

Director Emeritus

Gaetano Platania (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Director

Alessandro Boccolini (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Scientific Board

Irena Vaišvilaitė (Ambassador of the Republic of Lithuania to UNESCO)

Matteo Sanfilippo (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Massimo Carlo Giannini (Università degli Studi di Teramo)

Rimvydas Petrauskas (Vilnius University)

Giordano Altarozzi (Petru Maior University of Târgu Mures)

Giovanni Pizzorusso (Università degli Studi “G. d’Annunzio”, Chieti-Pescara)

Michaela Valente (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”)

Cesare La Mantia (Università di Trieste)

Prokhorov Andrei (Belarusian State University of Minsk)

Olexiy Sokyrrko (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

Rafał Quirini-Popławski (Jagiellonian University of Kraków)

Jarosław Pietrzak (Pedagogical University of Kraków)

Marta Gołabek (Museum of King John III’s Palace at Wilanów – Warsaw)

Dorota Gregorowicz (University of Silesia in Katowice)

Michał Salamonik (Södertörn University)

Language Expert

Sonia Maria Melchiorre (Università degli Studi della Tuscia)

Editorial Board

Bogdana Nosova (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv)

Francesco Vitali (Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”)

Małgorzata Trzeciak Cygan (University of Warsaw)



Centro Studi sull'Età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna
(Study Center on the Sobieski Age and of Modern Poland)
www.cespom.eu

Proprietà letteraria riservata. La riproduzione in qualsiasi forma, memorizzazione o trascrizione con qualunque mezzo (elettronico, meccanico, in fotocopia, in disco o in altro modo, compresi cinema, radio, televisione, internet) sono vietate senza l'autorizzazione scritta dell'Editore.

Eastern European History Review è una rivista on-line peer-reviewed con lettori anonimi

Chiuso il 31-12-2025

Impaginazione a cura di: *Emanuele Paris*

ISBN: 979-12-5524-219-2
ISBN ebook: 979-12-5524-220-8
ISSN: 2612-0402 009

Permalink: <http://hdl.handle.net/2067/54096>

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW
Via Santa Maria in Gradi 4 – 01100 Viterbo
www.easterneuropeanhistory.eu
eehr@unitus.it

Edizioni **SETTE CITTÀ**
Via Mazzini 87 – 01100 Viterbo
t. +39 0761 303020 – info@settecitta.eu

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW

Annually Historical Journal

~
n. 8/2025
Special Issue

**FROM THE LONG TURKISH WAR (1593-1606)
TO THE LIBERATION OF VIENNA (1683)**

Edited by
Alessandro Boccolini and Ovidiu Cristea



EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW: LA RIVISTA

Il Comitato redazionale e scientifico è lieto di presentare al pubblico la rivista scientifica *Eastern European History Review*.

Con un carattere internazionale e interdisciplinare, una cadenza annuale e una fruibilità *open access* la rivista focalizza i propri interessi sulle dinamiche occorse nell'Europa Orientale durante tutta l'età moderna (XIV-XIX). *Eastern European History Review* è espressione del Centro Studi dell'Università della Tuscia CESPoM (Centro Studi sull'età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna) nato nel 1997 per intuizione del Prof. Gaetano Platania, Direttore Emerito della Rivista.

L'iniziativa editoriale che presentiamo nasce dall'evidente mancanza in Italia di una rivista scientifica relativa alla storia dell'Europa centro-orientale in Età Moderna, nonostante la penisola abbia giocato un ruolo fondamentale per la Storia e la Cultura di una parte integrante del continente, a torto considerata come lontana e periferica.

Consapevoli di questo, il Comitato ha posto quale obiettivo primario della *Eastern European History Review* quello di offrire uno spazio di riflessione e di discussione su temi che appartengono alla storia dell'Europa centro-orientale, e insieme alle relazioni - politiche e culturali - che questa vasta area del Vecchio Continente ha avuto con l'occidente d'Europa, e l'Italia in particolare, incoraggiando il dialogo tra studiosi e esperti di settore, e tra differenti approcci della ricerca scientifica.

Il Comitato Redazionale e Scientifico

EASTERN EUROPEAN HISTORY REVIEW: THE JOURNAL

The Editorial and Scientific Board are proud delighted to present the *Eastern European History Review* under the aegis of Sette Città Editore.

