

Dávid Molnár

University of Szeged

Three letters from the early period of Walenty Radecke's activity in Transylvania*

In a well-known episode of the history of the connections between Polish and Transylvanian Unitarians, on 2 October 1605, Walenty Radecke (Valentinus Radecius),¹ one of the hopeful young members of the Raków synod of the Polish Brethren, was dispatched to Kolozsvár (Cluj-Napoca) to run a career there that included increasingly serious commissions. In the very beginning, he played an important role in revitalising the institutions in Kolozsvár that had been handed over to the Jesuits during the one year of Habsburg rule and then returned during the rule of István Bocskai. Not long after that, he was elected preacher of the Saxon congregation in Kolozsvár, then became bishop of the Unitarians of Transylvania in 1615, holding that office until his death in 1632. In the meantime, he became the first man in the Unitarian community of Kolozsvár, elected the first priest, parson of the town.

In recent years, researchers in Hungary have discovered a number of new data and considerations concerning his activities that could be worthy of attention of scholars interested in the radical Reformation,

* This research was supported by the European Union and the State of Hungary, co-financed by the European Social Fund in the framework of TÁMOP-4.2.4.A/2-11/1-2012-0001 "National Excellence Programme."

¹ His most complete biography with bibliography is by Z. Pietrzyk and J. Tazbir, *Radecke Walenty*, in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* (hereafter: PSB), vol. 29, no. 4, 1987, pp. 672-674.

working in Poland and elsewhere; now, disregarding later points of interest in his career, we are presenting only three letters relating to the earliest period. These autograph documents have been found in the Transylvania Archives in Kolozsvár of the Hungarian Unitarian Church.²

Leaving some of the more general lessons of the letters for later, it would seem right to discuss the most important facts first. The first letter was written in Cracow in 1603, its sender was Georg Ludwig Leuchsner, the Nuremberg lawyer already praised by Ludwig Chmaj, who had studied law at Altdorf between 1595 and 1600.³ The addressee, most probably staying at Raków, is first informed by the author of the letter that his stay in Cracow was extended on account of the belated arrival of the merchants from Lublin and the absence of a certain Schillingus, who is not more closely specified,⁴ but who had adequate accommodations with a merchant in the suburbs. Then he mentions Cettis suffering from fever, about whom already Chmaj knew based on the sources of the Altdorf circle that had been won for Unitarian ideas by Walenty Szmalc. One may even infer from the context that the writer is referring to the synod of Raków in 1602 when he mentions their meeting since both demonstrably attended it,⁵ and maybe even Cettis was also present along with Radecke and Leuchsner. If they were still in Cracow in March 1603, one might think their connection became stronger during the winter spent together. This is no insignificant piece of information since the Unitarian group operating around Ernst Soner at Altdorf from around 1606 would later be in epistolary contact with the Polish Brethren through Leuchsner and Cettis, a resident of Cracow.⁶

² In the Lengyel Unitárius Egyház Levéltára (Archives of the Polish Unitarian Church; hereafter: LUEL), cat. no. LUEL 43. Hereby I express my gratitude to the archivist Molnár B. Lehel for giving me access to the digitalized version of the documents and for thinking together with me, and to Ádám Szabó for helping me transcribe the documents and interpret the text.

³ L. Chmaj, *Bracia Polscy. Ludzie, idee, wpływy*, Warszawa 1957, p. 84.

⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 85.

⁵ Ch. Sandius, *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*, Warszawa 1967, p. 175.

