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Abstract

In January 1447, Enea Silvio Piccolomini, on a mission from Emperor Friedrich III to Pope Eugenius IV, requested a papal audience in which he could, on behalf of emperor, respond to a number of complaints against the emperor, sent to the pope by the Regent of Hungary, Janos Hunyadi. The Hungarians demanded the return to Hungary of the Boy King Ladislaus, Saint Stephen’s Crown, and a number of cities and castles on Hungarian territory, occupied by the emperor’s troops. In his response, Piccolomini provided a well-reasoned defense of the emperor’s position.
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Foreword

This is the first version of the final edition of the present text. I do not, actually, plan to publish further versions of this text, but I reserve the option in case I – during my future studies - come across other manuscripts containing interesting versions of the oration or if important new research data on the subject matter are published, making it appropriate or necessary to modify or expand the present text. It will therefore always be useful to check if a later version than the one the reader may have found previously via the Internet is available in HAL Archives.

In 2007, I undertook a project of publishing the Latin texts with English translations of the orations of Enea Silvio Piccolomini / Pope Pius II (altogether 77 orations - including papal responses to ambassadorial addresses - are extant today, though more may still be held, unrecognized, in libraries and archives). Later the project has been expanded to include ambassadors’ orations to the pope, of which about 40 are presently known.

I have published the preliminary editions of both the individual orations and the collected orations in the French digital research archive, HAL Archives, and I shall gradually be replacing them with the final edition until the whole work – Deo volente - is completed in 2020.

I shall much appreciate to be notified by readers who discover errors and problems in the text and translation or unrecognized quotations.

20 September 2018
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I. INTRODUCTION
1. **Context**¹

After the death of the Habsburg King Albrecht II of the Romans² in 1439, his son Ladislaus, born posthumously on 22 February 1440, was recognized as his successor to the Duchy of Austria and (later) the Kingdom of Bohemia. In view of the very serious military threat from the Turks, the majority of the Hungarian nobles did not want a child king, but voted for Wladislaw III of Poland as the next King of Hungary. On 15 May 1440, Ladislaus’ mother, Queen Elizabeth of Luxembourg, had the infant crowned as King of Hungary, and on 17 July Wladislaw, too, was crowned King of Hungary. Elizabeth then appointed Friedrich III, Ladislaus’ uncle and new Habsburg King of the Romans, as Ladislaus’ guardian and sent the child to him together with the Hungarian crown, Saint Stephen’s Crown.³

In 1444, King Wladislaw died in a battle against the Turks⁴. Despite some opposition the Hungarian estates then elected Ladislaus the Posthumous King of Hungary.

In the early summer of 1445, the emperor reacted to the activities of a number of robber bands based in Hungary by invading the frontier territory and capturing some castles and cities, including Güns. Piccolomi comments on this in a letter to his friend, Giovanni Campisio: *This year the king of the Romans, partly acting through his captains, has taken seventeen castles in Hungary and Moravia, having driven out robbers.*⁵

In August 1445, a splendid Hungarian embassy came to King Friederich in Vienna to announce the election of Ladislaus as King of Hungary and to request his person and the Crown of Saint Stephen. The negotiations failed, as did later diplomatic efforts.

Then, in June 1446, the Hungarians elected Janos Hunyadi as Regent of Hungary. On 16 October 1446 he sent letters to Venice and to Pope Eugenius IV in Rome complaining about the refusal of Friederich III to agree to the Hungarian demands.⁶

---

¹ Piccolomini: *De Europa*, 1, 8 (Brown, p. 59); Piccolomini: *Historia Austrialis / 1. Version* (Knödler, I, pp. 19, 33); Voigt, I, II, 9, p. 383; Zanetti, pp. 60-85. Cf. Also a number of letters of Piccolomini: *Epistolarium*, p. 299, 429, 472, 487; *WO*, II, pp. 76 ff, 238, 251
² I.e. uncrowned Holy Emperor
³ Cf. Haller
⁴ The Battle of Varna, 10 November 1444
⁵ *Epistolarium*, 185, p. 469: *XII castella hoc anno adeptus est rex Romanorum in Hungaria atque Moravia expulsis latronibus partim per se, partim per suos duces. Incepimus iam esse in castris.* Translation quoted after Reject, p. 227-228, and other letters, cf. Piccolomini: *Historia Austrialis* (Knödler, I, pp. 19, n. 104)
⁶ Published in *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*, II, p. 38. See Appendix
On 16 November 1446, Piccolomini left the imperial court to go to Rome, as the emperor’s ambassador, to declare the obedience of the Holy Roman Empire to the pope, ending 8 years of German neutrality between the pope and the rump Council in Basel.¹

While on the road, he visited Venice to deal with certain outstanding matters between the emperor and Venice. In his ambassadorial report to the emperor, after the completion of the mission to Rome, he wrote as follows about the visit to Venice:

When we left you, most unconquered prince, it was the sixteenth day of November in the year of the Lord 1446. It was a harsh winter; snow covered everything. The Hungarians raged all over Austria, for, having broken faith against law and justice, they invaded Austria in arms. We could not use the direct route. We crossed trackless mountains and inhospitable peoples and came to Bruck. After that, we went to Venice by the usual route. Vincent, a Hungarian and envoy of John the Voiwode,² who had come to Venice, was there. He accused your majesty and commended his lord to the Venetians. We visited the Venetian senate. We expounded the status of the case that was pending between you and the Hungarians, and strove to make apparent your innocence and the injuries done to you by the Hungarians. To those whom we knew not to be friends or whom we held suspect, we should not show ourselves to be poor, lest they should rejoice in our misfortunes and insult us, but it was necessary for us to show confidence and to have a clear mind. This we did abundantly. For that reason, the doge of Venice,³ who was accustomed to speak for all, said he condemned the deeds of the Hungarians, and that he did not doubt that your royal majesty would end these reversals with your honor intact.⁴

