OPEN ACCESS
perspektywy kultury / *perspectives* on culture
No. 51 (4/2025)

Péter Erdősi
http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4444-2700
Eötvös Loránd University
erdosi.peter@btk.elte.hu
DOI: 10.35765/pk.2025.5104.07

The Response of the Transylvanian Jesuit Mission to the Plague of 1585–1586

ABSTRACT

The Transylvanian Jesuit mission, organised by the Polish Province of the order and supported by King Stephen Báthory, suffered heavy losses during the plague epidemic of 1585–1586: around half of its personnel died. Accounts from the survivors shed light on how the Jesuits attempted to combat the plague. In their three urban centres – Cluj, Alba Iulia and Oradea – they responded to the challenge differently, achieving varying degrees of success in their defences and experiencing differing levels of human loss, depending on their relationship with the local institutions and communities. By comparing these strategies, the study reveals the logic behind the actions taken against the epidemic, as well as their consequences.

KEYWORDS: plague, early modern epidemic control, Transylvanian Jesuit mission, Polish province of the Society of Jesus, post-Reformation confessional heterogeneity

STRESZCZENIE

Reakcja transylwańskiej misji jezuitów na epidemię dżumy w latach 1585–1586

Transylwańska misja jezuitów, zorganizowana przez polską prowincję zakonu i wspierana przez króla Stefana Batorego, poniosła ciężkie straty podczas epidemii dżumy w latach 1585–86: zmarła około połowa jej personelu. Relacje ocalałych rzucają światło na to, jak jezuici próbowali zwalczać zarazę. W trzech swoich ośrodkach miejskich — w Cluj, Alba Iulia i Oradea – reagowali na to wyzwanie w odmienny sposób, osiągając różny stopień skuteczności w działaniach ochronnych i doświadczając zróżnicowanych strat ludzkich, zależnie od relacji z lokalnymi instytucjami i społecznościami. Porównanie tych strategii ujawnia logikę stojącą za podejmowanymi działaniami przeciwko epidemii oraz ich konsekwencje.

SŁOWA KLUCZE: dżuma, wczesnonowożytna kontrola epidemii, transylwańska misja jezuitów, polska prowincja Towarzystwa Jezusowego, poreformacyjna różnorodność wyznaniowa

Suggested citation: Erdősi, P. (2025). The Response of the Transylvanian Jesuit Mission to the Plague of 1585–1586, 17. *Perspectives on Culture*, 4(51), pp. 77–95. DOI: 10.35765/pk.2025.5104.07
Submitted: 27.08.2025 Accepted: 06.12.2025

For researchers studying early modern attitudes towards illness and contagion, sources produced by members of the Jesuit mission in Transylvania during the 1585–1586 plague provide valuable insight into how they dealt with the threat. While adding to the body of research on the responses of the Jesuits to epidemics, as exemplified by the seminal work of A. Lynn Martin (1999), this study also makes a contribution to scholarly literature on the Transylvanian Jesuits by presenting one of the critical turning points in their eventful history. Various aspects of the Transylvanian Jesuit mission have already been covered in the literature, including its establishment, objectives and strategies, the setbacks they encountered, the Holy See's efforts at recatholisation and the policies of the Báthory princes who supported it (see, among others, Jakó, 1991; Madonia, 2002, pp. 183–223; Crăciun, 2002; Kruppa, 2002, pp. 39–63; Molnár, 2009; Pop, 2014; Mihalik, 2024, pp. 10–16). However, the confrontation with the plague (Ganea, 2016; Erdősi, 2023) must also be included in the investigation if only because it highlighted the fragility of their endeavour. The crisis of 1585–86 disrupted a young mission that had been developing rapidly until then.

To interpret their actions, it is first necessary to review the circumstances of their presence in the country (Molnár, 2009, pp. 23–26; Mihalik, 2024, pp. 10–16). Led by the Polish Province of the Society of Jesus (Łukaszewska-Haberkowa, 2013, pp. 10, 62), and supported by King Stephen Báthory and his brother Christopher, Prince of Transylvania, the Jesuits settled there in 1579. The timing of their arrival could hardly have been worse in terms of how they were perceived by many Antitrinitarians: their bishop, Ferenc Dávid, died after being imprisoned by Christopher (Horn, 2009, pp. 137–142). In the Principality of Transylvania, the status of different denominations and the guidelines governing their relations with each other were set out in laws passed by the Diets. Although the legislation of 1556 and 1566 confiscated the property of Catholic institutions and banned Catholic clergy, it did not completely eradicate Catholicism or its followers (Balázs, 2016). By inviting the Jesuits, the Báthory family presented the Diet with a *fait accompli*, which approved their settlement "for the teaching and education of youth" on the condition that they did not exceed the scope of their pedagogical activities (EOE III, p. 143.). Thus, the Báthorys identified a loophole in the existing religious legislation: they saw an opportunity to introduce the Jesuits by proposing them as teachers rather than priests.

The first Transylvanian Jesuits began their mission in Cluj-Mănăștur (Kolozsmonostor) and Alba Iulia (Gyulafehérvár). However, in spring 1581, they moved from Cluj-Mănăștur to Cluj (Kolozsvár), where they started building a college. This move offended the town, which had an Antitrinitarian majority and was sensitive about its privileges. Around the same time, the Diet decreed that the prince should not appoint Catholic 'teachers' anywhere other than Cluj, Cluj-Mănăștur, and Alba Iulia (EOE III, p. 157). Following Christopher's

death in 1581, Stephen continued to protect and support the Jesuits. Giovanni Paolo Campano, the superior of the Polish Province (Grzebień, 1996, p. 84), led his fellow Jesuits in Transylvania, in consultation with the king and the superior general. A network of connections stretching from the Transylvanian court in Alba Iulia to Poland maintained this system of relations, as did regular correspondence between the Jesuits of Transylvania, the Rzeczpospolita, and Rome.

