

Borbála Lovas

On the Margins of the Reformation

The “Local” and the “International” in György Enyedi’s Manuscript Sermons and Printed Works

Introduction

Transylvania in the second half of the sixteenth century was anomalous in its stance on freedom of religion.¹ Following the collapse of the medieval Hungarian kingdom, a new reformed Church emerged in the principality during the reign of the young Prince John Sigismund Zápolya. At the Transylvanian Diet of 1568, the Edict of Thurda (Torda/Thorenburg)² was proclaimed, putting into law religious tolerance and freedom of conscience. Four “received” religions had equal rights in the territory: Roman Catholicism, Calvinism, Evangelical Lutheranism, and Antitrinitarianism (or known as Unitarianism).³ Owing to the Prince being influenced by his Italian physician Giorgio Biandrata, and by the first Anti-Trinitarian Bishop Ferenc Dávid, the Anti-Trinitarians used the young ruler’s sympathy to establish themselves as the dominant religious group in Transylvania. Employing printing facilities in Alba Iulia (Gyulafehérvár/Karlsburg), and in Cluj-Napoca (Kolozsvár/Clausenburg), the Anti-Trinitarians played a leading role in ecclesiastical debates that influenced the political life of the principality. Cluj-Napoca, a royal free town, became both the residence of the Unitarian bishopric and the intellectual and ecclesiastical centre of the Transylvanian radical Reformation movement (Balázs: 2008, 17). A wide range of Unitarian works were published, including polemics, catechisms, doctrines, orations in Latin and the vernacular, and notably, the first volume of the sermon collection of Ferenc Dávid (1569) that was dedicated to Prince John Sigismund.⁴ With the death of the young and tolerant Prince, later volumes were not to be. The fortunes of the Unitarians changed. Strict publishing regulations in the 1570s severely limited the Unitarian output. Only practical literature for the pious, such as hymn-books, catechisms, biblical stories in verse, and a handful of funeral

¹ This study, originating from ongoing research into Humanism in East Central Europe at Eötvös Loránd University of Budapest, is supported by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (MTA-ELTE Humanism in East Central Europe Research Group). I would also like to thank James Plumtree for his advice and comments.

² For ease of understanding for an international reader, modern place names are used in the text, with equivalent names following in brackets.

³ For the Edict, and the ecclesiastical and political context, see István Pásztori-Kupán’s analysis (2009, 167–176), and the more detailed perspective of Mihály Balázs (2013).

⁴ The single volume published shows signs of hurried production (Balázs: 2008, 233). Dávid, in the dedicatory epistle at the start of the volume, records the importance of the sermons being printed in the manner they were delivered (1569, [II]). The speed of the production suggests Dávid was intending the work – with references to significant Anti-Trinitarian works by Servet, Fausto, and Lelio Sozzini – not for preaching exempla, personal piety, or for posterity, but rather to be used in contemporary theological debates. The number of manuscript copies of the work in the following century suggests the work was moderately popular.

orations were allowed to be published.⁵ The new regulations favoured the Catholic and the increasingly powerful Calvinist Churches.⁶ Moments when members of the Unitarian Church could take advantage of weakening censorship to publish important texts were rare.

Positions were strengthened also in the Unitarian Church itself. Following the imprisonment and death of Ferenc Dávid, the second bishop, the hardliner Demeter Hunyadi, with Biandrata, attempted to move the Church towards more conservative doctrinal ideas. The radicals, including the non-adorantists, were expelled, and clerics were coerced into agreeing to sign *Consensus ministrorum* (1579) and into remaining silent. To the delight of his contemporary critics, in 1592 Hunyadi collapsed while delivering a sermon, died shortly afterwards. His successor, György Enyedi, continued the formulation of coherent Anti-Trinitarian ideas. Due to the lack of print, a variety of manuscripts were disseminated. Texts that would have been quickly printed, and even more quickly banned elsewhere, were carefully collected and copied by hand in Transylvania. In addition to a rich corpus targeting a broad range of readers, exclusive scholarly Anti-Trinitarian works by such radicals as Jacobus Palaeologus, Matthias Veheglorius, Johannes Sommer, and Christian Francken were circulated.

Less than five years into his role as bishop, Enyedi died on November 24 1597. Though a noted scholar, teacher, translator of Boccaccio into Hungarian and Heliodorus into Latin, and religious figure, the assessment of Enyedi, the dominant figure of the age,⁷ has been greatly shaped by the curious publication history of a single work. Owing to a moment of political instability in the principality, the *Explicationes*, Enyedi's polemical Latin summary of arguments that refute the traditional interpretation of texts used in debates to demonstrate the Trinity, was posthumously published in Cluj-Napoca in 1598.⁸ It was banned the following year, and copies were confiscated and burnt by the order of Prince Sigismund Báthory. While suppressed in Transylvania, surviving copies of the work were widely circulated on the continent, and in few years refutations were published. From a brief mention in the writings of the theologian Christoph Pelargus (1605), Enyedi's printed text was increasingly discussed and refuted in print by a notable list of leading Lutheran and Calvinist theologians,⁹ some of whom were supported financially by Transylvanian princes.¹⁰ Given the international attention the

⁵ The censoring regulations are examined in depth by Mihály Balázs (1996). Carmen Florea (2002, 73–80), provides a short summary of the Unitarian publications, and includes an account of how print culture turned into a handwritten culture. Of the two hundred and fourteen vernacular sermons and sermon collections known to have been printed in Hungary up to 1655, Dávid's sermon collection and three funeral orations are the only Unitarian works (Maczák: 2008, 63–89).

⁶ The suppression of Unitarian book printing became total with the judgment of the eighteenth century Habsburg rulers. The unintended result was an even greater manuscript tradition.

⁷ For details about Enyedi's life see Káldos/Balázs: 1993, 11–18, Balázs/Káldos: 1997, 5–27, and the studies in Balázs/Keserű: 2000.

⁸ Unless otherwise noted, in this paper the title *Explicationes* refers to the first edition of the work published in Cluj-Napoca by the Heltai Printing Press. For recent studies of the *Explicationes* see: Simon: 2013; Simon: 2014; Simon: 2016.

⁹ Notable examples being Paraeus: 1609, Martin: 1614, Balduin: 1619, Thumm: 1620, Feuerborn: 1658.

¹⁰ A major figure was Johann Heinrich Alsted's younger colleague, Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld. His unpublished *Mysterium Pietatis Ostens* discussing on the works of Fausto Sozzini and György Enyedi, is known to have

Explicationes was receiving, Enyedi's Latin text was translated into Hungarian and published in two editions (1619, 1620),¹¹ and then reprinted in Latin, with errors, around 1670 in what has been assumed to be Groningen.¹² Owing to the international reactions to the work, modern scholars of the Protestant Reformation know Enyedi primarily through this single publication.

