Cracow, 22nd January 1592, Gyulaffi’s copy⁶³.
- The letter of Zamoyski to Sigismund Báthory, Belz (at present Belz, Ukraine), 29th January 1592, Gyulaffi’s autograph with his later notes⁶⁴.
- Gyulaffi’s letter of commission issued and signed by Sigismund Báthory, Gyulafehérvár, 14th February 1592⁶⁵.
- The letter of Sigismund Báthory to Sigismund III, King of Poland, Gyulafehérvár, 7th April 1592, Gyulaffi’s autograph with his later commentaries⁶⁶.
- The letter of Sigismund III, King of Poland to Sigismund Báthory, Warsaw, 1st November 1592, Gyulaffi’s copy⁶⁷.
- Gyulaffi’s oration addressed to Sigismund III, Cracow, 15th December 1594, autograph draft with his later annotations⁶⁸.
- The oration written by Gyulaffi and uttered before Sigismund III and the Polish estates by Pongrácz Sennyei (d. 1613), a Transylvanian councillor, Cracow, 18th February 1595, Gyulaffi’s autograph with his later annotations⁶⁹.
- The letter of János Joó (d. 1609), personal representative of the Hungarian King to Sigismund Báthory, probably delivered by Gyulaffi, Cracow, 1st September 1596. The letter ends with the following specification: “Quae hic omissa sunt, dicet et referet fideliter Dominus Gýwlawffý.” [The things omitted here will be faithfully told and related by Mr Gyulaffi.]⁷⁰
- The letters patent of Sigismund Báthory in which he ordered all his officials and subjects to aid Gyulaffi, his ambassador in the course of his journey to Giorgio Basta (1550–1607). The document dated from Kolozsvár, 30th April 1601 bears

⁶⁰ Idem, *Följegyzései*, p. 52, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 1523/6, fol. 1v.

⁶¹ Idem, *Följegyzései*, pp. 53–61, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 172, fol. 1r–5r.

⁶² Idem, *Följegyzései*, pp. 71–76, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 186, fol. 1r–4v, 6v.

⁶³ Idem, *Följegyzései*, pp. 81–82, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 186, fol. 5v.

⁶⁴ Idem, *Följegyzései*, pp. 83, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 175, fol. 1r.

⁶⁵ Idem, *Följegyzései*, p. 86, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 178, fol. 1r.

⁶⁶ Idem, *Följegyzései*, pp. 85–86, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 180, fol. 1r–1v.

⁶⁷ Idem, *Följegyzései*, p. 90, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 1523/7, fol. 1r.

⁶⁸ Idem, *Följegyzései*, pp. 95–98, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 1358, fol. 68r–69v.

⁶⁹ Idem, *Följegyzései*, pp. 102–107, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 1358, fol. 66r–67v, 70r.

⁷⁰ Idem, *Följegyzései*, pp. 111–112, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 1358, fol. 71r–72v.

the signature and the seal of the Prince⁷¹. Gyulaffi summarized his oration held before Basta on the back of the document⁷².

- The summary of Basta's answers drawn up later by Gyulaffi; the general's answer was dated from Szatmár (at present Satu Mare, Romania), May 1601⁷³.

The last manuscript group gathers short separate notes which cannot be included in the other categories, such as the recipe of a medicine against the plague⁷⁴, or Lestár Gyulaffi's records made in his books which are more than strictly speaking owner's notes or simple marginalia. For example, on the first back flyleaf of one of his recently identified volumes⁷⁵, Gyulaffi described the fall of Constantinople (1453) and the Battle of Mohács (1526, a symbolic date and event in the history of the country, as it marked the end of the independent medieval Kingdom of Hungary) in parallel. The second back flyleaf contains similar parallel notes about the Battles of Actium (31 BC) and Lepanto (1571). The theme of these notes is connected to the topic of the book⁷⁶.

Later copies

There are approximately thirty texts of various lengths connected to Lestár Gyulaffi, which are known only from a later copy, the so-called *Bánfi Codex*, made at the end of the 18th or at the beginning of the 19th century according to Károly Szabó⁷⁷. Unfortunately, this document perished when the retreating German army set fire to the castle of the Bánffy family in Bonchida (at present Bonțida, Romania) where they were preserved. The conflagration destroyed an immensely valuable collection of a vast number of sources referring to the political, social, and cultural history of Transylvania. From the many thousands of documents, only one chest and fifteen sacks of old papers and books were salvaged. A part of these was taken to Kolozsvár, the fate of the rest is unknown⁷⁸. There is a faint hope that the *Bánfi Codex* might have been among the rescued materials. However, as it has not resurfaced so far, one may presume that it perished in the fire. The table of contents of the *Codex* compiled by Károly Szabó was published by Péter Sas⁷⁹. Thus, at least, it is known what has been lost. Fortunately, the greatest part of the material referring to Gyulaffi was published by Szabó⁸⁰. The table of contents just mentioned contains 117 items; however, one document published by Szabó himself from the *Bánfi Codex* does not figure in it⁸¹. Apart from this, Szabó repeated one number (21) probably by mistake. Out of the 117 (119) items, he published 44 as these were written by or to Gyulaffi or were connected to his person. As 12 of these

⁷¹ Idem, *Följegyzései*, pp. 116–117, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 155, fol. 2v.

