

TRIVULZIANA COD. N. 1458: A NEW TESTIMONY OF THE “LANDUS REPORT”

GÁBOR MIHÁLY TÓTH

Städtisches Cecilien-Gymnasium
Schorlemerstraße 99
40547 Düsseldorf
Germany
bewindoki@yahoo.com

Abstract: The Trivulziana Cod. N. 1458 is a variant of the dispatch, known as the “Landus report” in the Hungarian historiography. This report narrates the history of Hungary from the death of Louis the Great up to the peace between Matthias Corvinus and Frederick III in 1463. However, the codex of the Trivulziana Library also contains a new closing section, which narrates the events following the death of Matthias. In this paper, I examine two questions: (a) was this closing section written by the same person as the so-called Landus report?; (b) does this closing section provide us new pieces of information concerning the history of Hungary? In addition to this, I give a general account of the content of the dispatch and review its editions and its manuscript tradition. Moreover, I outline its reception in the Hungarian historiography. Finally, in the Appendix I give the transcription of the closing section of the manuscript as well as another unpublished part of the manuscript, although the examination of this will be the subject of further studies.

Keywords: Matthias Corvinus, Wladislaus II, Landus report, Trivulziana Cod. N. 1458, historiography

The Trivulziana Library of Milan has a wealth of important records of Hungarian history. The former library of the Trivulzio family is well-known among Hungarian scholars mainly for two Corvina codices, both with original Corvina binding.¹ However, these two manuscripts are not the only documents concerning the history of Hungary in the library. Giulio Porro, the eighteenth-century author of the manuscript catalogue of the Trivulziana

¹ Trivulziana Cod. № 817 and Cod. № 818.

Library gave the following short description about the Cod. N. 1458: “Relazione d’Ungheria dell’anno 1490, o poco dopo, senza nome del relatore”.² The Cod. N. 1458 is a 10-folio long, paper manuscript which was written in humanistic cursive by a scribe. Later, some marginal annotations were added by a second hand in red ink. It contains a detailed geographical description of Hungary, then it recounts the history of the country from the passing of Louis I (1342–1382) up to the peace between King Matthias Corvinus I (1458–1490) and Frederick III (1440–1493) in 1463. It also supplies information about the incomes of Matthias Corvinus, and finally it narrates the events of the year 1490 and 1491 after his death. During my research about the codex, I compared the incomes of King Matthias that appear in the manuscript with secondary sources dealing with the economic history of Matthias’s rule.³ Eventually, this led me to identify the Trivulziana Cod. N. 1458⁴ as a variant of the so-called Landus report; however, it incorporates a new, so far unknown closing section with respect to other testimonies of the dispatch. This closing section summarizes the history of two important years of Hungarian history, 1490 and 1491.

Throughout this paper, I will try to answer the following two questions: (a) was this closing section written by the same person as the already known parts of the dispatch?; (b) can we gain new information from this section about the history of Hungary with respect to other primary and secondary sources? Firstly, I will give a general account of the content of the Landus report, then I review its editions and give some annotations about its manuscript tradition. Secondly, I will discuss its reception in the Hungarian historiography. However, the focus point of my paper is the analysis of this unpublished closing section of the codex, in the course of which I compare its content with the information of other sources. Finally, in the Appendix, I will add the transcription of both this closing section and that which precedes it, although the thorough examination of the latter will have to be the subject of further studies.

The first part of the report is a detailed geographic and sometimes also demographical descriptions of the Hungarian Kingdom. The author begins his dispatch by positioning Hungary on the map of Europe, and informs the reader about the borders and neighbors of the country. Remarkable elements of this first part are those concrete numbers that the writer gives

² Giulio Porro (ed.): *Catalogo dei codici manoscritti della Trivulziana*, Torino: Fratelli Bocca Librai di S. M., 1884: 376.

³ Erik Fügedi: ‘Mátyás király jövedelme 1475-ben’, *Századok* 116 (1982): 486–487.

⁴ Henceforth: Trivulziana Codex.

about the size of medieval Hungary. Equally important is the characterization of the social classes and ethnical minorities living on the territory of the Hungarian Kingdom in the fifteenth century. A large segment of the report is dedicated to trace the class of *nobili e baroni* and its structure. On the one hand, the author paints a vivid picture about the ethnic minorities such as Germans, Jews and Gypsies, on the other, he emphasizes the depopulation of the country. Finally, the most important fortresses along the borders and also the minerals and other resources of the country are enumerated. Hence, the dispatch is a considerable source of historical geography and demography.

