

**UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED FACULTY OF ARTS
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HISTORY
MEDIEVAL STUDIES SUB-PROGRAMME**

Paul Szabó

1440 – The first Ottoman siege of Belgrade and its antecedents

The theses of the Doctoral (PhD) dissertation



**Supervisors: Prof. Dr. Terézia Olajos,
Dr. Ferenc Sebők**

Szeged

2014

1. The choice of subject

The theme of my PhD dissertation is the first Ottoman siege of Belgrade (or in Hungarian Nándorfehérvár). Without any exaggeration I can explain that this theme demands basic research, because this siege is not or hardly be remembered in the Hungarian historical literature. The glorious claim of the second siege of Belgrade (in 1456) outshines the earlier assault, 16 years earlier. The statement of Ferenc Szakaly in connection of the period of the Hungarian–Ottoman warfare, before the battle of Mohács, demonstrates the lack of the first siege in the Hungarian historiography. Up to the present the historical trade has obliged to complete the research of this assault, but keeps in evidence as in future-finishing work. The most accented reference to this deficiency is made by Elemér Mályusz in his study on Tallóci-family, in 1980: „*The observation of researchers left out of consideration few moments of our history, in spite of its importance... Scholars and laic readers takes no notice of the siege of Belgrade in 1440 and overglances the most majestic episode of the Ottoman–Hungarian life-and-death struggle.*”

In history works that have published in the second part of the 20th century and beginning of the 21th, hardly occurred something more than a chronological enumeration of the event of 1440. Therefore, I started a long-needed enterprise, because, as far as I know, this topic has not worked up yet, till now. In 2009, as a PhD student in the University of Szeged, Faculty of Arts, preparing for a presentation for the *Historic Circle of Hódmezővásárhely*, I was occupied in this topic in connection of the forthcoming jubilee of this siege. I have supposed this theme to be well written, but seen the taciturnity of literature, I have soon realized that I will have to proceed basic research, setting out from the sources. The majority of my foregoing studies have been published in connection of this theme, which has claims monographic unity by this dissertation.

2. The methods of the dissertation

The method of this dissertation is multidisciplinary. In the application of the sources, this unites itself with the Greek and Latin philological methods. I have not only finished the philological analysis of Byzantine, Greek sources in connection of the use of firearms, but the paralleled Greek and Latin texts, too. I used the methods of natural sciences (chemistry), and of the historical sciences: medieval history, war history, history of arms, Byzantine studies, Ottoman studies, jurisprudence (Hungarian medieval law history and Roman law) among the historical auxiliary sciences the diplomatics and sphragistics, too. The dissertation is established on a positivist approach, that is based on the principality of sources, from which tries to reconstruct the assault and from which concludes deductions. I aspired to entirety, made an effort to collect all available sources and published in Hungarian. Many times, I analysed and uncovered the sources, which till now have not known in historical literature. Especially, in the case of Byzantine Greek sources, the Latin sources of Poland, and the Osmanli Turk chronicles, too.

The theme of the dissertation demands the unusual complex researching method, in which ineludible the Ottoman studies. During this research, became evident the limited access of Osmanli Turk sources.

Researching of the castle sieges presumes the surveying of area and topometry. The topometry of castles, towers, walls of Belgrade, Smederevo and Thessaloniki provide an opportunity for me to make better understanding of siege techniques of Murad II, and to examine it with more complex, comparative methods.

I have also adapted the latest Hungarian and international historical scientific achievements and used the available databases on internet.

3. The structure and main conclusions of the dissertation

The dissertation is divided into 15 chapters, in which we can also find subsections. The first thematic part enumerates the antecedent of the siege (Chapter 1–7). The second (Chapter 8–12) consists of the sources of the siege, and analysis and its conclusions, which can be drawn. I fit to this a smaller unit, which connects with the siege of 1440 and its antecedents more remote, but refers to this theme, completes it and it has titled „Outlook” (Chapter 13). The dissertation concludes with bibliography of sources and literature and the enclosed supplements (Chapter 14–15).

I begin the „historiography” of this topic – which does really not exist – from the middle of the 19th century and pursue it until the scientific works, which have been published until recently (Chapter 1).

Because the lawful glory of the second siege of Belgrade in 1456 and the central theme of Hunyadi, our national historiography leaves out of consideration the previous period, before the siege of 1456. The contemporaries have not watched on the attack of sultan, because they – formed a political league by the dual coronation, owing to the divided country – expected the final fall of Tallóci-brothers. They did not dispatch relief troops. The more than six months resistance of Jovan (John) Tallóci has not produced so much international attention as the triumph of 1456.

