

Renaissance Contacts Between Dubrovnik (Ragusa) and the Kingdom of Hungary

M.D. Birnbaum

During the rule of the Angevin dynasty (1308-82) in Hungary, towns and cities increasingly assumed greater political influence. The first treaty between the King of Hungary and Dubrovnik (in those days Ragusa) was signed in 1358, during the reign of Louis (Lajos) the Great. According to its text, Dubrovnik was to pay the king 500 gold ducats and 300 perpers annually, a sum that previously went to Bosnia and Serbia for protection against enemy attacks. Dubrovnik, in addition, promised to honor the king and his heirs in church services three times a year; to fly the king's flag on land and on its vessels; and, in case of a royal visit, to treat the guests to two dinners and two suppers at the city's expense. The king's friends were declared Dubrovnik's friends, and his enemies the adversaries of the city.¹

As was the case with most towns in Hungary, in Dubrovnik too the terms defining the city's obligations and privileges were occasionally amended by subsequent Hungarian kings. From 1358 on there is an abundance of documented interchange between Buda and Dubrovnik in the archives of the latter, and this is a crucial source of information as in Hungary, owing to the numerous wars and foreign occupations, much of the documentary evidence disappeared or was destroyed.

The archival material of Dubrovnik testifies to the fact that the Crown frequently turned to Dubrovnik and asked for information on or for its mediation with Venice, the Turks, or the Bosnians. Dubrovnik's importance for Hungary was growing as time passed. In 1378 Sigismund (Zsigmond) of Luxembourg reconfirmed and added to its privileges. He later became a refugee and the city's guest after his resounding defeat at Nicopolis (1396). Following Sigis-

mund's death, Albert II immediately reconfirmed Dubrovnik's privileges, and so did the next king, Vladislav I, in 1444.

Johannes (János) Hunyadi, regent of Hungary and internationally one of the most important figures in the wars against the Turks, took the Ragusan ambassador along with him when, in Wiener Neustadt, he negotiated the terms of a new campaign. Also, in 1447 Dubrovnik offered Hunyadi 2000 gold ducats in support of his war effort.²

During the rule of Hunyadi's son Matthias Corvinus (1458-90), many important Croatian personalities emerged to serve at the Buda court. Johannes (János) Vitéz, archbishop of Esztergom, and primate of Hungary and Croatia, who had already served Hunyadi, comes readily to mind. At his episcopal court in Várad and later in his archdiocese, Vitéz surrounded himself with humanist scholars and artists from all over Europe, and as patron of many a budding scholar — among them Janus Pannonius, Petrus Garazda, and Johannes Vitéz Jr. — he almost single-handedly created a proper ambience for Renaissance culture in Hungary-Croatia.³

It is only natural, therefore, that cultural relations between Hungary and Dalmatia became especially lively during the rule of Matthias. This was the most felicitous period in the history of independent Hungary, as well as the height of the Italian-influenced Buda Renaissance.

For the years 1459-90 twenty different Ragusan ambassadors to Buda are known, and that number does not include the scores of one-time legates or scientists, merchants and church dignitaries who had functioned as occasional envoys. The list includes Marin and Sigismund di Giorgi, several members of the Gundulić (Gondola) family of whom Jacobus Marin was ambassador to the Buda court four times (1459, 1464, 1470, and 1471); three members of the Gučetić (Gozze), and three of the Palmotic (Palmotha) families.⁴

Among the most important ambassadors was Alexander de Ragusio who later became Abbot of Telk. He was also dispatched to Skanderbeg, and, in 1465, to the Signoria. He returned twice to Dubrovnik (in 1469 and 1472) during his tenure as legate.

With the rule of Matthias also begins what we would call in modern terms the "brain-drain" from Dalmatia. Dalmatian scientists and artists were frequent travelers to Italy but traveling to Hungary on a grand scale also started during this period.⁵

Matthias' second wife, Beatrix of Naples and Aragon, had two successive Dalmatian father confessors. She herself chose Antonius de Jadra, but the pope appointed Christophorus Ragusinus, bishop

of Modrus, instead.⁶ Later the bishop became a personal friend of the queen and had great influence at the Buda court.