Following the detailed geographical description, the writer gives a brief outline of the political history of Hungary from the death of Louis the Great in 1382 up to the peace between King Matthias and Frederick III in 1463. After the short discussion of the situation following the death of Louis the Great, the first years of the rule of Sigismund I (1387–1437) are presented; the last event mentioned in our source is the captivity of Sigismund in 1401. Surprisingly, we cannot read about the catastrophe of Nicopolis in 1396, which was one of the most important events of Sigismund's first ruling years. After the omission of more than thirty years, the dispatch continues by narrating the history of Hungary from the passing away of Sigismund (1437) up to the first years of King Matthias's rule. In addition to the political history, the report provides the exact revenue figures of King Matthias, as well as enumerating the names of the most important officers. Throughout the charts of the manuscript the writer lets us know how one event is connected to the others focusing on the internal affairs of Hungary yet leaves out important turning points such as the siege of Belgrade. In short, the so-called Landus report draws an outline of the history of fifteenth-century Hungary; however, placing this in such an interesting narrative is what makes it unique. We do not know about any other diplomatic source which would arch over such a long period of time, since other extant diplomatic reports recount only the everyday political life of the given era.⁵ In contrast to these, we have chronicles which enable us to see the history of long periods in one narrative. However, it is obvious that the goal of a chronicle and that of a dispatch are very different. Thus, the profound analysis of this dispatch may let us understand the history of fifteenth-century Hungary from a unique point of view. The interpretation of the sequence of the events in the dispatch will be the subject of further studies.

⁵ See, Iván Nagy & Albert B. Nyári (eds.): *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek Mátyás király korából 1458–1490*, Budapest: Akadémia, 1875–1878.

The so-called Landus report has various editions, but none of them is a critical one and each is very different from the others. The *editio princeps* is due to Johann Christian von Engel. In 1798 he published the report attributing it to a papal nuncio, dating the text to 1480.⁶ Later, Hieronymus Landus, papal nuncio and Cretan bishop was thought to be the author of the dispatch.⁷ In the same year, Martinus Georgius Kovachich issued a Latin version, dating it, however, to 1463.⁸ He agreed with Engel in the authorship, so did István Szamota, who published a Hungarian excerpt using Engel's transcription in 1891. Another excerpt was issued in the 19th century in an anthology of geographical descriptions about fifteenth and sixteenth century Hungary.⁹ This only focuses on the geographical description attributing it to a Venetian ambassador without dating the report. The various editions differ not only in the question of authorship, but also in the manuscripts which were used for the publication. While Engel and Kovachich¹⁰ mention two manuscripts of the Ambrosiana Library of Milan, the Ambrosiana R 94 Sup and S 86 Sup, the curator of the geographical anthology refers to a codex of the Marciana Library of Venice without specifying its call number. This is the Marciana It. VI. 276.¹¹ Moreover, we know two other testimonies that have never been published, one is the Codex Urbinae Latinus 728 of Vatican Library,¹² the other is the Trivulziana Codex.

A common feature of the testimonies is that the author is not identified in any of them. It is not clear at all what made Engel attribute the report to a papal nuncio. As he says, he used a manuscript that János Eszterházy gave him. As Engel tells us, Eszterházy copied this in the library of

⁶ Johann Christian von Engel (ed.): *Geschichte des ungrischen Reichs und seiner Nebenländer*, Halle: Gebauer, 1798, II: 6–17.

⁷ See Zsigmond Pál Pach: 'Hogyan lett a harmincadvámból huszad?', *Történelmi Szemle* 37, 1995: 257; András Kubinyi: 'Vitéz János és Janus Pannonius politikája Mátyás uralkodása idején', in: István Bartók, László Jankovits & Gábor Kecskeméti (eds.): *Humanista műveltség Pannóniában*, Pécs: Művészetek háza Pécsi Tudomány Egyetem, 2000: 11.

⁸ Martinus Georgius Kovachich (ed.): *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum Minores*, Budaë: Typ.Univ., 1798, 2: 13–22.

⁹ *Descrizione dell' Ungheria nei secoli XV. et XVI.*, Budapest: [s.n.]1881: 29–34.

¹⁰ It is not clear if Kovachich translated the Italian manuscript of the Batthyány Library or that time another manuscript existed also in Latin. According to Engel, it was Kovachich to carry out the translation, however Kovachich does not say this. See: Johann Christian von Engel (ed.): *Geschichte...*, *op.cit.*: 2: 17.

¹¹ Henceforth: Marciana Codex.

¹² Prof. István Draskóczy called my attention to this manuscript, moreover he gave me his reproduction of it. Therefore, I am most grateful to him for this, and also for providing me with important information concerning the dispatch.

count Ignác Batthyányi. János Eszterházy thought that the report had been copied from a codex of Vatican Library, however, Engel adds that the copy in the Batthyány Library was, in fact, transcribed from two manuscripts of the Ambrosiana Library: the Ambrosiana R 94 Sup and S 86 Sup.¹³ Once again, the author is not indicated in either Ambrosiana manuscripts.¹⁴ Besides, both the other two North-Italian testimonies and the codex of the Vatican Library lack any reference to the author. In summary, in the light of the original manuscripts, Engel's point of view concerning the authorship seems to be a hypothesis that needs further verification.