Chapter 2 examines the political position of Hungarian Kingdom and Serbia, among the international connections of Western-Europe, Papacy, Byzantium and the Ottoman Empire. I accentuate the dynastic conflict of the Holy Roman Empire (Luxembourg, Habsburg) and Kingdom of Poland (Jagiello), which was an evidence in claim to both Bohemian and Hungarian throne and it was determinative key factor in reign-unity of the Hungarian and Polish Kingdom, after the death of King Albert, in 1439. In 1440, this antagonism was effectively blocked the international and Christian concentration of forces against the Turks. The papal coordination was exhausted to create of Eastern and Western Ecclesiastical Unity in exchange for the military aid against the Ottomans. But it aroused the suspicion of Ottomans and accelerated the Islamic cooperation. I turn attention to an unappreciated question, in undirect connection of the international affinity to the siege of Belgrade, during the Ottoman occupation of Balkan. The military power of the Hospitallers –after settled down in Mediterranean parts in Rhodes – contrary to Ottoman Turks. In relation to the assistant foreign policy of the Ottoman Empire and the Mamluk Sultanate, toward each other, against the Christians. In this aspect the Mamluk sieges of Rhodes (1440, 1444) have not seen to be accidental coincidence.

From the chapters of architecture history of this castle Chapter 3 shows us the building up during the 12th and the 15th centuries. In the 12th century with powerful walls a Byzantine acropolis was built up, which bore a part between the wars of Hungarian Kingdom and the Byzantine Empire. This acropolis did not play a remarkable role as the neighbouring castle of Zemlen, which was frequently passed into each others possession. From the point of view of the siege of Belgrade, in 1440, the main reconstruction was performed from 1404 to 1427, during Belgrade was built up as a modern fortress. In this took a part the well-regulated vassal partnership with Serbia and the foresight of the despot Stephen Lazarević, who appointed this new fortress to his capital and his headquarter. For this reason, the appearance of heavy cannons in this time demanded the reconstructions and fortifications of walls. It has belonged to the double wall system, the necessary thickness of wall, building the towers, usage of moats, and also the usage shelling proof and the flexibility of composit walling technology. By this construction works the despot provided not just the defence of Acropolis, also the Lower Town, too. We can correctly estimate the value of this, if we match the fortress of Belgrade with several contemporary

fortified towns and fortresses in Europe. Hitherto, in Hungarian historical literature, in connection with the siege of 1456, the building up of Belgrade was examined by itself. I expanded the horizon in the direction toward the indirect or direct connection of the siege of 1440 (for example the siege of Smederevo, Thessaloniki by Murad II). For the purpose of gathering the comparative dates, I will observe the well-built condition of the walls of Ragusa, Rhodes and Thessaloniki, and nearby fortress of Smederevo. We can prove that Belgrade, by its thickness of walls, can be inserted in row the contemporary European fortified towns. Among the towns – fortified by doubled walls –this town qualified as a powerful and modern settlement.

By the death of despot (1427) the fortress passed into Hungarian possession, meaning of the treaty of Tata (1426), fundamentally misbalanced the *status quo* of Balkan, between the Hungarian Kingdom and the Ottoman Empire (Chapter 4). As the Byzantine contract, which handed over Thessaloniki to Venetians, so the Treaty of Tata in 1426 regrouped the forces in Hungarian border. It was hazarded by the increasing military activity, in the begining of the reign of Murad II (1421–1451).

The subject of the following chapter (Chapter 5) is the family of Tallóci and captain of the fortress, John Tallóci, too. I discuss in detail the participation of Tallóci-s, against the Ottoman army, the artillery skills of Matko Tallóci, the usage of the bomb throwing mortars and ship based battery, under the siege Golubać. His bravery at Golubać led to the royal appointment as captain of Belgrade, in September of 1429.

The Tallóci-brothers, especially Matko, Frank and John, shared this job between each other. This family changed his earlier name 'Ragusian' for the noble 'of Tallóc', after the royal donation, in 1431. Therefore, I observed again the question of nobility. Albeit donation chart of the nobility did not remind for us, but they got married such family, have had such honors, which postulated the existence of nobility, not mentioned the donations of possessions. There is a remarkable observation for the usage of seals in their charters, the coat of arms of Tallóci, which shows to us the existence of family coat of arms. For the correct description of coat of arms, we have to revise the published online database of MOL.