The response to Enyedi in Hungary by other religious factions followed sectarian lines. The Unitarian Church, diminishing in stature, was attacked by the Calvinists and the Lutherans, and, to a lesser extent, the Catholics. The increasingly dominant Calvinist Church, which was giving support from the aristocracy, aggressively targeted the radical congregations for potential converts. Subsequently, Hungarian refutations of Enyedi appeared, written by the Calvinist elite who had been educated in Germany. As a consequence of this change in affairs, disputes and polemics against Enyedi were widespread. István Milotai Nyilas, court preacher to the Calvinist Prince Gábor Bethlen, dedicated his *Speculum trinitatis* (1622) to his patron, presenting Bethlen as the true destroyer of idolatry ([i-xxi]). Enyedi was a prime target. In a similar manner, István Geleji Katona, supported by Prince György Rákóczi I, attacked in the most vitriolic way the *Explicationes* of the long dead bishop in his *Titok titka* (Secret of secrets), published in 1645.¹³ Enyedi was, in Geleji's view, a dangerous enemy of the truth, a Judaiser, a Jew, an idiot, a pagan, and a speaker who spoke in a more godless manner than the Turks.¹⁴ Attacks in print coincided with co-operation with Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld in

existed owing to its appearance in the property list of Mihcael Halicius (Viskolcz: 2004, 75–76). Márton Szentpéteri (2012) has revealed the work was published as the second part of Bisterfeld's book, *Sciagraphia symbioticae*.

¹¹ The 1619 edition, printed in Cluj-Napoca, did not receive the permission of the Prince for its secret publication, and was subsequently banned. The 1620 edition, published with the help of Simon Pechi (one of the leaders of the Transylvanian Sabbatarians), was exactly the same as the earlier edition, but with the date altered and the place of publication omitted on the title page. The 1619 edition was still used inside the town walls, with only the 1620 edition allowed to leave Cluj-Napoca. For more details of the perils of the printer János Makai Nyírő, see Tóth: 1957, 589–599.

¹² Another possible place of publication, printer and involved bookseller for the second Latin edition will be posited in a forthcoming publication by I.

¹³ Other refutations of the *Explicationes* Hungarians published abroad include Szentkirályi: 1619, Tályai: 1632, Almási: 1640, Jászberényi: 1662.

¹⁴ Geleji: 1645, 174–175: ("Elégvé tudalni nem győzöm, hogy ezt az embert, az ő utánna tsetlő boltó szegény vakok illy igen imádják, mintha soha aszonyi állat-tól nálánál böltsebb e' világra nem született volt. Én, Isten látja, nem tapasztalok semmi óllyas mély böltseget benne, hanem úgy veszem eszemben, hogy minden írása vagy szent írásvesztegetés, vagy pedig oktalan agyaskodás, melly rész szerént tudatlanságból, s' rész szerént pedig megáltkodott gonoszságból, származott, úgy mint ki az igazságnak meg esküdt dühös ellensége volt"), 534: ("Gyanu fér hozzája, hogy semmit sem [tulajdonított az apostolok írásának], hanem a' szivében merő Sido volt, tsak hogy szintén ki-fakasztani nyelvvel, és írásával nem merte"), 780–781: ("Ez igen veszett ügyü emberhez illendő habozás és nem írás magyarázás, hanem erőszakos tsigázás. Töri, faggatja a' tévelygő elméjét, s' fejét az igazsággal való tusakodtában, tsak hogy ezt a' nevezetes, és világos írást, az ő kábolgás képzésére tekerhesse, s' bötüköt egymástól szaggatja, diribeli, darabolja, és folyo rendeket el bontván tövel, hegyve állatja ökö't öszve, és tulajdon, s' természet szerént való jegyzéseket, idegen kedig szánt-szándékval olly homályos hálozással, és tétovázással, hogy alig veheti még az értelmes olvaso- is eszében, mit akarjon, és mi légyen értelme. De hamisság minden beszéde, egy sints igaz benne"), 1072: ("Hiszem Pogány ember volt ez? Pogányabul beszéllett még a' Törököknél is, kik azt mondják, hogy az Istennek nintszen fia, mert nem volt soha felesége; holott ez az ördög tagja, az Istennek nemzése, és születése felől nem is úgy gondolkodik, mint az embereknek tiszta szaporodások, hanem mint a' leg-nemtelenb oktalan állatoknak fajzások felől. Oh gehenna tüzével megtisztitando tisztátalan lélek!..."). For Enyedi's use of Biblical texts and Hebrew sources, see Róbert Dán's

Formatiert: Englisch (Vereinigte Staaten)

order to establish the Calvinists in Cluj-Napoca, the heartland of the Unitarians, and to legally attack their rival's position in Transylvania.¹⁵

In comparison with the broadsides of the Calvinists, the Catholic response was less active. Jesuits in Transylvania had long been urging for a refutation. A copy of the *Explicationes* had been sent to Rome in 1600 with this intention.¹⁶ Alfonso Carillo, who transported the volume, suggested to his superior general, Claudio Acquaviva, to give the work to the leading theologians of the Counter-Reformation: Gregory of Valencia, and Robert Bellarmine.¹⁷ No refutation was forthcoming. Jesuits under the protection of Gábor Bethlen had, for twenty years, written epistles countering Enyedi (Káldos/Balázs: 1993, 29–40), but were not supported by works in print. In 1626, Acquaviva responded by ordering György Káldi, the author of the first published Catholic Hungarian translation of the Bible (printed in Vienna in 1626), to produce such a text. Káldi, having been assigned rector of the collegium of Bratislava (Pozsony/Pressburg), was absolved of the work (Káldos/Balázs: 1993, 35–37). Káldi, however, continued with the condemnation of Enyedi's texts in sermons.¹⁸ The first major – and complete – Catholic refutation of Enyedi's *Explicationes* was by the Jesuit Ambrosio de Peñalosa. The *Opus egregium*, written by the Spanish professor of theology at the Viennese College, was begun in 1629 and printed in 1635. Despite its length and detail, the work had little influence in Hungary. The Jesuits had, again, been officially banished from Transylvania, and pleas to have the work translated from Latin into Hungarian were considered a colossal waste of time and effort. A Hungarian translation finally appeared in the eighteenth century (Molnár: 2000, 242–243).

Less known to modern scholars is a major corpus of vernacular texts through which Enyedi himself was the participant in contemporary theological disputes. His dissemination of Anti-Trinitarian ideas to local Transylvanian audiences in his daily sermons has long been neglected by scholarship, partly owing to their survival only in copied manuscripts. Recent studies have established the structure of the sermon collection (Káldos/Balázs: 1993, 121–130; Káldos: 2013; Lovas: 2013b) while covering new variants (Lovas: 2013a). The texts reveal the methods Enyedi and his later editors and copyists employed, focussing on the everyday sermons while incorporating the detailed

important study on Reformation, *Antitrinitarianism in the Hebrew language in Hungary* (1973, 109–114); for the Transylvanian Sabbatarians, see Dán: 1987.

¹⁵ On the development of confessionalisation see Murdock: 2000 and Szentpéteri/Viskolcz: 2005.

¹⁶ The said volume is possibly the one now located in the Biblioteca Casanatense (Molnár: 2000, 238).

¹⁷ Lukács: 1969–1987/IV, 463: “12. Postscriptum – Ex Transylvania missus fuit mihi liber pestilens arianorum, quem V. ae P. transmitterem, ut nunc facio, dandum Ill. mo Bellarmino vel Patri de Valentia confutandum, quia plurimum nocet. Ego nec lege quidem potui”.