This passage seems to indicate that Piccolomini had not left the emperor with specific instructions to deal with the Hungarian matter neither in Venice, nor in Rome, but that he took it upon himself, as ambassador, to do so when the situation required it, as was the case in Venice. Moreover, though the title of the oration states that the oration in Rome was held “ex inopinato et improviso”, he had in fact already, in Venice some weeks previously, had the opportunity to reason and talk about the matter. As a member of the imperial chancery, he had not only closely followed the development of the Hungarian matter, as witnessed by several of his private letters,⁵ but he had also been directly involved in imperial diplomacy concerning this matter, to the point of having written two letters from

---

¹ See Piccolomini’s oration “Non habet me dubium”
² Janos Hunyadi
³ Francesco Foscari
⁴ Letter report of Piccolomini to the Emperor of 1447 (Reject, pp. 243-244)
⁵ E.g. three long letters, one to Dénes Szécsi, Cardinal archbishop of Esztergom (Budapest) of 1 July 1445 (Epistolarium, pp. 472-481); one to Leonhard Laiming, Bishop of Passau, of 27 October 1445 (Epistolarium, pp. 485-495); and one to his friend, Giovanni Campisio, of 6 January 1446 (Wolkan, II, pp. 24-28)
the emperor to the pope\textsuperscript{1} and also the imperial edict of 21 May 1444, declaring a two-year truce between the emperor and King Wladislaw of Hungary.\textsuperscript{2}

Piccolomini arrived in Rome on 7 January 1447. On the 9\textsuperscript{th}, the German delegations were received by the Pope in a secret consistory, and Piccolomini gave his oration on German obedience, the “\textit{Non habet me dubium}”.

After this, he writes in the ambassadorial report, \textit{when Aeneas begged another audience about the affairs of Hungary, he [the Pope] granted it with a willing soul, and he ordered the letters of the voiwode John, which had already arrived and which blamed your imperial majesty, given to Aeneas so that they could be answered better.}\textsuperscript{3}

And later in the same report:

\textit{Also there was no little rumor that the Hungarians had insulted Austria and detracted very much from your fame, outstanding king. We, however, already in a secret consistory with the envoys of the princes, the electors, and others present, had expounded your justice and the perfidy of the Hungarians. We left all the cardinals sufficiently informed of the truth. What we said has been written down;\textsuperscript{4} there is no need to repeat it. We obviated the rumours as far as we could, but we did not admit that you fear the Hungarians. The cardinal of Bologna\textsuperscript{5} and the cardinal of Sant’Angelo,\textsuperscript{6} the best of fathers, not just like common men but like Austrians, defended your your honor and your dignity and dismissed these empty rumours.}\textsuperscript{7}

The initiatives of Piccolomini in this matter, both in Venice and in Rome, may be seen as diplomatic maneuvers aimed at damage control. Hungary was perceived by the European powers, including the papacy, as the bulwark against Turkish expansion. It would therefore not be expedient for the emperor to be seen as threatening Hungary from the rear. Nor was it expedient that the unchecked Hungarian depredations in Austria should make the emperor look weak. Europe would eventually learn, however, that this emperor was not a warrior king – his qualities were of a different kind.

\textsuperscript{1} Letters of 1 April 1444 and of February 1445 (Wolkan, I, II, pp. 24-28 and pp. 157-159)
\textsuperscript{2} Wolkan, I, II, pp. 141-144
\textsuperscript{3} Reject, p. 248
\textsuperscript{4} I.e. the oration “\textit{Tritum est sermone}”, the text of which had already been or would be communicated to the emperor
\textsuperscript{5} Tommaso Parentucelli who had been a papal envoy to the Emperor and was shortly afterwards elected Pope and took the name of Nicholas V
\textsuperscript{6} Juan Carvajal who had directly knowledge of German and Hungarians affairs. Both Parentucelli and Carvajal were friends of Piccolomini
\textsuperscript{7} Reject, p. 259
The oration “Tritum est sermone” may not have been quite as improvised as it appears from its title. Indeed, it is a succinct, precise, and rather effective statement of the facts of the matter, as seen by the imperial side, completely without the “humanist” embellishments which in other contexts characterized Piccolomini’s orations.

It was effective in the sense that the Apostolic See did not attempt\(^\text{1}\) to intervene in favour Hungary in the conflict, which was eventually settled peacefully later in 1447.\(^\text{2}\)

### 2. Themes

The Hungarians demanded the return to Hungary of the boy king, Ladislaus, Saint Stephen’s Crown, and a number of cities and castles on Hungarian territory, occupied by the emperor’s troops. The emperor could not grant the demands for Ladislaus and the crown for reasons explained by Piccolomini, and the demand for the return of cities could only be granted in part and on certain conditions

Concerning the first demand, Piccolomini gives 5 reasons for the refusal of the Emperor:

- The emperor is the most appropriate guardian of Ladislaus
- The boy king cannot possibly govern Hungary
- The boy king has other realms with equal rights
- The emperor cannot accept the Hungarian claim that Hungary is an electoral kingdom and that Ladislaus is an elected king
- It would unsafe for Ladislaus to return to the Hungarians who are a rebellious people\(^\text{3}\)

Concerning the demand for the crown, Piccolomini replied that naturally the crown should be with the king, and that returning it without the king might tempt the Hungarians to use it to elect another king. Since Saint Stephen’s crown was a powerful symbol of the ruler’s legitimacy, actual possession of the crown was a very important political issue, and for years it would influence Friedrich’s Hungarian policies.\(^\text{4}\)

---

1. It could not either, had it wished to do so, in view of the much more important pending imperial and German recognition of the pope
2. Zanetti, p. 84: *dass im Jahre 1447 ein endgültiger Friede zwischen den beiden Kontrahenten [Hunyadi and the emperor] zustande kam, dessen Abschluss sicherlich auch dadurch begünstigt wurde, dass das Auslieferungsansuchen betreffs Ladislaus sicherlich nicht ganz so ernst gemeint war.* Indeed it might be easier for Hunyadi to consolidate his power in the absence of the boy king from Hungary
3. Zanetti, p. 79: an undeclared motive for the emperor’s refusal to send Ladislaus to Hungary might have been his fear that Austria, ruled from Hungary, might eventually cease to be a Habsburg dominion
4. Haller, p. 94
Concerning the demand for the restitution of cities and castles, the emperor was willing to return some of them on condition of certain guarantees and payment of damages and war reparations. Others, he wanted to keep to ensure Ladislaus’ rights.