The *Eastern European History Review* is an international and interdisciplinary annually online and open access peer-reviewed journal about studies on Central and Eastern Europe in the Modern Age (XIV-XIX). The Journal is also the expression of the Study Center CESPoM (Centro Studi sull'età dei Sobieski e della Polonia Moderna – Center Study on the Age of Sobieski and Modern Poland) of the University of Tuscia, born in 1997, from an idea of Prof. Gaetano Platania, today Director Emeritus of this journal.

It publishes articles with significant approaches and original interpretations in all research fields concerning Central and Eastern Europe, with specific attention to the History sciences.

The editorial initiative we present comes from the obvious lack of a journal, in Italy, concerning the history of Central and Eastern Europe during the Modern Age, this despite its fundamental role in the history and culture of that part of the continent, wrongly considered distant and peripheral.

Quite the contrary is true, in fact. Main objective of the journal is to create a space for reflection and discussion on topics pertaining to Central and Eastern Europe, but also relations with Continental Europe, encouraging dialogue between scholars and experts in the field, and between different approaches of scientific research.

The Editorial and Scientific Board

SUMMARY

Ovidiu Cristea and Alessandro Boccolini <i>Preface</i>	9
Alessandro Boccolini <i>Introduction</i>	13
Marian Coman <i>Framing conflict. Maps of the Ottoman-habsburg Long War</i>	17
Livia Magina <i>Transylvanian defensive system and territorial changes on the Ottoman frontier in the first half of the 17th century</i>	41
Adrian Magina <i>Confrontation on the Transylvanian-ottoman frontier: the battles in Banat during the “Long Turkish War”</i>	53
Ovidiu Cristea <i>“Notabili successe nel viaggio dell’Ungheria”: a testimony about the Ottoman campaign of 1596</i>	69
Oana-Andreia Sâmbrian <i>Girolamo Frachetta, una spia per la spagna durante la lunga guerra turca (1593-1606). Tecniche, strategie e alcune informazioni sulla Transilvania</i>	89
Dorel Țuinea <i>The Habsburgs and the Transylvanian Diets convened by Michael the Brave</i>	101
Florina Ciure <i>The Transylvanian Contribution to the Thirty Years’ War in 17th-Century Venetian Historiography</i>	111

Paweł Duda	
<i>The Battle of Khotyn in 1621 in the accounts of papal diplomats</i>	131
Cristina Codarcea	
<i>La lutte anti ottomane et le monde catholique de la Bulgarie du XVIIème siècle. Sémantique et mythes historiographiques autour d'une réalité confessionnelle marginale</i>	153
Susanna Piselli	
<i>The Battle of Kothyn (1673): A Road to the Throne</i>	175
Alessandro Boccolini	
<i>From Żurawno to Grodno: Jan III Sobieski and the Ottoman Threat</i>	189
Gaetano Platania	
<i>Sobieski, Leopoldo, Innocenzo XI e la liberazione di Vienna (1683) attraverso alcuni documenti editi e/o inedita</i>	211

VARIA SECTION

Matteo Sanfilippo	
<i>Katalin Prajda's research on migratory exchanges between the late Middle Ages and the early modern period</i>	233



<http://hdl.handle.net/2067/54088>

THE HABSBURGS AND THE TRANSYLVANIAN DIETS CONVENED BY MICHAEL THE BRAVE

ABSTRACT: In his capacity as Prince of Transylvania, Michael the Brave summoned the Transylvanian Diet on four occasions, the final convocation ultimately failing to materialize. The first three assemblies were duly constituted and formally affirmed his accession to the princely dignity. As the Diet functioned as the central deliberative and legislative body of the principality, representatives of the Habsburg Monarchy repeatedly sought either to forestall its convocation or to secure their participation in its proceedings. Michael the Brave, however, systematically precluded imperial agents from attending the sessions, notwithstanding the fact that his tenure in Transylvania was marked by sustained diplomatic engagement—both official and informal—with the Habsburg court.

KEYWORDS: Michael the Brave; Diet of Transylvania; Habsburg agents; Papal nuncio; Princely prerogative.

The conquest of Transylvania by Michael the Brave, ruler of Wallachia, was a military event that was part of the Long War between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans. After Sigismund Bathory's second abdication, leadership of Transylvania was taken over by Cardinal Andrei Bathory, a relative of the former prince, who intended to make peace with the Ottomans. In this context, Michael the Brave organized the campaign to conquer Transylvania, which ended with the victory at Șelimbăr and the killing of Andrei Bathory by the Székelys on his way to Moldova and Poland.