By the time of the plague, the Jesuit community had forty-five members listed in its catalogue (MAH II, pp. 615–620, 1018–1020). Of this personnel, thirty-three were sent by the Polish Province. Fifteen of them were registered as *poloni* and thirteen as *pruteni* (Prussians). Two others were listed as *lithuani*, and the group also included one *italus*, one *tyrolensis* and one *suecus*. Of their three houses in Transylvania, the college in Cluj is the largest, with twenty-nine members and over two hundred students. Competing with the local Antitrinitarian college and operating a papal seminary, it focuses the intellectual resources of the Transylvanian mission (Veress, 1906; Lukács, 1976, pp. 8*–11*; Kovács, 2009; Pop, 2014, pp. 145–185; Balázs, 1990). Its rector is also the leader of the entire Transylvanian community, a position initially held by Jakub Wujek (Grzebień, 1996, p. 765; Łukaszewska-Haberkowa, 2013, pp. 336–337) and, at the time of our story, by the Italian Ferrante Capeci. So far, they have only established a college here, but the king and the order are preparing to do the same in the other two locations. The residence in Alba Iulia, which has thirteen members, is significant due to its association with the princely court. The infant prince Sigismund Báthory, son of Christopher, is seen as a future supporter of the restoration of the Catholic Church, receiving an education in this vein under the guidance of the Hungarian Jesuit priest János Leleszi. In their school, the sons of noble families are educated in the hope of forming the future elite (Bartók, 1987). At the small residence in Oradea (Várad) fortress on the Hungarian-Ottoman border, István Szántó and his three companions are interacting with the military and the local population (Szilágyi, 1999; Kruppa, 2015).

There are no other Catholic institutions in the region, so when the plague breaks out, Catholic residents have no other help from the Church besides the Jesuits. The vast majority of the order's members are foreigners to Transylvania. Although figures such as Szántó and Leleszi played a role in launching the mission, efforts to increase the number of Hungarian-speaking Jesuits met with limited success in the 1580s. Considering the prospects for maintaining the Jesuit community in Transylvania, the circumstances are not altogether promising, as linguistic and ethnic differences in the social environment are exacerbated by religious divisions.

The Jesuits enjoyed the protection of the ruling family, which was the most powerful political force in Transylvania. The Báthorys put pressure on the Protestant elite, which was divided along religious lines. This enabled the Báthorys

to exploit the competition among their members. At the same time, the Jesuits aligned themselves with the marginalised Catholic minority within the confessional arena of the post-Reformation era, despite their legal status being distinct from that of the Catholics in Transylvania (Balázs, 2016). This complex situation shaped the dynamics of their activities and influenced their prospects, ranging from growth to potential elimination. As support from secular power weakened, their position became fragile. They experienced various manifestations of this tension at the local level in all three of their centres. In 1585, the year the plague broke out, the conflicts were not just local. The Diet protested against the Jesuits' expansion beyond the places approved by law four years earlier, speaking out against their settlement in Oradea and their missionary activity (EOE III, pp. 157, 215; MAH II, pp. 783, 809, 848).

Circumstances that normally provide security can suddenly change during a crisis, such as a plague epidemic, associated with drought and famine. External and domestic communication channels may become disrupted, those responsible for the affairs of the Transylvanian community may be temporarily unavailable, and the three groups may find it more difficult to maintain contact with each other, even if they do not become fully isolated. The way in which members of the communities in Oradea, Alba Iulia and Cluj respond to the challenges posed by the epidemic reflects their activities and relationships with local institutions and the population. Their defensive measures yield varying results in terms of human losses.

The letters sent, along with the reports on the victims and survivors of the plague, present the Jesuits' defensive measures, their results and limitations, and their losses. The earliest records of the epidemic in the Jesuit correspondence are linked to the visit of the provincial superior, who mentioned the situation in Oradea in December 1585 and January 1586, as did the rector of the Cluj college. More extensive, coherent reports are known from April 1586 onwards, and their authors now face not only the developments in Oradea, but also those in Alba Iulia and Cluj — with the outbreak of the epidemic before or at the time of writing the letters, the losses, and the chances of survival — and report on the defensive measures taken. Three of the letter writers fell victim to the disease, but two recovered. The third group of letters is written after the most severe months of the plague, in which the survivors' reflections are supplemented with information about the members of the order who were lost and those who survived (these sources are published by László Lukács SJ in MAH II–III, on the pages referenced below.) The September and December catalogues, which contain data available in late summer and autumn 1586 on the place and time of death of the deceased, can be compared with the personnel lists that provide a picture of the community's earlier and later membership numbers, before and after the plague, and the duties of its members. (1584: FRT II, pp. 25–29; 1586: MAH II, pp. 1013–1020; 1587: FRT II,

pp. 204–208, 210–214; MAH III, pp. 29–39). Added to these are the reviews of events in the *litterae annuae* (MAH II, pp. 862, 864; FRT V, pp. 7–10, 16–17), as well as in Szántó's account, which was written in 1599 (MAH IV, pp. 543–545).

The Jesuit documents allow us to formulate a set of questions. What dangers were the Jesuits aware of? What risks were they taking? What were they willing to stake? And what forms of responsibility did they consider? What did they know about each other's situations? Were they able to help each other or learn from their companions' misfortunes? How did a fortunate decision unfold, and what price did they pay if the decision is wrong? During group action, what fate awaited each individual? Why did one die and another survive? How did the fact that their actions must be taken in a religiously heterogeneous environment, where opposition between denominational groups is a significant factor, influence their community action? What denominational and political tensions did this crisis reveal?

It is useful to take a closer look at the local contexts in which the events occurred before recounting them. Firstly, the legal status of the three towns meant that the Jesuits' actions took place across different jurisdictions. Cluj was at the top of the hierarchy of urban communities, enjoying the status of a free royal town (*libera regia civitas*). Its privileged legal status coincided with its economic importance, as well as the renown of its craftsmen and merchants. Alba Iulia was a market town (*oppidum*) and the former seat of a Catholic bishopric. Following the dissolution of Catholic institutions and the secularisation of their properties, however, the urban community came under the jurisdiction of the princes. Noble members of the court and townsmen, who were exempt from taxes and services due to the prince, retained their individual privileges. Oradea, another former bishopric seat, bore the weight of the military garrison stationed there. The fortress became a key part of the country's defence system and was controlled by a captain appointed by the prince.

In addition to legal status and local social conditions, another important factor was that the Jesuits did not face 'Protestants' as a uniform group, but rather various people and groups from different religious backgrounds. In Cluj, they encountered Antitrinitarians, while in Oradea they dealt with Calvinists. At the court in Alba Iulia, one of their main rivals was the Antitrinitarian doctor Giorgio Biandrata. However, they also encountered religious diversity among the political elite and the broader population who visited the court. Contact with the Lutherans of the Saxon region of Transylvania was less frequent, as the Jesuits did not settle among them.