¹⁸ It has long been suggested in Hungarian scholarship (cf. Bitksey: 1979, 24) that Káldi, in his first sermon on Pentecost Sunday (1631b, 719–728), third sermon on St Thomas' day (1631a, 119–127), second sermon on St Philip's and St Jacob's day (1631a, 478–485), referred to sermons delivered by Enyedi that he personally heard as a youth in Cluj-Napoca. Textual analysis however reveals that the Jesuit quoted from Enyedi's *Explicationes*, from either the Latin or Hungarian translation. These elaborated comments are supposedly the remaining parts of Káldi's unfinished refutation of Enyedi. Given Káldi's sermons were published in Habsburg territory (Vienna and Bratislava), it should be noted that the Jesuit was working in a different context. Notably, unlike texts of Ferenc Dávid and the other refuted errants, the published sermons of Káldi do not mark Enyedi's texts in the margin. The “pretender bishop of the Arians in Kolozsvár”, as Enyedi is described, does not even appear in the index of the volumes.

scholarly theological explanations of the Unitarian articles of faith. Though his sermons were mostly not the target of internal and international debates, the history of the corpus is more complicated than that of the afterlife of the *Explicationes*. In addition to being the first Unitarian to produce a detailed and comprehensive articulation of the Church's beliefs, he is also the first Unitarian to have produced a sizeable composed sermon collection – albeit surviving only in later manuscript copies. Only a dozen of the remaining copies and variants of the 213 individual sermons have been published.¹⁹ As a consequence, the scholarly bias towards easily available printed materials has led to an understanding of the Transylvanian Reformation being weighed heavily towards the denominations less affected by the censorious printing regulations. An ongoing project to publish Enyedi's sermons will help rectify this omission.²⁰

The collection has a complex textual transmission. No autograph manuscript survives. The remaining manuscript codices, located in Cluj-Napoca, Târgu Mureş (Marosvásárhely/Neumarkt), and Sárospatak, were almost all copied in small towns and villages in the principality, and are all dated between 1613 and 1696.²¹ The absence of any clear connection between these surviving manuscripts suggests far more copies of the sermons existed.²² The original period of composition was between 1592 and 1597, when Enyedi was bishop of the community. The sermons continued to be used as models in the century that followed his death. Some of the codices have dates and locations informing us where the sermons were delivered later; others show signs of editing – typically amendments and explanations. The collection employs a unique structure. While the sermons are individually numbered from one to two hundred and thirteen, the collection is divided into triacas – blocks with thirty-three sermons. Two of the manuscripts employ a centuria system, which is yet to be understood.²³

¹⁹ Kanyaró: 1900, 30–40 (Sermon 115); Horváth: 1905, 161–166 (Sermon 94); Boros: 1910, 26–32 (Sermon 38); Balázs/Káldos: 1997, 85–221 (Sermons 1, 2, 42, 43, 53, 56, 60, 95, 170); Gabriella: 2004, 379–389 (Sermon 115); Szelestei N.: 2005, 116–120 (Sermon 108); Takács: 2011, 75–181 (Sermons 186, 187, 190, 193, 194, 195), Lovas: 2014, 376–387 (Sermon 93).

²⁰ A four volume critical edition of the whole Enyedi sermon corpus by [redacted] author and the MTA-ELTE Humanism in East Central Europe Research Group is planned for 2016–2019.

²¹ Codex of Sámuel G [redacted] 1617–1626, contains sermons 43, 50, 100; 3rd Codex of Kolozsvár: 1613, copied by Lisznyai Gyárfás, co [redacted] the second triacas (sermons 34–66) with some hiatus; Codex of Sárospatak: mid-17th c., unknown copyist, partly fragmented, contains sermons 93–116 and 123–124; Codex of Székelykeresztúr: 1629, copied by Gergely Fejérdi, contains 42 selected sermons (24 sermons from the second triacas, 13 sermons from the sixth triacas, 2 sermons from the 7th triacas); Codex of Marosvásárhely: 1642–1696, mixed copy, Sinfalva, Tordatúr(?), contains around a dozen selected sermons (4 from the first triacas, 3 from the second triacas, 1 maybe from the third now not known triacas, 2 from the fourth triacas and some yet unidentified sermons maybe of Enyedi); 4th Codex of Kolozsvár: 1621, unknown copyist, Nagyajta, contains the second triacas (sermons 34–66) with some hiatus; 1st Codex [redacted] Kolozsvár: beg. of 17th c., unknown copyist, contains the sermons 200–212, the last sermon is fragmented; [redacted] Codex of Kolozsvár: mid-17th c., unknown copyist, contains the main part of the sixth triacas (sermons 167–195); Conciones vetustissimae: bef. 1642 – 1659, mixed copy, contains four sermons in Hungarian (Sermon 20, 185, 188, 191), and some sermons and drafts attributed to Enyedi in Latin; 2nd Codex of Kolozsvár: 1664, copied by János Bitai, Torockó, partly fragmented, contains 30 sermons from the 3rd triacas.

²² Some of these lost codices have been catalogued in Káldos: 2010, 189–190, 196, 202; Káldos: 2013, 89.

²³ 2nd Codex of Kolozsvár: 1664, 1: “Centuria Tertia Concionum Gyeorgii Enyedi”. 1st Codex of Kolozsvár: beg. of 17th c., 1: “Concionum Georgii Enyedi Centureae[!] primae Triakas septima”. Recent studies have revealed that while in the second case the copyist possibly used the term to represent a section of sermons of undefined

The relationship between Enyedi's sermons and his "Liber perniciosus" (Vogt: 1738, 235) is one that has gone unnoticed. The theologians who attacked Anti-Trinitarian beliefs quoted the *Explicationes* in their sermons (with Hungarian authors also quoting the translation). No evidence suggests that any other writings by Enyedi were used in their critiques. This "international" Enyedi, seen through the *Explicationes*, has obscured modern understanding of the "local" Transylvanian context. Though his opponents did not appear to make the connection, Enyedi – or his publisher – made links between the printed text and the written sermons. The first edition of *Explicationes*, published fifteen years before the first known surviving manuscript of the sermons, contains printed marginalia mentioning sermon 210 by number: this proves the sermon collection was already in existence and that connections were being made between the sermons and the *Explicationes*.²⁴

As the reception of the *Explicationes* illuminates the international debates, the reception of the sermons colour modern knowledge of the local disputes. The sermons reveal the Bishop developing his arguments to address a larger audience. A former student of Enyedi, Ános Szilvási, who had converted to Calvinism from Unitarianism, attacked the Bishop in an *oratio* at the Calvinist synod in Târgu Mureş.²⁵ Enyedi responded on the 17 October 1593 with a sermon delivered in the main Unitarian church in Cluj-Napoca. To engage with his former pupil and not merely his congregation, Enyedi sent the text of the sermon, which he had recorded in Latin, with an accompanying letter to Szilvási.²⁶ The autograph text testifies to Enyedi's linguistic abilities. He is likely to have delivered the sermon in Hungarian, with Latin notes, to the multilingual community of Transylvania.²⁷ The same sermon exists, in Hungarian, in several variants, as number 60 in his sermon collection. Continuing the debate, Enyedi followed his sermon with a *Defensio* and a *Concionis examen*, where he criticised Szilvási's orations.²⁸ In contrast to his predecessor Ferenc Dávid who was permitted by the ruling prince to employ technology to disseminate texts of delivered sermons in order to aid the Unitarian position in local disputes, Enyedi relied on manuscripts. Notably, when Enyedi printed his arguments in the *Explicationes*, the local context was removed. Printing only the full text of

number, the first case is clearly a mistake of the copyist owing to the codex containing the third triacas of the corpus. Further explanation will be provided in a forthcoming publication of the author.