⁷² Idem, *Följegyzései*, pp. 117–119, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 155, fol. 1r.

⁷³ Idem, *Följegyzései*, pp. 119–121, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 1523/8, fol. 1r–1v.

⁷⁴ [L. Gyulaffi], *Egy régi pestis recept*, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 273, fol. 4v.

⁷⁵ MTA KIK KRKGy, 542.282.

⁷⁶ P. Gherardi, op. cit.

⁷⁷ K. Szabó, *Gyulafi...*, p. 11.

⁷⁸ P. Sas, *A bonchidai Bánffy-kastély egykori kéziratgyűjteménye*, Magyar Könyvszemle, 124: 2008, pp. 56–61.

⁷⁹ [K. Szabó], *Kivonata a bonczidai könyvtárban lévő kéziratkötetnek*, [ed. P. Sas], Magyar Könyvszemle, 124: 2008, pp. 58–61, the manuscript: MTA KIK KRKGy, Ms 5086/3.

⁸⁰ L. Gyulafi, *Följegyzései*, op. cit., pp. 22–23, 48–52, 61–71, 76–81, 83–84, 87–89, 91–95, 98–102, 113–116, 121–124.

⁸¹ Idem, *Följegyzései*, op. cit., pp. 61–62.

documents also survived in the original or in contemporary copies—in some cases made by Gyulaffi himself—there are only 32 items known exclusively from the *Bánfi Codex*. Unfortunately, this 18th- or 19th-century manuscript contained two or three writings by Gyulaffi which are not known from anywhere else but Szabó failed to publish them for unknown reasons. These texts must be presumed lost at least for the time being. Two of these were letters addressed to the Polish Chancellor, Zamoyski, another was an epistle to an unknown person⁸². The table of contents compiled by Szabó offers little information on them. One of the missives addressed to Zamoyski was not only undated but rather short as well: it hardly occupied one page in the *Bánfi Codex*. The other, dated from Gyulafehérvár, 20th February 1593, must have been one and a half or two pages long⁸³. The third letter, addressed to an unknown person, was also undated. Moreover, it is not even certain that it was written by Gyulaffi. Szabó's table of contents only says about it: "95, s. d. letter by G[?]. L. to someone (asking for 25 florins) p. 283"⁸⁴. In all the other items, Szabó spelled out Gyulaffi's name, while here, it is uncertain even whether the first letter of the monogram is a G at all. Sas thought that the abbreviation referred to Gyulaffi⁸⁵.

Among the documents published by Szabó from the *Bánfi Codex*, there are diplomatic letters⁸⁶, requests of payment⁸⁷ and orders for payment⁸⁸, letters of guarantee⁸⁹, credentials⁹⁰, orations⁹¹, and poems⁹². The two Latin poems were translated into Hungarian twenty years ago⁹³. The present-day reader may find the eight private letters hidden among all these documents the most interesting because they reveal something about Lestár Gyulaffi's relationship with his family and friends⁹⁴. The only known charter issued for Gyulaffi's benefit⁹⁵ and a greatly damaged fragment of a letter⁹⁶ addressed to Gyulaffi among other persons and in need of further examination, must be mentioned as well.

Some of Lestár Gyulaffi's works have not been preserved in their original form but their content has partly been preserved by other historical compendia. For example, passages borrowed from Gyulaffi and included in a slightly modified manner in Szamosközy's works, the *Commentaries* of Baranyai Decsi, the *Historia* of Bethlen, and Bod's already mentioned lexicon entry about Gyulaffi belong to this category. Such borrowings in Szamosközy's writings were identified by the historian

⁸² [K. Szabó], *Kivonata...*, pp. 59–60, the manuscript: MTA KIK KRKGy, Ms 5086/3, fol. 1v, 2v.

⁸³ [K. Szabó], *Kivonata...*, p. 59, the manuscript: MTA KIK KRKGy, Ms 5086/3, fol. 1v.

⁸⁴ MTA KIK KRKGy, Ms 5086/3, fol. 2v.

⁸⁵ [K. Szabó], *Kivonata...*, p. 60.

⁸⁶ L. Gyulafi, *Főjegyzései*, pp. 51–52, 62–63, 81, 83–84, 87, 89.

⁸⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 115–116.

⁸⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 113–114.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 79.

⁹⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 61–62, 70–71, 87–88.

⁹¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 63–69, 76–79, 80–81, 98–102.

⁹² *Ibidem*, pp. 22–23, 49.

⁹³ L. Gyulafi, *Báthori Kristóf sírfelirata – Jóslat Lengyelország pusztulásáról, István király halála után*, [in:] I. Tóth, *A gyulafehérvári humanista költészet antológiája: „Költők virágoskertje”*, Budapest 2001, p. 108.