It should be noted that in this study, I use the term 'Protestant' only as a collective name. I do not wish to suggest that there was any kind of interdenominational unity between the non-Catholic groups. It should also be taken into account that the formation of confessions was a fluid process during this

period (Balázs, 2016, pp. 61–62). Indeed, it can be argued that the Báthory family exploited the conflicts and divisions between the various groups to promote the Jesuits. The conflicts between their rivals favoured the Jesuits, and the types of religious affiliations in their environment could influence their local opportunities and strategies. However, during the epidemic, there is no explicit evidence in their letters that the confessional affiliations of their interlocutors alone determined the types of conflicts, the methods of negotiation regarding precautions, or the chances of survival.

However, the grievances felt by their rivals may have been crucial factors, making it difficult for them to cooperate with the Jesuits during the epidemic. In Cluj, for example, the Jesuits' move from nearby Cluj-Mănăștur to the privileged town itself was a major grievance. In Oradea, as we have seen, their settlement may also have caused resentment. In Cluj, the recent grievance that they eliminated Peter Frischbier, an ex-Jesuit teaching philosophy in the Antitrinitarian's school, and established a philosophy course themselves to lure students of the rival institute to their side must have been particularly distressing (MAH II, pp. 845–846, 849; Lukács, 1976, pp. 9*–10*; Pirnát, 1971, pp. 365–366, 380–381; Molnár, 2009, p. 25). Another important factor was the level of confidence and self-awareness required to resist the Jesuits in each town. The predominantly Antitrinitarian population of Cluj had legal status, privileges and a position of power resulting from the town's economic importance, which facilitated resistance. Of the three settlements, Cluj certainly had the greatest and most serious reasons to take action in the crisis caused by the epidemic. In contrast, the customary control of the court, exercised by Stephen Báthory from Poland, may have moderated anti-Jesuit sentiments in Alba Iulia.

In addition to legal and confessional considerations, local circumstances relating to health precautions must also be taken into account. Cluj is notable for the hospital operating there (Rüsz-Fogarasi, 2012, pp. 14, 58–59). In Alba Iulia, we know of the doctors at the princely court, including Biandrata himself. Therefore, the foundations on which to build in the event of an epidemic must not be underestimated. As for Jesuit sources, they provide little evidence as to how these existing local resources could be utilised during the epidemic. Nor do they detail the precautions organised by public authorities, or the link between these and the Jesuits' own precautions. The quarantine in Alba Iulia, as referenced in Jesuit correspondence, and the evacuation of the court by Governor János Ghyczy (Gyulafy 1894, p. 19) are exceptions to this. In these cases, some degree of cooperation involving the Jesuits can be assumed. The Cluj municipal authorities' efforts to deal with the epidemic are reflected in measures such as suspending education at the Antitrinitarian school and ordering the urgent burial of the deceased (Kolosvári – Óvári, 1885. I, pp. 207–208; Gál 1935. I, p. 51). There is currently no evidence that the urban authorities and the Jesuits cooperated; their reports suggest that relations were tense.

In general, we currently know little about how the epidemic unfolded in the towns themselves, the precautions taken by authorities, or the institutions or individuals responsible for health-related matters. From this point of view, it would be important to consider sources other than the Jesuits'. Alongside the synthetic narratives on the countrywide crisis written by historians István Szamosközy and Ambrus Somogyi (Szamosközy, 1876, pp. 221–230, Simigianus, 1840, pp. 110–112), there are sporadic, brief accounts in personal recollections (e.g. Gyulafy, 1894, p. 19; Borsos, 1972, pp. 41–42). Further research is required on this issue. For now, it can be said that sources other than those produced by the Jesuits shed little light on what happened to them during the epidemic, while the Jesuit sources are important for understanding the situation in general during the plague in Cluj, Alba Iulia and Oradea. Except for the Jesuit documents, I am currently unaware of any sources concerning the three towns that provide coherent, detailed historical insights into how entire human communities coped with the plague.

Of the three Jesuit groups, the most modest, based in Oradea, was the first to face danger as early as autumn 1585. The epidemic claimed sixty, ninety, or more than a hundred lives a day there (MAH II, pp. 850, 862, 878, 883; MAH IV, p. 544). At the time, Provincial Superior Campano was visiting his Transylvanian colleagues and wanted to travel to Oradea from Cluj, but the plague blocked his path. Nevertheless, en route home in February 1586, he stopped by the mission on the western border (MAH II, pp. 685–689, 850, 873, 879, 882–883, 885). During his three-day stay, Campano inspected the nearby estates designated by the king to supply the future college, but he did not venture into the more distant estates located in Ottoman territory in the plague-stricken region (MAH II, pp. 823–824, 868, 873, 885; MAH IV, pp. 543, 544). His movements were risky. He negotiated with the castellan, who was surrounded by soldiers. Relatives of Catholics who had fallen victim to the plague knocked on the door of the Jesuit house. However, Campano did not fall ill and arrived safely at the college in Jarosław (MAH II, p. 883).

The Jesuits in Oradea initially managed to hold their ground, surviving through the autumn of 1585 and the first three months of 1586. Meanwhile, illness and death continued to spread among the population. In January 1586, the dead included Catholic nobles, and townspeople who had left their estates to the Jesuit house. They were buried in the Jesuits' church (MAH IV, p. 545). Sources reveal little about the precautions taken by István Szántó and his companions, but he certainly approved of medical treatment (MAH IV, pp. 544–545). However, it seems that the Jesuits did not take the opportunity to leave the town. Perhaps they were unable to do so in the infected area? Rather than describing precautions, the sources emphasise evidence of their dedicated work. Administering the sacraments to the sick and dying, and offering comfort to the desperate are tasks from which they did not retreat.