While the testimonies are equal regarding the question of the authorship, they differ in many other features. First, the incipit is different. While the Ambrosiana S 86 Sup¹⁵ and Codex Urbinas Latinus 728¹⁶ lack the short introduction in which the author summarizes the content of his writing, this is present both in the Marciana Codex¹⁷ and in the Trivulziana Codex.¹⁸ Second, the last event mentioned by each testimony is different. In the Codex Urbinas Latinus 728 this is the conciliation between King Matthias and the nobles who supported Frederick III after the second battle of Körmend (12 April 1459).¹⁹ In contrast, in the Ambrosiana S 86 Sup the political history finishes with the account of the events on 3 April 1462. On this day János Vitéz and Frederick III reached the settlement according to which Matthias could recover the Holy Crown but he had to pay 80,000 florins. Since the author knows about the settlement,²⁰ but the Holy Crown is not yet in Hungary, the *terminus ante quem* is 24 July 1463 when the Holy Crown returned to Hungary. At the same time, in the Trivulziana Codex we can read,

¹³ I could not find the manuscript, mentioned by Engel, in the contemporary catalog of the Batthyány Library, however it can be also part of a miscellaneous codex. See Róbert Szentiványi: *Catalogus concinnus librorum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Batthyányanae*, Szeged: Bibliotheca Universitatis Szegediensis, 1958.

¹⁴ I could not consult either the original or the reproduction of the Ambrosiana R 94 Sup. However, the question of anonymity can be seen also in the description of the manuscript which was published by the Amrosiana Library on the Word Wide Web: http://www.ambrosiana.it/ita/manus_scheda.asp?pagina=1&pva=1&pto=1&dkprog=106150000&ordine=0 (accessed March 10, 2008).

¹⁵ Biblioteca Ambrosiana, S 86 Sup, folio 185r.

¹⁶ Vatican Library, Codex Urbinas Latinus 728, folio 29r.

¹⁷ Marciana Codex, folio 96r.

¹⁸ Trivulziana Codex, folio 1r.

¹⁹ Codex Urbinas Latinus 728, folio 37r.

²⁰ One can read in the manuscript that "Federico imperatore s'ha accordato co' Mathias di dargli la corona del Regno d'Ungaria, et ha tolto 80 mila ducati", S 86 Sup, folio 193r.

“E nasuto el dito acordo limperador rendese la corona”,²¹ and in the Marciana Codex one can read, “havendo la corona insieme cum el Re et el regno aquistado”,²² which means that the two testimonies were written after 24 July 1463. Besides, they let us know that Bosnia is not occupied by the Ottoman Empire,²³ which makes us think that these testimonies were written in the summer of 1463. However, both in the Marciana Codex and in the Trivulziana Codex the text of the dispatch contains a closing section which provides information about the political system of medieval Hungary and narrates the history of the country from the death of King Matthias (1490) to the Peace of Bratislava (1491).²⁴ As we will see, this section must have been composed in October 1493. Another point to add is that the differences between the testimonies cannot be due to errors of scribes. Change of words, omission of whole sentences and paragraphs, insertion of new elements demonstrate that in course of long years the content of the dispatch was changed and completed. In addition, as we have seen, in the Trivulziana and Marciana Codexes, after the interruption of the narration in 1463, the closing section recounts the events of 1490/1491. Consequently, the main question is whether this closing section and the previous one, known as Landus report and published by Engel and Kovachich, were written by the same person. I will return to this question.

In the Hungarian historiography, the text of the dispatch was principally discussed in the context of economic history. In 2003, Professor Géza Érszegi gave a summary about the reception of the text among Hungarian historians.²⁵ In the nineteenth century, beside Lajos Thallóczy, Dezső Csánki dealt with the report.²⁶ The goal of Csánki's article is the reconstruction of the Matthias's court from different aspects. In order to outline the financial background of the court, he examines the incomes of the whole country using three sources, one of these is our dispatch in the edi-

²¹ Trivulziana Codex, folio 8r.

²² Marciana Codex, folio 103v.

²³ Marciana Codex, folio 103v; Trivulziana Codex, folio 7r.

²⁴ Marciana Codex, folios 107v–108v; Trivulziana Codex, folio 9v–10v.

²⁵ Géza Érszegi: ‘Relatio de statu Hungariae’, in: *Repertorium fontium historiae mediæ aevi*, Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 2003, IX: 486–487. I would like to thank Prof. Géza Érszegi for sending me his writing and providing me with important information about the manuscripts.