3. Date, place, audience, and format

Piccolomini nowhere states exactly when the oration was delivered, but it was after the reception of the German ambassadors on 9 January, and probably shortly afterwards, so that it would have been in January. Voigt believed that the oration was delivered in a private audience immediately after the consistory where he held the “Non habet me dubium”,¹ but this is probably not correct since Piccolomini shortly afterwards, in his report to the emperor, explicitly states that he was given time to study the letter sent by the voivode to the pope in order to be able to answer it better, and moreover that the oration was delivered in a another consistory (cf. above).

The place was presumably the Apostolic Palace in the Vatican.

The audience was the pope, the cardinals, and the curial officials participating in the consistory and the members of the German embassies.

The format was that of a diplomatic oration.

4. Text

The oration was not included in the Collected Orations of Pius II, compiled under his personal supervision in 1462.² It was therefore not revised in that context.

4.1. Manuscripts³

¹ Voigt, I, II, 9, p. 383
² Cf. Collected orations of Enea Silvio Piccolomini / Pope Pius II, ch. 5.2
³ Though very ably edited by Wolkan, the three manuscripts have, as a matter of principle, been collated on the basis of digital versions for the present edition
The oration is extant in three manuscripts used by Wolkan for his edition (see below):

- **Brno / Moravská Zemská Knihovna / Bibliothek Dietrichstein**
  
  Cod. II, 122, fol. 126-129 (N)

- **München / Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (BBS)**
  
  Clm 519, fol. 80r-83r (M)

- **Vorau / Augustiner Chorherrenstift Archiv**
  
  Cod. 35, fol. 175r-178r (V)

### 4.2. Editions

The oration has been published once:


It was not published as part of Mansi’s edition of Piccolomini’s orations (1755-1759).

### 4.3. Present edition

For principles of edition (incl. orthography) and translation, see *Collected Orations of Enea Silvio Piccolomini / Pope Pius II*, vol. 1, ch. 11-12.

**Text**

The present edition is based on all three extant manuscripts. The lead text is the clm 519.

Variants not listed in Wolkans edition are marked with an asterisk.

**Pagination**

---

1. Formerly in the Dietrichstein Palace in Nikolsburg, now in the Moravian Library in Brno
3. The manuscript was written by the humanist Hartmann Schedel and finished on 20 May 1468, cf. Wolkan, I, p. 526
Pagination is from the München manuscript 519 (in red) and the Brno manuscript (in blue).

5. **Sources**

In this short and very business-like diplomatic address, there is only quotation, the expression “tritum est sermone”, from Cicero’s *De officiis*.

6. **Bibliography**


Piccolomini, Enea Silvio: *De Europa* (1458)

- Enee Silvii Piccolominei postea Pii PP. II *De Europa*. Ed. A. van Heck. Città del Vaticano, 2001. (Studi e testi; 398)


Piccolomini, Enea Silvio: *Epistolae*


Piccolomini, Enea Silvio: *Historia Austrialis* [1453-1458]

---

1 For an analysis of Piccolomini’s use of sources, see *Collected Orations of Enea Silvio Piccolomini / Pope Pius II*, ch. 8

2 Abbreviations used in the notes are given in bold types

Pius II: *Orationes*

• Ed. Giovanni Domenico Mansi. 3 vols. Lucca, 1755-1759 [Mansi]


*Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*. Ed. by J.G. Schwandtner. 3 vols. 1766.


7. Sigla and abbreviations

*M* = München / Bayerische Staatsbibliothek / Clm 519

*N* = Brno / Moravská Zemská Knihovna / Bibliothek Dietrichstein / Cod. II, 122

*V* = Vorau / Augustiner Chorherrenstift Archiv / Cod. 35

**Abbreviations**


**Mansi** = Pius II: *Orationes* politicae et ecclesiasticae. Ed. Giovanni Domenico Mansi. 3 vols. Lucca, 1755-1759
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$WO = \textit{Der Briefwechsel} \ldots \text{Hrsg. Rudolf Wolkans. 3 vols.} \text{. Wien, 1909-1918}$
II. TEXT AND TRANSLATION
Responsio domini Aeneae\textsuperscript{1} poetae\textsuperscript{2} super querelis Johannis Huniat\textsuperscript{3} quam personaliter coram sanctissimo patre Eugenio ex inopinato et improviso dicit\textsuperscript{4} et\textsuperscript{5} super praescriptis respondit\textsuperscript{6}

[1] \{80r\} \{126r\} Trendum est sermone proverbium, pater sanctissime, priores qui faciunt, quam qui patiuntur injurias conqueri, quod Johannes de Huniat, qui se gubernatorem Hungariae vocitat\textsuperscript{7}, falsum \{126v\} esse non sinit. Is namque, licet nulla injuria lacerissus nullisque\textsuperscript{8} provocatus offensionibus, contra scripta sua, contra fidem publicam, contra jus fasque ingressus Austriam cum exercitu quamplures villas ferro et igne vastaverit, vim tamen se pati dicere, contumeliosis lacerare verbis Caesarem majestatem et, quod sibi culpae est, alteri vitio vertere non veretur. Sed respondebimus breviter dictis suis et insolentis hominis vanas refellemus accusationes. Nec nobis menti est regni totius praelatos proceresque reprehendere, inter quos multi sunt recti atque constantes, qui Johannis facta detestantur; sed ipsum dumtaxat et qui sibi alludunt et mendaces et culpabiles et poena dignos asserimus.

