

ACTA CLASSICA UNIV. SCIENT. DEBRECEN.	LVI.	2020.	pp. 309–323.
--	------	-------	--------------

ON THE MANUSCRIPT(S) OF LAZIUS' DESCRIPTION OF TRANSYLVANIA¹

BY FANNI CSAPÓ

University of Szeged Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Doctoral School of Literary Studies Neo-Latin Literature
fannicsapo@gmail.com

Abstract: The upsurge of cosmographical and geographical literature can be seen in humanist circles from the 14th century onwards. Beside chorography, the encomium of towns and cities was also a popular genre; some elements of ethnography, natural, economic and political geography were also built into the histography. A century later, this tendency reached Hungary and the social aspiration to presentation of the country appeared in Hungary too. Owing to these factors, chorography of Hungary was written by Miklós Oláh; humanist historians (for instance Antonio Bonfini) also incorporated geographical digression into their work. Not only descriptions of Hungary, but some geographical descriptions of Transylvania were made in the second half of the 16th century; one of these was written by a 16th century Viennese humanist polyhistor, Wolfgang Lazius. The purpose of this paper is to provide a description of the three textual variants of the manuscript of the Transylvania-description by Lazius, to explore their relationship to each other, and to establish their order of composition.

Keywords: geographical description, Transylvania, 16th century, Wolfgang Lazius, manuscript

Wolfgang Lazius was a sixteenth-century Viennese scholar and polymath, also the royal physician and historiographer of Ferdinand I., professor and dean at the medical faculty of the Viennese university, and a cartographer. He was also a practising physician, but his fame rests on his historical works and on his activity as a cartographer.² His historical text cover a wide array of topics: he wrote about migration, compiled a history of the city of Vienna, created a genealogy of the Habsburgs, etc. Many of his works were published during his lifetime, but the *Decades*, his masterpiece providing an account of the history of Austria from the ancient times up to Lazius' era, remains in manuscript up to this very day. It must be noted that literature often refers to this work as *Commentarii Rerum Austria-*

¹ This essay was supported by the NKFIH, research project number: K-119237, project title: *Buda oppugnata – Wolfgang Lazius elfeledett történeti műve* (The Forgotten Historical Work of Wolfgang Lazius).

² For a more detailed biography, see: Horowitz 1883; or Kratochwill 1985.

carum, because Lazius himself used this title temporarily, but later the two variants were used synonymously, while from 1557 he stuck to the title *Decades*. Certain sections of the work bear Hungarian relevance, like the *V. decas*, the title of which was *Rerum Pannonicarum libri*, as it relates the Hungarian events between 1540 and 1556,³ or the geographical description of Dacia, or Transylvania, which Lazius intended to be the isagoge, a critical introduction to his comprehensive work about the history of Austria; this description is also in manuscript today, furthermore, it was preserved in three variants.

This description of Transylvania follows the conventions of humanist historiography, according to which no comprehensive, monumental historical work can be written without a proper geographical introduction to the discussed country. The first geographical descriptions about the Hungarian Kingdom (and its part, Transylvania) which followed the tradition of humanist historiography and comprised the introduction of a historical work appeared toward the end of the fifteenth century in Hungary. The first geographical account surveying the borders, regions, rivers etc. of Hungary in a more or less systematic fashion was commissioned by Queen Beatrice, and its author was Pietro Ransano, whose *Epithome rerum Hungaricarum* contains (in its second and third index) a description of the country, as well as a short account of the River Danube and the major cities along its shores. The next chorography is the first book of the first decas in Antonio Bonfini's *Rerum Hungaricum Decades*, which is, in the vein of humanist historiography, another geographical introduction to a monumental work narrating the history of Hungarians from ancient times up to its own period. The second book adds a further ethnographical layer to this descriptive geography by providing an overview of the ethnicities once settled in the Carpathian Basin. The line of chorographies written as a part of historical works is closed by Antal Verancsics, whose *De situ Transsylvaniae, Moldaviae et Transalpinae* changes the focus from the Kingdom of Hungary to Transylvania and the two neighbouring Romanian voivodeships, a work which was appended to a historical account about the campaign led by the Moldavian voivode against the Turks in 1538. Instead of the natural history, Verancsics put more emphasis on the social-geographical aspects, like the customs, attire etc. of the ethnicities inhabiting the region.