²⁶ Lajos Thallóczy: *A Kamara Haszna (Lucrum Camerae) története kapcsolatban a magyar adó- és pénzügy fejlődésével*, Budapest: Weiszmann, 1879: 97–98; Dénes Csánki: ‘I. Mátyás udvara’, *Századok* 17, 1883: 518–522.

tion of Kovachich.²⁷ Before the Second World War, historians such as Vilmos Fraknói and Kováts Ferenc treated the dispatch.²⁸ In his article, Kováts estimated the contribution of the Hungarian gold mining to the European commerce in the fifteenth century. He controls the figures, appearing in the edition of Kovachich, by confronting them with the incomes of Ippolito d'Este. His conclusion is that the figures mentioned by the dispatch are acceptable.²⁹ In the second half of the last century, Jenő Szűcs, András Kubinyi, Erik Fügedi and Zsigmond Pál Pach discussed the dispatch, concentrating mainly on the information about the incomes of King Matthias.³⁰ Erik Fügedi summarized the debated issues concerning the two 18th century editions, besides he provided some pieces of information about the manuscripts containing the text, at a time when, however, only the two Ambrosiana testimonies were known. Moreover, Fügedi expressed his doubt concerning the fact that the report had been addressed to the Pope in 1463, as Pius II (1458–1464) Silvio Piccolomini knew very well Hungary, consequently, he would hardly have ordered such a detailed report.³¹ In 1993, Zsigmond Pál Pach used the data of the report as a starting-point for proving that by the 1450s the thirtieth customs duty became twentieth. He writes that "according to a report of the Pope's ambassador written in Italian of 1462 or 1463, however, the duty thirtieth only by name, and in effect it meant cinque per cento: 5%, i.e., twentieth".³² While in the Ambrosiana S 86 Sup on 195r and in the edition of Engel we can really read 5%, in the Trivulziana Codex on 9v one can find 3%, which contradicts the conception of Pach. Therefore, only a philological examination can help us to tell which data can be accepted.

The opening image of the concluding section of the Trivulziana Codex is the death of King Matthias Corvinus I.³³ The date of his death corresponds to that we can find in other sources: 6 April 1490. It is remarkable

²⁷ *Ibid.*: 518.

²⁸ Ferenc Kováts: 'A magyar arany világtörténeti jelentősége és kereskedelmi összeköttetéseink a nyugattal a középkorban', *Történelmi Szemle* 11, 1922: 113–115; Vilmos Fraknói: *Magyarország egyházi és politikai összeköttetése a római Szent-székekkel*, Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1901–1903, II: 113.

²⁹ Ferenc Kováts: 'A magyar arany. . .', *op.cit.*: 116.

³⁰ Jenő Szűcs: 'Városok és kézművesség a XV. századi Magyarországon', *Művelt Nép* 188, 1955; András Kubinyi: 'A XV–XVI. századi magyarországi városfejlődés kérdéseihez', *Századok* 99, 1965: 516.

³¹ Erik Fügedi: 'Mátyás király jövedelme. . .', *op.cit.*: 486–487.

³² Zsigmond Pál Pach: 'Hogyan lett a harmincadvámból huszad?', *op.cit.*: 276.

³³ Trivulziana Codex, folio 10r.

that the author of the Trivulziana Codex simply states the fact without specifying, for example, the place or cause of the death. Although, it was widely rumoured that Matthias was poisoned by his wife Beatrice,³⁴ the author does not reflect on this possibility. However, this rumour has never been proved and today it is generally accepted that he died of a disease.³⁵ Furthermore, King Matthias passed away in Vienna, in the seat of his biggest enemy, the Hapsburg dynasty. The occupation of this city per se was one of his biggest achievements. Besides, the retention of Vienna and the occupied Austrian territories of Matthias was to be one of the key elements of the years 1490/1491, which is the topic of the closing section of the manuscript. Thus, these small lacunas already indicate that we cannot expect a complex explanation of the events following the death of Matthias.

After the statement of his death, the reaction of the Hapsburgs is narrated as follows: “solicitati subito fono iprelati del serenissimo Imperador et Re de romani idoveseno elegier di[to] Re masimiano”.³⁶ This can be paraphrased as “I prelati dell’Imperatore et Re dei Romani furono subito sollecitati perché dovessero eleggere Re Masimiliano”.³⁷ This clause raises several problems. First, in the Marciana Codex we can read “prelati e baroni”.³⁸ The use of these two words together refers to the temporal and spiritual leaders of the country who had the right to take action during an interregnum. Consequently, addressing only the prelates makes no sense. We can, therefore, suppose that it is an error of the scribe or the negligence of the author, which could have been corrected later by the person who copied the Marciana Codex. Second, the meaning of *solicitati* is uncertain as well. The most logical translation of this verb seems to be ‘urge’ or ‘insist’. Nevertheless, the *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana* by Salvatore Battaglia mentions a second and a third connotation: (a) “sobillare un gruppo di persone, una popolazione affinché prendano le armi o tumultuino”, (b) “Invitare con insistenza a riunirsi”.³⁹ In order to reconstruct the meaning of this obscure sentence, we should confront it with other sources.

³⁴ ‘Molti sono, che giudicano la Regina havere tenuto mano alla morte del Re.’ — Letter of Stefano da Cremona to the Duke of Milan on 20 April 1490, in: *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek*, 4: 117.

³⁵ On the circumstances of Matthias’s death, see András Kubinyi: ‘Két sorsdöntő esztendő’, *Történelmi szemle* 33, 1991: 47–48.

³⁶ Trivulziano Cod. N. 1458, folio 10r.