⁶ M. Schmeisser, K. Birnstiel, *Gelehrtenkultur und antitrinitarische Häresie an der Nürnberger Akademie zu Altdorf*, "Daphnis – Zeitschrift für Mittlere Deutsche Literatur und Kultur der Frühen Neuzeit (1400-1750)", 39 (2010), nos. 1-2, pp. 221-286, at p. 250; *Sozinianische Bekenntnisschriften, Der Rakówer Katechismus des Valentin Schmalz (1608) und der sogenannte Soner-Katechismus*, ed. M. Schmeisser, Berlin 2012, pp. 44-45, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte des Antitrinitarismus und Sozinianismus in der Frühen Neuzeit, 1; M. Schmeisser,

They probably moved Radecke, too, closer to those at Altdorf, who knew him by the name Pancratius Eubulus, since Radecke visited the Empire only once, and then demonstrably only in Heidelberg, where, according to his note in the book, he bought *Poliorceticon, sive De machinis, tormentis, telis libri quinque Ad historiarum lucem* by Justus Lipsius.⁷ After that, Leuchsner says that he was unable to acquire a Hebrew grammar apart from Habermann's (Avenarius') book. This locus, difficult to interpret in itself, could certainly be connected to the contents of the letter that Faustus Socinus wrote to Radecke on 24 February 1602: „De libris tibi consulo, ut hos omnino h[abe]re cures: Biblia Ariae Montani, Nouum testame[n]tu[m] cum, annotationibus...ribus et integris Bezae, Annotationes Erasmi in idem Novum Testamentum, Grammaticam Hebraeam Coualerij uel Auenarij, eiusde[m] Auenarij Lexicum Hebraeum et compe[n]dium Thesauri Sanctis Pagnini ac praeterea biblia Tremellij et Junij cum annotationibus, Grammaticam graecam Clenardi cum scholijs et praxi Petri Antesignani in quarto (ut vocat[ur]) atque ut ipse Antesignanus edidit et Scapulae Lexicum.”⁸ It is another very important fact that the correspondent urges Radecke in the name of a certain Daniel Flamin(?), also more closely unspecified, and probably staying in Cracow too, to get Everard Spangenberg reply him. The writer of the letter took it for granted that the persons in question were in frequent

Martin Ruarus – eine Zentralfigur des Altdorfer Antitrinitarismus = Religiöser Nonkonformismus und frühneuzeitliche Gelehrtenkultur, ed. F. Vollhardt, Berlin, 2014, p. 86, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte des Antitrinitarismus und Sozinianismus in der Frühen Neuzeit, 2.

⁷ Á. Dankanits, *XVI. századi olvasmányok*, Bukarest 1974, p. 70.

⁸ Published: L. Chmaj, *Dwa nieznanne listy Fausta Socyna. Studia nad arianizmem*, ed. L. Chmaj, Warszawa 1959, pp. 529-530. In Polish: F. Socyn, *Listy*, prep. L. Chmaj, Warszawa 1959, vol. 2, pp. 281-282, 338-339; Ludwik Chmaj based his work on the following text: Cornelius Valerius, *Grammaticarum institutionum libri IV* (the work was published in 1604 by Sternacki; see: A. Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Ariańskie oficyny Rodeckiego i Sternackiego. Dzieje i bibliografia / Les imprimeurs des antitrinitaires polonais Rodecki et Sternacki. Histoire et Bibliographie*, Wrocław 1974); Johann Habermann, *Liber tradicum, sive lexikon hebraicum*; Pagninus Sanctes, *Thesauri linguae sacrae, Hebraicum institutionum libri IV*; Nicolaus Clynaerts, *Institutiones linguae Graecae, Tabula in grammaticam hebraicam; Institutiones linguae graecae authore cum scholiis Antesignani Rapistagnensis*; Pierre Antesignan, *Praxis seu usus praeceptorum grammatices graecae*; Johann Scapula, *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum Novum, in quo ex primitivorum et simplicium fontibus derivata atque composita ordine non minus naturali, quam alphabetico breviter et dilucide deducuntur*, Basel, Sebastian Henricpetri, 1615.

contact with each other, but even so it is interesting that they were involved in transactions concerning books, at least as indicated by two extant volumes in Kolozsvár from Radecke's library. One of those is Socinus' *De Jesu Christo Servatore*, and the other, a Bible published in 1557 in Geneva by Robertus Stephanus, with the following inscription on its title page: *Ex libris Spannenbergi*, and then, following the crossed out name: *Valentini Radekii Gedanensis, emptus ab Everardo Spannenbergio florenis 12, Anno Domini 1602.*⁹

The ending of the letter is less important for us. The writer sends greetings to the Nuremberg lawyer Spangenberg, a follower of Unitarian ideas, as well as to Faustus Socinus then living at Luśawice, and to the notable theologians of the Raków workshop, Nieciecki (?), Krzysztof Ostorodt and Lubieniecki.