In different subsection we can find the struggle for the territory government (bánság) of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia, and during this war, the connection with the Celje-family became a sharpening conflict. In this small combats Matko successfully employed the modern artillery. During the campaign of the Sigismund, in Serbia, against the Ottoman army in 1437, we can read the victorious fighting of Frank Tallóci. By another renewal of sharing job between Matko and Petko, they held in common the territory governmentship of Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia. Frank was responsible as the governor of Szörény for the defence of the eastern part of the southern frontier, including the defence of Belgrade, too. The youngest brother was the prior of Vrana as a member of Hospitallers Knight of Saint John and the commander of Belgrade, as mentioned in the charter in March of 31th, in 1438.

The Chapter 6 treats of the antecedents of the Ottoman attack, in 1440. The considerations of historians, Ottoman scholars, untill now, have based on too extensive and wide-spread periods. As for myself, I improve and uncover, circumstantially, the antecedent Hungarian–Ottoman combats, from the point of view of the siege in 1440. Not only point of view of Teutonic Order, but also the data of charters of the Ottoman invasions from 1429 to 1437, the campaigns against Transylvania in 1438 and against Smederevo in 1439, which was led by the sultan Murad II.

These military actions well presented the systematic preparations of Ottomans to conquer the Hungarian Kingdom. In the frontier invasions appears Ali and Ishak from the member of Evrenos-family, who led many times invasions in to the country. The

contradictory dating of the invasions, in the sources, we can correct by astronomical phenomenon (solar or lunar eclipse, comets) as I did in case of the invasion in 1433.

The campaign of 1438 was well timed, because King Albert had to wage war against the hussites in Bohemia, and against Polish army of Kazimir, which was invited by the hussites, in shadow of Ottoman threat against Transylvania. The king had to face up two-front or in worse case three-front war. I follow with attention the march of the Transylvanian campaign by the Latin sources of Poland, Byzantine and Ottoman sources.

The campaign in next year marked the changing in Court of the Sultan. In front of the peaceful, conservative period and policy of Grand Vizier, Halil Chandarli (1429–1453), the increasing influence of Hekīm Fazlullāh – compelling the military attacks – brought in turning point in case of campaign against Hungary, too. The first station of this is the new fortress and capital of despot George Branković, Smederevo. The power of walls of the recently finished fortress – being as high as of European architectural level – was not utilized. Yet, Murad II did not have heavy cannons, which was suitable for the siege, but the Ottomans, without any notable resistance, were able to seize the fortress by its hand over. In Ottoman policy of King Albert permitted a glance by a decree, which was edited at Titel, or to be more precise, at Tüdőrév in county of Bács. In this decree the king solemnly made a promise, that in next summer he will bring war on Ottomans with the most available grand army. His plan was hindered by own unexpected death. I draw attention to an Ottoman legation, in Latin sources of Poland. In 1439 sultan Murad sent an ambassador to the Polish King Wladislaw III in order to make an alliance against the Hungarians and to utilize the conflict of Poles with Albert in Bohemia. The sultan tried to prepare his campaign against Hungary and separate the country from its possible allied forces, in way of diplomacy too. King of Poland did not make alliance with Ottomans, but assumed an expectant attitude, hearing of the wish of the Hungarian legation to elect him as Hungarian king.

The domestic background and antecedents of the siege is in separate chapter (Chapter 7). By the spring of 1440, after the death of Albert the country has broken up into two „leagues”, given another opportunity for the sultan to reiterate his campaign against Hungary. Subdivision 7. 1 discusses the arrival of Wladislaw in Hungary, the resistance of queen Elisabeth and her withdrawal, the phases of civil war, the capture of Matko Tallóci, the coronation of Wladislaw and the role of Tallóci-s in all these events by the aid of contemporary sources (memoire, letter, charters). Conclusion of subdivision 7. 2. is that there was available army for the barons, which was suitable for rescue the siege or at least shorten the Ottoman blockade, but they rather used it against each other. Moreover, this Ottoman campaign and siege for the queen and her league of Garai–Cillei–Branković was in good time, because they would have preferred to wait for the fall of Tallóci-s at Belgrade and by this failure Tallóci-s would have sooner dropped out from the government of Hungary. In this situation, not only the Tallocci-s, but also Belgrade definitely were left alone too. This two political league under the Ottoman siege did not interrupt the war against each other. This refers to the fact, that in the sources, especially in the charters, we hardly find some references to siege of Belgrade, nothing but among the charters of king Wladislaw and Tallóci-s (Subdivision 7. 3).