[2] Tria, si recte accepi, Johannis litterae regi nostro obiciunt, quibus\textsuperscript{9} inferri regno violentiam asseruntur: ajunt sibi regem negari, coronam auferri, castella occupari, et, quia verbis haec nequeunt obtinere, vendicare armis intendunt. Nil miri est, pater sanctissime, si, qui habent manus\textsuperscript{10} nocentes, os\textsuperscript{11} quoque injustum ferunt; nam cordi malo facta simul et verba facile consonant.

---

\textsuperscript{1} Silvii \textit{add.} N \\
\textsuperscript{2} laureati \textit{add.} N \\
\textsuperscript{3} M*; Huniad \textit{et passim} N, V \\
\textsuperscript{4} duxit N*, V* \\
\textsuperscript{5} \textit{omit.} N \\
\textsuperscript{6} V*; \textit{omit.} N \\
\textsuperscript{7} faciat V* \\
\textsuperscript{8} ullisque M* \\
\textsuperscript{9} quidam M*, N*; quibus \textit{corr. ex} quidam V* \\
\textsuperscript{10} habent manus: manus habent N*, V* \\
\textsuperscript{11} eis M*
Response of Enea Silvio, poet, to the complaints of Janos Hunyadi, delivered directly to the Holy Father, Eugenius, as an unplanned and improvised oration

0. Introduction

[1] Holy Father, a well-known proverb\(^1\) says that those who cause injuries complain even before those who suffer them. This is also true of Janos Hunyadi who calls himself the Regent of Hungary.\(^2\) For though he had suffered no injury and been provoked by no offences, he has – against his written words, against his public promise, against law and justice – invaded Austria\(^3\) with an army and devastated many villages with fire and sword. And now he claims to suffer violence, attacks His Imperial Majesty with outrageous words, and culpably turns his own crime into somebody else’s. We shall briefly answer his claims and refute the groundless accusations of this insolent person. It is not our intention to blame the prelates and the nobles of the whole realm, for there are many upright and steadfast people who reject Janos’ actions. But we claim that he himself and those who play his game are both liars and deserve punishment.

[2] If I understand correctly, Janos’ letter\(^4\) raises three accusations against our king, claiming that the realm is being molested: their king is denied them, the crown has been removed, and castles have been occupied. And since they cannot recover them by words, they will reclaim them by arms. Holy Father, it is not surprising, that those who have harm in their hands also have injustice in their mouths, for to a wicked mind it is easy to shape words to fit actions.

\(^1\) Cicero: De officiis, 1, 10, 33: ... est ... tritum sermone proverbium
\(^2\) Hunyadi had been elected Regent (gubernator) of Hungary by the Hungarian estates in June 1446
\(^3\) In autumn 1446
\(^4\) See Appendix, the passage in bold types


¹ nec N*
² M*, N*, V*
³ faciet M*; faciat corr. ex faciet N
⁴ M*; habet quoque N, V
⁵ alia et M, V ; et alia N
⁶ M*; datur N; datur aut detur V
⁷ omit. M; Hungari V
⁸ obtinuerint V*
⁹ M, V*; quam horum sit : sit quam horum N
¹⁰ M, V*; regem N
¹¹ N*
¹² N*; sed M, V
¹³ esse add. [sic!] N
¹⁴ M, V*; omit. N
1. The Hungarian demand for the extradition of King Ladislaus

[3] But let us hear how justified is the Hungarian demand that the King be given to them. If I am not mistaken, this petition can be entirely refuted on five grounds.

1.1. The emperor is the most appropriate guardian for Ladislaus

As the boy is only seven years old, who can better take care of him and foster him than the King of the Romans, to whom he was entrusted as a baby by his own mother? Who is more closely related to him than his uncle? Who is greater in the House of Austria? Who has protected and fostered him until now with royal care?

1.2. The boy King cannot govern Hungary

And what would the boy do in a kingdom where he cannot govern, but only be governed?

1.3. The boy King has other realms with equal rights

Moreover, the boy also has other kingdoms and dominions. If he is given to the Hungarians, the Bohemians can rightly complain, as well as the Austrians, the Moravians, and others, who have asked for him, but did not get him – as if the loyalty of the Hungarians is greater than theirs!

1.4. The emperor cannot accept the Hungarian claim that Hungary is an electoral kingdom

[4] Moreover, the Hungarians demand Ladislaus as an elected king, not as the heir. But His Royal Majesty well knows that the realm comes to the boy [as an inheritance] from his mother, his father, and his grandfather, and not by virtue of an election. For apostolic decrees confirm that the Kingdom of Hungary is hereditary, not electoral. And the Hungarians do not deny that Albrecht, too, was king, he who – as they themselves say - was the father of Ladislaus. But if His Imperial Highness gave them the boy as an elected king, he would create serious prejudice to the boy and his successors. Indeed, as the boy has already been crowned legitimately and received the homage of the realm, he has acquired it in full right. Therefore His Imperial Majesty considers it absurd to send him back for a new coronation, as requested by the Hungarians.
[5] Accedit istis, quia non taliter se hactenus habuerunt Hungari, ut tradendus\textsuperscript{1} sit eis puer. Nam et avo saepe rebellearunt, et patri multivariam\textsuperscript{2} insidiati sunt et matrem persecuti et contra se ipsum, novellum regem verum \textsuperscript{81r} et indubitatum, infante tamen et orphanum, adulterum regem introduxere, paternam\textsuperscript{3} sibi maternam et avitam haereditatem\textsuperscript{4} auferentes. Ob quas res injusta petitio visa\textsuperscript{5} est, dum puerum sibi tradi\textsuperscript{6} cupiunt Hungari, apud quos, ut de malis loquor, qui non sunt pauci, fidem frangere quam servare reputatur honestius.