Another "type" of chorography can also be distinguished among the works about Hungary, which, from the mid-sixteenth century, focused exclusively on Transylvania. These are not only introductions to a historical work, but works in their own rights. The best example for this is Miklós Oláh's *Hungaria*, which was still quite far from present-day scholarly geographical works, even if it provided the reader with a wealth of information about settlement geography, and

³ For more details, see: Mayr 1894, also Kasza 2018.

featured a detailed list about the cities and castles located in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary. Yet, it cannot be doubted that besides the richly detailed settlement names, compared to the mentioned geographical descriptions, this is by far the most systematic and structured work (the parts dealing with the natural environment, or with the inhabitants and those exhibiting the prosperity of the country are clearly distinguished). While Oláh's *Hungaria* might raise critical questions as to whether it can be regarded as an independent work, or if it could have been another introduction to a grandiose historical work which never got to be written, Georg Reicherstorffer's *Chorographia Transylvania* is clearly one of the (Transylvania-)chorographies which were written as independent country descriptions. Reicherstorffer's geographical description differs from the above-mentioned chorographies in other aspects as well, in that it was published in Vienna in its own time (1550). The other geographical description that was published in the mid-sixteenth century, in 1543 in Basel, was that of Bonfini.

With respect to the interpretation of Lazius' description of Transylvania, the characteristic features of geographical descriptions embedded in historical works must be identified, and the terms and context in which the former Dacia province appears must also be explored. The chorographers describing a given territory strive to portray the country in question by touching upon the natural history (the topography, waters, and cities of the region), the economy (raw materials, commerce), and the social geography (the inhabitants) of the region, but they are still closer to what is known today as the "travel guide".

Finally, let us examine what the above authors meant under the term "Dacia". In Ransanus, Miklós Oláh, Verancsics and Reicherstorffer, an expanded use of the notion of Dacia can be observed, according to which the province of Dacia is not simply identical with Transylvania, but it extends to the Wallachian and the Moldavian Principality as well.

This paper does not undertake an in-depth analysis of Lazius' description of Transylvania, neither does it try to offer an inquiry into the work's relationship with the other mentioned chorographies. The purpose of this paper is to provide a description of the three textual variants of the manuscript of the Transylvania-description, to explore their relationship to each other, and to establish their order of composition.

Daciae sive Transylvaniae descriptio

All of the manuscripts are held in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (ÖNB) in Vienna, two of them sharing the shelfmark “cod 7967,” the third filed under shelfmark “cod 8664”. All three manuscripts are written on leaves of the size of 220 x 315 mm.

The total length of the texts in cod 7967 is 225 leaves. Besides the two Transylvania-descriptions, the codex contains a variant of the *V. decas*, too. The pagination of the Transylvania-description in the beginning of the codex starts on the recto of the first leaf (fol. 1r) and ends on the recto of the seventieth leaf (fol. 70r). It must be noted that the text contained an original pagination written with the brighter ink used in the text of the manuscript, while the newer pagination is written with darker tint. After a couple of empty pages, the *V. decas* begins on the recto of the seventy-second leaf (fol. 72r), and ends on the verso of the hundred-and-fifty-fifth leaf (fol. 155v).⁴ In the case of the *V. decas*, the original pagination is written in ink, while the repagination is in pencil.

Finally, the Transylvania-description closes the codex beginning on the verso of the hundred-fifty-sixth leaf (fol. 156r) without any empty pages before, ending on the recto of the two-hundred-and-twenty-fifth leaf (fol. 225r.). The pagination is similar to what we saw before: the original page numbers are in ink, while the repagination is in pencil. From the three Transylvania variants, the repagination is the most confusing in the case of the description in the end of cod 7967, because the original leaf-based numbering is changed to page numbering, and the original numbering is preserved on all verso pages. It must be pointed out that the Transylvania-description in the beginning and in the end of the codex are not in the same hands.

Cod. 8664 is a codex of eighty-three leaves, a third of which is the geographical description of Hungary, whose full title is *Regni Hungariae Archaeologiae libri tres ex observatione nobilis et excellentissimi viri Wolfgangi Lazii medici invictissimi Romanae, Hungariae Bohemiaeque regis a consiliis et scribendis historicis*. The Hungary description begins on the recto of the first leaf and continues until the verso of the twenty-sixth leaf (fol. 26v). The geographical description of Transylvania begins on the recto of the twenty-eighth leaf (fol. 28r) with the following lines: “Incipit liber primus Commentariorum Rerum Austriacarum, in quo populorum omnium septentrionalium origo, qui postea in pannonias ac Noricum... authore Wolfgango Lazo Vienensi medico et philosopho,” and it ends on the recto of the eighty-first leaf (fol. 81r). It must be clarified here that the Transylvania-description is no part of the *Archaeologia Hungariae*, it is not a

⁴ The contents of the *V. decas* are discussed in more details in Kasza, 2018.

sequel to that text, but a clearly distinct work.⁵ The end of the codex, the recto of the eighty-second leaf contains a privilege letter copied by Lazius and addressed to him, while the verso of the eighty-second leaf and the recto of the eighty-third leaf contain notes partially in German. These two latter documents have been bound into the codex later, they are not connected to any of the geographical descriptions in the codex. Up to the verso of the eighty-third leaf, a sort of post-script can be found.