The Wallachian voivode legitimized his rule in Transylvania through his membership in the Holy League, led by Emperor Rudolf II, and through the right of war (*jus belli*). As a result, between November 1599 and September 1600, Michael the Brave took several actions to be recognized as the legitimate prince of the country by both the Transylvanians and the Habsburgs. In this study, we aim to present the disputes between Michael the Brave and the representatives of the Habsburgs regarding the exercise of the princely right to convene the Diet of the country.

The act of convening the Diet was one of the most important and prestigious prerogatives of the prince, a central element of the political structure of the principality. These meetings were attended by the highest-ranking political figures of the time, who played key roles in the governance and administration of the region. Among the prominent participants were princely advisors, members of county committees, the supreme military captains, judges of the princely court, and representatives from various cities¹. Obviously, in order to participate, attendees had

¹ Lám Károly, *Az Erdélyi országgyűlés szervezete (1541-1848)* (Cluj: Gámán János, 1908), 10-1; Alexandru Herlea, "Dietele în Transilvania autonomă", *Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie*, 6 (1973): 207-15.

to represent one of the three primary political Estates of Transylvania: the nobility, the Saxons, or the Szeklers. The Wallachian prince convened the Diet of the country four times, but it only met three times (in Alba Iulia on 20-28 November 1599, in Brașov on 12-15 March 1600, and again in Alba Iulia on 20-27 July 1600)².

An examination of historical sources indicates that Michael the Brave consistently sought to exercise his prerogative to convene the Diet free from both internal and external interference. Nevertheless, imperial representatives repeatedly endeavored either to obstruct the convocation of the Diet or to secure the right to participate in these general assemblies. Consequently, on 2 November 1599—merely one day after his triumphant entry into Alba Iulia—Michael the Brave convened the Diet in Cluj, evidently with the intention of formally informing local authorities of the newly established leadership of the country³. Although the assembly was initially scheduled to convene on 20 November 1599, its venue was subsequently changed to Alba Iulia, as evidenced by new convocation orders issued by the Wallachian voivode to the municipal authorities of Bistrița and to the officials of Solnocul de Mijloc County⁴.

In his capacity as Apostolic Nuncio, Germanico Malaspina—an astute observer of Transylvanian affairs who regularly informed both the Holy See and Emperor Rudolf II regarding the political developments during the rule of Michael the Brave—remarked in a dispatch dated 14 November 1599 that the act of convening the Diet represented “the highest act of jurisdiction that a prince can exercise”. From Malaspina’s perspective, such an assertion of sovereign authority posed a direct challenge to Habsburg prerogatives; consequently, he sought to forestall the assembly, arguing that its convocation would prove detrimental to the political authority and strategic interests of the emperor⁵. However, the Wallachian voivode demonstrated a firm unwillingness to relinquish this essential prerogative of princely authority. This is evidenced by a report dated 7 December 1599, in which Bartolomeus Pezzen—having been informed by several envoys dispatched to Transylvania on behalf of the Habsburgs—noted that Michael the Brave “convened and held the Diet without the knowledge and approval of His Majesty” and that “he refused to have in his presence or within the Diet Mr. Ungnad and other imperial commissioners, namely Lords Pető Ladislau, Forgách, and Nieri, whom he dismissed with little regard”⁶. Among these commissioners, David Ungnad and Sigismund Forgách arrived in Alba Iulia on 12 November 1599, where they were received by “the logothete, the grand chamberlain, the commissioner, and many

2 Petre P. Panaitescu, *Mihai Viteazul* (București: Corint, 2002), 161-63.

3 *Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde*, vol. II (Hermannstadt: Verlag des Vereins, 1844), 458; Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor*, XII (Bucharest: Soccec, 1903), 483-84 (no. 769 and 770).

4 Kemény József, Kovács István, *Erdélyország történetei tára* (Cluj, 1837), 233, no. 6; Ioan Lupaș, *Documente istorice transilvane* (Cluj: Cartea Românească, 1940), 2, no. 2.