[6] Sed postulant Hungari coronam. Negato equidem rege et coronam negare\textsuperscript{7} consentaneum est. Quis enim non apud regem servandam esse coronam dicat? Ubi rex, ibi et diadema sit oportet. Nec aliter moris in \textsuperscript{127v} Hungaria fuit. Sed vellent forsitan Hungari (neque hoc insuasum est) diadema, quod sanctum vocitant, apud se retinere, ut suo ex arbitrio novum, quando vellent, regem constituerent, ut sicut homines rerum novarum cupiditi\textsuperscript{8}, quod licet nullo jure facere queant, regnum tamen turbarent, cum habere jus eligendi regem se dicant. Atque idcirco nec regem permitti Hungarlis puerum neque coronam persuasum est.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} credendus suprascr. V*
\item \textsuperscript{2} M*; multifarie N; multifariam V*
\item \textsuperscript{3} patriam M*, V*
\item \textsuperscript{4} \textit{em.}; hereditariam M, N, V
\item \textsuperscript{5} petitio visa M*, V*; visa peticio N
\item \textsuperscript{6} sibi tradi : tradi sibi V*
\item \textsuperscript{7} negari N*, V*
\item \textsuperscript{8} cupidum V*
\end{itemize}
1.4. The Hungarians are a rebellious people

[5] Moreover, until now the Hungarians have not behaved in such a fashion that the boy can be handed over to them. For often they rebelled against his grandfather, they plotted against his father in many ways, and persecuted his mother. And against Ladislaus himself, the new, true and undisputed king, but an infant and orphan, they set up a false king,\(^1\) thus robbing him of his own country, inherited from father, mother, and grandfather. Therefore, the Hungarian demand for the boy to be handed over to them is unreasonable, especially as there are many men among them - I am speaking of the wicked ones - who consider it quite permissible to break faith rather than to keep it.

2. The Hungarian demand for the return of Saint Stephen’s Crown

[6] The Hungarians also demand the crown. However, if the king is denied them, it is only consistent to deny them the crown as well. For who would claim that the crown should not be with the king. Where the king is, there the crown should be, too, and this has always been the custom in Hungary. But the Hungarians may well want to keep the crown, which they believe to be holy, with themselves so that they can appoint a new king at will. For they are a people liking political change, and though justice is not on their side, they would definitely bring disturbance to the realm since they claim that they are entitled to elect their own king. Therefore it is inadvisable to allow the Hungarians to have the king or the crown.

---

\(^1\) Wladislaw III of Poland, crowned King of Hungary on 17 July 1440, 2 months after the coronation of the infant Ladislaus the Posthumous
[7] Nec de castellis ac civitatibus separatior ratio est. Sunt in manu Caesareae majestatis ex Hungariae oppidis\(^1\) atque castellis Jaurinum et\(^2\) Supronium, Guns, et alia plerumque. Jaurinum et Supronium\(^3\) annis jam pluribus Caesar in potestatem accepit, ut patruelis sui jura tueri posset. Nam\(^4\) nisi haec oppida tenuisset, actum erat de jure pueri. Guns et alia quaedam cum exercitu de manibus praedonium recepit, treugarum\(^5\) vigore, quas cum Hungaris habebat. Cum tamen tua sanctitas, beatissime pater, adversus Teucros\(^6\) Hungariam excitasset, placuit Hungaris biennales indutias ex Caesarea majestate deposcere, ne, dum in fronte cum Teucris pugnarent, in tergo ab Australibus\(^{81v}\) caederentur. Quas rex noster intuitu fidei et tuae beatitudinis id exigitibus libenter concessit. Sed caveri voluit, ut qui treugas non servarent, liberum si\(^7\) esse tueri posset. Erant enim praedones quidam Austriae Stiriaeque finitimi, qui nec Hungaros ut impotentes, nec regem nostrum quasi non suum dominum metuebant, et sic undique praedabantur. Similiter et Hungaris permissum est, si qui ex nostris non servarent indutias, ut eos frenarent. Litterae utrimque sigillis munitae sunt\(^{28r}\) et utrimque traditae.

[8] Servatae sunt treugae per Caesaream majestatem suosque subditos; praedones vero\(^9\), quorum feci mentionem, ut qui nullis se legibus teneri\(^10\) arbitrantur, majora dietim spolia majoraque praedia\(^11\) factitabant. Scripsit regia serenitas saepe Hungaris, ut providerent, illisque\(^12\) se\(^13\) alii occupatos negotiiis afferrentibus post mortem regis Poloniae, juxta tenorem treugarum, quae adhuc durabant, exercitum movit, praedones supplicio affectit, provinciam expurgavit, castella in potestatem redegit, de qua re etiam Hungari majestati\(^14\) regiae per suas litteras egerunt gratias.