On the more mundane side, Matthias' own barber and *familiaris* (royal servant) also came from Dubrovnik. Stefanus de Ragusio, *barbitonsor regis*, became a wealthy man in Buda. He owned a large house there with a sizable orchard. When in 1506 he returned to Dubrovnik, he brought along a letter from the next king, Wladislas II, in which he was referred to as "*servitor serenissimi regis Hungariae*."⁷

Several Dubrovnik patricians sent their offspring into royal service. All five sons of Damiano Marino de Giorgi, the Ragusan ambassador, became Matthias' *parvuli* (pages). They later received lucrative positions and special privileges.⁸ Beatrix too had a Dalmatian *familiaris*. Nicolaus Castro of Senj.⁹

Traveling medical doctors were a familiar phenomenon throughout Europe and the Near East, thus it is not surprising that, in 1463, Dubrovnik agreed to send Magister Johannes Petrus to join Matthias' camp, presumably at Jajce.¹⁰

In 1459, one of the most famous Dubrovnik scientists, Johannes Gazulo, was invited to become a court astronomer. He declined, yet retained amicable relations with Hungary. In the 1460s, he received a letter from Janus Pannonius in which the bishop of Pécs asked for further books on astronomy and on measuring instruments.¹¹ The instruments could have been meant for Buda, for Esztergom, or even for Pécs where it is assumed that one of the towers was built for a planetarium. Janus did not initiate any building of note at his Pécs see. This tower is the only construction that can be identified with his tenure there. He did little to embellish his cathedral. Sigismund Ernuszt, who followed Janus in the see, was urged by his father to restore it.¹² Ernuszt did indeed begin the renovation of the cathedral. He also commissioned work at Djurdjevac, on the Drava River. A handsome red marble shield bearing his family crest (dated 1488) shows the expertise of the artisans working for him.¹³

The building boom that characterized Matthias' rule brought scores of architects and sculptors to Buda, and along with them came *lapidariae* (stone cutters), various artisans, and skilled laborers. Of them the most significant figure was Giovanni Dalmata (Ivan Duknović) who probably spent three years (1487-90) at Buda. (He also appears in Hungarian sources as Ioannes Duknovich da Tragurio.)¹⁴ This original artist left the hallmark of his genius on each piece he created, revealing a mixture of refined realism and tender lyricism.¹⁵

Matthias obviously appreciated the Dalmatian sculptor's unique talent. This is reflected in the tenor of the royal deed.¹⁶ As is known, Ludovicus Cerva Tubero has also written about Duknović, referring to Matthias' gift, the castle at Majkovec, on the Sava, from which Bartholomaeus Berislavus (Prior Varanensis) later removed the sculptor by force.¹⁷

Giovanni Dalmata worked at the royal court, but also for Johannes de Zokol (Szokoli), bishop of Csanád, who commissioned him to carve an altar for the Paulist church at Diósgyőr, in the late 1480s. This altar fragment is further proof of the range and quality of works that adorned the various regional ecclesiastic buildings of Hungary during that period, of which so few have survived the wars of the centuries that followed. It is also assumed that Giovanni Dalmata was entrusted (by the king himself) with Matthias' tombstone at Székesfehérvár.¹⁸

Another artist from Trogir, Jacobus Traugirus, was active in Hungary during the same period. He worked in stone and perhaps also in bronze. He has been identified by some art historians as Johannes Statilić, about whom Nicolaus Istvánffy and Jerolim Kavanjin the Split historian both wrote, the latter mentioning his work at Vác.¹⁹ In the lapidary collection of the Pécs cathedral, a red marble rosetta — similar to those found in Buda, Split, Hvar, Trogir and Sibenik — is also from the workshop of Jacobus Traugirus.²⁰ Marble fragments of a fireplace excavated in the fort of Márévár in the vicinity of Pécs, convinced Hungarian scholars that the owner, Voivod Paulus Bakić, also used Dalmatian artisans, probably from the Pécs workshop.²¹ Since the remodelling of the building took place between 1527 and 1533, the presence of Dalmatian craftsmen testifies to the longevity and vitality of the Pécs workshop.²² The Dalmatian *lapicidae* remained popular at the royal court even after Matthias' death. In the 1490s Ragusan masons and stone-cutters were recorded in Wladislas' service.²³ They probably began working at the court during Matthias' lifetime and remained there after the ruler's death.