5 MVCE, I (Bucharest: Ed. Academiei, 1982), 281, no. 104.

6 MVCE, I, 313, no. 115; see also Ștefan Andreescu, *Restitutio Daciae*, III (Bucharest: Albatros, 1997), 300-01.

other prominent nobles”⁷. On the following day, Michael the Brave granted the commissioners an audience, after which several exchanges of gifts occurred over the ensuing days. Notably, on 16 November 1599, the two commissioners were invited to dine with the voivode, on which occasion “Mr. Ungnad presented the voivode with a finely crafted gold medal, adorned with the effigies of ten Roman-German emperors and set with exquisite oriental rubies”⁸. Details of this banquet were later circulated within Habsburg circles, as evidenced by Gheorghe Rabuss’s correspondence to Archduke Maximilian. Rabuss reported that he had learned directly from Ungnad that, “upon arriving together with Forgách Sigmund in Alba Iulia, at the court of Voivode Michael, the latter invited them both, along with Pető Ladislau, as guests; and there they all became so inebriated—he and they alike—that each had to be taken home by carriage”⁹.

Despite the sumptuous banquet and the exchange of valuable gifts, the imperial commissioners failed to achieve their intended objectives, as Michael the Brave refused to permit their participation in the proceedings of the Diet. Consequently, one of the guests, Sigismund Forgách, wrote in a tone of evident bitterness to Nicolae Pálffy, stating that “just today, when the Diet was to be held, he removed me, Mr. Ungnad, and the papal nuncio from here, so that we would neither know nor witness what was being decided there”¹⁰.

The emperor was apprised of Michael the Brave’s convocation of the Diet by David Ungnad himself, who took care to communicate this information both in writing and through specially dispatched messengers¹¹. Ungnad’s correspondence reveals that, on 6 November 1599, he and Bartolomeus Pezzen were in Tășnad en route to Alba Iulia. At that time, they were unaware that the Diet was to convene there, their mission being primarily to observe closely the measures adopted by Michael the Brave and to assess his relations with the Transylvanian Estates. It is certain that Ungnad subsequently arrived in Alba Iulia and, upon learning of the planned assembly, likely requested permission from the Wallachian ruler to attend its proceedings. As previously noted, however, his participation was not permitted; indeed, he was, in his own words, “sent away from here by this palatine more quickly than he would have liked”¹².

The same fate befell the papal nuncio Germanico Malaspina, whom Michael the Brave informed that he must leave for Rome within two days at the latest, but who nevertheless did not leave Alba Iulia before being received in audience by the voivode¹³. His departure was not scheduled until November 18, alongside

7 MVCE, IV, 188, no. 133.

8 MVCE, IV, 188, no. 133.

9 MVCE, I, 314, no. 116.

10 MVCE, I, 289, no. 107.

11 MVCE, I, 267, no. 100.

12 *Călători străini despre Țările Române*, IV, eds. Maria Holban, Maria Matilda Alexandrescu Dersca-Bulgaru, and Paul Cernovodeanu (Bucharest: Ed. Științifică, 1972), 167.

13 *Călători străini*, IV, 167-68.

a representative of the voivode and together with David Ungnad and Sigismund Forgach, who were accompanied by 400 Hungarian horsemen¹⁴. Returning to Transylvania, David Ungnad wrote to the emperor in Alba Iulia on 15-16 February 1600, repeating the words spoken to him by Gașpar Kornis: “if it is true that he took this country for Your Majesty [...] then it would not have been appropriate to convene the Diet without Your Majesty’s knowledge”¹⁵.

Beyond the objective of informing the Transylvanian Estates of the new political order in their country, the necessity of convening this Diet emerges clearly from the text of the decisions adopted on that occasion. Indeed, even before enumerating the specific resolutions agreed upon, the Transylvanian representatives declared that “Your Majesty [Michael the Brave] desires two things from us for the good and preservation of our poor country,” namely, “that Your Majesty should lack neither food nor money”¹⁶. Therefore, the first articles of the Diet concern the amount of taxes in grain, cattle, and money, an obligation from which no inhabitant of the country can escape, except for the exemptions specifically specified in the text of the Diet¹⁷. Subsequent provisions of the Diet addressed matters concerning the maintenance of the army, the punishment of fugitive serfs who had rebelled against their masters, and the accountability of those nobles who, having joined the voivode’s forces, had incited the troops to acts of plunder, thereby inflicting considerable losses on certain individuals. The *privileged nations* further secured assurances that the ruler would uphold their rights of ownership and inheritance, undertake the restitution of estates unlawfully occupied by some of his retainers, and permit those nobles who had fled the country to return to their homes without incurring any form of punishment.