---

\(^1\) opidum N*
\(^2\) M*; omit. N, V
\(^3\) Guns et ... Supronium omit. M*
\(^4\) M*; non N, V
\(^5\) M*, V*; 'trew- et passim N
\(^6\) M*, V*; 'Thew- et passim N
\(^7\) esse M*
\(^8\) M*; omit. N, V
\(^9\) non M*
\(^10\) M*, V*; 'tueri N
\(^11\) majoraque praedia : majoresque predes V
\(^12\) M*, V*; 'illi qui N*
\(^13\) omit. M
\(^14\) majestatis M*, V*
3. The Hungarian demand for the return of castles and cities

[7] The same reasoning applies to the castles and cities. Of the Hungarian cities and castles His Majesty controls Raab, Sopron, Güns and several others. The emperor took over Raab and Sopron several years ago in order to protect the rights of his nephew. If he had not held these cities, the boy would no longer have had any rights at all. Güns and some other cities he took by arms from the hands of robbers by virtue of his truce with Hungary. For when Your Holiness roused Hungary to fight the Teucrians, the Hungarians decided to ask His Imperial Majesty for a two-year truce so that they would not have to fight the Teucrians in front while being attacked by the Austrians from the rear. Out of respect for the Faith and the demands of Your Holiness, our king granted this gladly, stipulating that he would be free to restrain those who did not keep the truce. For there were robbers close to Austria and Styria who feared neither the powerless Hungarians nor our king, as they did not owe him any allegiance, and therefore plundered everywhere. The same was allowed the Hungarians, so that they – on their part - might restrain those from our side who did not keep the truce. Letters were sealed by both parties and transmitted to both.

[8] The truce was kept by His Imperial Majesty and his subjects. But [on the opposite side], the abovementioned robbers, believing that they did not have to observe any laws, looted on a daily basis and took much booty. Often His Serene Highness wrote to the Hungarians that they should take this matter in hand, but they claimed that they were otherwise occupied. So after the death of the King of Poland, his Majesty, in accordance with the provisions of the truce that were still in force, sent in his army, punished the robbers, cleansed the province, and took over the castles. For this, even the Hungarians thanked His Royal Majesty, in a letter sent to him.

---

1 Ödenburg
2 Köszeg in Hungary
3 Note that Piccolomini used the term Teucri for the Turks as late as 1447
Cum ergo haec vel oppida vel castella repetunt Hungari, et contra Ladislai regis foedus et contra foedus induciarum [bellum] faciunt nec inhoneste possunt repelli, quis enim, ut alia omittamus, haec oppida sive arces, quae juris Ladislai regis munimenta sunt, justius teneat et melius regat quam Caesarea sublimitas, quo tamquam proximior, conveniendor, et fidelior regem nutrit? Quae cum ita sint, nullam facit injuriam Hungaris regia serenitas, si, quae petunt injuste, negantur juste. Sed non egi hoc modo noster Caesar cum Hungaris, qui immo motus eorum precibus, motus oratorum, qui saepe ad se missi sunt, rogatibus, de puero responsum dedit, quamvis coronatus esset, non abnueret tamen novam coronationem, curarent dumtaxat Hungari fieri, ut tute possit post coronationem conservare regem in Posonio, quod est Hungariae oppidum regno Bohemiae et Austriae vicinum. Consensit sicut et genitor ejus divae memoriae Albertus in testamento reliquerat, et illic assignare coronam obtulit. Sed quoniam arx in potestate alterius erat, illam in manu eorum, qui nutrirent regem, restituui postulabat.

Nec minus modeste de castellis et oppidis respondit. Nam Jaurinum, quod est ecclesia cathedralis, quodque rex non ex manibus ecclesiae, sed occupatorum recept ac pro ejus tutione aureorum circiter 20 milia exposuit, quam primum illic episcopus daretur, juxta cor suum, qui sibi et patrueli suo fidelis esset, satisfacto sibi restituere non negaret, nec Supronium, quod sub pignore tenet, recepta pecunia amplius retineret. Ad restitutionem vero reliquierum castrorum, resarciri damna, quae praedones fecerant, impensas belli reddi, et ut sibi ac patrueli suo ex illis post hac nullam fient detrimenta provideri postulabat. In hac sententia saepe responsum est Hungaris, quibus ex rebus facile videre potest tua beatitudo, an regia serenitas vim faciat Hungaris aut injurias inferat.

---

1 M; omit. N, V
2 em.; omit. M, N, V
3 M, V; quos N
4 qua N
5 sed non: si vero M
6 em. Wolkan; omit. M, N, V
7 M, N, V
8 omit. N, V
9 omit. M
10 episcopus daretur: emptus daret M; episcopi darent N
11 M, V; ac N
12 M, N, V
13 faciant N
14 M, V; et N
15 M, V; hoc N
16 nulla N
17 videri M
Now the Hungarians persist in demanding these cities and castles, which is contrary to [the rights] of King Ladislaus and they are making [war] in contravention of the truce treaty. It is quite legitimate to expel them, for who - not to mention other things - can more justly hold and better rule these towns and fortresses that guarantee the rights of King Ladislaus than His Imperial Highness who fosters the king as his closest relative and the most appropriate and most faithful guardian.

In this situation, His Serene Highness would do no injury to the Hungarians if he justly denied their unjust demands. But this is not how our emperor dealt with the Hungarians. On the contrary, moved by their prayers and moved by the requests of the ambassadors often sent to him concerning the boy, he answered that although Ladislaus had already been crowned once\(^1\), he would not reject a new coronation if only the Hungarians would arrange that, after the coronation, he could keep the king safely in Pressburg, a Hungarian town close to the Kingdom of Bohemia and Austria. This assent was in accordance with the testament left by the boy’s father, Albrecht of holy memory, and the emperor even offered to have the royal crown kept in Pressburg. But as the castle in Pressburg was held by somebody else, the emperor demanded that it should be transferred to those who fostered the king.

Concerning the castles and towns he replied just as moderately. Raab is an episcopal city that the king received not from the Church, but from those who had occupied it, for a sum of 20,000 ducats. The king offered to give back the city as soon as a bishop acceptable to him had been appointed there, one who would be loyal to himself and to his nephew. Nor would he keep Sopron, held by him as surety, if a sum was paid to him. Concerning the restitution of the other castles, he demanded compensation for the losses caused by the robbers, payment of war expenses, and measures against future injury to himself and to his nephew. An answer in this vein was given to the Hungarians on several occasions. Thus Your Holiness can easily see whether His Serene Highness uses violent measures against the Hungarians or molests them in any way.