⁹⁴ L. Gyulafi, *Főjegyzései*, pp. 50–51, 91–95, 113–115, 122–124.

⁹⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 69–70, the manuscript: Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára / National Archives of Hungary [further: MOL], Kolozsmonostori Konvent Levéltára, Liber Ruber, fol. 322r–322v. – F 15, vol. 11, microfilm: MOL Filmtár, box 1580.

⁹⁶ MOL, Mf. 43589.

Gyula Szekfű⁹⁷. As this was the young scholar's first publication, despite all its merits, it requires some amendments. These would be necessary because Szekfű worked from the 19th-century editions of both Szamosközy's and Gyulaffi's works, which, though relatively recent at that time, did not follow the latest methodological standards of that age. The borrowings from Gyulaffi still need to be identified in the historical compositions of Baranyai Decsi and Bethlen. For example, both historians relate an event from 1594 when Gyulaffi, a mere official, was not successful in his mission in Poland; therefore, Pongrác Sennyei, a councillor with more significant political power was sent after him to add weight to the embassy. Both Baranyai Decsi's and Bethlen's narration must go back to Gyulaffi's records⁹⁸. Similarly, the last words of Chancellor István Jósika (d. 1598) recorded both by Szamosközy and Bethlen⁹⁹, the presentation of Gyulaffi's and Sennyei's planned journey to Poland in 1599 which did not take place after all¹⁰⁰, as well as Gyulaffi's oration held before General Basta in Facsád (at present Făget, Romania) in the late summer of 1603¹⁰¹ go back to the secretary's records. Bethlen's opus contains several further passages which partly or in their entirety originate from Gyulaffi's notes¹⁰².

Mentions and references

Some other works by Gyulaffi are known only from 18th-century mentions. The learned Calvinist minister dealing with both botany and history, József Benkő (1740–1814)¹⁰³, as well as the already mentioned Bod¹⁰⁴, Horányi¹⁰⁵, and Seivert¹⁰⁶ unanimously stated (partly by taking data from one another) that Gyulaffi—in Bod's words—“recorded the Transylvanian events of his time.” Several of these authors believed that this *opus* by Gyulaffi was written in Latin. Belief in this work resurfaces in several 20th-century literary historical compendia either as a certain fact¹⁰⁷ or as a hypothesis¹⁰⁸. Nevertheless, no such work, nor any writing by Lestár Gyulaffi that can be called a traditional historical narration is known today. Moreover, recent research has strengthened Károly Szabó's doubts¹⁰⁹ regarding the existence of such an opus.

From among the enumerated scholars, only one may have owned manuscripts by Lestár Gyulaffi: Benkő presumably had the secretary's diary, or a copy of it. This, however, must have perished in the Calvinist College of Nagyenyed (at present Aiud, Romania) on 8th January 1849 when a mob fanaticized by the tribune Ioan Axente Sever (1821–1906) and the Orthodox priest Probu Prodan

⁹⁷ Gy. Szekfű, *Adatok Szamosközy István történeti munkáinak kritikájához*, Budapest 1904, pp. 32–35.

⁹⁸ J. Baronyai Decsi, *Magyar históriája...*, p. 157; W. de Bethlen *Historia de...*, t. III, p. 518.

⁹⁹ I. Szamosközy *Történeti maradványai, Vol. II: 1598–1599*, ed. S. Szilágyi, Budapest 1876 p. 25; W. de Bethlen *Historia de...*, t. IV, p. 106.

¹⁰⁰ I. Szamosközy *Történeti...*, Vol. II, p. 281; W. de Bethlen *Historia de...*, t. IV, p. 319.

¹⁰¹ I. Szamosközy, *Történeti, Vol. III*, pp. 323–330; W. de Bethlen *Historia...*, t. V, pp. 505–513.

¹⁰² W. de Bethlen *Historia...*, t. III, pp. 61–62, 85–105, 166–167.

¹⁰³ J. Benkő, *Ad lectorem! Præfatio editoris*, [in:] W. de Bethlen *Historia de...*, t. V, pp. 8–9.

¹⁰⁴ P. Bod, op. cit., p. 95.

¹⁰⁵ A. Horányi, op. cit., pp. 63–64.

¹⁰⁶ J. Seivert, op. cit., pp. 14–15.

¹⁰⁷ *A magyar irodalom...*, p. 429. [The chapter referred to was authored by Béla Varjas.]

¹⁰⁸ E. Bartoniek, op. cit., p. 541.

¹⁰⁹ K. Szabó, *Gyulaffi...*, pp. 9–10.

(d. 1852) destroyed the town¹¹⁰. Although, theoretically, it is possible that the diary survived the destruction of the college library, as it has not resurfaced since, it must be considered annihilated. At the same time, it must be emphasized that Benkő mentioned only Gyulaffi's diary, and no other work by him¹¹¹. Therefore, even if the diary was burned in Nagyenyed, the Latin historical writing alluded to by others could have survived elsewhere.