The Dubrovnik *lapicidae* had a long-standing reputation for excellence. As early as 1466 Johannes Thuz of Lak, ambassador to Dubrovnik, later Croatian-Slavonian ban, wanted to hire stone-cutters and carpenters for his own court. At the same time the Ragusan Council decreed that Paschoe Michelievich (Paskoje Miličević), *ingenarius prothomagister* (master-engineer), travel to Hungary with the envoys, Johannes Rozgonyi and Johannes Thuz.²⁴ As is known, Paskoje Miličević built the old harbor in Dubrovnik, and his

fame reached Matthias who immediately pleaded that he join the Buda court.²⁵

The most sought-after *lapicida* was Johannes Grubanić, whose testament serves as a revealing document. The signatories to his will prove that in 1487 at least four more wealthy Ragusan stone carvers lived in Buda. Grubanić himself owned a house in Buda, one in Šibenik, and a third in Zadar.²⁶

Works of the famous Dubrovnik silversmiths also found their way to the royal palace and to the cathedrals and churches of Hungary. Candelabra, bowls, drinking vessels, and goblets testify to their expert art. Gifts were sent to Matthias by envoys on special occasions such as the celebration of this victory over Bohemia (1468) and at the time of his wedding to Beatrix (in 1476), with separate gifts to the bride.²⁷

Not only did the royal couple receive gifts but so did the Hungarian envoy to Dubrovnik. Records also show that Archbishop Vitéz was presented with silver dishes in 1470.²⁸ The silversmith Johannes Progonović, whose work can still be found in the Dubrovnik cathedral, is identified as the creator of a number of gifts sent to the Hungarian court.²⁹ It is noteworthy that by the 1490s Dubrovnik turned less generous, and after a long discussion in the Council, Wladislas' gifts were considerably reduced.³⁰

Not all the presents sent by Dubrovnik were locally produced; some were ordered from Italy. But, as is known, there were several Dalmatian artisans active in Italy, among them Luca de Ragusa, who forged some pieces which Ercole d'Este sent to Matthias from Ferrara. Moreover, the Ragusan style became known as an independent type of design. In 1525 Yppolito, archbishop of Esztergom, referring in his inventory to a number of silver items, had them listed as executed "in modo raguseo," and recorded two candelabra "ad modum ragusino."³¹

There is a strong possibility that as far back as during Matthias' rule silversmiths from Dubrovnik were employed at the Buda court. In 1505, after the death of the natural son of a Ragusan silversmith, the father was listed as Nicholai Pasqualis Lenaić increasing the plausibility that some Dubrovnik silversmith moved to Buda as early as the fifteenth century. In addition, in the 1508 inventory of the Eger diocese, there are silver articles mentioned: among them two in "Ragusan style."³²

The most typical features of the Renaissance are the increase in humanist contacts, the travel of scholars, and the distribution of books. This is the time when humanists move from one center of

learning, or from the service of one monarch or prelate, to another. And this is the time when private, secular libraries begin to grow. This was the case in Hungary with the collections of Johannes Vitéz, and Janus Pannonius whose libraries, later confiscated, formed a part of Matthias' famed Corviniana. The lively trade in books involved primarily Italy, but frequently also Dubrovnik. It has been recorded that Johannes Vitéz, perhaps the best-read individual in Hungary of his time, turned to Dubrovnik to obtain Cicero's *Epistolae familiares* for himself.³³ Franko Vasilević (Francho Vasiglievich), a Ragusan citizen, probably also purchased codices for Matthias.³⁴

A controversial issue is the Buda illuminating workshop of Felix Ragusinus whom several scholars — with the notable exception of Jolán Balogh — identified as Feliks Petančić, earlier ambassador to Wladislas II.³⁵ Petančić was the author of *Itineribus in Turciam libellus*, first published in Vienna in 1522 (reprinted in Venice in 1542), and frequently quoted both by contemporary "turcologists," and travelers to the Holy Land.³⁶ Nicolaus Olaus referred to Felix Ragusinus in his *Hungaria* when describing the court of Buda, Matthias' treasures, and the Corviniana. He placed him in the illuminators' workshop and commented on his knowledge of Greek, Latin, Chaldaic and Arabic.³⁷ Although I too believe that the Cassianus codex, earlier attributed to him, was not his work,³⁸ I accept the views of those who hold Feliks Petančić and Felix Ragusinus to be identical.³⁹

Italian merchants, especially from Florence, had simultaneous contact with Dubrovnik, Zagreb and Buda.⁴⁰ Antonio Melini, a Florentine merchant living in Dubrovnik, had a brother Ridolfo who had his business in Buda, and through him Antonio also traded with Hungary.⁴¹ Nichus Pribissaglich (Pribisaglić), twice ambassador to Hungary, was a respected merchant in Ragusa.