Radecke had been at Kolozsvár for a few months when Paweł Szoman wrote a letter to him.¹⁰ Unfortunately, this second document presented in the article has survived in a form torn in many places. Szoman, son of the author of the first completely independent Unitarian catechism, gives an account of the political turmoil in Poland, including the conflict between the king marrying an Austrian princess and the nobility, strongly hoping that the monarch would leave the country. After that he discusses events in the eastern part of the country, but is in not easy to make sense of what he writes. Thus, we do not know who „Calobus noster” (Ernest Kalb) and Josua are, who have not found their way out of the swamps of Moscow yet. The reference to the connection between Voivode of Sandomierz Jerzy Mniszech, his daughter Maryna and Vasily Shuysky is somewhat more concrete. Transylvanian and Hungarian matters follow after that only, and then in a reserved manner. He says thanks for a Grobianus Ungaricus, who was sent there, but in the absence of lists of students, his identity is not possible to establish. The request to the addressee, however, to convey special greetings to Pál Göcs among those in Kolozsvár hoping that he still remembers him, is much more tangible. So he is referring to their meeting, and that tallies with Transylvanian sources since in the wake of the nearly contemporary diary of Bálint Segesvári,¹¹ all later compendia mention that

⁹ The library of the Kolozsvár Branch of the Romanian Academy of Sciences, cat. no. U 60288. I am grateful to Bíró Gyöngyi for the information.

¹⁰ LUEL, 42.

¹¹ *Historical notes of Bálint Segesvári (1606-1654)*, in: *Kolozsvári emlékirók*, eds. J. Bálint, J. Pataki, Bukarest 1990, p. 153. The most detailed summary of

when the Unitarian pastors, found guilty of attacking the Jesuit college in Kolozsvár, had to flee the town coming under Habsburg rule in the autumn of 1603, Pál Göcs found refuge in Poland, probably at Raków. Thus it is more than probable that Radecius was invited to Kolozsvár upon his initiative after the change in the political situation.

The third letter, written by Johannes Ferberinus (Frobenius) appears to be a piece from an intermittent correspondence, on the basis of the introductory words. Unfortunately, the lines that Ferberinus is directly responding to are also lost. They could be a description of the political situation in Transylvania having turned uncertain again with the death of Ruling Prince István Bocskai since an armed conflict unfolded in the usual manner between two political concepts represented by the anti-Habsburg Sigismund Rákóczi on the one hand, and by Bálint Homonnai on the other, trying to achieve a compromise. Ferberinus does everything he can to persuade him to return to Poland, and since he uses the phrase „una cum tuis carissimis” in one place, he probably had the termination of the mission in mind. Of course, he did not have much to say by way of encouragement, and leaving detailed accounts to others, he mentions the defeat of the Zebrzydowski uprising and the devastating consequences of the civil war. To all this is added Ferberinus’ personal loss since he had also lost one of his parents much beloved by Radecke.

The present publication cannot, of course, undertake to draw conclusions concerning Radecke’s whole career from these newly discovered documents. The desire for continuously keeping in touch perceptible in the surviving fragmentary correspondence is, however, definitely consistent with what the literature on the subject has recovered on the early period of this career coming to full bloom at Kolozsvár. That is to say, Walenty Radecke had come to Kolozsvár as a member of the young generation concentrating at Raków, who without a shred of doubt held that embracing Faustus Socinus’ theology was the guarantee of the survival and/or further spreading of Unitarianism. This is especially important with regard to the mission in Transylvania, since contrary to what most of the international literature on the subject claims,¹² Unitarianism in Transylvania had not

Pál Göcs is: J. Kénosi Tózsér, I. Uzoni Fosztó, *Unitario-Ecclesiastica historia Transylvanica, Liber II*, vol. 4/2, ed. J. Káldos, intr. by M. Balázs, rev. by M. Latzkovits, Budapest 2002, pp. 847-849, Bibliotheca Unitariorum, vol. 4/1-3.