In what follows, let us take a look at the codices containing the manuscripts. Since no unambiguous conventional reference style or symbol is available for the individual textual variants, I will facilitate understanding and consistency with the following abbreviations: the text contained on 1r-70r in cod. 7967 is L₂, the text between 156r-225r in the same codex is L₃, while the text in cod. 8664 (28r-83v) will be L₁.⁶

It must also be made clear in advance that the title of the Transylvania-description is extremely misleading, as it is a geographical description that is not restricted to the territory of Transylvania, because, like other authors (including Ransanus, Georg Reicherstorffer and Miklós Oláh), Lazius understood the province of Dacia as the territory of Transylvania, Partium, and the two Romanian principalities, Wallachia and Moldova. In certain cases, he is much more liberal in his extension of the term, as he also includes regions (like the Danube–Tisza Interfluve, or the Upper Hungary region) which were not covered by the former geographical term “Pannonia”. Thus, Lazius’ *Descriptio* does not only provide us with a simple geographical description, but it is more like a geographical, pre-historical, and ethnographical overview of Transylvania.

Manuscript L₁ bears the following title: *Incipit liber primus commentariorum rerum Austriacarum, in quo populorum omnium septentrionalium origo, qui postea in Pannonias ac Noricum, quo tractu hodie Austriacae provinciae sitae cernuntur, passim commigrarunt, explicatur. Itaque provinciae Daciae, quam Transilvaniam nunc dicimus, hoc libro situs ac municipia huiusque gentium emigrationes morosque depingunt auctore Wolfgang Lazio Viennesi medico et philosopho.* The manuscript contains the full text of a Transylvania-description

⁵ After his death, Lazius’ estate was transferred to the Hofbibliothek in an unbound form, where someone later bound it together, often without following any traceable logic, like in the above-cited example where the first book of *Archaeologia Hungariae* is followed not by the extant second volume, but by the Transylvania-description. Cod. 7967 is a similar case, as a version of the V. decas is inserted between the two versions of the Transylvania-description.

⁶ I want to call the reader’s attention to the fact that the codex referred to in Péter Kasza’s paper, *Lazius-kéziratok. Filológiai alapvetés egy kritikai kiadás elé* as “aW₁” contains the texts referred to here as L₂ and L₃. It must also be emphasised that numbering the codices instead of the individual textual variants might be a bit confusing, as the codices marked as W₂ and W₃ only contain the text of the V. decas, but the case of W₁ is completely different.

split into thirteen chapters. In the first chapter Lazius brings in arguments for writing a description of Transylvania even though it has never belonged to the Habsburg empire. The second chapter is a historical narrative about the reign of Vannius. The third chapter, though its title suggests a geographical tract, is more like an ethnographical-prehistorical chapter, where the author provides information about the people in the kingdom of Vannius. The prehistorical parts are followed by two geographical chapters, which give an account of the regions of Dacia, and the waters and mountains of Transylvania. The sixth chapter introduces those ethnicities which have settled for a shorter or longer time in Transylvania from ancient times up to Lazius' own era. The seventh and eighth chapter is also devoted to prehistory, but this time it focuses on Dacia under the Romans' rule. The final four chapters are again geographical descriptions, which not only relate the geographical features, and the natural resources of the region, but also offer an overview about the major Transylvanian cities and the Roman inscriptions found there. The inscription collection can be read on pages fol. 66r, 74r, 76r, 77r – 77v, 78r, 79r, and fol. 81r. The unique case of fol. 81r must be emphasised, as here a supplementary sheet is fastened to the page, one side of it featuring an inscription,⁷ the other hosting a draft about Lake Balaton and its environs,⁸ together with place names. The case is particularly interesting because neither this nor any similar drawing can be found in the text of other Transylvania-descriptions. Some observations concerning manuscript L₁: it includes a scattered, rather confuse text, with a lot of corrections and later insertions, most of which can be found in extra sheets fastened to the pages of the codex. If we clear the text from these later additions (be they on the margins or on such extra pages), then we in fact end up with the basic variant of the Transylvania-description (L₀), which, together with the additions, comprises the L₁ variant. Remarkably, although *Descriptio* is a Latin text, it occasionally contains sections written in Greek letters, which are consistently followed by their Latin translations. The author sometimes also uses German words and expressions. Finally, the marginal notes should also be mentioned. The main text is occasionally supplemented with such notes, and they can be sorted into two groups: some suggest corrections, including emendations or later insertions, while other notes summarise the subject, like *Tibiscus fluvius*, *Polonia*, *Croatia* etc., and indicate the subject of the relevant passage, thus guiding the reader within the text.