In the Tallóci-practice of charter-issuing appeared that Matko Tallóci mainly edited his charters as governor of Croatia in the previous years, before the siege, far away from Belgrade. The further of his charters were also made in this office, and among of his brothers, are the greatest number. In 1440 is does not justify with data that Matko would have been in Belgrade. Summing up his charters, we can not find concerning one to the siege. So, we can draw a conclusion that he directed the affairs of government of Bánság. We have no data concerning him, that he would have taken aid there or he ever had aid

transported to that fortress, which were blockading by the Ottomans. This is confirmed by the chronicle-sources in Latin language, which does not know of rescue of the defenders of the fortress or getting any support sent to that place. Only Frank Tallóci have a charter concerning on the siege. As former governor of Szörény (bán) in 20th of May in 1440, he issued – in the historical research known – charter, in which particularly for the defence of Belgrade he assessed tax (as *subsidium*) people and serfs of Szentmiklós in county of Krassó. In a further charter, which was dated in 7th of July, he informed the serfs of Perlek, Asszonyfalva, Csáktó, Csőreg, Újfalu, Szentkirály and Endrőd of the royal donation of the castle of Becső in county of Torontál, and told that they had nominated Michael Dóci and Stephen Horváth for 'castellanus' and 'officialis.' By reason of this data, the hypothesis that Frank Tallóci would be in Belgrade, is not confirmed by sources (charters). Unfortunately from the defender of Belgrade, John Tallóci, we do not know of any own issued charter. He merely appeared with his brothers in the donation-charter of King Sigismund (in 27th of September) and in a purchasing-charter, which was issued by King Albert (in 31th of March). This taciturnity we can consider as testimony of the entire blockade of the fortress. At the same time, this makes heavier to research the sources of the siege and henceforward directs the researcher to chronicle-sources.

The second main part of the dissertation starts the presentation and publication of original texts of the sources – collected by myself–, which follows my own Hungarian translation. The systematic collection of sources of the siege took place in Chapter 8. Separate subdivisions consider one after the other the sources in Latin language from Hungary and Poland, in Byzantine, classicizing and modern Greek, and Osmanli Turk language.

I designed for the philological analysis of texts of the sources different chapter (Chapter 9). Before, we can not leave out of consideration the possibility that Hungarian humanist chroniclers could have borrowed from ancient authors and this would be sample of the description of the assault. For example, if we compare the siege of Ambrakia and its description of the ancient authors (Polybius, Livy) with the „parallel” description of the humanist authors (Thuróczy, Bonfini), the similar episodes of the events can be matched with each other. Moreover, it is worthy to examine – in the aspects of philology – the words of firearms in Byzantine sources of the siege, concerning of early usage of firearms. The Byzantine authors, solicitude for the millennial tradition of their language, abstained from the direct borrowing of the foreign phrases and words of firearms, rather they made an effort to find archaic and general meaning words for the naming these instruments. This too general meaning words can hide away the early usage of firearms (cannons, rifles), so we have to examine and interpret these texts repeatedly.

The accented part of the dissertation is Chapter 10, which based on the collected sources of the siege. By the sources, the established and brief construction of the siege as follows. In the first phase of the siege the Ottoman army, arriving at Belgrade, entirely beleaguered the fortress, that is blockaded (Thuróczy, Bonfini, Callimachus). The Ottomans made preparations for long-time assault, which bared to carry in the outside support and afforded the possibility of starving of the castle-defenders. Only the the sources in Latin language from Poland mentions the ambassadors of Wladislaw I, King of Hungary and Poland to Sultan Murad II. The real target of this embassy was to gain time and the exploration of purpose of the Ottomans. The beleaguering army was well supplied with usual catapults, which used for the assaults of the fortresses. Dlugos have known of wall-demoliting bombard at the hand of the beleaguers and of the bombards of the defenders, with which they effectively shot the Ottoman ships and galley. Callimachus mentioned belfry (mobile tower), which was made out of wood and other machines. The Byzantine sources – in my interpretation – reported the usage of firearms, which was

numbered new and modern using. While our sources (Thuróczy, Bonfini, Dlugos, Callimachus, Anonymous Zoras) named the defender of Belgrade (John Tallóci), about the commanders and leaders of the beleaguers we have hardly any information. It is remarkable, that the Ottoman sources does not inform us of it. Only the Byzantine Chalkokondyles named the aforementioned and brave man, during the siege, Ali Evrenos-oghlu, who is well identifiable in the Osmanli Turk sources, concerning of his incursions against Hungary and Albania.