¹² See, e.g.: M.E. Welti, *Kleine Geschichte der italienischen Reformation*, Gütersloh 1985, pp. 131-132.

yet developed a unifying process like that in Poland, and although we have no clear picture of the power relations among the individual trends, the positions of the nonadorantists were definitely very strong.¹³ In that respect, Walenty Radecke was especially fit for the job, since he was able to get information on the East-Central-European events of Unitarianism, on the developments of the previous decades from the members of his own family. For it is well-known that his father was Mateusz Radecke,¹⁴ who until the early 1590s had represented a version of Unitarianism in Gdańsk that in many respects differed from nearly every one developed in Greater or Little Poland (Wielkopolska/Małopolska) or Lithuania. Lech Szczucki was the first to analyse in detail the phenomenon in Poland emphasising that besides Mennonite influences, probably the spiritualistic motivations (Sebastian Franck, Kaspar Schwenckfeld) from Germany were the most significant, but what made their theology really unique was adding nonadorantism to the rejection of all external church institutions, that is to say, they denied that Christ was entitled to any divine veneration.¹⁵ Szczucki here naturally had in mind the influence of Ferenc Dávid and those around him since it turns out from the immensely exciting correspondence between Faustus Socinus and Radecke senior in the mid-1580s that Mateusz Radecke referred to him with respect to nonadorantism (unfortunately, as in the case of almost all the opponents of Socinus, Socinian tradition has deemed Socinus' letters alone worth keeping). Some elements nevertheless would indicate that he knew the Transylvanian nonadorantist movement as a whole, and may even have been in contact with them. The literature on the subject so far has not attributed much significance to Samuel Bock's statement, on account of its obscurity, that Mateusz Radecke was also known as „quasdam hungaricas disputationes,”¹⁶ but this expression will be more clear if we consider the piece of information from

¹³ G. Keserű, *The Late Confessionalisation of the Transylvanian Unitarian Church and the Polish Brethen*, in: *Faustus Socinus and his Heritage*, ed. L. Szczucki, Kraków 2005, pp. 163-188.

¹⁴ His detailed biography was written by J. Tazbir in: *PSB*, vol. 29, no. 4, 1987, pp. 672-674.

¹⁵ L. Szczucki, *Marcin Czechowic (1532-1613). Studium z dziejów antytrynitaryzmu polskiego XVI wieku*, Warszawa 1964, pp. 134-138; see also: J. Tazbir, *Socinianismus in Gdańsk und Umgeburg*, "Studia Maritima", 1 (1978), pp. 76-78.

¹⁶ F.S. Bock, *Historia Antitrinitariorum maxime Socinianismi et Socinianorum*, Regiomonti et Lipsiae 1776.

Mihály Balázs that Radecke's library included a copy of *Tractatus aliquot christianae religionis*, the representative publication of the Transylvanian nonadorantists, printed in Radecke's Cracow printing shop in 1583.¹⁷ Another not precisely interpretable fact may also be used to support the continuity of this connection. Faustus Socinus wrote a letter to Jan Balcerowic on 29 March 1593, in which he wrote that he had forwarded Radecke's letter to Transylvania, and he would soon inform the latter, too, of that. However, he asks Balcerowic himself to pass him the letter written in Italian, which should be forwarded to the wife of a certain apostate.¹⁸ The editors of the Polish version of the Socinus correspondence, Ludwik Chmaj, and Lech Szczucki, who as far as we know was assisting him, identified the unnamed apostate as Christian Francken, which would seem fairly substantiated. On the other hand, it is not at all certain that „Radcicus noster” should be identified with the younger Radecke, that is Walenty. We should bear in mind that Radecke senior had by that time broken with his nonadorantist-spiritualistic “errors,” and expelled from Gdańsk, he essentially joined the group organising around Socinus and gaining increasing influence. The reference, at the same time, is indicative of a very intimate connection since if the said apostate is really identified as Francken, who converted to Catholicism in Gyulafehérvár (Alba Iulia), capital of Transylvania in April 1591, then Socinus is involving one of the Radeckes in a measure to be taken concerning a rather sensitive person, especially with regard to the Unitarians in Transylvania. It is precisely this reference that makes one wonder which of them might be the one. We believe it would be a little too early for the great Faustus to share such important intelligence with the younger Radecke who is continuing in Raków the high school studies he had started in Gdańsk. Our doubts would be made more reasonable by the fact that according to the dating, Socinus was at the time staying in Cracow, as was the young Radecke, if we accept Alodia Kawecka-Gryczowa's claim, first supervising the printing of his father's German publications in the Radecke press,