⁷ This was written in MS L₂ fol. 69v – 70r. The extra sheet in the MS L₁ includes only the Roman inscription without mentioned of the Bonfini's name, but in MS L₂ Lazius mentioned that this inscription is written by Bonfini.

⁸ In the Lake Balaton you can read *Lacus Pelso* inscription, and *Bokon silva* was written for forest next to the lake.

MS L ₁	Chapter
fol. 28r – 29v	Cap. I. In quo autor huius operis rationem reddit quamobrem Datiam describere coactus sit
fol. 30r – 34v	Cap. II. De regno Vanniano in quo Datiae provincia et Austria Ultra-danubiana comprehendebantur, quod sequuta sunt postea Vandalorum, Gottorum et Sclavinorum imperia
fol. 35r – 44r	Cap. III. In quo locus Ptolomej lib. III cap. V tabul. Europae VII explicatur
fol. 44r – 47v	Cap. IV. De genuina Datiae descriptione, quae in tres portiones quondam Alpestrum Mediterranea et Ripensem dissecta fuerat
fol. 47v – 59r	Cap. V. De montibus et fluvibus Datias Alpestris
fol. 59r – 69r	Cap. VI. De populorum diversorum in Transilvaniam emigratione
fol. 63r – 66r	Cap. VII. Quando et quibus auspitiis Romani primum Datias sui iuris fuerant
fol. 66v – 67r	Cap. VIII. Qui tempore Datiae a Romanis primum deseueret
fol. 67r – 70r	Cap. IX. De municipiis Datiae Mediterraneae, qua partim a populorum successione crebra, partim etiam a Romanis constructa sunt
fol. 70r – 74r	Cap. X. De Datiae Ripensis municipiis
fol. 74v – 78r	Cap. XI. De municipiis Datiae Alpestris et primo de Alba Iulia, Varhelio, Bintzio et Engetino
fol. 78v – 79r	Cap. XII De caeteris iuxta Marisii cursum Datiae municipiis nempe Schlottna, Torrenburgio, Clausenburgio, Vaal et Rodna et Regen et cetera
fol. 79v – 81v	Cap. XIII De postremis Datiae Alpestris municipiis, qua inter Morossum et Aluta fluvios campis late patentibus sita sunt, hoc est Schesburgio, Medwisio, Khusti, Pyrhalbu, Ciresem, Gross Schartz, Hermanstadio et Chronstadio

The title of manuscript L₂ is as follows: *Wolfgang Lazii Viennensis Pannonii Commentariorum rerum Austriacarum. Liber primus qui reliquorum et sequentium Isagogen ac Transilvaniae descriptionem comprehendit*. Again, the manuscript is divided into thirteen chapters,⁹ and its structure follows the same logic as manuscript L₁. Consequently, the content of the two manuscripts is identical. Manuscript L₂ is a text full of corrections and later insertions, and extra sheets with further insertions are fastened to some of the pages. The Latin work is frequently decorated with Greek quotations, and German words and expressions. Quotations written in Greek letters are always followed by their Latin translations. Another characteristic feature of manuscript L₂ is the abundance of marginal notes: almost every page features some commentary, addition, or insertion. Marginal notes can be sorted into two categories in this manuscript, too. Some of the notes indicate the subject for more efficient search,

⁹ At first sight the page numbering is extremely confusing, as in manuscript L₂, there is a lapse in chapter numbering is, the first chapter appears twice, and a superficial reader might think that the Transylvania-description is split into twelve chapters.

like *locus Ptolomei*, *Tibiscus flumen* vagy *Hungarorum exules Mescio Polonus hospitio excepit*, while the other type contains corrections. Manuscript L₂ contains the inscription collection on the following pages: fol. 60r-60v, 63v, 64r-66v, 67r-67v, 69v-70r.