---

\(^1\) As an infant
[11] Sed illi, cupiditati magis quam justitiae suas petitiones aptantes, tamquam solum et unicum justum sit, quod ipsi volunt, convenientes Bdae exercitum coegerunt, quem, dum parari regia majestas sentiret, praemissis oratoribus sciscitata est, quo suas copias essent ducturi, et an sibi cavendum esset. {82v} Nam et pacem cum eis, si vellent, libenti servaret animo, et bellum, si necessitas affuerit, non detractaret; sed pacem se magis cupere dicebat. At illi, quibus nihil est quam mentiri facilius, fideles se regiae serenitatis servitores (129r) esse respondent, bonos vicinos pacem tenere, discordiam abhorrere vitandosque fore tamquam dissidii et zizaniarum satares, qui copias Hungarorum adversus dominia Caesarae dignitatis vel majestatis quovis pacto venturas dicerent. Sed ecce constantiam, ecce justitiam, aequitatem, nobilitatem, fidem: venit ex improviso Johannes armatasque copias in Austriae limitibus exponit, et, nisi quae petit obtineat, ingressurum se Austriam et omnia ferro et incendio vastaturum minatur. Regia sublimitas missis legatis, ut supra dixi, et justius etiam respondet.


---

1 M*; afferret N, V
2 majestatis N
3 M*; responderunt N, V
4 suprascr. V; omit. M, N
5 zizaniorum N*
6 M*; dignitatis vel omit. N, V
7 serenitatis N
8 M, N*, V
9 Austria N*
10 non M*
11 reverentiave N*
12 custodiende N; custodie V
13 recipieran N*
14 at quod : atque M*
15 eis fuit M*, V*; fuit eis N
[11] But the Hungarians, suiting their demands to their greed rather than to justice - as if the only just cause is that which they themselves want - gathered an army at Buda. When His Royal Majesty was informed about these preparations, he sent orators to ask where these troops were to be sent, and whether or not he had to take precautions. For he would willingly keep the peace with them if they so wanted, but he would not avoid a war if necessity so demanded. However, he would rather have peace, he said. But the Hungarians, who lie easily, answered that they were the loyal servants of His Serene Higness, and that, as good neighbours, they would keep the peace and avoid conflict. They also said that those who claimed that Hungarian troops would be coming against the territories of His Imperial Highness and Majesty should be ignored as sowers of discord and thistles. But see what Hungarian steadfastness, justice, equity, nobility, and faithfulness are like: suddenly Janos\(^1\) arrived in force and deployed troops at the Austrian borders, threatening to invade Austria and devastate all by sword and fire if he did not get what he wanted. His Royal Highness sent legates - as I said before - with an answer that was more than fair.

[12] But what respect for justice do the Hungarians have (I speak only of the evil ones)? What care for faithfulness? What memory of promises? Their army invaded Austria, burnt noble cities, set fire to holy buildings, raped virgins and matrons, and their swords spared neither sex nor age. But the barbarians could not rampage as much as they wanted to, for most people fled to fortified places, and the Hungarians were unable to conquer the fortresses. But otherwise they committed every evil they could.

\(^1\) Janos Hunyadi
5. Conclusion

[13] Holy Father, you have now heard both about the perfidy of those Hungarians who support Janos, and the moderation of His Imperial Majesty, who is not discouraged though he has suffered grave losses among his subjects. For he has the strength of his subjects, his friends, his relatives, and he has justice on his side, and God, who protects the just, and who – as he does not doubt - will help him to get just retribution. In a short time - we hope - you will hear important news [on this matter], for when we left our king¹, he was at the point of going to war. We are certain that Your Holiness will forgive him since he has not taken up arms willingly, but only out of necessity, and to end war, not to make it. May he enjoy the favour of the Best God and the Lord of Armies, and may God also protect Your Holiness and give you a prosperous and tranquil rule of his Holy Church. Amen. Thanks be to God.

¹ 16 November 1446
Appendix¹: Letter from Janos Hunyadi, Regent of Hungary, to Pope Eugenius IV of 18 October 1446²

(125Ar) Beatissime pater, vim patimur expertes culpae, gravisque rebus nostris et inopinata⁴ violentia ingeritur⁴. Terra nostra intestine hactenus⁵ bello tumida⁶, jam⁦ divino munere parabat conqueriscere, solum⁸, aduersus⁹ infideles Europa pellendos, sollicitudinem reliquens¹⁰ erectam¹¹: verum princeps ille, qui Christiani populi¹² Augustus reputatur et caput¹³, turbatis addit vulnera, et quaesitae paci¹⁴ nova jurgia pronus ministrat¹⁵, quamuis non dubitet, nullum jus sibi ex¹⁶ regno nostro, nullumque commune deberi¹⁷,

(125Av) praeestim, cum submotam noverit causam illam, qua eadem terrae nostrae et patriae manum contendebat violentiam immittere. Cum autem¹⁸ et¹⁹ beatitudini vestrae²⁰ non lateat²¹, quia²² totalis dissensio illa tam aspera²³ ex duorum regum contraria electione viguerit, jam amplius²⁴ non videtur locus dissidio, dum unum judicio divino sublatum agnovimus et alterum votis nostris concorditer electum²⁵. Huius²⁶ equidem¹ electi regis