The sultan at first, traditionally started the siege with general assaults by land and sea. After he did not succeed in assaults, he chose an other siege-technique; he tried to get in by undermining. By that, this siege became special. I count the second phase of the siege from here. About the existence of mines the sources were divided. The usage of undermining was written in the Latin sources from Hungary (Thuróczy and following him, Bonfini) and from the Byzantine sources: Anonymous Zoras. The Polish chroniclers, Dlugos and Callimachus writes that the defenders sprinkled with gunpowder the logs, with which were previously filled the ditch by Turks. Then they set those fire, when the assault was started against the walls. The Byzantine authors and the Ottoman sources does not mention of explosion of mines or blowing up of ditches. It concludes that the sultan forced by his loss to abandon the second phase of the long siege and to retreat. We have scarcely any concrete data. On the losses of the defenders our sources neither left to us any information. Thuróczy and Bonfini said that the death toll of the Ottomans had been 17 000. This amount was better perceptible by data of Bonfini that is, in the digging of the mine 20 000 man were participated and in the siege of the town 8 000 people were killed. The Ottoman sources accented the giant plunder, which were acquired by Turks. Only the Anonymous Polish Letter-writer, Dlugos and Callimachus remembered the combat and the loss of the Ottoman navy. However, it took an important role under the siege, because the navy closed the sail into the fortress from the rivers and the important road of arriving supports. By the Polish sources in Latin language, sultan Murad dismissed the Pole ambassadors, just after at the end of the siege.

Among the few concrete datas of this siege is the most important one the long time of the besieging (Subdivision 10. 2). Thuróczy, Bonfini, Anonymous Zoras and Tarih-i Ungurus determines 7 month; Dlugos, Ducas 6 month. All these important to stress, because the Turks kept on record and on the occasion of the second siege in 1456, reminded sultan Mehmed II, by the report of Thuróczy. Unfortunately, the available sources do not determinate the precise beginning and finishing of the siege, merely length of time. If the army of the Sultan, following the Ottoman military tradition, in the day of Hizir Iljas (in 23th of April) from the April of 1440, had started on their way, they would have arrived at Belgrade – calculating with data of military historians (Géza Perjés, Gyula Rázsó) – in the middle of June or July, but this was not verified by sources. According to the Chronicle of Dlugos, when Wladislaw, after his coronation in Alba Iulia, had arrived in Buda, the Ottoman besieging had been occurring for 3 month. Actually, it must have been started in second half of April. We not only have to take into account the Ottoman imperial army, but also the provincial units, too. Among these, the akinji-units in the frontier zone, had equally important role and assembled at the border fortress, in one of the base of operation. At this point, we take into account that the opening of the siege was not started by the Ottoman central-imperial army, which was on the way, but the guard of closer border fortresses and corps of neighbouring sanjaks and the units of akinjis. At first – as my opinion – in April of 1440, the army of Ali arrived at the walls of Belgrade and began the assault as reported it Chalkokondyles. The Ottoman imperial army – led and called together by Murad II – according to traditional „time-table” could arrive later. We can confirm this practice of the two-phase mobilization by another, such large-scale campaign

of Murad, against Constantinople in 1422. The time of finishing of Ottoman military operation at first siege of Belgrade has not formed compulsorily. In 1444, after the victory of Varna, Murad II granted the right to his army, by that on the expiration day of St. Demetrius, it is not permitted to force the army to remain further in camp.

In the latest international literature has occurred the possibility of short time of the siege (by John Jefferson), which – as for my part – is confutable. Apart from this, in some references of the earlier Hungarian literature the short-time of besieging is also widespread, concerning of the siege in 1440. It origins from the translation of Chronicle of Thuróczy, in 1978, the edition of John Horváth. In this edition occurs – mistaken – the two-month siege, instead of 'seven'. Unfortunately, this number is partially transferred to the historical literature, having a substantial influence on the real estimation of this siege.

It is to be regretted that the sources does not mention the number of the opposite armies. So, just we can estimate the number of the defenders at Belgrade. In this I used the data of Sigismund military proposal in 1433 and the report of Bertrandon de la Brocquière and the research of John Jefferson (subdivision 10. 3).

Under the siege, the usage of undermining by Turks is the accepted part of siege-techniques of Murad II (for example in siege of Thessaloniki, 1430). At the siege of Belgrade, the main problem is that Thuróczy and Bonfini does not mention the possibly place of Ottoman mine. In 2009, a piece of news from press closer guide us to solving that. There is a medieval mass grave in an exploded tunnel, next to a club, near the fortress, which conserved the Ottoman corpses from time of the siege, in 1440. It also verifies the statement of Thuróczy and by the identification of the club can be more determinable the place of exploded tunnel. In Belgrade I surveyed this place and my observations verified the reports of Thuróczy and Bonfini, this is such a place, from where the defenders in the fortress were not able to see the diggers of the tunnel. But it corrects the remark of Bonfini that „*the way out was near the river*”, this is river Sava, few meters far away. By the examinations of Zoran Lj. Nikolić and Vidoje D. Golubović the surface of the tunnel is about 500 m², which was hollowed into the hill. Its height of between 1, 2 – 4, 2 m, and breadth is 1, 6 – 12 m. From the main cave further, ramifying tunnels starts.