Matthias most probably never visited Dubrovnik, although it was thought for a while, based on an official invitation by the City Council dated November 3, 1463. There is also a letter by him to Samko de Ragusio (December 24, 1480), in which he refers to having been his guest. But the Ragusan also owned property in Zagreb, and the king's letter thanking Samko for his hospitality is also dated from Zagreb.⁴² Thus it is more plausible that, for want of documentation of the royal visit in the Dubrovnik archives, Matthias' letter refers to his having been entertained in Zagreb.

Instead, there is much information about Matthias and his court that has come down to us directly from Ragusan sources. The king's summer residence was described by Janus Dubravius in his *De*

piscinis ad Antonium Fuggerum.⁴³ Dubravius traveled in Hungary after Matthias' death and wrote about the famous fountains and fishponds he had seen, comparing them with those he had visited in Bohemia.⁴⁴ It was the Ragusan poet, Aelius Lampridius Cervinus (Ilija Crijević, 1463-1520) who, on May 4, 1490, delivered a funeral oration over Matthias, eulogizing him as a great ruler and a glorious fighter against the Turks. He also emphasized the king's turning the Buda palace into a citadel of learning. As almost every contemporary, when referring to the palace, Crijević too mentioned its kudos, the prodigious library of Matthias.⁴⁵ The same poet also wrote epitaphia in Matthias' memory.⁴⁶ The king fared less well in the work of the Ragusan Ludovicus Cerva Tubero (Ludovik Crijević Tuberon, 1459-1527), who, strongly criticizing Matthias in his *Commentariorum de rebus suo tempore...*, stated that he only cared for his own glory.⁴⁷

Dubrovnik's privileges were confirmed in 1465 by Matthias, who sent out letters to the *ordines* and the free towns in which he reminded them of the special protection of the Crown the Ragusans enjoyed. In 1466 he commended Dubrovnik *en bloc* to Ferdinand of Naples, and in 1470 the city received additional privileges from the Hungarian king.

After the death of Matthias, Dubrovnik turned its hopes to the next ruler, Wladislas II, who in 1493 indeed confirmed all privileges that had earlier been granted the city. Yet soon thereafter, in 1493, with their usually perfect foresight, the Ragusans strengthened their contacts with Emperor Maximilian. He began to use their information regarding the Ottoman danger, about which they regularly advised the Emperor.

Wladislas too was aware of the Turkish army's advances but did little else than watch the slow disintegration of the kingdom of his famed predecessor. Ineffective as he was in politics, Wladislas made no lasting impression on Hungary's cultural life either. His humanist court was made up of holdovers from Matthias' people. The most important Croatian scholar in his court was Petrus of Warda, archbishop of Kalocsa, a relative of Johannes Vitéz. He was educated in Vienna, at Vitéz' expense. His humanist activities connect him with yet another member of the same family. It was he to whom Matthias entrusted the collecting of Janus Pannonius' epigrams. During Wladislas' rule Cervinus sent his poetry from Dalmatia to the king in hopes of being invited to the court, but despite having sought Archbishop Szathmári's support, the invitation never came.

The next king, Louis II, who followed his father on the throne in

1516 only to die at the battle of Mohács ten years later, did not improve the quality of intellectual and artistic life at his court either. The Jagiello kings, although expected to act as Renaissance patrons of the arts, had little interest in the muses. The gradual depletion of the Corviniana (through the giving away of volumes, and through general indifference and neglect) was the beginning of the final destruction of the treasures of the Hungarian court.

Yet, when Suleiman entered the deserted streets of Buda on September 8, 1526, he was still mesmerized by the beauty of the city and the splendor of the royal palace. "I wish I could move this castle to the shore of the Bosphorus," he allegedly said.⁴⁸ He was of course unable to move the entire palace, but he did the best he could. Laden with the priceless tomes of the library, which Naldo had not so long before called the "sanctuary of wisdom," Suleiman's galleys made several trips from Buda to Constantinople. He had the bronze statues, the silver candelabra, and the precious gold and silver dishes — the pride of the Dalmatian artists — moved to his palace in Istanbul. Soon the fabulous capital became but a shadow of its former self, its memory kept alive merely in the descriptions of Olaus and a few others.