²⁴ Enyedi: 1598, 26. This note is found in other editions: Enyedi: 1519, 1520, 37; and Enyedi: c. 1670, 26.

²⁵ The text was published (Szilvási: 1591), but no known copy survives. The oratio concerned 1Cor 1:4. Szilvási later converted to Catholicism.

²⁶ Enyedi's sermon discussed Eph 4:1. For a detailed analysis of the Enyedi–Szilvási debate see Simon: 2009; Simon: 2016, 25–120, 340–345 etc.

²⁷ As Carmen Florea (2002, 72) has shown, Enyedi was a special case in the Unitarian hierarchy in Cluj-Napoca: "With the exception of György Enyedi, the Church's superintendents [bishops] were also all elected to serve as the plebanus of Cluj, and, with the exception of John Erasmus [Erasmus Johannis], all preached to the Hungarian-speaking community in the town". In addition, it should be noted that in the principality of the Three Nations (Hungarians, Saxons, Szeklers), the Unitarian Church had a bilingual community. Following set rules, the role of bishop was alternated between the Saxons and the Hungarians. Enyedi, having made a pact with the German Erasmus Johannis, who had been asked not to preach heretical ideas from the pulpit, preached instead. For more on Erasmus Johannis, see Dán: 1983.

²⁸ All three texts can be found in the autograph Enyedi-Codex: bef. 1597, 1–37, 37–75, and 75–141. A copy of the texts are available in the Codex of Balázs Karácsonyi (manuscript, copy, Academia Română, Cluj-Napoca, MS. U. 32). Given that the latter is a copy by another hand, the volume is less relevant to this study.

Formatiert: Englisch (Vereinigte Staaten)

the *Defensio* and parts of the *Concionis examen*, omitting sermon 60, Enyedi notes in his text that the arguments are taken from a dispute against someone concerning the divinity of Christ.²⁹ Enyedi's written response to a local debate with a former pupil becomes recast for his printed argument.

The relationship between the printed polemic and the handwritten sermon possibly reflects Enyedi's balancing of the local audience and the international one. In Enyedi's exegesis of Paul's letters to the Philippians in the *Explicationes*, he includes references to Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, which he had translated from Greek to Latin and prepared for publication in 1592.³⁰ His exegesis influenced later scholars, from Erasmus Schmied, Lambert Bos, Jean Leclerc, Georg Raphael, Daniel Whitby, and Johann Jakob Wettstein in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, up to the twentieth century in the writings of Wilhelm Werner Jaeger and Adolf Jülicher.³¹ The question arises whether this exegesis, with its noted classical erudition, was presented to his local Transylvanian audience. A fragmented copy of sermon 195 corresponds paragraph by paragraph with the elucidation in the *Explicationes*, but frustratingly ends before the *Aetiopica* reference is reached.³² It does not seem too far-fetched to picture Enyedi preaching on the parallels between the letters of Paul and the geography of Heliodorus.

For Hungarians, the connection between delivered sermon and published polemic was strengthened by Enyedi's posthumous translators. Máté Toroczkai's printed

²⁹ Enyedi: 1598, 123–124, on Luke 1:16: “Ea quae ad argumentationem ex hoc loco, pro Christi deitate confirmanda depromissolitam, cuidam mecum disceptanti alioquando respondi, hic repetam, & reponam”.

³⁰ The biblical section discussed in the *Explicationes* is 2:5–11. Enyedi's translation of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* was not published; it survives in only one late handwritten copy. Currently only part of the foreword, in Hungarian translation, has been published, though an edition is in preparation. Though Enyedi describes himself in his preface as the first Latin translator of the work, *Aethiopica* had been translated into Latin and published in Basel already in 1552 (and, later, Antwerp in 1556) by the Polish Jesuit Stanislaw Warszewicki, then a pupil of Melanchthon. Enyedi did not merely translate Heliodorus' text, but also provided his text with quotations and references to the studies of Julius Caesar Scaliger, Marcus Antonius Muretus, Michael Neander, Vincent Obsoepoens, Nicephorus, Angelo Poliziano, Guilielmus Canterus, and Martin Crusius, to highlight qualities of the romance. In the later opinion of a key figure of the Counter Reformation, the Hungarian Jesuit Péter Pázmány, *Aethiopica* was listed among works deemed advisable to avoid and inappropriate for moral teaching; to being capable of giving “offence to the youth”, Heliodorus' work was placed alongside Epicurus, Cicero, and Terence (Bitskey: 1979, 62). Enyedi knows the French, Italian, Spanish, German, English translations, but he does not mention Warszewicki, nor Melanchthon. And as Berkes mentions, Enyedi also had to know the name of Warszewicki because of the Jesuit's connections to the Báthory family. As she suggests, the former translation did not escape Enyedi's attention, but he intentionally kept it quiet. (cf. Berkes: 2010; Berkes: 2011). Given that Enyedi dedicated his translation to the young Prince Sigismund Báthory, and mentioned his age and – following Melanchthon and the above-mentioned scholars – the didactic qualities of the work, the Unitarian Bishop had have disagreed with Pázmány (*Heliodori Aethiopicae*: 1592, 3–5). The subject of the dedication, Prince Sigismund, however, would later be subjected to rebuke in Enyedi's sermons.

³¹ The long afterlife of Enyedi's writings was given greater breadth by the recently published research of József Simon (2014). Simon also suggests that Enyedi's contemporaries were indifferent to comparing the New Testament to classical secular novels. Reading Hungarian and international responses of that period, it is clear that while they scrutinised Enyedi's arguments and sources, none of them indicated the use of Heliodorus' Greek romance. The first notice appears a century later. Likewise, with the later authors, it is notable that Jülicher, who mentions Enyedi as Erasmus Schmied's source, admits that he was unable to examine Enyedi's *Explicationes* (Simon: 2014, 206), which remained in a comparatively large number of copies in European libraries in comparison to the average number of Hungarian and Transylvanian publications, because he could not find a single copy of the Bishop's work.

³² Sermon 195, fragm. (Christus quomodo aequalis Deo; 5th Codex of Kolozsvár: mid-17th c., 148r–153v).