Even as Easter approaches, the plague is not over: while the Jesuits fulfil their duties during Lent and Easter, they are at risk when interacting with the population. During this period, they had a large number of contacts. With the help of Bálint Ladó, a fellow Jesuit preacher from Cluj who had been sent to support the people of Oradea, they heard more than a thousand confessions during Lent. Ladó visited the sick in the surrounding market towns and villages, and then set off on another mission (MAH II, pp. 822, 878, 927, 936–937; MAH IV, p. 545). In March, on the Feast of the Annunciation, a large congregation gathered for Mass. However, we do not know how the Jesuits of Oradea organised the Easter celebrations, which fell on 6 April that year. Did 1,500 people receive communion at the Church of Saint Giles outside the town walls, as they did the previous year? (MAH II, pp. 862–863, 925, 927)

The Jesuit group remained intact until Easter, but lost members in the following weeks. The chaplain died on 18 April, and the only novice passed away five days later (MAH II, pp. 923–925, 940, 1017; MAH IV, p. 545). Only two remained: Szántó and Piotr Szydłowski (Grzebień, 1996, p. 670; Łukaszewska-Haberkowa, 2013, p. 332), whom Campano had brought to Oradea. The young, educated Polish priest, who was not in the best of health, was learning Hungarian and would regularly celebrate Mass. Following the death of his two companions, he took on various responsibilities of the Oradea mission. These included key keeper, cook, chaplain, and schoolmaster (MAH II, pp. 616, 881, 903, 923–931). He witnessed religious debates between Szántó and the Calvinists Péter Beregszászi and Ambrus Derecskei, which took place several times in the presence of the castellan. The May episode of this trial of strength, which dated back two years, had aroused the curiosity of many: the Catholic and Protestant audience listening to Szántó's long speech filled the spacious cemetery surrounding the Jesuit church (MAH II, pp. 927–928, 930–931; MAH IV, pp. 544, 546; Szilágyi, 1999, pp. 11–15). At that time, it seemed that the epidemic was subsiding. Szydłowski was optimistic in his May letter: the price of grain was falling and a good harvest was finally in sight. However, in June, Szydłowski became infected while hearing confessions and baptising people in a village (MAH II, pp. 928, 940, 1014). Szántó buried all three of his companions and was left alone to carry out the tasks he had previously shared with others. The signs of relief observed in May were only temporary, and even in autumn there was no respite: the castellan fell victim to the epidemic in November (MAH II, pp. 940, 987; MAH IV, p. 546).

While the Jesuit community on the western border of Transylvania was defying the plague and was almost completely wiped out during those months, the effects of the epidemic were still relatively bearable in the interior of the principality. However, the consequences of the ensuing drought certainly affected the groups in Alba Iulia and Cluj. The plague reached them in the summer of 1586. By mid-June, the Jesuits in Alba Iulia realised that their lives

were in danger and rumours circulated that the disease had reached the court because of them (MAH II, pp. 921–922, 940–941, 966, 970, 981; MAH IV, p. 546). Did the ruling authorities at court help them? János Ghyczy, the governor, organised the evacuation of Sigismund Báthory and his entourage, as well as certain members of the courtly elite and Leleszi himself, from Alba Iulia. This group left the capital at the beginning of July, when the disease had already claimed victims, and headed east towards the region inhabited by the Transylvanian Saxons, in order to get as far away as possible from the infected parts of the country. Sigismund and his entourage later arrived in Făgăraș (Fogaras), the fortress near the south-eastern border of the principality (Gyulafy, 1894, p. 19; MAH II, pp. 988, 990, 991, 993; MAH III, p. 16).

However, the scope and effectiveness of these precautions were limited, and even the Báthory family could not be shielded from significant loss (Szamosközy, 1876, p. 230; MAH III, p. 988; MAH IV, p. 546). The measures taken by the court did not provide an escape route for all the Jesuits in Alba Iulia: Leleszi, Sigismund's tutor, had to stay with him, but most of the other twelve Jesuit residents left the town differently from the court. The most detailed account of their tribulations comes from Massimo Milanesi, one of the survivors, who dictated his lengthy narrative while convalescing (MAH II, pp. 985–993). The elderly Italian Jesuit, who hailed from the Polish Province (Grzebień, 1996, p. 424; Łukaszewska-Haberkowa, 2013, p. 321; Łukaszewska-Haberkowa, 2014, pp. 35, 120), initially served as a nurse in Cluj. In April he wrote a poignant report to a fellow Jesuit in Vilnius about the suffering of the people and the double scourge of plague and famine. At that time, he considered the famine to be the greater evil (MAH II, pp. 861, 904, 914). He confronted the increasingly threatening epidemic in Alba Iulia, to which his superiors in Cluj had sent him on an architectural assignment. When the plague broke out, Milanesi's medical knowledge was already benefiting his fellow Jesuits in his new location.

In mid-June, the illness of Stanisław Jawicki, the cook at the house in Alba Iulia, warned of imminent danger. Milanesi attempted to treat him by isolating him in a garden building, but he passed away five days later (MAH II, pp. 981, 987–988, 1015, 1017). While the courtiers were still in the town, the Jesuits were preparing to leave Alba Iulia under the leadership of their Hungarian superior, Mátyás Thomány. At the end of June, they closed their school and travelled to Szentmihályköve (Rupes Sancti Michaeli), the recently acquired former Pauline monastery (MAH II, pp. 791, 881, 988). To put their church and house in order, Stanisław Zabielski, the caretaker, went back to Alba Iulia with Paweł Woiciechowicz, the sacristan (Grzebień, 1996, pp. 775–776; Łukaszewska-Haberkowa, 2013, pp. 336, 338). By the time Woiciechowicz returned to the monastery, he was already ill. Perhaps he was infected during his journey into town or among the people gathered on the rural estate. He was isolated and

cared for, but soon died on July 6 (MAH II, pp. 969, 972, 981, 989, 1015, 1017), followed two days later by the steward, the Prussian Urbanus Elbingus (MAH II, pp. 989, 991). Szentmihályköve could not be considered a safe haven. The old monastery building was crowded with local residents, while the epidemic claimed victims in neighbouring houses. In the garden, Milanesi built a hut for the sick, bandaged their wounds and prepared medicine from herbs. He also ensured that they could receive the sacrament with a clean, long-handled wooden spoon.

Despite the unsettling circumstances, the Jesuits remained in Szentmihályköve during the first few weeks of July. However, they were already making plans to disperse their community and send its members to different locations. It was suggested that Leleszi's right-hand man, the Croatian Marko Pitačić, and two teachers, Jakub Koritowski and Jakub Mostowski (Grzebień, 1996, pp. 305, 441), could go to the Székely Land region. However, Thomány rejected this idea, deciding instead that the teachers should move to the nearby village of Ighiu (Magyarigen) to stay with the father of one of their students. Unfortunately for them, they were unable to stay there due to a local conflict. The superior chose his Croatian companion for a daring mission when he assigned him to Alba Iulia "for the care of the people and the church" — only now there was no way back. When Zabielski, the housekeeper, and Milanesi travelled to Alba Iulia by cart, they were stopped at the town's border; both were visibly unwell (MAH II, p. 991). On that day, 11 July, the monastery received news that the court had left the town two days earlier. A week later, Péter Erdösi (Sylvanus), a young priest who had died of tuberculosis and had been cared for in Szentmihályköve, was buried. This also meant that none of them would remain on the estate (MAH II, pp. 969, 972, 992; MAH III, p. 12).