With the Turkish conquest of Hungary, Hungarian-Dalmatian (especially Ragusan) relations ended. The relationship was not restored after the departure of the Turks from Hungary 150 years later. The Kingdom of Hungary had become a part of the Habsburg realm. And so did Dubrovnik: on August 24, 1684, it accepted the sovereignty of Emperor Leopold I.

Notes

1. A few paragraphs later it is, however, stated that if the king decides to wage war against Serbia or Venice, the Ragusans may still continue trading with them. One of the most important items in the treaty was the one that permitted Ragusan citizens to be tried in Dubrovnik, even if they had been charged elsewhere.
2. In 1461, however, Joannes Gazulo visited the pope and asked that the city's taxes to Rome be reduced as Dubrovnik had already contributed to Hunyadi's crusade.
3. It would fall outside the scope of this study to discuss in detail the intellectual contributions of Vitéz and his group. For more on the subject, cf. among others *Johannes Vitez de Zredna. Opera quae supersunt*. Ed. by I. Boronkai, Budapest, 1980; M. D. Birnbaum, *Janus Pannonius: Poet and Politician*, Zagreb 1980, (henceforth Birnbaum, followed by page no.). Ivan Česmički *Janus Pannonius, Pjesme i epigrami*, translated by Nikola Šop. Zagreb, 1951; and R. Gerézdi, *Janus Pannoniustól Balassi Bálintig*. Budapest, 1968.
4. The records are available in the archives and were published by J. Gelcich and L. Thallóczy, *Diplomatarium relationum reipublicae Ragusanae cum regio Hungariae*, Budapest, 1887, (henceforth Gelcich followed by page number). I. Mitić has published a book about the consuls from Dubrovnik, *Konzulati i Konzularna služba starog Dubrovnika* (1973), but there is still need for a work connecting their function and the

broad influence of the patrician families of Dubrovnik and how they affected the history of Hungary and Croatia.

5. There were, of course, earlier feelers to Dubrovnik from Buda. For instance, in 1413 Master Bartholo, a medical doctor, sent his apologies from Ragusa to the court and decided not to leave his home town.

6. The latter was most probably instrumental in calling the king's attention to his nephew, Felix Petancius (Petančić) Ragusinus.

7. Gelcich, 814.

8. Gerolimo Marino (who later became captain of Senj), Guigno Niccolo, and Pasquale began their careers at Buda. (*Annales Ragusini*. Zagreb, 1883, 58).

9. He is listed as Nicolas de Castro Segnie, "Italicus Familiaris" (published in *Beatrix-okiratok*. Budapest, 1914, 101), quoted by J. Balogh, *A művészet Mátyás király udvarában*, Budapest, 1966, I. 696, (henceforth Balogh followed by volume and page number).

10. Gelcich, 760.

11. The correspondence was published by Gelcich, 613 and 741.

12. Birnbaum, 116 and 122.

13. The marble shield of Ernusz is presently exhibited in the Povijesni Muzej Hrvatske in Zagreb. Adela Horvat's *Između gotike i baroka*, Zagreb, 1975, provides a good bibliography on the subject.

14. I have no intention of even referring to the rich scholarly literature that treated each work of this artist. For a concise bibliography cf. Balogh, I, 490-3.

15. A number of his works (some in fragments) are still at the center of discussion in the art circles of contemporary Hungary and Yugoslavia. Especially Balogh is unwilling to credit him with the famous double portrait of Matthias and Beatrix. (For more on this cf. Schallaburg, 1982, 201-4). For a long time Balogh maintained that Giovanni Dalmata, active in Rome, and Ivan Duknović were two different people, but in recent years she has accepted a number of attributions. Among views claiming Giovanni Dalmata as the sculptor of the marble relief, cf. mostly K. I. Prijatelj, *Duknović (Giovanni Dalmata)*. Zagreb, 1957. Numerous artifacts and fragments bearing the mark of Dalmatian masters, especially of Giovanni Dalmata, were recently brought together and put on a permanent display in the National Gallery of Budapest.