³⁷ *Sollicitati* is a variation of *sollecitare*. *Fono* is probably an error of the scribe, also in the Marciana Codex, on 108r we can read *foreno*, which corresponds to *furono*.

³⁸ Marciana Codex, folio 108r.

³⁹ Salvatore Battaglia: *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana*, Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1998, 19: 326.

The Hapsburgs did not defer to take action after the death of Matthias; however, I could not find any source which would confirm either the second or the third meaning of *sollicitare*. On 9 April 1490 Frederick III ordered the conquest of the Austrian territories occupied by Matthias. Ten days later, his son, Maximilian I appealed to the Hungarian estates. András Kubinyi gives an excellent summary of this appeal. According to this, Maximilian emphasises his claim to the Hungarian throne, he promises to defend Hungary from the Ottoman Empire, but he does not request the Hungarians to gather or to form an army.⁴⁰ Erasmo Brascha, an Italian diplomat, wrote an account to the Duke of Milan from the court of Maximilian I at the beginning of May. This lets us know that Maximilian sent ambassadors to the widow of Matthias and to the Hungarian Barons, but Erasmo Brascha cannot give exact information about the message that they should take. According to him, the ambassadors were sent to discuss only about the restitution of the lost territories and not about Maximilian's claim to the Hungarian throne.⁴¹ To sum up, the source cited by Kubinyi makes us accept the first meaning ('insist' or 'urge'), as long as Maximilian pressurized the Hungarian estates in order to elect him. Ironically, however, the Roman King was behind schedule: on 17 April the royal council had already issued the invitations to the diet of election.

Whatever the author of our source wants to express with *solicitati*, the goal of the act described by this word is clear: "doveseno elegier il di[to] Re". The fact that *congiuntivo imperfetto* is used assures us that it is an adverbial clause of purpose. The writer lets us know not only the intention of Maximilian but also what is expected from the Hungarians, who are supposed ("doveseno")—according to him—to elect Maximilian. After this, more arguments are presented why Maximilian had "pleno iure a sucieder i(n) Regno" and consequently why the Hungarians should choose Maximilian. First, the author refers to the settlement between Matthias and the father of Maximilian in 1463, quoting the most important part of the treaty: if Matthias dies without apparent heir, Frederick III or his descendants will succeed to the throne. Second, the treaty between the Hungarian King and the Holy Roman Emperor was ratified by the barons and prelates. During the diet of 1464, a part of the Hungarian prelates and barons confirmed this agreement. However, in 1490 the Hungarian prelates and barons wanted to exercise their right to elect the new king which they had obtained in 1447.

⁴⁰ András Kubinyi: 'Két sorsdöntő...', *op.cit.*: 15.

⁴¹ *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek*, 4: 190.

As a result of this, the claim of Maximilian based on the settlement of 1463 was not welcome.⁴²

At this point I should return to the question of authorship: was the closing section, which appears only in the Marciana and Trivulziana Codexes, written by the same person as the previous one already published by Engel and Kovachich? In the latter, one can find important pieces of information about the agreement of 1463 between Matthias and Frederick III as far as the author tells exactly how much money Matthias had to pay to get the corona.⁴³ Nevertheless, the author discussing this treaty seems to be forgetting a point of the agreement which in 1463 was not as important as in 1490. This point concerns the already quoted question of succession: if Matthias dies without apparent heir, Frederick III or his descendants will succeed to the throne. If the closing section and the preceding part of the text were written by the same person, why did the author omit such an important fact that would influence the subsequent events? It is hardly credible that this lacuna is due to negligence. Besides, when the author speaks about the offspring of János Hunyady, we can read the following, “ladislao valente homo darne e laltro E matia al presente Re dongaria”.⁴⁴ While the closing section was certainly written out after the death of the king, the preceding part of the text regard Matthias as a person still alive. In conclusion, I suppose that both the Trivulziana Codex and Marciana Codex are the result of different editorial phases, carried out by at least two authors.

As our source says, Matthias died “sine liberis legitimis”,⁴⁵ although he left behind an illegitimate son, John Corvinus, a significant protagonist of the year 1490, who is, however, missing from the manuscript. After it became clear that Matthias could not have a child from Beatrice, he acknowledged John as his son and did everything to provide his succession. On the one hand, a large quantity of estates was granted to Corvinus, on the other, in 1489 Matthias made the barons and captains of the royal and ducal castles promise to support Corvinus after his death. In spite of this, after his death, the succession of Corvinus was still pending and later the followers of his father, one after the other, deserted him. Finally, on 17 June Corvinus and all who were against his succession agreed that he could keep all estates

⁴² András Kubinyi: ‘Két sorsdöntő...’, *op.cit.* : 18.

⁴³ Trivulziana Codex, folio 8r; Marciana Codex, folio 105v; Ambrosiana S 86 Sup, folio 193r.

⁴⁴ Trivulziana Codex, folio 5r; we can read the following in the Marciana Codex on 101r: “ladislao valente homo darne elaltro E Re mathias che ora e Re dongaria”.