Hungarian translation of the *Explicationes* (Enyedi: 1619, 191–192) inserted parts of two of Enyedi’s sermons into the text, introduced chapter headings that refer clearly to the sermons, and printed references to the sermons,³³ although he did not adapt the material for print. Enyedi’s statement that more would be told at a later date, a sign of oral delivery, is incongruously retained in Toroczkai’s text.³⁴ Likewise, the second half of a sermon delivered with an *objectio-responsio* format, is similarly printed with an out of place “Amen”.³⁵ Toroczaki included the sermons of Enyedi in the parts of the *Explicationes* that were frequently disputed by international readers, providing his vernacular Hungarian readers with more material to understand the ongoing debate. This feature, of supplementing the *Explicationes* with other writings by Enyedi, did not go unnoticed. While criticising Enyedi’s work, Milotai Nyilas also targeted his publishers, noting that sections of his work had been thrown together by his successors.³⁶

This treatment of Enyedi’s work by his followers echoes the strange relationship among the Bishop’s writings. The cross-fertilisation of texts by the later editors and translators resembles Enyedi’s own style of composition. In the aforementioned printed marginal reference to sermon 210, it has been shown that while the text of the *Explicationes* and sermon share the same idea, they were not copied from each other due to a divergence in tone and approach (Káldos: 2010, 190–194). In a similar manner, Enyedi incorporated his own translation of Heliodorus in his debate with his former student. It appears that the Bishop deliberately incorporating his different writings – his sermons, translations, and debates – into the *Explicationes*. A closer examination of the manuscripts of the sermon collection has further illuminated a feature of Enyedi’s work that has been little noticed. The sermons and the *Explicationes* share a large number of identified sources,³⁷ suggesting the two productions, one for local listeners and the other for the international readers, were closely connected as Enyedi prepared them.

³³ Beneath the exegesis of Jer 10:11 in the Hungarian translation is the note: “In concione 82. de his verbis ita loquitur. Idem G. Enyedi”. The sermon variant of the chapter survives in a single copy, in the 2nd Codex of Kolozsvár (Causae durationis et ruinae impiorum; 1664, 150 [77v]). In a similar manner, the translated *Explicationes* has beneath the discussion of Mich 5:2 the note “Ex concione ejusdem G. Enyedi. 187”. One copy of this section’s sermon equivalent survives, in the 5th Codex of Kolozsvár (De Christi nativitate; mid-17th c., 101v–108v).

³⁴ Enyedi: 1619, 192: “De erről mászszor többet”. As recently noted, Enyedi’s reference in this twenty-line chapter is inserted in a paragraph of a sermon now numbered as sermon 16 (cf. Káldos: 2013, 110). This connection makes clear the status of the sermon, and supports the rearrangement of the sermon structure in the 2nd Codex of Kolozsvár. Sermon 16 should be put in place of Sermon 82 (16+33+33), and all the sermons from the first to third triacas subsequently moved. Correspondences between the two codices have already been noted (cf. Káldos: 2013; Lovas: 2013b), but closer analysis by the author of this paper has proved that the fragmented texts in the Codex of Sárospatak (containing the third triacas) correspond one by one with the sermons in the 2nd Codex of Kolozsvár. It should, however, be noted that the 2nd Codex of Kolozsvár contains only thirty sermons instead of thirty-three.

³⁵ Sermon 187 (De Christi nativitate; 5th Codex of Kolozsvár: mid-17th c., 108v).

³⁶ “Megkandicsálta ezt Enyedi, es az mit ellene talahatot, ugyan Praedicationoban szerzette, az mint az ő Ivadéki, több irasi köziben taszitották” (“Enyedi glimpsed this [about the birth and nature of Jesus], and what he found against it, wrote it up in a sermon, which was tossed among his other writings by his scions”) (Milotai Nyilas: 1622, 327).

³⁷ The identifying of Enyedi’s sources is still in progress. In the manuscripts, the marking of sources in the margins is different not only in the printed format, but also among the individual manuscripts. Closer study can reveal the shared sources of the parallel texts, and so subsequently aid understanding of the manuscripts. Research into

More exciting for the modern scholar are the shared textual parts that appear in the first edition of the *Explicationes* that are not identified in the published volume; these reveal tantalising alterations in presentation by Enyedi to suit the intended context. One concerns Enyedi's explication of a common feature of sixteenth- to seventeenth-century debates produced by Anti-Trinitarians: Psalm 2. In addition to resembling an earlier exegesis in the *Explicationes* on Ps 2:7 (1598, 56–63; 1619, 82–111), the text closely resembles three sermons surviving in two codices.³⁸ Almost three hundred lines, in which Enyedi criticises the doctrine of the Trinity combining typical Unitarian arguments with arguments from post-Biblical Hebrew polemics, closely correspond. It seems likely that the Hungarian sermons and the Latin treatise originated from a *dispositio*. The main difference – other than the language – is the employment in the sermons of the didactic topos of the mirror for princes. Enyedi asserts that monarchs that go against the will of God will be punished. Given contemporary concerns about the encroaching Ottoman threat, a recurring theme in the talk of the Regnum Christi is a discussion of uniting with pagans. This social context is omitted in the *Explicationes*, which does not feature these elements. These political connotations, made the sermons easily adaptable by later preachers in the increasingly assaulted Unitarian minority for use against the monolithic Calvinist majority.

This local context explains the inclusion of another topos in the sermons: the image of a chosen people. Following the death of John Sigismund, the Unitarian Church lacked a ruler who would aid their religion. The princes, turning to Catholicism in Enyedi's time and Calvinism in the period following his death, did not assist the Unitarians. Mercantile, cultural, and educational connections with the Hungarian, German, Polish and Italian territories meant the Transylvanian Unitarians were familiar with the frequent Reformation analogy of Biblical Israel. Reformation authors frequently compared living rulers to exemplary figures such as Josiah, Moses, David, Gideon, and Solomon (Murdoch: 1998). Owing to the marginalisation of the Unitarians, Enyedi compared Sigismund Báthory to the less popular Zedekiah, Jehoiakim, King of Judah, and even to Rehoboam, “the folly of the nation”. Since copyists kept these complaints, a preacher was able to creatively substitute a contemporary ruler for the same result. Likewise, Transylvania, as a tributary state of the Ottoman Empire, balanced between the Sublime Porte and the Habsburgs, is a thematic issue much emphasised in Enyedi's sermons. Using the Jewish-Hungarian parallel, and applying the common Reformation model of New Israel to Transylvania and the Unitarian community, the Bishop holds the well-known analogies for confessional and territorial identities in a unique way. Nebuchadnezzar becomes a positive figure, used as an analogy for the Sultan, while the Transylvanian Prince assigned the role of Zedekiah. Though Enyedi does not identify the Prince by name, explicit references to the ruler's age make it apparent to his audience who is meant. In another dazzling use of biblical allegory, Enyedi presents the Habsburg

how the copyists, using their different strategies during the writing process, may have altered or omitted many of the references is currently in its early stages.

³⁸ The sermons in the 5th Codex of Kolozsvár: Sermon 192 (*Frustra temunt contra Deum homines*): 130v–136v; Sermon 193 (*Quomodo Christus filius Dei*): 136v–142r; Sermon 194 (*De Regno Christi*): 142r–148r. The sermons in the Codex of Székelykeresztúr: Sermon 192: 618 (518) – 634 (534); Sermon 193: 634 (534) – 643 (543); Sermon 194: 643 (543) – 656 (556).