16. The Latin text was published, among others, by Balogh, I, 489.

17. Ludovicus Cerva Tubero, *Commentaria de temporibus suis*. Liber III: X, also quoted by Balogh, 490.

18. This is also mentioned in Tubero, *op. cit.*

19. According to Balogh, Kavanjin mistakenly identified Giovanni Dalmata as Statilić (Balogh, I. 493). Several Croatian scholars, among them K. Prijatelj (who identifies him as Jacobus Statilić) and C. Fisković (who believes that the issue has to be further researched) do not share Balogh's view. (Cf. *Bulletin Instituta za Likovne Umjetnosti*, JAZU, VII, 1959.) Balogh considers Jacobus Traugurinus "a figment of the imagination," arguing that there exists no contemporary document about him in Hungary.

20. For more on this, cf. O. Szőnyi, *A pécsi püspöki múzeum kótára*, Budapest, 1906.

21. Schallaburg, 1982, 571-2.

22. The fragments are presently housed in the Renaissance Lapidarium of Pécs.

23. For more on this, cf. C. Fisković's contribution at the *Journées internationales d'histoire de l'art*. Budapest, May 4-8, 1965.

24. The text was published by Gelcich, 771.

25. Here we may also talk about a two-way flow. In 1470, Dubrovnik in turn hired two Hungarian engineers. For more on Miličević, cf. L. Beritić, *Dubrovački graditelji*. Split, 1948.

26. Grubanić died on December 2, 1487. His statement was published and partially quoted by Balogh, 498. Miho Puhera of Hvar, Frano Radov and Juraj Librarij of Zadar also worked at Buda for a while.

27. Balogh, I. 365-6.

28. Gelcich, 798.
29. By the same token, one of the reliquaries of the cathedral bears the signature of a Szeged silversmith.
30. Gelcich, 819.
31. Quoted by Balogh, I, 365.
32. *Ibid.*
33. Gelcich, 751.
34. *Ibid.*, 759.
35. Among others F. Rački (In *Starine*, 1872), and later F. Bánfi, "Felix Ragusinus," *Janus Pannonius*, I, Rome, 1947, 679-706, and several Hungarian and Croatian scholars thereafter.
36. For more on this, cf. the forthcoming work by M.D. Birnbaum, *Humanists in a Shattered World: Croatian and Hungarian Latinity in the Sixteenth Century*. Los Angeles, UCLA Slavic Studies. 14 (in press).
37. *Hungaria-Athila*. Ed. by K. Eperjessy and L. Juhász. Leipzig, 1939 (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum*, Saec. XVI).
38. By the time the Cassianus codex was completed, he had left Hungary.
39. Balogh based her conviction on the findings of P. Kolendžić in the Dubrovnik Archives. According to those, Felix Petančić was a dubious character, always in financial trouble. Yet the same discoveries further convinced Kolendžić that the two were the same. My only doubts are due to the absence of any reference by Olaus' to his having been a diplomat in his youth. Knowing Olaus' interest in diplomatic missions it is curious that he did not mention this about Felix Ragusinus.
40. Cesare Valentini, Ferrarese ambassador, wrote to Eleonora, Princess of Ferrara, that merchants from Florence had arrived in Zagreb, via Hungary. (*Magyar Diplomáciai emlékek*, 1877). Large Italian merchant houses had "branches" in Buda and in Dubrovnik. The Benizzis lived in Buda but also had a son who represented another Florentine firm in Dubrovnik. Another Benizzi was listed as creditor of the Marinović merchant house in Dubrovnik. For more on this, cf. Balogh, 596-623.
41. *Ibid.*
42. Published, among others, by J. Teleki, *A Hunyadiak kora Magyarországon*, V, Pest, 1865, 167.
43. *Posonii*, 1547.
44. In addition to Olaus' *Hungaria*, this is the most important source on the architecture and plumbing system of Matthias' buildings. Olaus also recorded for posterity the once famous *Fons musarum* in his *Hungaria*.
45. "Oratio funebris in regem Matthiam," published in *Analecta recentiora*, 1906, 44-66.
46. *Ibid.*, 66-7.
47. Ed. by Johannes Georgius Schwandtner, Vienna, 1748, Tom. II.
48. Recorded by Evlyia Čelebi and quoted by L. Zolnay, *Az elátkozott Buda. Buda aranykora*. Budapest, 1982, 335.