The sources concerning of siege, accentuated the usage of firearms, which was very early practice. By the report of the Byzantine authors, in which they used black powder. But by the account of each Byzantine authors (Critobulos, Anagnóstés, Ducas, Codex Anonymous Zoras) the consistency of this kind of black powder was not 'powder', but 'herb' or rather 'chaff'. I acquainted the importance and the possible solving this problem in subdivision 10. 5. I also identify a possible method of saltpeter-production in the text of Bonfini.

We can read in the sources the early usages of firearms, cannons and rifles as shows to us the subdivision 10. 6. It is important to stress that albeit there are some early data in the historical literature, but also the high speed of development of the Ottoman artillery starts at the age of Murad II and Mehmed II. Gábor Ágoston, Pál Fodor suppose that the artillery – as a separated and salaried corp – was organized in time of Murad II. Colin Imber regarded the years of 1440 as a decisive turn, precisely owing to the Hungarian–Ottoman wars. In this respect, the siege of Belgrade illustrates that the Ottoman artillery has been inaptitude for sieges of powerful fortresses, yet. Murad II used cannons in sieges, in 1422, 1430, 1439 and 1440, but he could not put faith sufficiently in them, because in addition, he had the walls broken with ballistas too. In 1440, the defenders were supplied with firearms too. The beleaguers were not able to stand against the dashing projectiles of the rifles from the walls. The *communis opinio* of the research is that the artillery became implanted in Hungarian Kingdom in the reign of King Sigismund and first of all, the Southern, Dalmatian influence was in it effective. Ragusa played in this an important role.

This city soon has grown the centre of producing firearms, where from other Balkan states also could supply firearms. Since the connections of the Tallóci-s remained with Ragusa, most likely that the modern, reliable firearms, which was held on in the defence of Belgrade, they were able to supply hence. Those firearms, which were used in the resistance of the defenders had many technological innovations. We are hearing of it from the report of Byzantine sources. Ducas, incomparable precisely describes the *méchané*, which was made of bronze and was used by the defenders. Possibly this was a harquebus. The description of Ducas is modern from the point of the bullets too. The Byzantine author mentioned that it shot 5 or 10 bullets, which were Pontian walnut sized and were filled in the barrel, after one after, directly in row. For the wide-spreading of the firing, this usage can be considered as the ancestor of the 'lead shot' in our days. Ducas, beside this globular form of bullets, describes the conical bullet which were hammered, and this form gave frightening trajectory and penetration. By these bullets the armour can be shot through. In my opinion that it is the first mention of conical bullet, in Central-European siege, in relation of Hungary. I also accentuate the usage of other, modern firearm: the bomb throwing mortars. We know that, from report of Bertrandon de la Brocquière, there was such bronze mortar in Belgrade, especially one.

In the Chapter 11, I examine the question: Did one of the Hunyadi-brother participate in the siege of 1440? Three charters concerns us of the activity of Hunyadi-s – regarded in the younger John Hunyadi too – in 1439 and 1440. It was not probable that they could have presented at the siege of Belgrade by their duties.

The Chapter 12, modifies the approachings of literature, sets the siege of 1440 in row of early Ottoman–Hungarian warfare, which needs to have a paradigm shift of Hungarian military history. The siege can not fit in the 'gradual phases' of the Ottoman conquer, which were created by a part of historians (Gyula Rázsó, Ferenc Szakály). As for my part, I can not regard the campaigns of 1438, 1439 and 1440 as only Ottoman incursions of the 'first phase' at the borders. Because, they only by place were near the border, but they were started as regular campaigns, led by the Sultan, the purpose of conquer the country or at least preparation of it. The preparation of campaign in 1440 signs the real purpose of Murad. It not only contains the making alliance with Poland against Hungary, but also the military coordination with the Mamluk Sultanate for the defence of Islam, keeping watch over the invitation of Christian Unity against the Ottomans in synod of Florence and of course the viewpoint of Byzantium.

At this time the Ottomans had the intention to conquer of Hungary. It signs that already sultan Bayezid I has planned to conduct campaign(s) against Hungary, just the Eastern foreign affair and unfortunate situation (Tamburlaine) turned him to realise his purpose.