Empire as Egypt.³⁹ Given the fluctuations in context, from the end of the seventeenth century these sermons became increasingly unadaptable.

One possibility is that the “local” was written earlier than the “international”. The fragmented Codex of Sárospatak contains a sermon that appears – without any indication – in the *Explicationes*.⁴⁰ The connection is not immediately apparent, as the subject of the sermon is John 8:56, and for the *Explicationes* John 8:58. The latter, “I say to you, before Abraham was, I am”, was an oft used text in international ecclesiastical debates. Placing the two Enyedi texts side by side, it becomes apparent that the hand-copied sermon and the printed text contain the same content, argument, and quotations, paragraph by paragraph. The philological analysis of the Bible’s Greek text and conclusion are shared. The only omission is the beginning and the close of the sermon, and a statement by Enyedi excusing himself to the unlettered for speaking in a foreign language.⁴¹ Given that the Hungarian sermon is closer to the *Explicationes* than the later Hungarian translation, it seems likely that Enyedi wrote for his local, less scholarly audience first, before engaging with the larger religious disputes that embroiled the continent. It also appears that the Bishop, though writing on various subjects that would not be understood by all of his listeners, was yet considerate of their abilities.

The connections between the *Explicationes* and the sermon collection reveal how Enyedi presented Unitarian beliefs for local listeners and international readers. They


³⁹ For discussion of this analogy, see Lovas: 2012. A short paragraph of one of Enyedi’s sermons will provide a clear impression of his crafting of Biblical comparisons (Sermon 53, 4th Codex of Kolozsvár: 1621, 70v; abbreviations have been expanded and italicised) Sedechias kiraly az sok tanaczok miatt, keorwlle forgolodok akarattyabol, meg vete Nabugodonozort hwn enen, s’ az Aegyptombeli kirallyal keote frigyet, kit minden Nemzetseguel inkab kel vala gywleolniek az sidoknak, mert ott tartottak vala rabsagban, es ott nyomorgattak vala az eo eleieket. [...] Immar tekinczy ket fele, gondolkodgyal magadban a’ mostani allapatunk feleol, lasd meg ha nem ezen linean vagyunke? A Nemet, (mikor velwnk frigye vala,) nem otalmazhatta meg Orszagunkat, mikeppen az elseo Joachim kiralyt Aegyptom. Az vtan Sedechias az eocze, megis oda keote magat, maga iol tudgya vala rosztokat, de bizony meg fizetenek neki erette. Am mig bekess leon Nabukodonozorral, addig sem Aegyptom, sem semmi Nemzetsegh nem mere bantani, nagy czyendessegben vralkodek, bekessseggel bira Orszagat 8. eszteneig. De mihelt onnat el hordola, nyaka szakada, mind Orszaganak s’ mind eo maganak. Pogan vala Nabugodonozor, pogan a’ teoreokis. De a’ mint amaz tellyesseggel elfoglahattya vala Sido Orszagot, ketszer, de megis io akarattyabol kiralt hagyta ott az Sidoknak eo nemzetsegekbeol: Azonkeppen bizony kezeben volt Magyar Orszag es Erdely a’ teoroknek, de megis kiralyt feiedelmet hagyott a’ mi magunk Nemzetsegwnkbeol. [...] Sedechiastol czyak hwseget s adoot keuan vala Nabugodonozor. Mit keuan mi teollwnkis egyebet teoreok czyaszar?” (King Zedekiah, because of his many aldermen, and because of the will of the schemers, despised Nebuchadnezzar against his pledge, and made a league with the king of Egypt, who is most hatred by the Jews, because there were kept and oppressed their ancestors. [...] Now look around, and ponder in yourself concerning our present state, and see, whether or not we are in the same situation. The German, (when he had a league with us), could not save our country, just as the first king, Jehoiakim was not saved by Egypt. Then Zedekiah, his brother fastened himself on these, though he knew well that they were bad, and was paid well by them. But while he was at peace with Nebuchadnezzar, neither Egypt nor any other nation could harm them, and he was ruling in great tranquillity, and there was peace in his land for eight years. But as soon as he turned from them, his neck was broken, just like his country’s neck. Nebuchadnezzar was pagan, the Turk is also pagan. But as he occupied entirely the Land of the Jews twice, but yet according to his benevolence left them a king in charge from their own nation, so likewise Hungary and Transylvania were in the hands of the Turk, but yet, he left a king, a reigning prince from our nation. [...] Nebuchadnezzar expected only loyalty and contribution from Zedekiah. What else does the Turkish emperor want from us?)

⁴⁰ Sermon 93 (Codex of Sárospatak: mid-17th c., I/288–305).

⁴¹ “Az kik penigh irast nem tudnak, ne banniak, ha szokason kwuwl idegen nieluen kell it szollanom” (Codex of Sárospatak: mid-17th c., I/297; abbreviations expanded and italicised).

illuminate how sermons delivered to a minority in a marginal principality became a central subject in continental polemics. It also shows how a regional bishop, whose Church was subjected to stringent state control, became a name to be mentioned in debate (even if his work was not properly identified). Notably, though the sermon collection themselves dropped out of usage due to later political and social upheavals in Transylvania, the parallel parts printed in the *Explicationes* continued to be quoted and disputed in tracts and Biblical explications as late as the early years of the twentieth century. Though this is in part due to appearing in print, it is also owing to Enyedi's continuation of the oral techniques in a different format. That a studious bishop, on the geographical border of European Christianity, repeatedly crossing the border between the written and printed and the silent and spoken word, could become a posthumous presence in later continental theological debates is testament to both Enyedi and the unique political context in which his works were produced and disseminated.

Bibliography

- ALMÁSI P., ANDREAS (1640), *Disputatio Theologica, De Tribus in unica Deitate Personis... adversus Pauli Samosteni, Photini, Socini Enyedini, horumque sequacium, vera ac orthodoxa sententia dilucide demonstratur ...*, Franeker: Uldericus Balck.
- BALÁZS, MIHÁLY (2013), Tolerant Country – Misunderstood Laws: Interpreting Sixteenth-Century Transylvanian Legislation Concerning Religion, *Hungarian Historical Review* 2, 1, 85–108.
- BALÁZS, MIHÁLY (2008), Ferenc Dávid, *Bibliotheca Dissidentium* vol. XXVI, Ungarländische Antitrinitarier IV., Baden-Baden & Bouxviller: V. Koerner.
- BALÁZS, MIHÁLY (1996), János Zsigmond fejedelem és a cenzúra, in: András Kovács/Gábor Sipos/Sándor Tonk (eds.), *Emlékkönyv Jakó Zsigmond születésének nyolcvanadik évfordulójára*, Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 21–30.
- BALÁZS, MIHÁLY/GIZELLA KESERŰ (eds.) (2000), *György Enyedi and Central European Unitarianism in the 16th to 17th Centuries*, Budapest: Balassi.
- BALÁZS, MIHÁLY/JÁNOS KÁLDOS (eds.) (1997) ~~(eds.)~~, *Enyedi György válogatott művei*, Bucharest–Kolozsvár: Kriterion.
- BALDUIN, FRIEDRICH (1618), *Trinitatis Disputatio...* Wittenberg: Helwig.
- BERKES, KATALIN (2011), Enyedi György és a zsráf, *Magyar Könyvszemle*, 126, 381–386.
- BERKES, KATALIN (2011), Kikről hallgat Enyedi?: A Héliodórosz-fordítás előzményeihez, *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae: Acta Historiae Litterarum Hungaricarum*, 53–59.
- BITSKEY, ISTVÁN (1979), *Humanista erudíció és barokk világnép. Pázmány Péter prédikációi*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- BOROS, GYÖRGY (1910), Enyedi György. *Concio Ján.* 12, 42, *Unitárius Szószék* (Székelyudvarhely), 1910/1–4, 26–32.
- Conciones vetustissimae (bef. 1642 – 1659), manuscript, *Academia Română*,  la Cluj-Napoca, MS. U. 262.
- DÁN, RÓBERT (1987), *Az erdélyi szombatosok és Péchi Simon*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- DÁN, RÓBERT (1973), *Humanizmus, reformáció, antitrinitarizmus és a héber nyelv Magyarországon*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- DÁN, RÓBERT (1983), Erazmus Johannis “Világos bizonyítékai”, *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 87, 120–129.