The doubts regarding the existence of Gyulaffi's historical work are enhanced by the lack of any references to it from the 16th and 17th centuries. Baranyai Decsi, Bethlen, and Szamosközy all made references to Gyulaffi. Baranyai Decsi presumably, Szamosközy certainly had a direct contact with the secretary; they could have received oral information from him. Bethlen, who was born several decades after Gyulaffi's death, could only have used his records. He, however, mainly borrowed his data referring to Gyulaffi from Szamosközy, and used Gyulaffi's own records seemingly more rarely. When using them at all, he resorted to the ones which have been preserved in Szamosközy's collection to this day. There are only a few instances, which we have mentioned above, when Bethlen referred to now unknown writings by the secretary. Neither Baranyai Decsi nor Szamosközy and Bethlen, nor indeed any of their contemporaries spoke about Lestár Gyulaffi's historical work to which no other trace leads. Therefore, its existence is highly doubtful.

However, it is certain that—as Szabó pointed it out¹¹²—Lestár Gyulaffi kept a diary, even though this has perished by now. The secretary himself mentioned when recording István Báthory's death that: "Obit[us] ei[us] die[m] sic ego in Ephemeride mea notauera[m]." [I noted thus the day of his death in my *Ephemerides* as well.]¹¹³. This is followed by the quotation of his own note in Latin. All this suggests that the *Ephemerides*, contrary to several statements, was not the title of Gyulaffi's lost (or more precisely never existing) historical work, but simply of his diary. The word *ephemeris*, according to the 17th-century dictionary of Albert Szenci Molnár (1574–1634), a Calvinist minister, poet and translator meant "Mündennapi jedző könyv" [a book for everyday notes]¹¹⁴.

József Benkő reports in his introduction to the fifth volume of Farkas Bethlen's *Historia* that Lestár Gyulaffi's diary was written in Hungarian and it discussed mainly economic matters and his official activity¹¹⁵. In the case of a Chancery secretary, who fulfilled the task of a diplomat and of the Master of the Kitchen, these subjects seem to be natural. Regarding the language of the diary, it is a general characteristic of Gyulaffi's writings that he changed from Hungarian to Latin and *vice versa* or mixed the two languages within one text, sentence, sometimes even within a single grammatical structure. It depends entirely on the researchers whether they consider these Latin or Hungarian texts. Nevertheless, it seems that he wrote his records basically in Hungarian. Whenever he had some linguistic difficulty, for

¹¹⁰ J. Krizbai, *Nagyenyed: Bethlen Gábor Kollégium*, Kolozsvár 1997, p. 8.

¹¹¹ J. Benkő, op. cit., pp. 8–9.

¹¹² K. Szabó, *Gyulafi...*, p. 10.

¹¹³ L. Gyulafi *Főjegyzései*, p. 19, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 188, fol. 14v.

¹¹⁴ A. Szenci Molnár, *Dictionarium Latinoungaricum*, Noribergae, 1604, fol. M8r.

¹¹⁵ J. Benkő, op. cit., pp. 8–9.

example, he could not find a suitable Hungarian word for some notion right away, he switched immediately to Latin. Most of the charters, letters, and orations are naturally entirely in Latin. It must be underlined, nonetheless, that despite being an excellent Latinist, Gyulaffi pointedly strove to write in Hungarian. Something similar can be observed in the case of Szamosközy too, who also prepared his notes in the vernacular for his historical work written of course in Latin.

We may deduce how Lestár Gyulaffi's diary looked like based on its presently known fragments. These have not been preserved in their original form but were copied by him, among his other notes. It is possible that he did not quote the diary entries completely, but only in an abstracted form; however, even considering this, the texts seem to be rather dry. It is in fact natural that the diary of a high official living more than four hundred years ago cannot be compared to 19th- and 20th-century diaries with a literary value. What is interesting is rather that Lestár Gyulaffi kept a diary at all, for this was quite rare in the 16th century, especially in the Carpathian Basin¹¹⁶.

Sometimes, it is quite difficult to distinguish between the diary fragments inserted by Gyulaffi among his notes and the historical records he made related to given dates¹¹⁷. All the more so, because he probably used his diary entries to compile the latter as well. The report on the almost half-a-year-long embassy to Poland in 1594/1595 is a good example of this¹¹⁸. Basically, this is a Hungarian-language record as well but the dates and the parts presenting the diplomatic events are in Latin.

Conclusion

As a conclusion, we can state that most of the writings preserved under Lestár Gyulaffi's name (records, notes, diary and correspondence fragments, orations, etc.) were indeed authored by him in the modern sense of the word. At the same time, this cannot be said about some of the documents connected to his work as an official (diplomatic letters, charters). Although his records were not published until the 19th century, they were known to his contemporaries and were used even in the 17th and 18th century. However, there was no historical *magnus opus* authored by Gyulaffi. The overview of his writings revealed their variety and the fact that nothing could be further from them belonging to one comprehensive work. Therefore, one must use those older editions which (not only in the case of this author) published the text in a rearranged form, constructing thus from it, even against the editors' intentions, almost consistent works, which, however, have never existed in reality with more than customary caution.