MS L ₂	Chapters
fol. 1r- 4v	Cap. I. In quo Author huius operis rationem totius instituti reddit, quamobrem Datiam describere ab exordio operis sui coactus fuerit, ostendit
fol. 5r – 11v	Cap. II. De regno Vanniano, in quo Austria, Ultradanubiana ac Transilvania comprehendebantur
fol. 12v – 24v	Cap. III. De omnium pene gentium ortu, quae in Vanniani Illiridisque regnorum agros sese superioribus seculis contulerunt
fol. 24v – 28r	Cap. IV. De vera et Genuina Datiae descriptione quae in tres portiones quondam Alpestrum videlicet: Ripensem et mediterraneam dissecta fuerat
fol. 28v – 34v	Cap. V. De montibus et fluviis Datiae insignioribus
fol. 34v – 48v	Cap. VI. De populorum diversorum in Transilvaniam Datiasque immigratione
fol. 48r – 52r	Cap. VII. Quando et quorum auspitiis Romani Datiam in provinciae formam redegerunt
fol. 52r – 53r	Cap. VIII. Quo tempore Datia primum a Romanis defecerit
fol. 53r – 56r	Cap. IX. De municipiis Iazigum mediterraneis quae a populorum crebra successione constructa
fol. 56r – 60v	Cap. X. De Ripensis Datiae municipiis
fol. 61r – 68r	Cap. XI. De municipiis Datiae Alpestris et primo de Alba Iulia, Varhelio Pintzio et Mulnbachio Engetinoque
fol. 68v – 67v	Cap. XII. De caeteris iuxta Marisii cursum Datiae municipiis nempe Schlottna, Torrenburgio, Clausenburgio, Vaal et Rodna et Regen et cetera
fol. 67v – 70r	Cap. XIII. De postremis Datiae Alpestris sive Transilvaniae municipiis quae inter Marusium et Alutam flu[mina] campis late patentibus sita sunt, hoc est Scheschburgio, Medwisio, Khusti, Pyrhalben, Gyrsau, Hermanstadio et Chronstadio

In MS L₃ the Transylvania-description begins on the recto of the one-hundred-and-fifty-sixth leaf. A hand differing from that of the main text wrote the title “*Dacia sive Transilvannia Lazii*” in the top-left corner of the page, it is probably a later addition. The main text begins with the line “*Suevorum regnum, quod et Vannianum a Vannio Suevorum...*”, according to the original numbering, on the twenty-first page (fol. 156r), which means that the first ten pages of the original variant are missing from this volume. Not only the beginning of the manuscript, but its end is also truncated, as the text ends in an unfinished state on fol. 225r, with the words “*latinis inscriptum litteris, erantque qui talia*”. It contains the text of the *Descriptio*, as known in its

entirety from the other two variants, from the second until the seventh chapter. MS L₃ features a legible, fair copy of the text. Only some German words and expressions are interspersed into the Latin text, and while the Greek quotations are omitted, their Latin translations are preserved, and the place of the Greek quotations is always indicated. Besides, the marginal notes are also missing from L₃.

MS L ₃	Chapters
fol. 156r – 164v	Cap. II. De regno Vanniano, in quo Austria, Ultradanubiana ac Transilvania comprehendebantur
fol. 164v – 184v	Cap. III. De omnium pene gentium ortu, quae in Vanniani Illiridisque regnorum agros sese superioribus seculis contulerunt
fol. 184v – 191r	Cap. IV. De vera et Genuina Datiae descriptione quae in tres portiones quondam Alpestem videlicet: Ripensem et mediterraneam dissecta fuerat
fol. 191r – 199v	Cap. V. De montibus et fluviis Datiae insignioribus
fol. 199v – 219r	Cap. VI. De populorum diversorum in Transilvaniam Datiasque imigratione
fol. 219v – 225r	Cap. VII. Quando et quorum auspitiis Romani Datiam in provinciae formam redegerunt [imperfect chapter]

The following comprehensive table provides a clear overview of the three textual variants:

	L ₁	L ₂	L ₃
Cap. I. In quo Author huius operis rationem totius instituti reddit, quomobrem Datiam describere ab exordio operis sui coactus fuerit, ostendit	fol. 28r – 29v	fol. 1r- 4v	
Cap. II. De regno Vanniano, in quo Austria, Ultradanubiana ac Transilvania comprehendebantur	fol. 30r – 34v	fol. 5r – 11v	fol. 156r – 164v
Cap. III. In quo locus Ptolomej lib. III cap. V tabul. Europae VII explicatur/ Cap. III. De omnium pene gentium ortu, quae in Vanniani Illiridisque regnorum agros sese superioribus seculis contulerunt ¹⁰	fol. 35r – 44r	fol. 12v – 24v	fol. 164v – 184v
Cap. IV. De vera et Genuina Datiae descriptione quae in tres portiones quondam Alpestem videlicet: Ripensem et mediterraneam dissecta fuerat	fol. 44r – 47v	fol. 24v – 28r	fol. 184v – 191r