Following another death at the end of July, the Jesuits decided to split into two groups ("so as not to appear indifferent to God's many warnings"), with most of them departing from Szentmihályköve and leaving only Pitačić and Zabielski behind with a lay coadjutor (MAH II, pp. 992–993, MAH III, p. 16). Thomány, Milanesi and the two Polish teachers finally set out on 28 July. Their intended destination was Caransebeș (Karánsebes), which Ladó had recently explored. However, neither this destination nor the alternative of Târgu Mureș (Marosvásárhely) was safe anymore. After much wandering, they found refuge from the plague in the monastery of Şumuleu Ciuc (Csíksomlyó). Two of them then joined Sigismund's entourage and ended up in Făgăraș (MAH II, pp. 981, 992–993; MAH III, p. 16).

Four of the Alba Iulia community's thirteen members died, but the majority, including the leaders, survived. Their defence against the plague, which was only partially aligned with the court, was relatively effective in this regard. They quickly left the town after the first deaths among them, ensuring that teachers, intellectuals and other educated members of the order were moved

to safer places. In the monastery, Milanesi's remedies helped the survivors to recover, and in some cases brought about a full recovery. Those who left the estate exchanged relative safety for the unknown, but those who remained there also survived the summer months.

Of the three Jesuit groups, the largest was confronted with the epidemic last. The stakes were high in Cluj, where twenty-nine Jesuits and over two hundred students required protection. The epidemic had reached the town by June and was growing stronger (MAH II, pp. 939, 966), but by the end of the month, philosophy professor Girolamo Fanfoni could still report that all members of the order were alive. He believed that nobody had contracted the plague, despite there being sick people among the community. This offered some hope, and Rector Capeci was confident that the situation would improve, according to one survivor. However, the severity of the crisis was palpable, as were the stakes involved in continuing or suspending education (MAH II, pp. 939, 966, 970). Fanfoni's letter highlights that the institution's leadership was concerned about the disintegration of the student body. He says that the "schools" had still been "maintained", but the students, especially the nobles, had mostly scattered in fear of the plague. This meant that they would have to close the schools and discontinue education. If they could save some students from the seminary and boarding school, he believed it would be no small thing, and they would be needed when the school reopened after the plague. He also feared that, with their dispersal, many of those who felt a calling to the Society would be lost. They were still waiting, even though the town authorities had already decided to close the rival Antitrinitarian school (MAH II, p. 940; Gál, 1935, I, p. 51; Pirnát, 1971, p. 381).

The death of one of the Jesuits' students at the end of June proved how well-founded their fears were. Fanfoni also shared another disturbing piece of news with his superior: when the Jesuits could not rely on the court's protection, the armed people of Cluj provoked a border dispute and occupied their Cluj-Mănăștur estate (MAH II, pp. 940, 941). Unlike the Jesuits in Alba Iulia, who withdrew quickly to their nearby estate, the Cluj group lost this opportunity, and they could not feel safe among the townspeople either. This hostile environment may have complicated decision-making regarding action against the plague. The tensions of previous years, particularly relating to the expansion of the Jesuit college at the expense of the Antitrinitarian school, were bound to leave their mark on the townspeople's memory.

It took far too long to take action to protect the students: the optimistic Capeci was slow to decide to close the Jesuit school, by which time several students were ill or had died. Once this decision had been made, the Jesuits were free to leave Cluj en masse. In mid-July, they finally opted to go. Most of the community fled to Cluj-Mănăștur, where the property dispute had already been resolved. Only five or six of them remained in the town (MAH II,

pp. 966–967, 970). Even then, there were no signs that they were unwell; they believed they would leave Cluj in good health. Some seminarians stayed in the town after the school closed, under the supervision of Paweł Kieniszkowicz, a history professor from Vilnius. Eighteen to twenty seminarians took refuge in the nearby forests of the Jesuits' estate with Jan Krakówieński, their syntax teacher. He survived the epidemic in this way. (MAH II, pp. 987, 1019).

The partial abandonment of the town and the closure of the school came too late. A few days after the evacuation, on 17 July, the first death among the order's members occurred in Cluj-Mănăștur, presumably due to an infection brought from the college. Two more deaths occurred within three days. One of the victims was Kieniszkowicz, who had stayed with the students (MAH II, pp. 967, 970, 986–987, 1014, 1016). The epidemic spared neither the community in Cluj nor that in Cluj-Mănăștur. Despite this, they continued to provide spiritual care to the population, administering the sacraments and hearing confessions. However, they were not sufficiently cautious, often working without isolating the sick or taking other precautions (MAH II, pp. 967, 970, 981). Some decided to take a similar step to those who left Alba Iulia for Szentmihályköve: another exodus. Five of them went to Cetatea Chioarului (Kővár), a fortress on the northern border. Among them were György Tőrös, who had been seriously ill for years, and Andreas Busau, the school and church prefect. They were welcomed there by the Catholic castellan, Kristóf Keresztúry. This small group did indeed escape the threat of the epidemic (MAH II, pp. 967, 970–971, 987).

However, among their fellows in Cluj-Mănăștur and Cluj, the death toll soared, peaking on 28 July. In the following two weeks, they lost one or two people almost every day. By the end of the month, five more people had died, including the rector, who fell victim to the plague on 31 July inside the college. Before his death, he entrusted Fanfoni with leadership of the community (MAH II, pp. 983, 1017–1018). The group lost another nine members and only six survived the plague. Fanfoni passed away on 17 August. According to reports, the depopulated college was about to be attacked by the Antitrinitarians at the instigation of Bishop Demeter Hunyadi, but two citizens defended it. In contrast, Catholics in Cluj-Mănăștur rushed to the aid of the sick (MAH II, pp. 969–970, 972; MAH III, p. 13).

The loss of life in Cluj was severe in terms of both quantity – 17 out of 29 died – and the calibre of those who perished: nine foreign teachers and the rector were among those mourned by the community (MAH II, pp. 967–968, 971–972, 981, 982–983, 986–987, 994, 997, 1014–1019. Thus, the most populous centre, which played a leading role in intellectual life and education, suffered the greatest blow. The Cluj Jesuits paid a high price for their perseverance in the town – or rather, for their delay in taking precautions – which stood in sharp contrast to the outcome of the resistance in Alba Iulia, where most of

the key figures survived because they left the town in time, albeit not without losses.