- ENYEDI, GYÖRGY (1598¹, c. 1670²), Explicationes locorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti, ex quibus Trinitatis dogma stabiliri solet, Auctore Georgio ENIEDIO superintendente ecclesiarum in Transylvania, unum Patrem Deum et eius Filium Jesum Christum per Spiritum Sanctum profitentium, 1st edition [Heltai]: [Kolozsvár]; 2nd edition [n.p.]: Groningen.
- ENYEDI, GYÖRGY (1619¹, 1620²), Az ó es vy testamentvm-beli helyeknek, mellyekből az Háromságról való tudománt szokták állatni, magyazattyok, ENYEDI Gyeorgy, Erdély országban az egy Atya Isten, es az ő Sz. Fia, az Iesus Christus felől, Sz. Lélek által ki adatott tudomány-ban eggyező ecclesiáknak püspöke által deák nyelven iratott, Máté Toroczka (tr.), 1st edition, 2nd edition [Heltai]: [Kolozsvár].
- Enyedi-kódex [Enyedi-Codex] (bef. 1597), manuscript, Academia Română, Cluj-Napoca, Ms. U. 474.
- FERENC, DÁVID (1569), Első Resze az szent irasnac külön külön reszeiből vöt predicacionac az atya istenről, ennek kedig az ő fiáról az Ihesvs Christvsrol, es az mi öröcseguncnec peczetiről az szent lelekről. Gyula-Fehérvár: Vagnerus.
- FEUERBORN, JUSTUS (1658) Posthumus Anti-Enjedinus, Giessen: Hampel.
- FLOREA, CARMEN (2002), Shaping Transylvanian Anti-Trinitarian Identity in an Urban Context, in: Maria Crăciun/Ovidiu Ghitta/Graeme Murdock (eds.), Confessional Identity in East-Central Europe, Aldershot: Ashgate, 64–80.
- GELEJI KATONA, ISTVÁN (1645), Titkok titka..., Gyulafehérvár: (typ. principis).
- Gyalai Sámuel prédikációgyűjteménye [Sermon collection of Sámuel Gyalai] (1617–1626), manuscript, Cluj-Napoca, Biblioteca Centrala a Universitatii Victor Babes, MS. 1777.
- Heliodori Aethiopiae historiae libri decem (1592), Nunc primum in Latinam linguam conversi interprete Georgio Eniedino Transilvano, manuscript, copied by S. Nemay in 1647, Academia Română, Filiala Cluj-Napoca, MS. U. 1089.
- GABRIELLA, H. HUBERT (2004), A régi magyar gyülekezeti ének, Budapest: Universitas.
- HORVÁTH, CYRILL (1905), Enyedi György egyházi beszédeiből. III. Triac. Conc. XCIV., in: Cyrill Horváth (ed.), Sárospataki Füzetek, Sárospatak: Radil Károly, 161–166.
- JÁSZBERÉNYI, P. PÁL (1662), Examen doctrinae ariano-socinianae, London: Sumptibus Samelis Broun.
- KÁLDI GYÖRGY (1631a), Az Innepekre-valo Predikatzionknak Első Resze, Bécs/Pozsony: Rikeszt [et typ. Societatis Jesu].
- KÁLDI, GYÖRGY (1631b), Az Vasarnapokra-valo Predikatzionknak Első Resze, Bécs/Pozsony: Rikeszt [et typ. Societatis Jesu].
- KANYARÓ, FERENC (1900), Enyedi György unitárius püspök beszéde, Keresztény Magvető 1, 30–40.
- KÁLDOS, JÁNOS/MIHÁLY BALÁZS (1993), György Enyedi, Bibliotheca Dissidentium vol. XV, Ungarländische Antitrinitarier II., Baden-Baden/Bouxviller: V. Koerner.
- KÁLDOS, JÁNOS (2010), Enyedi György prédikációinak szöveghagyománya, in: László Boka/Ildikó Sirató (eds.), Érték és értelmezés, Budapest: Gondolat/OSZK, 188–207.
- KÁLDOS, JÁNOS (2013), Enyedi György prédikáció-gyűjteményének szerkezete és a prédikációk textológiai vizsgálatának tanulságai, Erdélyi Múzeum 2013/1, 88–120.
- Kolozsvári Kódex [1st Codex of Kolozsvár] (beg. of 17th c.), manuscript, Academia Română, Filiala Cluj-Napoca, MS. U. 737/I.
- Kolozsvári Kódex [2nd Codex of Kolozsvár] (1664), manuscript, Academia Română, Filiala Cluj-Napoca, MS. U. 737/II.
- Kolozsvári Kódex [3rd Codex of Kolozsvár] (1613), manuscript, Academia Română, Filiala Cluj-Napoca, MS. U. 737/III.
- Kolozsvári Kódex [4th Codex of Kolozsvár] (1621), manuscript, Academia Română, Filiala Cluj-Napoca, MS. U. 737/IV.