¹⁰ The title Cap. III. In quo locus Ptolomej lib. III cap. V tabul. Europae VII explicatur only appears in L₁, L₂ and L₃ feature the alternate title (Cap. III. De omnium pene gentium ortu, quae in Vanniani Illiridisque regnorum agros sese superioribus seculis contulerunt).

Cap. V. De montibus et fluviis Datiae insignioribus	fol. 47v – 59r	fol. 28v – 34v	fol. 191r – 199v
Cap. VI. De populorum diversorum in Transilvaniam Datiasque imigratione	fol. 59r – 69r	fol. 34v – 48v	fol. 199v – 219r
Cap. VII. Quando et quorum auspitiis Romani Datiam in provinciae formam redegerunt	fol. 63r – 66r	fol. 48r – 52r	fol. 219v – 225r
Cap. VIII. Quo tempore Datia primum a Romanis defecerit	fol. 66v – 67r	fol. 52r – 53r	
Cap. IX. De municipiis Iazigum mediterraneis quae a populorum crebra successione constructa	fol. 67r – 70r	fol. 53r – 56r	
Cap. X. De Ripensis Datiae municipiis	fol. 70r – 74r	fol. 56r – 60v	
Cap. XI. De municipiis Datiae Alpestris et primo de Alba Iulia, Varhelio Pintzio et Mulnbachio Engetinoque	fol. 74v – 78r	fol. 61r – 68r	
Cap. XII. De caeteris iuxta Marisii cursum Datiae municipiis nempe Schlottna, Torrenburgio, Clausenburgio, Vaal et Rodna et Regen et cetera	fol. 78v – 79r	fol. 68v – 67v	
Cap. XIII De postremis Datiae Alpestris municipiis, qua inter Morossum et Aluta fluvios campis late patentibus sita sunt, hoc est Schesburgio, Medwisio, Khusti, Pyrhalbu, Ciresem, Gross Schartz, Hermanstadio et Chronstadio	fol. 79v – 81v	fol. 67v – 70r	

Three conclusions can be drawn from this table. L_1 and L_2 contain the full text of the *Descriptio*, while L_3 is a fragmentary variant containing only six caputs. Although the individual variants differ not only in the main title, but also in the title of the third chapter, in terms of content and structure (chapter division and order) there are no essential differences between them.

Before discussing the relationship between L_1 , L_2 , and L_3 , the genesis of the different manuscripts should be established. Occasionally, manuscript works are dated, like at the end of one variant of the V. decas, where the year 1548 is indicated.¹¹ Unfortunately, none of the manuscripts of the *Descriptio* bear such an indication, therefore the reconstruction must be based on a textual analysis. Manuscripts L_2 and L_3 contain the following sentence: „*Quorum se primus Vagus offert, quem in*

¹¹ Kasza 2018, 153.

*Cepusiensi agro scaturire, ac ad Comoron castrum, unicum iam seculo nostro (proch dolor) **adversus Thurcarum vim simulatque Budae Strigoniique ac Albae munimenta magna Christianorum omnium pernitie amissa sunt, propugnaculum in Danubium ostiare, nemo non novit***".¹² The same sentence occurs in manuscript L₁ with minor modifications (which do not affect the dating): „*Quorum primus se Vagus*¹³ *offert, quem in Zepusiensi agro scaturire, et ad Comoron castrum, unicum iam seculo nostro, proch dolor, **adversus Thurcarum vim simulatque Budae Strigoniique munimenta magna Christianorum omnium pernitie amissa sunt, propugnaculum in Danubium ostiare, multi seculi nostri homines novere...***” With respect to dating, the passages set in bold are particularly important. Based on these, Lazius claims that besides Buda, Esztergom and Székesfehérvár were also defeated by the Turks. Since Buda was captured by the Turks on 29 August 1541, Esztergom on 4 September 1543, and Székesfehérvár on 4 September 1543, if Lazius was already aware of these developments, then the Transylvania-description must have been composed after 1543.