Of the forty-five Transylvanian Jesuits, only twenty-two survived. Almost half of the teaching staff were lost, which was a significant setback for the mission. Of course, the figures are equally serious when viewed from the perspective of the losses incurred by the Polish Province itself. Of the thirty-three people sent from there, nineteen perished. Three of the six priests died: Michał Ripinensis and Piotr Szydłowski belonged to the first generation of Jesuits in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (Grzebień, 1996, pp. 670, 855; Łukaszewska-Haberkowa, 2013, pp. 328, 332). However, the greatest casualties of the Province were not among the priests: the number of teachers from the Province fell from twelve to five, and only five of the fifteen coadjutors survived.

There was also a significant loss in terms of individual talents and qualities. Andreas Busau, a surviving first-generation member of the Province (Grzebień, 1996, p. 80; Łukaszewska-Haberkowa, 2013, p. 309), wrote a letter to Krakow in which he remembered some of his companions (MAH II, p. 971). He admired Father Ardolphus (Grzebień, 1996, p. 17), a Tyrolean theologian who had studied with him in Rome, for his spirit and energy; Urbanus Schipper, a Prussian craftsman (Grzebień, 1996, p. 605), for his skill; and Casimirus Loviciensis, another coadjutor, for being "equally Hungarian and Polish"; Joannes Psarski (Łukaszewska-Haberkowa, 2013, p. 326) knew Hungarian too and served as the rector's right-hand man and interpreter (MAH II, p. 618). Father Szydłowski was said to have learned Hungarian well enough to be able to hear confessions and preach in the villages (MAH II, p. 940). The efforts to reduce the language gap were suggestive. Recruitment of Hungarians began, and Gergely Vásárhelyi played an important role in the following decades, after being sent to the novitiate in Vilnius (MAH II, pp. 662, 685, 797, 1025).

When examining the causes of the disaster, it is important to note that the plague epidemic hindered the coordination of the three Jesuit houses. They would otherwise have communicated through correspondence or personal meetings. Even if they were not completely cut off from each other and knew that their colleagues were in distant trouble, it was extremely difficult for them to pass on news of the danger and casualties. Although the epidemic did not strike them all at once – after the people of Oradea, it reached those in Alba Iulia, and then those in Cluj – and the latter two communities had time to prepare, they were unable to prevent all losses. However, the same logic of dividing groups into smaller units could be seen in both Cluj and Alba Iulia. This essentially corresponded to the respective regulations of the order, which they could implement separately without coordinating their actions (MAH II, p. 967, note 5). The series of steps taken by the three groups was shaped by their social environment and the tasks they undertook. They also had to consider the various

conditions posed by the defensive measures devised by the court, town and fortress authorities.

In the face of the epidemic, decisions were motivated by two fundamental aspirations: caring for and providing spiritual guidance to the Catholic population, and ensuring the safety of their community. These objectives were difficult to reconcile, and many exposed themselves to mortal risk through their tireless work among the people. All three communities accepted this, albeit to varying degrees and in different ways. The Oradea group, which did not leave the epicentre of the epidemic, became extremely vulnerable. They resisted for a long time, but they were outnumbered and were eventually overwhelmed. The two larger communities adopted a different approach: they remained within the town walls for a while, but then some of them fled to areas that appeared safer.

This decision may have been reached differently in Alba Iulia than in Cluj. At the seat of the prince, the political leaders' general measures also outlined the course of action for the Jesuits, providing a decisive impetus for their relatively quick departure. The order's members in Alba Iulia left for their nearby estates just in time, although not without loss of life. In this way, they also avoided the danger of being forced into quarantine in the infected town, from which the court had already departed. They did not hesitate regarding the fate of their noble students and swiftly ceased teaching.

For their colleagues in Cluj, who led a much larger group of students and were far more numerous, the suspension of teaching posed a more serious problem. They had to decide how to ensure the safety of the students and the college. There is no indication in their letters that they could rely on the municipal authorities for support, and they had to find answers to their questions without guidance or protection from the princely court. Given the problematic beginnings and subsequent expansion of the Jesuit college mentioned above, the apparent lack of cooperation with the authorities of the predominantly Antitrinitarian town is not surprising. The concerns of the Jesuits were not limited to preventing the students from dispersing. They also had to consider the risks of abandoning their buildings in the event of an attack. Their departure from Cluj-Mănăștur may have been delayed by the conflict that arose there. They managed to hold out for a month and a half under these circumstances, which could have proven the effectiveness of their method if the situation had indeed improved as the rector had hoped (Lukács, 1976, p. 9*).

The situation worsened and they stayed too long. Unable to ensure the safety of the students entrusted to them, they suffered greater losses than those in Alba Iulia, even though most of them were eventually given the opportunity to withdraw. As neither the shelter in Szentmihályköve nor the one in Cluj-Mănăștur was adequate, the Jesuits in Alba Iulia and Cluj finally decided to

improve their chances of survival by sending some of them on a second exodus to Şumuleu Ciuc and Cetatea Chioarului.

When analysing the motives behind actions taken against the plague, it is important to consider cultural attitudes as well, such as the question of whether people were even permitted to resist it. Szamosközy, the coeval historian, mentions the belief that fleeing from inevitable fate is pointless as a factor that facilitated the spread of the epidemic. Even those who could have left for a safer place did not do so, he explains. The healthy did not isolate the sick, thus inhaling the 'virus' and becoming infected (Szamosközy, 1876, pp. 221–230). The decision and course of action may have been influenced by conflicting views on resistance to the epidemic within religiously diverse communities. Does man defy God's will when he resists the plague (Dormeier, 1992; Tóth G., 2001; Bajáki, 2022; Gecser, 2016)?

An episode from István Szántó's recollections, written in 1599, chronicles the dispute that arose over the religious interpretation of the disease and the measures taken to combat it. The Hungarian Jesuit had argued with the Calvinists of Oradea over whether the plague was contagious and whether it was permissible to take measures against it. The Calvinists "proclaimed from the pulpit that the plague was not contagious, but a divine punishment from which no one could escape and for which there was no effective remedy." Szántó publicly refuted their foolish view, urging people to first wash away the filth of their souls through confession and then use the remedies ordained by God, lest they appear to be tempting God" (MAH II, pp. 544–545). The Romanians, he adds, tended to agree with the Catholics and chose to resist; many fled to the forests, but some took the infection with them. Szántó's notes suggest that the Jesuits could view their difficult situation as an opportunity to proselytise among the population labelled as "heretics", and to strengthen the faith of Catholics (see Shore, 2012). He claims that the plague claimed fewer victims among Catholics than among Protestants, and that the sick were attracted to religious life and recovered after confession (MAH IV, p. 544; cf. MAH II, p. 928). The views of rival religious groups on the actions of the Jesuits may influence the latter's decision-making when considering how to defend themselves against the epidemic. The choice of defence measures could even resemble a kind of religious competition.