- Kolozsvári Kódex** [5th Codex of Kolozsvár] (mid-17th c.), manuscript, **Academia Română**, Filiala Cluj-Napoca, MS. U. 737/V.
- LOVAS, BORBÁLA** (2012), Erkölc és identitás. Pogányság és kiválasztottság Enyedi György prédikáció-jében. In: Pál Ács/Júlia Székely (eds.), *Identitás és kultúra a török hódoltság korában*, szerk. Budapest: Balassi, 299–310.
- LOVAS, BORBÁLA** (2013a), Másolási stratégiák Enyedi György prédikációinak hagyományozódásában, *Studia Litteraria*, 2013/3–4, 79–94.
- LOVAS, BORBÁLA** (2013b), Non multa sed multum. Párhuzamos beszédek Enyedi György prédikáció-gyűjteményében, *Erdélyi Múzeum* 2013/1, 71–87.
- LOVAS, BORBÁLA** (2014), Textológiai és értelmezésbeli kérdések Enyedi György magyar nyelvű munkáiban. A prédikációgyűjtemény, PhD dissertation, ELTE.
- LUKACS, LADISLAUS** (1969–1987), *Monumenta Antiquae Hungariae, I–IV. (1550–1600)*, Rome: Institutum Historicum S. I.
- MACZÁK, IBOLYA** (2008), A prédikációk szerepe és jelentősége a lelkiség-történeti kutatásokban, in: László N. Szelestei (ed.), *Lelkiségtörténeti számvetés*, Piliscsaba: PPKE BTK, 63–89.
- Marosvásárhelyi Kódex [Codex of Marosvásárhely] (1642–1696), manuscript, Târgu Mureș, **Biblioteca Teleki**, ex 0636.
- MARTIN, JACOB** (1614), *De tribus Elohim liber primus, photinianorum novorum et cum primis Georgii Eniedini blasphemiis oppositus*, Wittenberg: Schurer.
- MILOTAI NYILAS, ISTVÁN** (1622), *Speculum Trinitatis*, Debrecen: Rheda.
- MOLNÁR, ANTAL** (2000), Sur la genèse d’une polémique catholique contre Enyedi (Ambrosio Peñalosa: *Opus egregium...1635*), in: Mihály Balázs/Gizella Keserű (eds.), *György Enyedi and Central European Unitarianism in the 16th–17th Centuries*, Budapest: Balassi, 237–243.
- MURDOCK, GRAEME** (1998), The Importance of Being Josiah: An Image of Calvinist Identity, *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 29, 4, 1043–1059.
- MURDOCK, GRAEME** (1995), International Calvinism, Ethnic Allegiance, and the Reformed Church of Transylvania in the Early Seventeenth Century, in: Maria Crăciun/Ovidiu Ghitta (eds.), *Ethnicity and Religion in Central and Eastern Europe*, Cluj: Cluj University Press, 92–100.
- MURDOCK, GRAEME** (2000), Beyond the Pale: International Calvinist Attacks against Unitarianism in Transylvania, in: Mihály Balázs/Gizella Keserű (eds.), *György Enyedi and Central European Unitarianism in the 16th–17th Centuries*, Budapest: Balassi, 245–252.
- PARAEUS, DAVID** (1609), *In Genesin Mosis commentarius*, Frankfurt: Rhodius.
- PÁSZTORI-KUPÁN, ISTVÁN** (2009), The Spirit of Religious Tolerance – A Transylvanian “extra calvinisticum”? in: Ábrahám Kovács (ed.), *Calvinism on the Peripheries: Religion and Civil Society in Europe*, Budapest: L’Harmattan, 155–179.
- PELARGUS, CHRISTOPH** (1605), *Admonitio de Arianis recentibus eorumque blasphemis dogmatibus*, Leipzig: Francus.
- PEÑALOSA, ABROSIO DE** (1635), *Opus Egregium De Christi Et Spiritus Sancti Divinitate, Nec Non SS. Trinitatis Mysterio. Contra Iudaeos, Photinum, Socinum, Eniedinum aliosque veteres & novos Arrianos*, Vienna: Formica.
- Sárospataki Kódex [Codex of Sárospatak] (mid-17th c.), manuscript, **Sárospataki Református Kollégium Nagykönyvtára**, Kt. 7.
- SIMON, JÓZSEF** (2009), Enyedi György (1555–1597) és a szillogizmus középfogalma, *Világosság*, 2009 ősz, 41–48.
- SIMON, JÓZSEF** (2013), Aristotelismus, Nominalismus und Trinitätskritik. Die philosophischen Grundzüge der *Explicationes Locorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti* von György Enyedi (1555–1597), in: Ulrich Wien, András Balogh (eds.), *Radikale Reformation – Die Unitarier in Siebenbürgen*, Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 227–240.

- SIMON, JÓZSEF** (2014), Zsákmány. Enyedi György esete Pál apostollal, Héliodórosszal és Werner Jaegerrel, Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények 118, 189–214.
- SIMON, JÓZSEF** (2016), Explicationes explicationum: Filozófia, irodalom és egzegetika Enyedi György életművében, Budapest: Typotex.
- SZCZUCKI, LECH** (1982), Polish and Transylvanian Unitarianism in the Second Half of the 16th century, in: Róbert Dán/Antal Pirnát (eds.), Antitrinitarianism in the Second Half of the 16th Century, Budapest, 231–241.
- Székelykeresztúri Kódex [Codex of Székelykeresztúr] (1629), manuscript, Târgu Mureș, Teleki-Bolyai Library, Codex 0439.
- SZELESTEI N., LÁSZLÓ (ed.)** (2005) ~~(ed.)~~, Régi magyar prédikációk, 16–18. század, Budapest: Szent István Társulat.
- SZENTKIRÁLYI, BENEDICTUS** (1619), Vindicatio locorum veteris testamenti... adversus Georgii Enyedini locorum ut vocat explicationes, Marburg: R. Hutwelcker.
- SZENTPÉTERI, MÁRTON** (2012), The Mystery of Piety Revealed and Defended: A Sequel to Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld's *De uno Deo*? Acta Comeniana 26, 89–98.
- SZENTPÉTERI, MÁRTON/NOÉMI VISKOLCZ** (2005), Egy református–unitárius hitvíva Erdélyben 1641–ben, in: Heltai, János/Réka, Tasi (eds.), “Tenger az igaz hitrül való egyenlenségek vitatásának előadott özöne...” Tanulmányok XVI–XIX. századi hitvitáinkról, Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetem BTK, 93–102.
- SZILVÁSI, JÁNOS** (1591), Oratio Ioannis Zilvasii, Praemissa Disputationi Publicae, in Synodo Orthodoxorum Vngarorum Vasarhelyini celebratae, Anno 1591. mensis Janij die 13, Sibiu: Typis Joannis Henrici Cratonis, 1591.
- TAKÁCS, DÁNIEL** (2011), Enyedi György krisztológiája hat prédikációjának elemzése alapján, MA thesis, ELTE BTK.
- TÁLYAI Z., MARTINUS** (1632), Disputatio Theologica Tertia De Persona D. nostri Iesu Christi ac duabus naturalis... Quarum vera unio personalis ex Sacra Scriptura adversus falsas Enjedini aliorumque socinianorum contradictiones demonstratur... Leiden: Ex Officina Bonaventurae & Abrahami Elzevir.
- THUMM, THEODOR/JOHANN ÚLRICH RENTZ** (1621), Apodeixis theologica, spiritum sanctum non per...: erroribus et corruptelis modernorum Photinianorum, inprimis Fausti Socini, Georgii Enjedini, Christophori Osterodi, Valentini Smalzii etc. ad disputandum proposita, Tübingen: Werlinus.
- VISKOLCZ, NOÉMI** (2003), Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld (1605–1655) Bibliográfia. A Bisterfeld-könyvtár, Budapest/Szeged: OSZK/Scriptum Rt.
- VOGT, JOHANN** (1738), Catalogus historico-criticus librorum rariorum, Hamburg: Christian Herold.