⁴⁵ Trivulziana Codex, folio 10r.

and titles that he had got before, but he had to renounce the crown. Nevertheless, a few days later he seized the crown and decided to retreat to the southern territories of Hungary. Eventually, he was defeated by Pál Kinizsi in a bloody battle in Csonthegy. Conclusively, Corvinus could not but submit to Wladislaus II. After this we find him on behalf of the Jagiellon king.⁴⁶

In spite of being an illegitimate son, John Corvinus was a well-known figure at the end of fifteenth century. One of King Matthias's acts to raise international recognition for his son was the marriage he arranged with Bianca Maria Sforza (1487), but the princess did not come to Hungary in the end. After the death of Matthias, Ludovico Sforza, uncle of Bianca Maria Sforza became the most prestigious supporter of the young Corvinus abroad. He and his ambassadors wrote several letters to the European Courts in order to promote his candidacy in Hungary.⁴⁷ In sum, we can conclude that it is impossible to answer the question why Corvinus is missing from our source. Nevertheless, in the light of Corvinus's importance for Milanese diplomacy, it seems logical that the author of the closing part could have hardly been in service of the Milanese prince.

The next event appearing in the manuscript is the election of Wladislaus II, which was the result of the diet started in June 1490. Two important affairs are absent: one is the above-mentioned battle of Csonthegy, the other is the funeral of King Matthias (25 April 1490), the latter, however, was only of formal significance. It is notable that the writer emphasizes how the Hungarian electors should have acted—i.e., “idoveseno elegier di[to] Re masimiano”—but he does not explain why they eventually elected Wladislaus II. The expression *parse non dimeno* highlights that the Hungarians acted deliberately without accepting an accordance carried out thirty years before. However, our source also acknowledges the legitimacy of Wladislaus II by letting know that his maternal grandfather, Albert I (1437–1439) was King of the Romans, Bohemia and Hungary. Finally, the manuscript correctly tells us the date of applause, even though according to Bonfini, the election of Wladislaus II had been decided secretly before.⁴⁸

The hinge of the election was the conditions that Wladislaus II accepted on 31 July. Our source does not discuss these conditions, although it mentions something which was part of them: the marriage with Beatrice. According to the conditions, Wladislaus had to marry the widow of King Matthias. The compiler speaks ambiguously about this: “publicato per Re

⁴⁶ András Kubinyi: 'Két sorsdöntő...', *op.cit.* : 20.

⁴⁷ See, for example, *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek*, 4: 176 and 4: 174.

⁴⁸ Antonio Bonfini: *Magyar történelem tízelei*, Budapest: Balassi, 1995: 483.

a di XV luio per co(n)sentime(n)nto precipue de la Reina Beatrizie Relita del Re matias induta da li baroni in spera(n)cia de esser moglie dil Re di boema”.⁴⁹ The first part of the sentence is clear: Wladislaus II was elected with the agreement of Beatrice. In contrast, the second part is not lucid: the meaning of the verb *induta* is the source of the ambiguity. This can mean both *convincere*, *suggerire*, *comunicare* and *costringere*, *obbligare*.⁵⁰ In András Kubinyi’s interpretation, Beatrice gladly accepted the marriage with Wladislaus. This makes us examine other sources concerning the marriage.⁵¹

It seems logical that the barons wanted the new king to marry the widow, and Beatrice also probably wanted to marry again. After the death of Matthias, Beatrice was one of the richest people in the country, therefore, the situation of the new king could be stabilized only with the help of Beatrice, a fact which also the barons may have been aware of.⁵² Our source itself stresses that the marriage was in the interest of the barons.⁵³ Nevertheless, Beatrice was not very popular in the country. Moreover, she was infertile. It was the interest of not only Beatrice but also the Aragonian dynasty to make the new king marry Beatrice, since this marriage would have contributed to the prestige of the dynasty. The Milanese ambassador, Maffeo da Treviglio wrote on 25 May that the ambassador of Naples did his best in order to procure the marriage of Beatrice.⁵⁴ The question is if she wanted to be the wife of Wladislaus or Maximilian. On 20 June Maffeo da Treviglio reported to the Duke of Milan that “Questa Serenissima Regina se affatica, quanto po, per el Serenissimo Re di Romani per una efusissima ambitione de essere imperatrice”.⁵⁵ What this indicates is that Beatrice desired to be the wife of Maximilian rather than Wladislaus.

However, this desire of the widow and what the Hungarian estates wanted, did not meet. As Bonfini states, the Hungarian barons and prelates decided in secret about the election of Wladislaus before the settlement

⁴⁹ Trivulziana Codex, 10r.

⁵⁰ Salvatore Battaglia: *Grande dizionario...*, *op.cit.*: VII, 867.

⁵¹ András Kubinyi: ‘Két sorsdöntő...’, *op.cit.*: 17.