¹¹⁶ M. S. Sárdi, *Napló-könyv: Magyar nyelvű naplók 1800 előtt*, Máriabesnyő 2014, pp. 93–95.

¹¹⁷ E. g.: L. Gyulafi, *Főjegyzései*, p. 36–37, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 188, fol. 19r–19v; L. Gyulafi, *Főjegyzései*, pp. 44–45, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 188, fol. 23v.

¹¹⁸ L. Gyulaffi *Történelmi maradványai*, pp. 25–26, the manuscript: ELU UB, LEO 272b, fol. 44r–44v.

References

- Baronyai Decsi, János. 1866. *Magyar históriája 1592–1598*, intr., ed. F. Toldy. Pest: Eggenberger Ferdinánd M. Akad. könyvtárusnál.
- Bartoniek, Emma. 1975. *Fejezetek a XVI–XVII. századi magyarországi történetírás történetéből*, intr. T. Klaniczay, ed. Á. Ritoók[-Szalay], Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Irodalomtudományi Intézet – Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára.
- Benkő, Josephus. 1789. “Ad lectorem! Præfatio editoris.” In W. de Bethlen, Wolffgangi de. *Historia de rebus Transsilvanicis. Tomus quintus. Nunc primum e manuscripto editus*, ed. J. Benkő, 1–36. Cibinii: Hochmeister.
- Bethlen, Wolffgangi de. [1684–1690]. *Historiarum Pannonico-Dacicarum libri X.* [Keresd: Székesi Mihály].
- Bethlen, Wolffgangi de. 1782. *Historia de rebus Transsilvanicis*, 1, ed. J. Benkő. Cibinii: Hochmeister.
- Bethlen, Wolffgangi de. 1782. *Historia de rebus Transsilvanicis*. 2, ed. J. Benkő. Cibinii: Hochmeister.
- Bethlen, Wolffgangi de. 1783. *Historia de rebus Transsilvanicis*, 3, ed. J. Benkő. Cibinii: Hochmeister.
- Bethlen, Wolffgangi de. 1785. *Historia de rebus Transsilvanicis*, 4, ed. J. Benkő., Cibinii: Hochmeister.
- Bethlen, Wolffgangi de. 1789. *Historia de rebus Transsilvanicis*, 5, ed. J. Benkő. Cibinii: Hochmeister.
- Bethlen, Wolffgangi de. 1793. *Historia de rebus Transsilvanicis*, 6, ed. J. Benkő. Cibinii: Hochmeister.
- Bibor, Máté János. 2021 “Gyulaffi Lestár diákévei.” In *Valóságos könyvtár – könyvtári valóság: Könyvtár- és információtudományi tanulmányok 2020*, eds. P. Kiszl and N. Köntös, 17-27. Budapest: ELTE BTK KITI.
- Bibor, Máté János. 2005. “Gyulaffi Lestár lengyelországi követjárásai.” *Annales Bibliothecae Universitatis de Rolando Eötvös Nominatae* 12: 121–144.
- Bibor, Máté János. 2007. “Gyulaffi Lestár Erdélyben.” In *Emlékezet és devóció a régi magyar irodalomban*, eds. M. Balázs and Cs. Gábor, 495–507. Kolozsvár: Bolyai Társaság – Egyetemi Műhely Kiadó.
- Bibor, Máté János. 2015. “„Meg-írta a’ maga ideje-béli Erdélyi dolgokat” Gyulaffi Lestár följegyzéseinek, levelezésének és naplójának ma ismert töredékei.” In *Stephanus noster: Tanulmányok Bartók István 60. születésnapjára*, eds. J. Jankovics et al., 127–140. Budapest: Reciti.
- Bibor, Máté János. 2020. “Gyulaffi Lestár született..., de mikor is? Avagy az információkészítés buktatói.” In *Információközvetítés és közösségépítés – multifunkciós könyvtári hálózatok*, eds. P. Kiszl and K. Németh, 31–39. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Bölcsészettudományi Kar, Könyvtár- és Információtudományi Intézet.
- Binder, Pál, ed. 1976. *Utazások a régi Európában: Peregrinációs levelek, útleírások és naplók (1580–1709)*, intr., notes P. Binder. Bukarest: Kriterion.
- Bíró, Vencel, ed. [1941]. *Tűzpróba 1603–1613*, intr. V. Bíró. Budapest: Franklin.