¹ Edition based on texts edited in the *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*. Ed. J.G. v. Schwandtner. 3 vols. 1766. / II, p. 38 (HU), and the mss. collated above, i.e. the M (ff. 79r, the N and the V. Lead ms. is M. Pagination from N (blue
² Epistola querimonialis a gubernatore et proceribus regni Hungarie ad sanctissimum dominum nostrum papam contra Caesaream majestatem et in qua excusationem petunt si propter a invaderet armis Austriam ex eo quod petita non habere queant M; Epistola querimonialis a gubernatore proceribusque regni Hungarie ad sanctissimum dominum nostrum papam contra Caesaream majestatem in qua excusationem petunt si propterea invaderent armis Austriam eo quod petita non queant N
³ et inopinata *omit.* HU
⁴ in gratur N
⁵ intestino hactenus : hactenus intestino HU
⁶ tumida *corr. ex tumefacta* M
⁷ jamjam N, HU
⁸ solam HU
⁹ adversos N
¹⁰ *omit.* HU
¹¹ relinquabat *add.* HU
¹² Regni HU
¹³ reputatur et caput : appellatur HU
¹⁴ *omit.* N
¹⁵ intorquet HU
¹⁶ in HU
¹⁷ debere N
¹⁸ enim HU
¹⁹ uti HU
²⁰ beatitudini vestrae : beatitudinem quoque vestram HU
²¹ latet HU
²² *omit.* HU
²³ illa tam aspera : prior in hoc regno HU
²⁴ amplior HU
²⁵ unum judicio ... electum : alter judicio divino sublatus est et alter per concordem electionem susceptus HU
²⁶ hujus HU
nostri\(^2\), ut pueri\(^3\) illustriissimi Ladislai nati quondam serenissimi domini\(^4\) Alberti regis cuius partem hoc usque praenotatus princeps, rex Romanorum\(^5\), fuit pro quo instetit et contendit pro quo demum laborem cohibuit\(^6\) qui\(^7\) proni subditi sumus, cuique sine labore obtulit unanimiter regnum seruamus, multis modis\(^8\), multaque instantia, apud eundem operas dedimus et\(^9\) laborauimus, ut electum ipsum regem\(^10\), cum corona sublata\(^11\), regno suo et solio\(^12\) restitueret\(^13\), finesque regni ejus\(^14\) et ciuitates, ceteraque occupata, quae amplius, sublata dissidiorum causa\(^15\), tenere non licuit, suadente\(^16\) iustitia resignavit\(^17\). At ipse, ut praemisisimus, quasesit pacem non ferens aequo animo, multis dilationibus, multisque verbis, haec tene nos\(^18\) tenuit, festinans hoc\(^19\) dilationum\(^20\) medio innovare gravaminam, occupatis\(^21\) addere, regalia quoque, et ecclesiarem proventus usurpare, immo, quod molestius referimus, nova imponi onera, novaque fortitudo erigi, apud ecclesiarem, et praecipue cathedralis lauris latera, equis et iumentis stabula, curiasque\(^22\), et detestanda commercia institui patitur et forsero\(^23\), utque brevis\(^24\) conclamamus plura, non infidelium, non denique paganorum insultus, tantum patriae nostrae nunc afficit, quantum turbatio, et insperata\(^25\) arma, principis supra dicti in notabilem et etiam\(^26\) regni nostri immo totius Christianae religionis dedecus et jacturam\(^27\). Quia igitur, beatissime pater\(^28\), rebus his acerbis non injuste\(^29\) moveri nos opportuit, juste incitati\(^30\), justissima iterato\(^31\) arma

\(^{1}\) quidem HU
\(^{2}\) utpote illustriissimi ... omit. HU
\(^{3}\) ut pota N
\(^{4}\) domini add. N
\(^{5}\) rex Romanorum omit. HU
\(^{6}\) fuit quo ... cohibuit : fovit pro quo denique laboris adhibuit N
\(^{7}\) quia HU
\(^{8}\) mediis HU
\(^{9}\) dominum Romanorum regem HU
\(^{10}\) omit. M, N
\(^{11}\) omit. M, N
\(^{12}\) suo et solio : et solio suo N
\(^{13}\) restitueret HU
\(^{14}\) omit. HU
\(^{15}\) sublata dissidiorum causa : post sublatam dissidiorum causam HU
\(^{16}\) ea dum M
\(^{17}\) resignaret HU
\(^{18}\) non M
\(^{19}\) hac N
\(^{20}\) dilationis M; dilatatione N
\(^{21}\) occupanda add. HU
\(^{22}\) choreasque HU
\(^{23}\) patitur et forsero : et forsero patitur HU
\(^{24}\) brevis HU
\(^{25}\) inspira M, N
\(^{26}\) in add. HU
\(^{27}\) In notabile ... jacturam omit. HU
\(^{28}\) beatitudo vestra M, N
\(^{29}\) indigni N; indigne HU
\(^{30}\) juste incitati : injuste provocati N
\(^{31}\) contra eum HU
decrevimus, ad defensionem reintregationemque ¹ patriae nostrae, quae, ut praemisimus ², oppressione turbatur, supplicantes devotius, ut, si post hos ³ dies, beatitudo vestra, apud fines ⁴ praetactos copias armorum nostrorum ⁵ acturas forte aut passuras aliquid audiverit, non ob aliam rem id obtingere putet ⁶, nisi eam, quam superius, eidem beatitudini vestae, dolorosis satis verbis deteximus, et pro qua quidem re ⁷, in hoc iustissimo certantes ⁸ bello, et et vincere pium et vincere ⁹ reputavimus ¹⁰ gloriosum ¹¹. Recommittimus devotionem nostram beatitudini vestae, quam altissimus conservare dignetur feliciter ¹² longe feliciter conservet regimini ¹³ ecclesiae suae sanctae. Datum in opido Feuldwar ¹⁴ ¹⁵ die decimo septimo ¹⁶ octobris anno domini ¹⁷ MCCCCXLVI.