⁵² Father of Beatrice, Ferdinand I of Naples (1458–1494) wrote this to his daughter, Leonora on 23 May 1490: “I baroni haveano deliberato in consilio creare Re per tutto el presente mese de maio, et che era opinione de tutti darlo ad essa Regina per marito”, *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek*, 4: 203.

⁵³ In my interpretation the expression *in speranza* refers to the barons—i.e., the barons who had hoped that Beatrice would be the wife of Wladislaus.

⁵⁴ *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek*, 4: 206.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*: 4: 224.

with Corvinus (17 June) without the agreement of Beatrice.⁵⁶ According to Fraknói, almost a month after the secret election, the barons and the dowager queen met (14 July).⁵⁷ As a result of this meeting Beatrice gave her consent to the election of Wladislaus and to the marriage. We do not know what really happened then and there but we have a diplomatic report which, speaking about Beatrice and her marriage, says that "benche la Maesta de Madama longamente havesse ricusato, tamen e rimasta contenta, imperoche lei desiderava Massimiliano".⁵⁸ What this indicates is that the result of the secret election was presented to Beatrice as *fait a complaint*. We cannot know if she were forced or simply convinced to accept the future marriage but it is sure that she could do nothing but give her consent, even though she desired to be an empress. Consequently, *induta da li baroni* may refer to the situation that Beatrice did not have any other choice than accept Wladislaus as both king and husband.

After all this, the manuscript focuses on the circumstances of Wladislaus's arrival in Buda, omitting important affairs such as the meeting of the Hungarian Barons and Prelate with the new king on 31 July in Farkashida. The importance of this is given by the fact that the new king accepted here the conditions of his election. Also other sources approve that King Wladislaus II arrived in Buda on 9 August; the appearing of John Albert on 10th, as we can read in our source, however, seems to be doubtful. For example, Maffeo da Treviglio reported that John Albert was the first to arrive on 8th and followed Wladislaus on 9th.⁵⁹ Moreover, the manuscript leaves out the assembly of the two brothers, where Wladislaus vainly attempted to convince John Albert to leave Hungary.

The dispatch gives an explanation for John Albert's arrival by quoting his claim, "prete(n)dendo esser eleto nel Regno chiamato per ava(n)ti da qualunque dil Regno"; nevertheless, we do not get to know when and by whom he was elected.⁶⁰ During the diet on 7 June John Albert was acclaimed by the crowd of common nobles,⁶¹ which neither the barons nor the prelates accepted. However, as Bonfini also states, later John Albert invoked this election.⁶² The other question is who was behind this acclaim,

⁵⁶ Antonio Bonfini: *Magyar történelem tízedei, op.cit.* : 483.

⁵⁷ Vilmos Fraknói: 'II. Ulászló királlyá választása', *Századok* 19, 1885 : 196.

⁵⁸ *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek*, 4 : 244.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* : 262.

⁶⁰ Trivulziana Codex, folio 10r.

⁶¹ *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek*, 4 : 223.

⁶² Antonio Bonfini: *Magyar történelem tízedei, op.cit.* : 423.

saying with other words who “qualunque” refers to. According to a report of Maffeo da Treviglio, the bishop of Vác, Miklós Báthory was the one who encouraged the crowd to shout the name of John Albert.⁶³ Furthermore, in another letter of the Italian ambassador we can read that John Albert accused István Báthory, the brother of the bishop of betraying him. It is a generally accepted fact that both Miklós and István Báthory firstly sustained John Albert, later however, they supported his brother.⁶⁴ Nevertheless, the author of our dispatch instead of nominating anyone specific, uses the pronoun *qualunque*.

After the treatment of Wladislaus II's coming, the compiler narrates the autumn of 1490. As also the manuscript states, the next important step of John Albert was the siege of Kosice. The younger Jagiellon brother decided to retreat to the regions near the Polish border and from October onwards he was besieging Kosice, but finally he could not occupy it. Meanwhile, Wladislaus II had to face numerous problems such as financial difficulties or the campaign of Maximilian I against Hungary. Only the final step of this latter appears in the manuscript, which was the occupation of Székesfehérvár on 17 November. Another significant event of the autumn 1490 was the coronation of Wladislaus II in September. The codex does not tell us the exact day of it. While Vilmos Fraknói thought that it was on 18 September,⁶⁵ András Kubinyi indicated 21 September.⁶⁶ Furthermore, in a letter of Maffeo da Treviglio we can read a third date, 19 September.⁶⁷

Following the autumn of 1490, the campaign against John Albert is narrated, the consequence of which was the treaty on 20 January in the camp of Kosice. As a result of this agreement John Albert renounced his claim to the Hungarian throne accepting the Hungarian territories in Silesia in compensation. As also the writer of the dispatch states, after the peace in Kosice, the goal of Wladislaus II was the recuperation of the territories occupied by Maximilian in the autumn of 1490, concentrating mainly on Székesfehérvár, which he finally reached on 29 June. After the siege of

⁶³ “[L]i nobili de alchuni Comitati stimulatī, como si crede, dal Vescovo de Watia, fratello de Vojvoda [...] se reduxeno [nobili] insieme conductosi alla frascata de Lavanio, dove era el dicto Vescovo, incominciarono ad cridare Re Alberto fiolo del Re de Polonia.” *Magyar Diplomáciai Emlékek*, 4: 223.