¹⁷ A. Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Ariańskie oficyny*, pp. 191-192. The copy is kept in Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel.

¹⁸ “Literas Radeçii nostri in Transilvaniam misi tertio post die, quam illas ad me miseris; qua de re ipsum Radeçium, brevi, ut spero, per literas certiorum faciam. Tu vero obsecro, literas illas italicas ad uxorem illius apostatae scriptas quqm primum ei reddendas cures. Facies mihi rem gratissimam”, *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, vol. 1, p. 428.

then going on to be involved in the editorial processes of Socinus' publications there, which means Socinus hardly needed to communicate with him by letters from Cracow.¹⁹ Thus, if in the letter to Balcerowic the elder Radecke is mentioned, then there is some ground to assume that he had serious connections in Transylvania, and on the basis of both his intellectual *curriculum vitae* and the facts mentioned here, it would be safe to believe that these connections were not limited to one trend of Unitarianism only. That was probably also considered at the headquarters of the Polish brethren when they sent the son of this multitalented person to Kolozsvár. Whichever of them is mentioned in the above letter, the literature on the subject in Poland says that Walenty Radecke cooperating in the publication of Socinus' works in the mid-1590s had the complete trust of those working around Socinus. Let us not forget that one of the works he helped edit was precisely *De Jesu Christi invocatione disputatio*, containing the material of the debate with Ferenc Dávid, which Socinus deemed important to publish because the issue of Jesus Christ's invocation had surfaced again in Transylvania. The young man probably had a clear understanding of this since Socinus wrote to Walenty Szmalc in his letter of 14 February 1595, that Radecke could give him, Szmalc, a clear picture of the expectations he, Socinus, had for the publication of that work.²⁰ On the other hand, he could rely on the credit and set of connections he inherited from his family. His suitability could only be enhanced at the same time by the fact that for familial reasons he had become very well informed concerning the eschatological disputes Transylvanians were so preoccupied with. For these became actual issues in Transylvania around the turn of the century not only because nonadorantism, and especially the idea that Christ was at present not ruling over his followers, inescapably put the novel approach on the agenda to a number of biblical loci traditionally interpreted on the ruling of Christ, but also because political events, as a result of the breaking out of the so-called long Turkish war, widely made the role the Turks were playing in the final days seasonable. Consequently, as many various ideas were formulated in

¹⁹ A. Kawecka-Gryczowa, *Ariańskie oficyny*, pp. 44, 47-48, 95-96, 180, 186.

²⁰ "Quod quaedam ex Disputatione mea cum Francisco Davidis excerpseris, gratissimum mihi fecisti, nec erat cur Moscorovius noster aliter existimaret, quae spes huius libelli edendi sit, ex Radecio intelliges", *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, vol. 2, p. 459 (in Polish: *Listy*, vol. 2, p. 158).