Finally, the relationship between the three manuscripts and their order of composition should be reconstructed. This calls for a meticulous textual analysis of the three manuscripts, together with the changes introduced in the individual copies. Generally, the changes seem to suggest a movement from L₁ to L₃, and they can be sorted into the following categories:

- 1) grammatical changes: in such cases the sentence/clause structure is changed, sometimes whole sentences are rephrased, and tense shifts also belong to this category;
- 2) lexical changes, meaning the replacement of a word with an alternative, considered more fitting for the context;
- 3) omission: when Lazius deletes a word or words which were originally there, or crosses out whole sentences
- 4) insertion: when new word(s) or clauses are added to the original text.

¹² The following marginal note is placed next to this sentence in manuscript L₂: *Vagus flumen hodie der Wag*, and it is also noteworthy that at the end of the sentence, the word *multi* is crossed out, and it is corrected to *nemo*.

¹³ The manuscript originally contained *Tibiscus* which was later emended by the author to *Vagus*, and the marginal note next to the sentence was also corrected from *Tibiscus fluvius* to *Vagus fluvius*.

First, I provide examples of changes which were introduced by the author in L₁, and were repeated in the later variants:

Lexical:

L ₁	L ₂	L ₃
Ptolomeus populos eos omnes ab eapite ostio Vistulae... accolebant	Ptolomeus in hoc textu populos eos omnes, qui ab ostio Vistulae ... accolebant	Ptolomeus in hoc textu populos eos omnes, qui ab ostio Vistulae ... accolebant
quos Windos vulgari nostro sono nuncupamus Sarmaticorum[!] populorum propaginem sobolem	quos Windos vulgari nostro sono nuncupamus ... Sarmaticorum scilicet populorum sobolem	–

Omission:

L ₁	L ₂	L ₃
Vandilis non modo digressis sed etiam Gottisque	Vandilis digressis Gottisque	Vandilis digressis Gottisque

Insertions:

L ₁	L ₂	L ₃
... sub examen vocare quod hic unico veluti false comprehendat gentes quasi omnes	sub examen vocare quod isthic unico veluti fasce comprehendat gentes quasi omnes	sub examen vocare quod isthic unico veluti fasce comprehendat gentes quasi omnes
quicquid Venedi eo loci terrarum imperio quondam suo premebant, Fennii occupavere	quicquid Venedi eo loci terrarum imperio quondam suo premebant, Fennii occupavere	quicquid Venedi eo loci terrarum imperio quondam suo premebant, Fennii occupavere

Finally, a few examples of changes made on L₂ and repeated in L₃:

Grammatical changes:

L ₁	L ₂	L ₃
„a Constantio augusto Pannoniam per XL annos obtinuerant...”	„...a Constantio augusto in Pannonias admissi sunt, quam per XL annos sub tributo obtinuisse... ”	„...a Constantio augusto in Pannonias admissi sunt, quam per XI annos sub tributo obtinuisse... ”
a quibus Windorum Marcha posterioribus seculis Ferdinande rex inclitissime domum transgressaris ad Oderam in Silesia et Vagi in Cepusioripam Austriacis subdita provincia crevit	a quibus Windorum Marchia posterioribus annis in Austriacorum domum transgressa Austriacoque obsequio subdita provincia crevit	a quibus Windorum Marchia, posterioribus annis in Austriacorum domum transgressa, Austriacoque obsequio subdita provincia crevit

Lexical changes:

L ₁	L ₂	L ₃
inter Amaxobios vero et Roxolanos Reucinali et Ex-obitae	inter Amaxobios vero et Roxolanos Reucinali et Ex-obitae Exobigitae...	inter Amaxobios vero et Roxolanos Reucinali et Ex-obigitae
Id quod et Iordanes verus Gottorum historiae author cum septentrionales populos recenset	Id quod et Iordanus Gottorum historiographus cum septentrionales populos recenset	Id quod et Iordanus Gottorum historiographus cum septentrionales populos recenset

Omissions:

L ₁	L ₂	L ₃
<p>quorum etiamnum reliquiae et in regni illius Vanniani tractu plurimae tum in septentrionalibus Austriae appellatis terris Ferdinande rex infinitae supersunt, quos Windos vulgari nostro sono nuncupamus Sarmaticorum populorum sobolem, horum meminit eodem nomine et loco Plinius pergravis in historia vir lib 4 naturalis historiae cap 13</p>	<p>Quorum etiamnum reliquiae et in regni illius Vanniani tractu plurimae, tum in sacramento tuo imbutus Austriae appellatis terris FERDINANDE rex augustissime, infinitae supersunt, quos Windos vulgari nostro sono nuncupamus, tua nomina magna animorum inclinatione profectos, Sarmaticorum scilicet populorum sobolem et huc in illa frequenti Sarmatarum septentrionalium nationum emigrationem transgressam in Carpathi montis convallibus, non paucae supersunt. Horum meminit eodem nomine et loco Plinius pergravis in historia vir lib. IIII Naturalis Historiae cap. XIII.</p>	<p>Quorum etiamnum reliquiae et in regni illius Vannianj tractu plurimae, tum in Carpathj montis convallibus, non paucae supersunt. Quorum etiamnum reliquiae et in regni illius Vannianj tractu plurimae, tum in Carpathj montis convallibus, non paucae supersunt. Horum meminit eodem nomine et loco Plinius pergravis in historia vir lib. IIII Naturalis Historiae cap. XIII.</p>
<p>Ferdinande rex inclitissime domum</p>	<p>in tuam rex inclitissime Ferdinande Austriacorum domum</p>	<p>in Austriacorum domum</p>

Insertions:

L ₁	L ₂	L ₃
<p>... quamquam mutatis cultoribus. Minores autem gentes, inquit Ptolomeus, tenent Sarmatiam</p>	<p>... quamquam mutatis cultoribus. Locus vero sic habet, minores autem gentes (inquit Ptolomeus) tenent Sarmatiam</p>	<p>quamquam mutatis cultoribus. Locus vero sic habet, minores autem gentes (inquit Ptolomaeus) tenent Sarmatiam</p>
<p>intellegit vero Vannianum regnum</p>	<p>intellegit vero Vannianum supradictum regnum</p>	<p>intellegit vero Vannianum supradictum regnum</p>

Finally, a few examples of changes which point from L₁ to L₃. One instance of such a transition can be observed in L₁, where the following text appears on a sheet attached to the bottom of the page: “*Ad haec quod hic de Hossis Ptolomeus tradit, ulteriora Venedici sinus hos loca tenere, haud multum ab eo discrepare videtur...*”, lines which in L₂ and L₃ are already integrated into the main text.

Similarly, in L₁ the paragraph beginning with the line “*Quo videlicet loco et Procopius Agathias Graeci historici Hunnorum meminere...*” on folio 44r is already integrated into the main text of the other two variants of the Transylvania-description. Similar examples are found in L₂ as well: on folio 36r, there is an attached page containing a short insertion beginning „*Atqui Gothos non ad Tibiscum modo imo adusque Maeotida paludem tenuisse satis ostendit Stephanus Bizantius his verbis*”, which is already a part to the main text of L₃. Similar examples could be cited which show that just like changes in L₁ are already built into L₂, changes to L₂ are in turn become integrated into L₃.

Conclusion

Based on the above examples, the first textual variant of the Transylvania-description is the manuscript preserved in cod 8664, and the second, revised and expanded Transylvania-description can be found in the beginning of cod 7967, whereas the manuscript at the end of cod 7967 contains the fair copy of this expanded version. Although Lazius introduces minor changes in the individual manuscript versions, these do not substantially affect the content and the chapter structure of the Transylvania-description. Furthermore, it can be safely concluded that all three manuscripts were composed in the mid-1540s. It is also clear that Lazius' Transylvania-description is not without precedents; on one hand, as a geographical introduction to the *Decades*, it follows the conventions of humanist historiography, on the other hand, as it was mentioned in the beginning of the paper, *Descriptio* fits well into the lineage of the chorographies about Hungary and Transylvania which were written in the fifteenth-sixteenth century. It is also remarkable that the *Descriptio* offers geographical, prehistorical and ethnographical overview not only about Transylvania but about the whole Carpathian Basin.

Bibliography

- Horawitz 1883 = Horawitz, Adalbert, "Lazius, Wolfgang" in: *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 18 (1883), 89-93 – <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118726870.html#adbcontent>
- Kasza 2018 = Kasza, Péter: Lazius-kéziratok. Filológiai alapvetés egy kritikai kiadás elé (Philological comments before a critical edition), *Magyar Könyvszemle* 2018/2, 148-169.
- Kratochwill 1985 = Kratochwill, Max, "Lazius, Wolfgang" in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 14 (1985), 14. – <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118726870.html#ndbcontent>
- Mayr 1894 = Mayr, Michael: *Wolfgang Lazius als Geschichtschreiber Österreichs. Ein Beitrag zur Historie des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Innsbruck, 1894.