We have already seen that the participation of imperial or papal representatives in the Diet was not permitted by Michael the Brave, but the account of the Scepusian Chamber to Archduke Mathias, according to which not even the name of the emperor was mentioned in the proceedings of the Diet, is unfounded¹⁸. We know from Ioan Darahi’s report to Commissioner Mihail Szekely that the participants in the Diet swore allegiance to the Roman-German emperor and to Michael the Brave as governor of the country¹⁹. The information provided by Ioan Darahi is also confirmed by the document dated 16 December 1599, in which the magistrate of Sebeș attests that the leaders of the city and the surrounding estates swore allegiance to the emperor and Michael the Brave individually, as decided by the Diet of Alba

14 *Călători străini*, IV, 172.

15 MVCE, I, 424, no. 149.

16 MVCE, I, 298, no. 109.

17 This is the case for the cities of Cluj, Aiud, and Turda, which are exempt from paying taxes due to the expenses incurred by their residents for maintaining the army.

18 Andrei Veress, *Documente privitoare la istoria Ardealului, Moldovei și Țării Românești*, V (Bucharest: Cartea Românească), 340-42, no. 233.

19 *Călători străini*, IV, 130.

Iulia²⁰. Furthermore, in the documents sent by the Diet to the local authorities in Transylvania, Michael the Brave uses the official title of deputy emperor (“Sacratissimae Caesareae Regiaeque Majestatis Consiliarius, per Transsilvaniam locumtenens”)²¹, which proves once again that the information provided by the officials in Košice does not correspond to the actual situation. In fact, on the day the Diet’s work ended, news arrived in Prague that an oath had been sworn to the emperor at the Diet in Cluj and that the voivode intended to convene another one in Alba Iulia, in which the commissioners would have no say (“nella quale non voleva altrimente v’intervenissero li commissarii imperiali”)²², and this ambiguity can also be attributed to the limited information available, including to the imperial commissioners in Transylvania.

A situation analogous to that surrounding the convocation of the first Diet can be observed in the case of the second, which was likewise summoned and assembled at the order of Michael the Brave. On this occasion, however, he altered not only the venue of the assembly but also the date of its convocation. This is attested by a document dated 28 January 1600, issued in Alba Iulia and addressed to Volfgang (Farkas) Kornis, which has been preserved in its original form²³. According to this document, Volfgang Kornis²⁴ was invited to participate in the Diet of Alba Iulia, scheduled to convene on 16 February 1600. However, for reasons that remain unknown, no such assembly took place in February. Instead, on 4 March 1600, the Wallachian voivode issued new letters of summons for a Diet, this time to be held in Braşov on 12 March 1600²⁵. News of the convocation of a new Diet also reached the imperial commissioners, as evidenced by a letter from Mihail Szekely to the imperial councillor Ioan Barvitius, dated 7 March 1600, in which he reported that the assembly was to be held in Braşov, though, as he remarked, “what will be discussed there remains to be seen”²⁶.

Once again, the imperial commissioners were excluded from the deliberations of the Diet, and the information available to them was both limited and contradictory. It is, however, certain that during the days in which the assembly was in session, both David Ungnad and Mihail Szekely were present in Braşov, as attested by their report to the emperor dated 13 March 1600²⁷. The two commissioners informed Rudolf II

20 Lajos Szádeczki, *Erdély és Mihály vajda története (1595-1601)* (Timişoara: Csanad Egyházmegyei, 1893), 319-20, no. 62.

21 MVCE, I, 298, no. 109.

22 Hurmuzaki, *Documente*, XII, 548, no. 880.

23 Szádeczki, *Erdély és Mihály*, 328-29, no. 77.

24 This nobleman is one of the deputies that Michael the Brave leaves in charge of Transylvania during his campaign to conquer Moldavia. The voivode informs the imperial commissioners of this on May 4 and 6, 1600. See Hurmuzaki, *Documente*, IV/1, 45-46, no. 26 and 27; MVCE, I, 479-480, no. 171; Nicolae Iorga, *Istoria lui Mihai Viteazul* (Bucharest: Ed. Militară, 1968), 336.