polemical essays and sermons in Latin, Hungarian, and German,²¹ by preachers representing various trends, it was definitely advisable for anyone going to Transylvania to be well-versed in that respect as well. Just remember that his father wrote a treatise, now regrettably lost, on the subject with the title *Scriptum de regno Christi millenario*, and the community put the son's erudition to the test, too, in 1600. They sent him to Gdańsk to subdue a group spreading chiliastic ideas under the leadership of the English Thomas Leamer, and the young Radecke did his best to turn them towards the doctrines he deemed correct by sermons and by other written works.²² It could be important in that context that in the period before the mission, Walenty Radecke was in permanent contact with Spangenberg, who would not dissociate himself from such ideas. As we have seen, that prophetically inclined preacher was at that time staying at Raków, and the young Radecke getting a book from him precisely in that year might be seen piquant, 1602 being the very year that Spangenberg expected to see the second coming of Christ. This possibility of everyday contact, on the other hand, could have significance with regard to the later mission to Transylvania. For Spangenberg had been staying in Transylvania until 1597, and thus could provide information on the situation there on the basis of direct experiences.

²¹ On that, see: M. Balázs, *Antitrinitarianism and Millenarianism in Transylvania* (to be published).

²² K. Dobrowolski, *Nieznana kronika arjańska 1593-1595*, "Reformacja w Polsce", 4 (1926), p. 171.

Appendix

1. Krakkó, 1603. március 5.

Georg Ludwig Leuchsner levele Valentin Radeckéhez
LUEL 43

Pietate ac eruditione praestantiss[imo] viro, d[omi]no Valentino Radekio, fratri in D[omi]no plurimum amando. Racoviam. Redditae 9. Martij.

Salutem a Deo patre et D[omi]no n[ost]ro, J[esu] C[hristo]

Quod praesentem commoditatem ad vos proficiscendi negligere coactus sum, caussa est, quod negotium, cuius gratia hic subsisto, nondum exspedire licuit. Mercatores ex nundinis Lublinensib[us] serius, quam putatum, redeunt, nunc tamen propediem exspectantur. Interea ipse Schillingus urbe abfuit et adhuc abest. Cuius praesentiae si copia fuisset adeundi, eo fortasse res meas iam deduxissem, ut pecunia[m] alia ratione nactus hinc discedere potuissem. Nam absentiam a vobis et studijs nostris tam diuturnam non possum non aegerrime ferre. Nunc, post abitum d[omi]n[i] magnifici nostri, mutato veteri hospitio habito hic in suburbio, quod vocat[ur] cerdonum auf der Gerberey, in aedibus mercatoris, alias mei popularis loco satis com[m]odo. Caeterum d[omi]n[us] Cettis nunc feбри laborat, quater iam paroxismo corrept[us]. Deus benigniss[imus] ipsum liberet! Hebraeas gram[m]aticas nullas hic nancisci possu[m] praeter unam Auenarij, alioqui nullae, nisi Schindleri prostant. Porro rogo, ut d[omi]natio v[est]ra d[omi]n[o] Spangenbergio praeter salutem plurimam significet Danielem Flamin mirari, quod nullas ad ipsum det literas. Et ille, si videatur, quod superiorib[us] dieb[us] per l[ite]ras ab ipso petij, huc ad me servum suum cum curru et equis mittat me petitum. Nam alias fortasse hinc nulla illuc eundi com[m]oditas dabitur. Si est missurus, velim, ut servus die Lunae saltem vesper huc veniat. Sin die Martis sequenti neminem videro, alio quoque modo mihi prospicia[m]. Hisce d[omi]n[o] Socino, d[omi]n[o] Ostorodo, d[omi]n[o] Lubieniecio et d[omi]n[o] Nieciecio (?) mea[m] salutem plurimam, illoru[m] amoris ac precib[us] me diligenter com[m]endans. Itemq[ue] caeteros fr[at]res meo no[m]i[n]e salutatos, volo. D[omi]no magnifico velim, d[omi]n[atio] v[est]ra praeter mea servitia significet me librum, quem petijt, emisse ligandumq[ue] dedisse. Mecum una adfera[m] Deo volente. D[omi]n[atio] v[est]ra una cum suis bene

valeat meq[ue] amet et precib[us] suis com[m]endatu[m] habeat. Cracoviae 5. Martij 1603.