- Bíró, Vencel, ed. 1993. *Tűzpróba 1603–1613*, intr. V. Bíró. Budapest: Akadémiai. Bod, Péter. 1766. *Magyar Athenas*. [Nagyszeben]: [s.n.].
- Fodor, Adrienne J. 1991. "A Szamosközy-kézirat könyvészeti leírása." In *Magyar nyelvű kortársi feljegyzések Erdély múltjából: Szamosközy István történetíró kézirata: XVII. század eleje: A nyelvemlék betűhű átírata bevezetéssel és jegyzetekkel*, intr. E. E. Abaffy, A. J. Fodor, I. Sinkovics, notes, eds. E. E. Abaffy, S. Kozocsa, 10–12. Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság.
- Gecsényi, Lajos. 1992. "Magyar diákok a bécsi tartományi iskolában a 16. század második felében." *Történelmi Szemle* 34: 95–106.
- Gherardi, Pietro. 1572. *In foedus et victoriam contra turcas*. Venetiis: Guerraea.
- Gyulaffi, Lestár. 1893. "Történeti maradványai", intr., ed. S. Szilágyi. *Történelmi Tár*: 109–145, 193–231.
- Gyulaffi, Lestár. 1894. "Történelmi maradványai", intr., ed. S. Szilágyi. In *Magyar történelmi emlékek és naplók a XVI–XVIII. századokból*, 2, 1–80. Budapest: A Magyar Tud. Akad. Könyvkiadó-Hivatala.
- Gyulafi, Lestár. 1881. "Följegyzései.", Intr., ed. K. Szabó. In *Magyar történelmi emlékek és naplók a XVI–XVIII. századokból*, 1–124. Budapest: A Magyar Tud. Akad. Könyvkiadó-Hivatala.
- Gyulafy, Léstár. 1876. "Gyulafy Léstár följegyzése Dávid Ferencz fogsága s halála körülményeiről", ed. E. Jakab. *Keresztény Magvető* 16: 193–195.
- [Gyulaffi, Lestár.] 1879. "Egy régi pestis recept", [ed. K. Szabó/S. Szilágyi]. *Századok* 13: 442.
- Holban M., and M. M. Alexanderescu-Dersca Bulgaru, P. Cernovodeanu, eds. 1971. *Călători străini despre țările Române*, 3, ed. București: Editura Științifică.
- Horányi, Alexius. 1776. *Memoria Hvingarorum et provincialium scriptis editis notorum* [...], 2. Viennae: Posonii Loewius Posonii Typis Patzkoianis.
- Horváth, Cyrill. 1899. *A régi magyar irodalom története*. Budapest: Athenaeum.
- Klaniczay, Tibor, ed. 1964. *A magyar irodalom története 1600-ig*, ed. T. Klaniczay. Budapest: Akadémiai.
- Krizbai, Jenő. 1997. *Nagyenyed: Bethlen Gábor Kollégium*. Kolozsvár: Utilitas.
- Kultsár, István. 1805. *Krónika A' mohátsi veszedelemtől a' bécsi békülésig Magyar országban, Erdélyben, Havasalföldön, és Moldovában történt dolgokról*. Pest: Trattner.
- Makkai, László, and András Mócsy, ed. 2001. *History of Transylvania: From the beginnings to 1606*, 1. ed. L. Makkai and A. Mócsy, transl. by A. Chambers-Makkai et al. Boulder, Colo.: Social Science Monographs – Highland Lakes, N.J.: Atlantic Research and Publ.
- Nagy, Iván. 1858. *Magyarország családai czimerekkel és nemzékrendi táblákkal*, 4, Pest: Beimel és Kozma.
- Nussbächer, Gernot. 1971. "Adatok Gyulafi Lestár utazásaihoz", intr. B. K[eserű], *Acta Historiae Litterarum Hungaricarum*, vol. 10–11: pp. 37–42.
- Oborni, Teréz. 2003. "The Country Nobody Wanted: Some Aspects of the History of Transilvanian Principality." In *Specimina nova. Pars prima, Sectio mediaevalis*:

dissertationes historicae collectae per Cathedra Historiae Medii Aevi Modernorumque Temporum Universitatis Quinqueecclesiensis, 2: 101–107.