25 Hurmuzaki, *Documente*, XII, 751, no. 1118.

26 MVCE, I, 431, no. 152.

27 Hurmuzaki, *Documente*, XII, 771-775, no. 1142. A short fragment of this

that the information available to them was imprecise, that decisions appeared to change from day to day, and that, in fact, the Diet had not taken place. They further reported, on the basis of information provided by the great boyar Stoica, that adverse weather conditions had rendered the roads difficult to traverse, preventing many of the delegates from arriving on time²⁸. According to Stoica, consideration was given to relocating the Diet's meeting place to Sibiu or Alba Iulia, the principal motivation for convening this new assembly being the voivode's financial needs. The possibility of postponing the Diet and transferring it to Sibiu is likewise mentioned by Saxon chroniclers, who record that, at the request of the Transylvanian leaders already gathered in Brașov, Michael the Brave consented to continue the proceedings of the Diet²⁹.

106

This report clearly raises questions about the accuracy and completeness of the information available to the imperial commissioners. The final act of the Diet confirms that its proceedings began on 12 March 1600, meaning the commissioners' report was drafted one day after the partial opening of the assembly. Nevertheless, the Habsburg representatives admitted they knew nothing with certainty and, as a result, informed the emperor that, owing to this uncertainty, they were unable to provide a substantive account of Michael the Brave's governance. In fact, they were unaware that the Diet's debates had commenced the previous day, having learned only from Stoica that the assembly had been convened too late and that some of those summoned had been unable to attend.

Whether Stoica himself was ignorant of the Diet's start, deliberately withheld information, or whether the session was indeed delayed due to the low number of participants remains unclear. While the first possibility seems improbable, what is certain is that Michael the Brave and his close collaborators effectively kept the emperor's representatives at a distance from the internal political affairs of the principality. Consequently, the commissioners could ascertain nothing definite about the assembly's decisions, apart from the voivode's financial demands. In a subsequent report, sent from Brașov on 15 March 1600³⁰, the very day the Diet concluded, they stated that the Diet had been held "yesterday and today", yet they still knew nothing of its resolutions except for the imposition of a new monetary contribution, which they believed to be eight thalers per gate. In reality, the Transylvanian Estates had agreed to pay only four florins per gate, and this inaccuracy serves to confirm Michael the Brave's deliberate policy, together with that of his collaborators, to ensure that the imperial authorities received information that was both minimal and ambiguous.

The third Diet of Transylvania, convened at the behest of Michael the Brave, met in Alba Iulia in July 1600 with the stated purpose of addressing matters "that will

document is translated in *MVCE*, V, 250, no. 163.

28 Hurmuzaki, *Documente*, XII, 771, no. 1142.

29 "iterum autem mutata sententia, volebat prorogare et transferre celebranda Cibinii, verum quia jam confluerant regni proceres, precibus obtinebant, ut continuarentur", *Chronicon Fuchsio-Lupino-Oltardinum sive Annales Hungarici*, ed. Joseph Trausch, (Corona: Johann Gott, 1847), 153.

30 Hurmuzaki, *Documente*, XII, 776-78, no. 1145.

seem to be of the greatest benefit to our public salvation”³¹. The agenda included the imposition of a new tax of six florins, the punishment of fugitive serfs who had abandoned their rightful masters and engaged in acts of plunder, the reorganization of internal customs, the enlistment of soldiers, and preparations for military mobilization³².

As a new development, at the request of Michael the Brave, measures are also taken in favor of the Wallachians in Transylvania. Thus, the voivode demands that Wallachian villages be granted free grazing rights for their animals, with the exception of sheep, from neighboring villages, whether Hungarian or Saxon. In turn, Wallachian villages had to offer the same benefit to neighboring villages. Free grazing was only allowed on common pastures and not in forests, vineyards, or other cultivated areas, so as not to cause damage to other inhabitants. Another request made by the voivode concerned the exemption of Wallachian priests from corvée labor, and the Transylvanian “nations” accepted this demand as well, so that all priests were to benefit from this exemption in their own right. At the same time, Wallachian priests were not allowed to remarry, and villages that did not notify the local bishop of such a situation were to be fined two hundred florins, which went to the princely treasury. The text of the Diet explicitly states that these measures were taken on the voivode’s own initiative, being the first decisions of the Diet made for the benefit of the Wallachian inhabitants of Transylvania during the reign of Michael the Brave³³. The course of history would show that these measures were the only ones adopted, and their implementation was too short-lived to significantly improve the situation of the Transylvanian Wallachians, because during the following month (August 1600), Michael the Brave’s authority over Transylvania had begun to face mounting challenges.