D[omi]n[at]ionis v[est]rae in D[omi]no amantiss[imus] fr[ater]
serv[us]q[ue] deditiss[imus]
Georg[ius] Lud[ovicus] Leucssner[us]

2. Raków, 1606. február 17.

Paweł Szoman levele Valentin Radeckéhez

LUEL 42

Eruditione et pietate insigni morumq[ue] integritate ornatissimo viro, d[omino] Valentino Radecio Gedanensi, amico optatissimo ac observandissimo. Claudiopoli.

S[alutem] p[lurimam]. Mulieribus et <...> abeuntibus non potui <...> enim et meo <...> praesertim tanto temporis et locor[um] intervallo <...> diversitate solus quoddam et nefarium piaculum <...>. Volui itaq[ue] mihi et huic tam commodae occasioni non deesse, nec officiu[m], quo tibi, tam iucundo amico sum obligatus, deserere, neq[ue] deniq[ue] illud a te desiderari. Licet autem, quod nunc praecipue scriberem, non esset, malui tamen aliquid scribere potius, quam alto silentio erectam expectationem tuam eludere. Domestica igitur quotidianaq[ue] illa, usitatissima familiari formula utar, qua amicissimi inter se uti consueverunt, ut ne quem cum Cic[erone] isthuc euntem sine mea schedula dimittam. Nos hic omnes, atq[ue] adeo ipsa Respub[lica] Christiana, quod Christo gratia sit, quanq[ue] in variis polithiae procellis, valemus tamen optime. Rex discessum ad suos Suecos, nescio quibus consiliis, non tantum molitur, sed confidenter etiam et quidem splendido Austriaci gynaeei comitatu pro viribus parat et adornat. Quod propositum utinam tam feliciter teneat, urgeat deniq[ue] ac persequatur Stronie, quam facile successit (!) et qua[m] ardentem omnium votis, ut promoveat, expetitur. Porro Calobus noster et Josua nondum ex Arctois illis Moschoviticis paludibus, licet frigore astrictis, emergerunt. Mnisci quoq[ue] Sedomiriensis palatini filia, Moschovitico Basilidi nuptura p[ro]p[ter] nimium et exq[ui]situm ornatus luxum, cui praeter modum <...> suo sponso studere iussa est, nondum hinc in Moschoviam ad suum <...> iter aggredi potuit, sed tamen comitiis peractis et dimissis plane tunc statim discessura dicitur. Utinam hunc Josianum eius herois animu[m]

Deus confirmet conataq[ue] pia et sancta ad optatum eventum perducatur. De tuo quoq[ue] illo Grobiano Ungarico tibi quam maximas gratias ago, animu[m] enim tuum, q[ui] esset erga me et quam indefatigatus in gratificando mihi, abunde testatus est. In hanc sententiam scriberem plura, quamq[uam] tandem in buccam venirent, nisi te a tuis uberiores, pleniores, suaviores, omni deniq[ue] ex parte locupletiores et accuratiores, quae tibi abunde et cumulate in omnibus satisfaciunt, epistolas acceptur[um] sperarem. Quod igitur restat, valebis mi, optime Radece, et nos, quod obnixè petimus quodq[ue] hactenus non gravate, nec illibenter fecisti, ut fratres frater, amore pristino prosequeris, mei omnes tibi salutem dicunt plurimam. Tu quoq[ue] tuos Claudiopolitanos, praesertim vero d[ominum] Paulum Götzcium, si nostri adhuc immemor no[n] est, salute imperties plurima. Faxit Deus, ut tua isthac commoratio tantum apud istos proficiat, quantum ad ipsos Christo reconciliandos vitamq[ue] illam sempiterna[m] adipiscendam sufficiat. Haec enim, quod ome[n] Deus avertat, non effecto, quid <...> accedere possit praeter susceptos <...> non video. Iterum atq[ue] iterum <...> Racovia, 13. Cal[endas] Martii. Anno 1606. <...> cupidissimus Paulus Schoman.

3. Raków, 1607. september 30.

Ioannes Ferberinus levele Valentin Radeckéhez

LUEL 41

Clarissimo doctissimoq[ue] viro, d[omino] Valentino Radecio, fautori meo perquam colendo.