Sometimes, only a hair's breadth separates discord from the outbreak of conflict. Although the Jesuits did not record differences of opinion or consequences regarding the religious basis of the two opposing approaches to the epidemic — action or passivity — more widely than in the case described by Szántó during the plague, rumours that they were spreading the disease showed that they could easily be scapegoated. The threat to their property signalled a major conflict brewing, which the princely power could only delay temporarily. Even during more peaceful periods, the order's activities in Transylvania were fraught

with tension. Their opponents agreed to their presence for a time, in response to pressure from the Catholic ruling family. A letter written by Dávid Zsigmond Kassai, a humanist poet and professor from Alba Iulia, to Chancellor Farkas Kovacsóczy reveals what some members of the power elite loyal to István Báthory might have thought about the Jesuits: they are like frogs in amber, feeling comfortable in the liquid mass for a while, but then getting stuck in the hardening resin (Kassai, 1982). The crisis caused by the plague, which was accompanied by a temporary weakening of public authority in some places, could easily exacerbate the already tense situation. In the year after the plague, at Easter 1587, a group of armed Calvinists reportedly attacked a Catholic procession carrying an image of Jesus Christ into the town of Oradea. According to the Jesuit letter about the incident, it was prompted by the Reformed pastors' condemnation of 'idolatry' (MAH III, p. 26).

In autumn 1586, the epidemic was still ongoing and did not end everywhere at the beginning of the following year (MAH III, pp. 4, 13), but the survivors had already summarised their knowledge of the losses and reviewed how those who survived endured the most difficult months. They also included the story of the disaster in their annual reports (*litterae annuae*) (MAH II, pp. 862, 864, 1013–1020; MAH III, pp. 10–16; FRT V, pp. 7–10, 16–17). If the order had not taken steps to reorganise, the loss could have disrupted the progress made in the seven years since the mission was founded. The king also urged its revival. In his letter to the Superior General at the end of August, he honoured the Jesuits who, in their dedication to saving souls, refused to flee the plague. He knew that, as there were few Hungarians among them, they could send help from their German, Italian, or Spanish houses (MAH II, pp. 973, 1001–1002). The Society did indeed activate its effective network of contacts and information and mobilised its reserves to support the survivors. They brought in people from abroad and filled vacant positions wherever possible. The mission was entrusted to Jakub Wujek, Capeci's predecessor. By June 1587, there were already thirty residents in their three houses, with the focus mainly on the college in Cluj (MAH III, pp. 17, 29–39, 42). However, plans to found colleges in Alba Iulia and Oradea were postponed.

The sense of estrangement from the Jesuits did not diminish during the reorganisation following the plague. The next blow to them was the death of their most important supporter, Stephen Báthory, at the end of 1586. Shortly afterwards, in spring 1587, the Diet of Alba Iulia demanded that Sigismund expel the Jesuits from Transylvania. Their positions were undermined by crises within the Báthory family and shifts in power associated with them. The Society of Jesus was indeed banished in December 1588. Another turning point came in 1594, when Sigismund Báthory violently purged his political opponents. The following year, he pressured the diet to repeal the law banning the Jesuit order, which allowed the mission to restart under the leadership of the

Austrian province and with new personnel, rather than the Polish province. In a story of mixed opportunities and expectations, challenges and failures, the epidemic marked the first serious crisis for the Jesuits of Transylvania.

References

Bajáki, R. (2022). A döghalál Isten ostora. Imádság és járványkezelés a 16–17. századi Magyarországon. In E. Draskóczy & M. Etlinger (eds.), *Betegség és gyógyulás a kora újkori irodalomban (1450–1760).* Budapest: Reciti, 199–210.

Balázs, M. (1990). Bevezetés. In M. Balázs & I. Monok, *Pápai szemináriumok magyarországi alumnusai. Adalék a jezsuita iskoláztatás kezdeteihez*. Szeged: JATE, 5–29.

Balázs, M. (2016). Az új ország és a katolikusok. In *Hitújítás és egyházalapítás között. Tanulmányok az erdélyi unitarizmus 16–17. századi történetéről*. Kolozsvár: Magyar Unitárius Egyház, 61–73.

Bartók, I. (1987). A gyulafehérvári fejedelmi udvar és az ifjú Báthory Zsigmond. In Á.R. Várkonyi (ed.), *Magyar reneszánsz udvari kultúra*. Budapest: Gondolat, 135–156.

Crăciun, M. (2002). Traditional Practices: Catholic Missionaries and Protestant Religious Practice in Transylvania. In H. Paris & W.G. Naphy (eds.), *Religion and Superstition in Reformation Europe*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 75–93.

Dormeier, H. (1992). Die Flucht vor der Pest als religiöses Problem. In K. Schreiner & E. Müller-Luckner (eds.), *Laienfrömmigkeit im späten Mittelalter. Formen, Funktionen, politisch-soziale Zusammenhänge*. München: Oldenbourg, 331–397.

EOE III. (1877). *Erdélyi országgyűlési emlékek*. III. S. Szilágyi (ed.). Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

Erdősi, P. (2023). Erdélyi jezsuiták az 1585–86. évi pestisjárvánnyal szemben. In Zs. Banai et al. (eds.), *Katasztrófák után... Természeti csapások, járványok és ökológiai folyamatok a történelemben*. Budapest: Martin Opitz, 41–60.

FRT II (1913). *Fontes Rerum Transylvanicarum*. II. *Epistolae et acta Jesuitarum Transylvaniae temporibus principum Báthory (1571–1613).* II. *(1575–1588).* E. Veress (ed.). Budapest: Athenaeum.

FRT V (1921). *Fontes Rerum Transylvanicarum*. V. *Annuae litterae Societatis Jesu de rebus Transylvanicis temporibus Principum Báthory (1579–1613).* E. Veress (ed.). Budapest: Institutum Fontium Historicorum Hungariae.