- Oborni, Teréz. 2011. "...quem historiae Transilvanicae patrem merito dixeris..." Az erdélyi történetírás atyja: Szamosközy István.", *Korunk* 22(5): 16–21.
- Oborni, Teréz. 2013a. "Between Vienna and Constantinople: Notes on the Legal Status of the Principality of Transylvania.", In: *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, eds. G. Kármán and L. Kunčević, 67–89. Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- Oborni, Teréz. 2013b. "State and Governance in the Principality of Transylvania." *Hungarian Studies* 27(2): 313–324. <https://doi.org/10.1556/hstud.27.2013.2.8>.
- Pálffy, Géza. 2009. *The Kingdom of Hungary and the Habsburg Monarchy in the Sixteenth Century*, transl. by Th. J. and H. D. DeKornfeld. Boulder, Colo.: Social Science Monographs – Wayne, N. J., CHSP – Budapest: Inst. of Habsburg History.
- Pintér, Jenő. 1930. *A magyar irodalom a XVI. században*. Budapest: Stephaneum.
- S[ípos]-Sárdi, Margit. 2014. *Napló-könyv: Magyar nyelvű naplók 1800 előtt*. Máriabesnyő: Attraktor.
- Sas, Péter. 2008. "A bonchidai Bánffy-kastély egykori kéziratgyűjteménye." *Magyar Könyvszemle* 124: 56–61.
- Sebestyén, Józsa. 1905. *Gyulafy Lestár történeti maradványainak művelődéstörténeti vonatkozásai*. Budapest: Franklin.
- Seivert, Johann. 1801. "Sechster Beitrag zur Gelehrten-Geschichte der Siebenbürgischen Unger und Szekler." *Siebenbürgische Quartalschrift* 7(1): 1–23.
- Szabó, Károly. 1881. "Gyulafi Lestár élete és munkái: Bevezetésül.", In: *Magyar történelmi emlékek és naplók a XVI–XVIII. századokból*, 3–11. Budapest: Magyar Tud. Akad. Könyvkiadó-Hivatala.
- [Szabó, Károly]. 2008. "Kivonata a bonczidai könyvtárban lévő kéziratkötetnek.", [ed. P. Sas]. *Magyar Könyvszemle* 124: 58–61.
- Szamosközy, István. 1876. *Történeti maradványai* 1, ed. S. Szilágyi. Budapest: Magyar Tud. Akad. Könyvkiadó-Hivatala.
- Szamosközy, István. 1876. *Történeti maradványai*, 2, ed. S. Szilágyi. Budapest: Magyar Tud. Akad. Könyvkiadó-Hivatala.
- Szamosközy, István. 1877. *Történeti maradványai*, 3, ed. S. Szilágyi. Budapest: Magyar Tud. Akad. Könyvkiadó-Hivatala.
- Szamosközy, István. 1880. *Történeti maradványai*, 4, ed. S. Szilágyi. Budapest: Magyar Tud. Akad. Könyvkiadó-Hivatala.
- Szekfű, Gyula. 1904. *Adatok Szamosközy István történeti munkáinak kritikájához*. Budapest: Barcza.
- Szekfű, Gyula. 1908. "Szamosközy műve az 1594 év eseményeiről." *Századok* 42: 217–244.
- Szenci, Molnár, Albert. 1604. *Dictionarium Latinoungaricum*. Noribergae: Hutter.
- Szilágyi, Sándor, ed. 1881–1910. *Catalogus manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Reg. Scient. Universitatis Budapestinensis*, 1-2. Budapestini: [s. n.].

- Szilágyi, Sándor. 1858. "Erdély irodalomtörténete különös tekintettel történeti irodalmára." *Budapesti Szemle* 1: 140–189.
- Szilágyi, Sándor. 1893. ["Előszó."] In: L. Gyulaffi, Lestár, "Történeti maradványai.", *Történelmi Tár*, pp.: 109–110.
- Szilágyi, Sándor. 1894. "Előszó." In *Magyar történelmi emlékek és naplók a XVI–XVIII. századokból*, 2, 3–4. Budapest: Magyar Tud. Akad. Könyvkiadó-Hivatala.
- Szinnyei, József. 1896. *Magyar írók élete és munkái*, 4. Budapest: Hornyánszky.
- Szinnyei, József. 1980. *Magyar írók élete és munkái*, 4. [reprint] Budapest: Magyar Könyvkiadók és Könyvterjesztők Egyesülése.
- Szinnyei, József. 2000. *Magyar írók élete és munkái*. CD-ROM. Budapest: Arcanum.
- Szinnyei, József. 2006. "Magyar írók élete és munkái." Hungarian Electronic Library. <http://mek.oszk.hu/03600/03630/html/index.htm>.
- Tóth, István. 2001. *A gyulafehérvári humanista költészet antológiája: „Költők virágoskertje.”* Budapest: Accordia.
- Tóth, Zsombor, 2017. "Cserei másol... A kora újkori íráshasználat mellőzött kontextusairól." In Tóth, Zsombor. *A kora újkori könyv antropológiája: Kéziratos irodalmi nyilvánosság Cserei Mihály (1667–1756) írás- és szöveghasználatában*, 277–303. Budapest: Reciti
- Tóth, Zsombor. 2015. "Kéziratos nyilvánosság a kora újkori magyar nyelvű íráshasználatban: medialitás és kulturális másság." *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 119: 625–650.

Máté János Bibor

Uniwersytet Eötvösa Loránda w Budapeszcie, Węgry. Wydział Humanistyczny

e-mail: bibor.mate@btk.elte.hu

ORCID: 0000-0002-1062-3813

Rękopisy Lestára Gyulaffi i podział Magnum

Opus*

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/FT.2021.001>



Tekst jest opublikowany na zasadach niewyłącznej licencji Creative Commons Uznanie autorstwa-Bez utworów zależnych 4.0 Międzynarodowe (CC BY-ND 4.0 PL).