It is certain that David Ungnad and Mihail Szekely did not participate in this Diet, as they were in Satu Mare at the time, having gone there to receive Bartolomeus Pezzen. They remained in Satu Mare, as evidenced by their letter to Michael the Brave dated 25 July 1600, in which they expressed dissatisfaction with the manner in which they had been treated in Transylvania³⁴. During the Diet, however, Bartolomeus Pezzen was in Alba Iulia, where he engaged in difficult negotiations with the Wallachian ruler concerning the governance of Transylvania, Moldavia, and Wallachia. Nevertheless, there is no evidence to suggest that this high-ranking imperial official was present at the Diet’s deliberations.

The negotiations between Michael the Brave and Bartolomeus Pezzen, analyzed in detail and convincingly interpreted by Ștefan Andreescu³⁵, were arduous. Yet, beyond the official sessions, which unfolded over the course of several days, one must also consider the possibility of more informal and amicable exchanges conducted in less

31 MVCE, V, 288, no. 196.

32 MVCE, I, 536-541, no. 198.

33 See also Ioan-Aurel Pop, “Decizii referitoare la români în dietele transilvane din timpul lui Mihai Viteazul”, in *Mihai Viteazul și Transilvania. Culegere de studii*, ed. Camil Mureșan (Cluj: Napoca Star, 2005), 99-118.

34 Hurmuzaki, *Documente*, IV/1, 88-9, no. 75.

35 Andreescu, *Restitutio Daciae*, III, 308-15.

tense settings, such as those afforded by festive banquets. Historical sources attest that Pezzen was received in Alba Iulia with full honors and that several exchanges of gifts took place³⁶, and the chronicler István Szamosközy further records that the two parties also met in a convivial atmosphere during feasts marked by good cheer and lively conversation, noting that, at one such gathering, “Voivode Michael got Bartolomeus Pezzen and David Ungnad drunk, and he himself was also very drunk”³⁷.

Bartolomeus Pezzen brought with him to Prague the final version of the demands advanced by the Wallachian ruler, who insisted, among other points, on the formal recognition of his perpetual authority over Wallachia and Moldavia. Regarding Transylvania, Michael the Brave expressed his willingness to rule under the title of “governor”, provided that “whenever I wish and deem it necessary, I may convene the Diet, in which we can bring everything to a conclusion for the good and preservation of the country”³⁸. It is evident, therefore, that Michael the Brave had relinquished his claim to the title of Prince of Transylvania, yet he sought to govern the principality in the same manner as his predecessors, notably by retaining the right to convene the Diet, even if its decisions were to require the emperor’s ratification. Emperor Rudolf II’s response, dated 12 September 1600, formally acknowledged Michael’s authority in Transylvania³⁹; however, this recognition had no practical effect on his reign. Merely days later, on 18 September 1600, Michael the Brave suffered defeat at Mirăslău and was expelled from the country by the rebellious nobility, aided by imperial forces under the command of Giorgio Basta⁴⁰.

In conclusion, we can observe that Michael the Brave exercised his princely prerogative to convene the Diet without reservation, which demonstrates once again that the voivode did not intend at any time to change the legal regime of Transylvania, but respected the rule of the three nations, which had been at the foundation of the country’s constitutional organization since 1437, when the nobles, Saxons, and Szeklers concluded the well-known fraternal agreement *unio in Căpâlna*, thus constituting themselves as privileged Estates of the country. Starting in the mid-16th century, a new religious order was added to the social structure, so that between 1542 and 1571, the new Christian denominations, namely Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Unitarianism, were added to Catholicism and became, through regulations of the Diet, the four accepted denominations in Transylvania⁴¹. This legal order was also respected by Michael the Brave, like the other Transylvanian princes. Although he came to power in Transylvania by force of arms, the first legal

36 MVCE, IV, 290, no. 219, 290.

37 Ioachim Crăciun, *Cronicarul Szamoskozy și însemnările lui privitoare la români 1566-1608* (Cluj: Ardealul, 1928), 130.

38 MVCE, I, 553, no. 200.

39 MCRT, IV, 539-544, no. 61.

40 Iorga, *Istoria lui Mihai Viteazul*, 363-367.

41 For more information, see Ioan-Aurel Pop, “Reformă și națiuni în principatul Transilvaniei”, in *Studia historica et theologica. Omagiu prof. Emilian Popescu*, ed. Constantin C. Petolescu (Iași: Trinitas, 2003), 459-68.

act performed by the Wallachian voivode after entering Alba Iulia was to convene the Diet, so that the Estates could be officially notified of Cardinal Andrei Báthory's defeat and recognize the victor as the new ruler of the country.