At this point the dissertation joins with the studies of the third thematic part (Chapter 13. 'Outlook'). The main subject matter of this the mentions of campaign(s) of Bayezid I, against Hungarian Kingdom by the Byzantine and Ottoman sources (Subdivision 13. 2) To raise the question of it that is why original and modern, because in the discussions of the early Ottoman–Hungarian warfare the main accent was making catalogue of almost annual, borderer, Ottoman invasions and incursions. The invasion of the regular, imperial army was out of viewpoint of research. By the read sources, it can be seen that Bayezid I went against Hungary. By the datas of the cited sources I separated from each other a campaign, before the battle of Nicopolis, connecting with other Ottoman campaign against Wallachia and a quick, imperial campaign just after the Ottoman victory at Nicopolis.

Another subdivision follows this study, which discusses the so called by me 'zeroth' siege of Belgrade, inserted in the campaign of Bayezid I, against Hungary (Subdivision 13. 3). An Ottoman author, Oruç Beğ mentioned one month's siege, after the Ottoman capture of Golubać. The chronicler states further the Wallachian campaign of Bayezid I. Albeit, in

the international Ottoman studies, this data has been known for a long time, that is from the published study of Franz Babinger (1944) and the study (1957) and a dictionary entry in the Encyclopaedia of Islam by Halil İnalcık (1960), in Hungary has remained without any resounding. Maybe, because for the Hungarian historians a better known Serb historian, J. Kalić mentioned in her book, concerning of medieval history of Belgrade, but it is not respected as an authentic data, because the Hungarian sources does not mention it. But in the Serbian historical literature it is not the only exclusive viewpoint. As by the sources can be reconstructed, this siege was once in the years of 1390–1391–1392. Maybe, it connects with the Ottoman invasion in beginning of 1392, or with the Serbian campaign of Sigismund and the unsuccessful attempt to reconquer of Golubać. In this case, the brief and fruitless 'zeroth' siege of Belgrade was part of the Ottoman campaign and it may occurred in 1392.

I enclosed in part of 'Outlook' a topographical problem, which I found in the Latin sources from Hungary (Subdivision 13. 1). This third thematic part of the dissertation ends with a description of unknown siege of Sarno, near Belgrade in 1463, in reign of King Matthias Hunyadi (Subdivision 13. 4).

The publications of the Author pertaining to the Topic of the Dissertation

1. „*Ahol Magyar Királyságunk épsége ered*” –Nándorfehérvár első török ostroma (1440). [*from where originates the integrity of our Hungarian Kingdom*] –The first Ottoman siege of Belgrade, 1440.] *Belvedere Meridionale* XXII. évf. (2010) 3–4, 59–85.
 2. „*nem jegyezték fel többet néhány szűkszavú mondatnál*” Nándorfehérvár első török ostroma a magyar történetírásban. [*It were not recorded more than few, laconic sentence.*] –The first Ottoman siege of Belgrade in the Hungarian historiography.] *Partium* 2011/2012 (XX. évf. tél). 12–19.
 3. Új fejezetek Nándorfehérvár első török ostromáról (1440) 1. rész. [New chapters on the first Ottoman siege of Belgrade, 1440. First Part.] *Partium* 2012, XXI. évf. (nyár) 80–96.
 4. Nándorfehérvár első török ostromának kül- és belpolitikai előzményei (Második közlemény). [The antecedents of the first Ottoman siege of Belgrade in foreign and internal politics. Second Part.] *Partium* 2012, XXI. évf. (ősz) 8–29.
 5. Nándorfehérvár első török ostromának forrásai (Harmadik közlemény). [The sources of the first Ottoman siege of Belgrade, 1440. Third Part.] *Partium* 2012, XXI. évf. (ősz) 109–131.
 6. Értékelés és következtetések Nándorfehérvár első török ostromáról (1440) (Negyedik közlemény). [Analysis and conclusions on first Ottoman siege of Belgrade. Fourth Part.] *Partium* 2012/13 XXI. évf. (tél) 45–75.
 7. Egy elfeledett hadisiker nyomában: Nándorfehérvár első török ostromáról (1440). [Following of a forgotten victory: on first Ottoman siege of Belgrade.] Vajdasági Magyar Helytörténeti Társaság, Évkönyv 3. Szerk.: Szabó József. Bajmok, 2013. 3–58.
 8. Nándorfehérvár első erőpróbája. Történeti szinopszis az 1440. évi szultáni török ostromról. [The first trial of strenght of Belgrade. A historical synopsis of imperial siege in 1440.] *Bácsország* 2013 / 2. (65.) 24–28.
 9. I. Bayezid szultán Magyarország ellen vezetett hadjáratai és Nándorfehérvár „nulladik” ostromának lehetősége. [The campiagns of Bayezid I against the Hungarian Kingdom and the possibility of 'zeroth' siege of Belgrade.] *Partium* 2013, XXII. évf. (nyár) 73–89.
- Book:** Baán István: A XIV–XVI. századi magyar történelem bizánci és kora újkori görög nyelvű forrásai. Balassi Kiadó. Budapest, 2013. [The Byzantine and early modern Greek sources of the Hungarian history in the 14th–16th centuries.]
[My translation of verses and participation with the preparing notes and collecting the Hungarian bibliography.]