Przysłany: 5 V 2021

Zaakceptowany: 9 VIII 2021

Dr. Máté Bibor jest bibliotekarzem i historykiem literatury, który w 2001 r. uzyskał tytuł magistra bibliotekoznawstwa i informacji naukowej na Uniwersytecie Eötvösa Loránda (dalej: UEL). Doktorat z historii literatury obronił na tej samej uczelni w 2011 r. W latach 2003-2014 pracował w Bibliotece Uniwersyteckiej UEL (dalej: BU UEL) jako specjalista ds. starych książek. Od 2004 r. prowadzi zajęcia dydaktyczne na Wydziale Humanistycznym UEL, gdzie w 2014 r. został etatowym asystentem dydaktycznym w Katedrze Bibliotekoznawstwa Instytutu Bibliotekoznawstwa i Informacji Naukowej. Specjalizuje się w średniowiecznej i wczesnonowożytnej historii książek, bibliotek i typografii, historii i inkunabułów biblioteki opactwa Zirc oraz życiu i zapiskach Lestára Gyulaffi, siedmiogrodzkiego pamiętnikarza z XVI w.

S

łowa kluczowe: XVI w.; humaniści; Lestár Gyulaffi; István Szamoskozy; Księstwo Siedmiogrodu; dyplomacja; zapisy/notatki; rękopisy; listy; edycja tekstu; historiografia

S

treszczenie: Lestár Gyulaffi (1556-1606?) był sekretarzem Wielkiej Kancelarii Księstwa Siedmiogrodu. Dziś najbardziej znany jest jako autor notatek i komentarzy historycznych. Zapisy te są uważane za doskonałe źródło i dlatego są wykorzystywane przez uczonych badających ten okres. Ponieważ teksty nie były ostatnio publikowane, badacze zazwyczaj posługują się XIX-wieczną edycją tekstów. Jednak patrząc na oryginalne dokumenty zachowane w BU UEL, można zauważyć, że pisma Gyulaffiego nie tworzą zwartego dzieła, XIX-wieczne wydanie jest w dużej mierze tekstem skonstruowanym. W niniejszym artykule przedstawię, jakie dodatkowe informacje można uzyskać z badania rękopisów.

* Chciałbym podziękować Margit Sárdi, Emőke Szilágyi oraz bibliotekarzom z Biblioteki Uniwersyteckiej UEL za ich hojną pomoc.

Máté János Bibor

Eötvös Loránd Universität in Budapest, Ungarn. Fakultät für

Geisteswissenschaften

E-Mail: bibor.mate@btk.elte.hu

ORCID: 0000-0002-1062-3813

Handschriften Lestár Gyulaffis und die Einteilung des Magnum Opus*

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/FT.2021.001>

Dieser Text wird unter der Creative Commons-Lizenz Namensnennung-Keine Bearbeitungen 4.0 International (CC BY-ND 4.0) veröffentlicht.

Zugesandt: 5 V 2021

Angenommen: 9 VIII 2021

Dr. Máté Bibor ist Bibliothekar und Literaturhistoriker, der 2001 den Magistergrad der Bibliothekswissenschaft und wissenschaftlichen Information an der Eötvös Loránd Universität in Budapest (weiter im Text als ELU) erwarb. 2011 promovierte er in der Literaturgeschichte an derselben Universität. In den Jahren 2003–2014 arbeitete er in der Universitätsbibliothek der ELU (weiter im Text als UB ELU) als Spezialist für alte Bücher. Seit 2004 unterrichtet er an der Fakultät für Geisteswissenschaften der ELU, wo er 2014 als Lehrkraft im Lehrstuhl für Bibliothekswissenschaft des Instituts für Bibliothekswissenschaft und Wissenschaftliche Information angestellt wurde. Er ist spezialisiert auf die mittelalterliche und frühneuzeitliche Buch- und Bibliotheksgeschichte sowie die Geschichte der Typografie, aber auch auf die Inkunabel der Abteibibliothek Zirc sowie das Lebenswerk des siebenbürgischen Memoirschreibers Lestár Gyulaffi aus dem 16. Jahrhundert.

S **tichworte:** 16. Jahrhundert; Humanisten; Lestár Gyulaffi; István Szamoskozy; Fürstentum Siebenbürgen; Diplomatie; Einträge/Notizen; Handschriften; Briefe; Textedition; Geschichtsschreibung

Z **usammenfassung:** Lestár Gyulaffi (1556-1606?) war Sekretär der Großkanzlei des Fürstentums Siebenbürgen. Heutzutage ist er am meisten als Memoirschreiber und Autor von historischen Kommentaren bekannt. Seine Notizen sind eine hervorragende Quelle und werden von den Forschern, die sich mit dieser Epoche auseinandersetzen, gerne genutzt. Da die Texte zuletzt nicht veröffentlicht wurden, bedienen sich die Forscher gewöhnlich der Textedition aus dem 19. Jahrhundert. Doch wenn man die in der UB ELU aufbewahrten Originalschriften näher betrachtet, kann man erfahren, dass die Schriften Gyulaffis kein einheitliches Werk darstellen. Die Ausgabe aus dem 19. Jahrhundert ist größtenteils ein konstruierter Text. Im Beitrag schildere ich, welche zusätzlichen Informationen man aus der Analyse der Handschriften einholen kann.

* Ich möchte mich bei Margit Sárdi, Emöke Szilágyi sowie den Bibliothekaren aus der Universitätsbibliothek der UEL für ihre große Unterstützung herzlich bedanken.