Per <...>

At nos te potius incolumem conspexissemus, quam l[itte]ras tuas legissemus, vir clarissime. Profecto si aliquam ex tuis ad nos l[ite]ris datis cepimus voluptatem, cepissemus te praesente maximam. Quid ig[itu]r est in causa, quominus ad nos venires? Bellum fortasse! Bellum certe, quod & apud vos de integro suscitatum esse, ad nos accuratissime perscripsisti. O dolorem! Quoties & ego te l[ite]ris compellassem, quoties epistolam meam vidisses, nisi id ipsum, quod totius mundi partes personat, bellum obstitisset? Itaq[ue] & nunc sum dubius perlatas iri & hasce, & olim, quas dedi, perlatas esse. Sed quicquid fiet, sic habeto tamen, clarissime Radeci, siue belli, siue pacis tempore me semper tui amantissimum futurum. Flagitat id ille tuus

toties in me collatus amor, postulat ineffabilis & semper praedicanda benevolentia, requirit etiam meus, quo erga te semper praeclare fui affectus, animus. Vixi ego tecum aliquando, & vixisse me memini, ut filius apud patrem, ut apud patronum servum (!). Nihil erat, in quo ego officium tuum desiderarem, in quo afflictae sorti meae succurrere nolles, erat nihil. Itaq[ue] non solum mihi, tecum viventi, sed etiam discendenti es opitulatus, Neq[ue] enim cuipiam, tibi soli, quod e tenebris illis cimmerijs in lucem prodierim, asscribo, hanc ego cum aspicio, cum mihi venit in mentem usum me aliquando fuisse adversa fortuna, confossum infirma valetudine in lecto iacuisse, fortunas omnes meas & diem primam accusasse, nunc vero vires meas prostratas recolligere me iterum agnosco. Eheu, in haec verba prorumpo, Deus altissime, & horum conatus benedicito, quorum ego olim sum usus auxilio, & qui me pristino officiorum & valetudinis meae vigori volebant restituere. Sed quo ego delabor, quasi putem, hac schedula beneficia tua in me collata includi posse! Praesenti igitur potius animi mei gratitudinem offeram praesens, praesens Deo volente praesentis animum colam. Illud tamen addam summo nos tui, ut initio attigi, vir clarissime, desiderio teneri eoq[ue] fuisse animo, nempe conspectu tuo dulcissimo nos frui debuisse. Sed mille sunt, ut ego quidem novi, causae, & bellum, quod attigi inprimis, quod propositum tuum retardavit. Itaq[ue] non tibi vitio damus, ardentem tamen illud optamus, ad nos quamprimum, & si fieri poterit una cum tuis carissimis, venires. Nos, ut dixi, periclitamur, & quod magis republica. Omnis fere nobilitatis flos est in armis, editae iam aliquot cruentissimae strages, direptae quaedam civitates, vastati pagi, urbes incensae, de quo, ut arbitror, n[ost]ri ad te fusius, nam & ego ob angustiam temporis brevius ad te scribo, quam tua humanitas postulasset, ad tuos vero ne syllabam ob eandem causam. Rogo, ne mihi succenseant. Salutem eis defero tamen plurimam. O[mn]es, quibus tua virtus nota, te quoq[ue] salutant. Parentem fata mihi eripuerunt, si nescis, illum, quem vehementer amasti, nam admonuisti erroris, imbecillitatis, peccati. Reddat te nobis Deus! Vale! Racoviae. Ultima septemb[ris]. A[nno] D[omini] 1607.

Omnibus, qui me norunt & amarunt Transylvanis salutem.
Tui tuorumq[ue] studio[si]ssi[mus], amantissj[mus]
Ioannes Ferberinus
[...] (?) mp.

MA Dávid Molnár, Ph.D. student at the Institute of Hungarian Language and Literature, University of Szeged; he studies Transylvanian Antitrinitarians in the first half of the seventeenth century.

E-mail: david.molnar86@gmail.com.