The Diet of Transylvania recognized Michael the Brave as prince of the country, even though the final acts of the Diet opened with the official title assumed by the voivode and then conferred by the emperor Rudolf II. The Estates called him a merciful prince, and the undoubted proof of this is that they responded to the call to the Diet, an exclusively princely prerogative⁴². It is true that Michael the Brave's exercise of this princely attribute can be linked to the authority of the Habsburg emperor, from whom Michael the Brave himself claimed legitimacy, but from the reports of the imperial commissioners and papal representatives we can easily see not only that they were not received at the Diet meetings, but also that the emperor himself was not informed in advance by the prince of his intention to convene the privileged Estates in the Diet. Also, it's telling how hard it was for the Habsburg representatives to get reliable info about what was discussed in the general assembly, which is why they sent several reports to Rudolf II. All this supports the idea that Michael the Brave acted like a real prince at the head of Transylvania, and the fact that he insisted until the end of the negotiations with the imperial authorities on having the unrestricted right to convene the Diet of the country proves once again that he did not accept external constraints, not even from his suzerain, regarding the internal affairs of Transylvania.

109

42 See also Andor Csizmadia, "Les congrégations générales et les diètes en Transylvanie", *Acta juridica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 21 (1979): 217-48.

ABBREVIATION

MVCE: Mihai Viteazul în Conștiința Europeană.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrescu, Ștefan. *Restitutio Daciae*, III: *Studii cu privire la Mihai Viteazul*. Bucharest: Albatros, 1997.
- Crăciun, Ioachim. *Cronicarul Szamoskozy și însemnările lui privitoare la români 1566-1608*. Cluj: Ardealul, 1928.
- Csizmadia, Andor. "Les congrégations générales et les diètes en Transylvanie". *Acta juridica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 21 (1979): 217-48.
- Herlea, Alexandru. "Dietele în Transilvania autonomă". *Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie*, 6 (1973): 207-15.
- Iorga, Nicolae. *Istoria lui Mihai Viteazul*. Bucharest: Ed. Militară, 1968.
- Károly, Lám. *Az Erdélyi orszaggyűlés szervezete (1541-1848)*. Cluj: Gámán János, 1908.
- Kemény József, Kovács István. *Erdélyország története tára*. Cluj, 1837.
- Panaiteșcu, Petre P., *Mihai Viteazul*. București: Corint, 2002.
- Pop, Ioan-Aurel. "Decizii referitoare la români în dietele transilvane din timpul lui Mihai Viteazul". In *Mihai Viteazul și Transilvania. Culegere de studii*, edited by Camil Mureșan, 99-118. Cluj: Napoca Star, 2005.
- Pop, Ioan-Aurel. "Reformă și națiuni în principatul Transilvaniei". In *Studia historica et theologica. Omagiu prof. Emilian Popescu*, edited by Constantin C. Petolescu, 459-68. Iași: Trinitas, 2003.
- Szádeczki, Lajos. *Erdély és Mihály vajda története (1595-1601)*. Timișoara: Csanad Egyházmegyei, 1893.

PRINTED SOURCES

- Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde*, vol. II. Hermannstadt: Verlag des Vereins, 1844.
- Călători străini despre Țările Române*, IV, edited by Maria Holban, Maria Matilda Alexandrescu Dersca-Bulgaru, and Paul Cernovodeanu. Bucharest: Ed. Științifică, 1972.
- Chronicon Fuchsio-Lupino-Oltardinum sive Annales Hungarici*, edited by Joseph Trausch. Corona: Johann Gott, 1847.
- Hurmuzaki, Eudoxiu de. *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor*, XII. Bucharest: Socec, 1903.
- Lupaș, Ioan. *Documente istorice transilvane*. Cluj: Cartea Românească, 1940.
- Mihai Viteazul în conștiința europeană*, I. Bucharest: Ed. Academiei, 1982.
- Mihai Viteazul în conștiința europeană*, IV. Bucharest: Ed. Academiei, 1986.
- Mihai Viteazul în conștiința europeană*, V. Bucharest: Ed. Academiei, 1990.
- Veress, Andrei. *Documente privitoare la istoria Ardealului, Moldovei și Țării Românești*, V. Bucharest: Cartea Românească.