Gál, K. (1935). *A kolozsvári unitárius kollégium története*. I–II. Kolozsvár: Minerva.

Ganea, S.-M. (2016). *Reception of the Plague in Transylvania. Official Discourses from the 16th-17th Centuries*. (MA Thesis in Medieval Studies). Budapest: Central European University.

Gecser, O. (2016). Doctors and Preachers against the Plague: Attitudes toward Disease in Late Medieval Plague Tracts and Plague Sermons. In B.S. Bowers & L.M. Keyser (eds.), *The Sacred and the Secular in Medieval Healing. Sites, Objects, and Texts*. London–New York: Routledge, 78–102.

Grzebień, L. (1996). *Encyklopedia wiedzy o jezuitach na ziemiach Polski i Litwy 1564–1995*. Kraków: Wydział Filozoficzny Towarzystwa Jezusowego, Instytut Kultury Religijnej – Wydawnictwo WAM.

Gyulafy, L. (1894). Gyulafy Lestár följegyzései. In S. Szilágyi et al. (eds.), *Magyar történelmi évkönyvek és naplók a XVI–XVIII. századokból*. II. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 3–80.

Horn, I. (2009): *Hit és hatalom. Az erdélyi unitárius nemesség 16. századi története*. Budapest: Balassi – Transylvania Emlékeiért Tudományos Egyesület.

Jakó, K. (1991): *Az első kolozsvári egyetemi könyvtár története és állományának rekonstrukciója 1579–1604*. Szeged: Scriptum Kft.

Kassai, D.Zs. (1982). Kovacsóczy Farkasnak. In T. Klaniczay (ed.), *Janus Pannonius. Magyarországi humanisták*. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 793–794.

Kolosvári, S. – Óvári, K. (1885). *A magyar törvényhatóságok jogszabályainak gyüjteménye*. I. *Az erdélyi törvényhatóságok jogszabályai*. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

Kovács, A. (2009). A kolozsvári Farkas utcai templom és kolostor jezsuita korszaka. In G. Csilla, K. Luffy, & G. Sipos (eds.), *Erdély reneszánsza. A 2008. október 8–11. között tartott konferencia előadásai*. Kolozsvár: EME, 100–110.

Kruppa, T. (2002). Kísérletek Erdély rekatolizációjára. Tervek az erdélyi püspökség visszaállítására Báthory István és Zsigmond idejében. *Magyar Egyháztörténeti Vázlatok*, 1–4 (14), 39–75.

Kruppa, T. (2005). Nagyvárad jelentősége a Báthoryak művelődés- és valláspolitikájában. *Századok*, 4(139), 945–968.

Lukács, L. (1976). Introductio generalis. In L. Lukács (ed.), *Monumenta Antiquae Hungariae*. II. Romae: Institutum Historicum S. I., 1*–23*.

Łukaszewska-Haberkowa, J. (2013). *Pierwsze pokolenie polskich jezuitów w świetle biografii i egzaminów*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM – Akademia Ignatianum.

Łukaszewska-Haberkowa, J. (2014). *Wpływ pierwszego pokolenia polskich jezuitów na życie kulturalne i religijne Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów w latach 1564–1608*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM – Akademia Ignatianum.

MAH I–IV (1969–1987). *Monumenta Antiquae Hungariae*. L. Lukács (ed.). Romae: Institutum Historicum S. I.

Madonia, C. (2002). *La Compagnia di Gesù e la riconquista cattolica dell'Europa orientale*. Genova: Name.

Martin, A. Lynn: *Plague? Jesuit Accounts of Epidemic Disease in the 16th Century*. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1999.

Mihalik, B. (2024). *The Ever-Reviving Phoenix. Jesuits in Hungary*. Leiden–Boston: Brill.

Molnár, A. (2009). A jezsuita rend a 16. századi Magyarországon. In: *Lehetetlen küldetés? Jezsuiták Erdélyben és Felső-Magyarországon a 16–17. században*. Budapest: L'Harmattan, 17–28.

Pirnát, A. (1971). Arisztoteliánusok és antitrinitáriusok (Gerendi János és a kolozsvári iskola). *Helikon*, 3–4 (17), 363–392.

Pop, I.-A. (2014). *Cultural Diffusion and Religious Reformation in Sixteenth-Century Transylvania. How The Jesuits Dealt with Orthodox and Catholic Ideas*. Lewiston–Queenston–Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Rüsz-Fogarasi, E. (2012). *Egy elfeledett intézmény. A kolozsvári Szentlélek-ispotály kora újkori története*. Budapest: L'Harmattan.

Shore, P.J. (2012). *Narratives of Adversity. Jesuits on the Eastern Peripheries of the Habsburg Realms (1640–1773)*. Budapest–New York: Central European University.

Szamosközy, I. (1876). *Szamosközy István történeti maradványai*. I. (1566–1586). S. Szilágyi (ed.). Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

Szilágyi, Cs. (1999). „Domine Pater Stephane". Szántó Arator István váradi hitvitái. In L. Kósa & R. Kiss (eds.), *Fiatal egyháztörténészek kollokviuma (1998. november 3.)*. Budapest: ELTE BTK Művelődéstörténeti Tanszék, 9–19.

Tóth, G.P. (2001). Félelem és rettegés a pestistől. Egyéni és kollektív szenvedéstörténetek. In E.S. Lackovits & V. Mészáros (eds.), *Népi vallásosság a Kárpát-medencében 5/2. Konferencia Pápán 1999. június 22–24.* Veszprém: Veszprém Megyei Múzeumi Igazgatóság, 361–396.

Veress, E. (1906). A kolozsvári Báthory-egyetem története lerombolásáig 1603-ig. *Erdélyi Múzeum*, 3(23), 169–193, 4 (23), 249–263.

Péter Erdősi – began his academic career with the study of early modern courtly culture. His doctoral thesis examined the court of late sixteenth-century Transylvania. Since 2012, he has been an assistant professor of history at the Eötvös Loránd University of Budapest, Hungary. At the Atelier Department for Interdisciplinary History, he teaches in the Cultural Heritage Studies MA programme and has a course on the historiography and methodology of cultural history for doctoral students. In the field of urban history, Erdősi has contributed to and co-edited a monograph on the small town of Szentendre. He has published articles on the historical and contemporary use of memory and heritage, including the survivals of Roman antiquity, the image of early modern courts, and perceptions of Baroque culture in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Hungary. His current work includes research on the Jesuit mission and the Italian presence in the sixteenth-century Transylvanian principality.