Under the press:

- Névtelen bizánci krónikák Nándorfehérvár első török ostromáról. [Anonymous Byzantine chronicle fragments on first Ottoman siege of Belgrade.] In.: A Kárpát-medence, a magyarság és Bizánc. Szerkesztette: Olajos Terézia. Szeged 2014 (s. a)

The Conference Presentations of the Author pertaining to the Topic of the Dissertation

2010. március 19. „*Nándorfehérvár első török ostroma.*” [The first Ottoman siege of Belgrade.] Hódmezővásárhely, a Vásárhelyi Történelmi Kör márciusi előadása.
2010. július 17. „*1440–Nándorfehérvár első török ostroma.*” [1440– The first Ottoman siege of Belgrade.] III. Történettudományi Találkozó, Hódmezővásárhely 2010. július 10–18.
2011. február 15. „*Nándorfehérvár első török ostroma (1440)*”. [The first Ottoman siege of Belgrade –1440.] Sokmindentudás Egyeteme előadássorozata, Algyő.
2011. július 14. „*Ahol Magyar Királyságunk épsége ered*” –*Nándorfehérvár első török ostroma (1440)*” [„*from where originates the integrity of our Hungarian Kingdom*” –The first Ottoman siege of Belgrade, 1440.] IV. Történettudományi Találkozó, Hódmezővásárhely. 2011. július 9–17.
2011. november 11. „*Egy elfeledett hadisiker nyomában, Nándorfehérvár első török ostromáról (1440).*” [Following of a forgotten victory: on first Ottoman siege of Belgrade.] Szabadka, Magyar Ház.
2012. május 22. „*Névtelen bizánci krónikák Nándorfehérvár első török ostromáról.*” [Anonymous Byzantine chronicle fragments on first Ottoman siege of Belgrade.] A Kárpát-medence, a magyarság és Bizánc. A Magyar Bizantinológiai Társaság szegedi tagozata által szervezett nemzetközi bizantinológiai konferencia. Szeged, 2012. május 21–22.
2012. július 17. „*Újabb eredmények Nándorfehérvár első török ostromáról.*” [The latest results of my research on first Ottoman siege of Belgrade.] V. Történettudományi Találkozó, Hódmezővásárhely. 2012. július 14–22.
2013. január 31. *Hunyadi Mátyás ismeretlen győzelme Nándorfehérvárnál, Zsarnó ostroma (1463).* [An unknown victory of Matthias Hunyadi at Belgrade, the siege of Sarno, 1463.] Szeged, SZTE–BTK, Bölcsészettudományi Kar, Történeti Intézet, Történeti Segédtudományok Tanszék. (Ünnepi előadás Dr. Dér Terézia tiszteletére).
2013. június 18. *Ostromolhatta-e I. Bayezid Belgrádot?* [Could have Bayezid I besieged Belgrade?] VIII. Medievisztikai PhD-konferencia, Szeged. 2013. június 17–19.
2013. július 9. *I. Bayezid szultán Magyarország elleni hadjárata(i).* [The campaign(s) of sultan Bayezid I against the Hungarian Kingdom.] VI. Történettudományi Találkozó, Hódmezővásárhely. 2013. július 6–14.
2013. július 13. *Nándorfehérvár „nulladik” ostromának lehetősége.* [The possibility of 'zeroth' siege of Belgrade.] VI. Történettudományi Találkozó, Hódmezővásárhely. 2013. július 6–14.
2013. szeptember 27. „*Egy ostromrekonstrukció az írott források által: Nándorfehérvár 1440.*” [A siege reconstruction by the written sources: Belgrade, 1440.] Szeged, SZTE–BTK, Bölcsészettudományi Kar, Történeti Intézet „Sokszínű középkor” Kutatók éjszakája 2013. programsorozat.