⁶⁴ Vilmos Fraknói: ‘II. Ulászló...’, *op.cit.*: 103–104; András Kubinyi: ‘Két sorsdöntő...’, *op.cit.*: 34.

⁶⁵ Vilmos Fraknói: ‘II. Ulászló...’, *op.cit.*: 103–104

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* 210; András Kubinyi: ‘Két sorsdöntő...’, *op.cit.*: 28.

⁶⁷ *Magyar Diplomáciai Emlékek*, 4: 273.

Székesfehérvár, the negotiations between Maximilian and Wladislaus were opened in August, by means of which the treaty was signed on 7 November in Bratislava. According to our source, Wladislaus is supreme ruler of Hungary provided that he pays four times 25 thousand ducats to Maximilian every 6th month, so 100 thousand ducats in two years. Furthermore, Maximilian, in exchange, sends four thousand cavalries against the Turkish if necessary.⁶⁸ However, the most debated point of the agreement is omitted: if Wladislaus II dies without a legitimate successor then Maximilian or his legitimate descendants will succeed to the throne.⁶⁹ Consequently, the settlement of Bratislava was a return to the agreement between Matthias and Frederick III in 1463. Besides, two adverse circumstances that may have influenced the settlement are missing. One of these is the continuous Turkish incursions in southern Hungary, the other is the fact that John Albert was attacking Hungary since July. Finally, John Albert was defeated by István Szapolyai in December which made him give up his claim to the Hungarian throne.

The settlement in Bratislava is the last historical event of Hungarian history appearing in the manuscript; however, as we will see, this is not the *terminus post quem* of the text. After the narration of Hungary's history from 1490 to 1491, the verso of folio 10 deals with the Jagiellonian dynasty. The author, deflecting from the succinct style of the diplomatic reports, gives a description about the physical appearance of Wladislaus II. Till now it may have seemed that the writer favors Maximilian, nevertheless, here he appreciates not only the personality of Wladislaus but also his rule.⁷⁰ We know one important piece of information from the manuscript which can help date the text: Casimir IV (1447–1492) had died the year before.⁷¹ The Polish king passed away on 7 June 1492, so the manuscript was certainly written after June of 1493. Moreover, the author presents again the maternal lineage of Wladislaus repeating the same information that we can read on 10r but inserting also the name of the Holy Roman Emperor and Hungarian King, Sigismund, who was the great-grandfather of Wladislaus II, which further emphasizes his legitimacy. Ultimately, another positive feature of Wladislaus is presented: after the death of his father, despite being the firstborn he ceded the Polish throne to his younger brother, to that John Albert,

⁶⁸ Trivulziana Codex, folio 10v.

⁶⁹ Szabó Dezső: 'A pozsonyi béke. 1491 nov. 7.', *Századok* 48, 1914: 383.

⁷⁰ Trivulziana Codex, folio 10v.

⁷¹ "El qual Serenissimo Re Valadislao fo fio prozenito del Re de Polana zauno anno morto", Trivulziana Codex, 10v.

who made his first year in Hungary so difficult.⁷² Nevertheless, Wladislaus, having neither enough money nor power, could hardly do anything else, particularly because his father Casimir IV also advised the Polish nobles to elect John Albert after his death.⁷³ The fourth brother of Wladislaus II, mentioned in our source as “tercio fradelo” was Alexander Jagiellon, duke of Lithuania (1492–1506) and later king of Poland (1501–1506). Indeed, Casimir IV and Elisabeth of Austria had another son, Saint Casimir Jagiellon (1458–1484). The fifth son, said to be the fourth in the manuscript, was Frederick (1468–1503), the cardinal-archbishop of Gniezno about whom the source writes “et hora fato cardinal”.⁷⁴ He became cardinal on 20 September, consequently this section of the manuscript was written around October–November 1493. The sixth son of Casimir IV was Sigismund, who—as also the manuscript states—did not hold any position in the end of the fifteenth century, however, ultimately he ruled Poland for more than forty years, from 1506 till 1548.

The manuscript ends with an obscure statement referring to the sixth brother: “il quinto fradelo e lo principe sigismondo fino a qui sancia stato ma per la grande union e fra Iditti fradeli facil cosa he il Re dongaria gli dara stato”.⁷⁵ After that John Albert gave up his plan to obtain the Hungarian throne; the relationship between the Jagiellon brothers started to be normalized. In December 1492, Wladislaus II and John Albert, who became the king of Poland as John I (1492–1501), made a secret contract in December 1492. This was the starting point of that union among Jagiellon brothers about which our source speaks. The next important step of this secret union was the meeting in Lőcse in the spring of 1494, the participants of which were the five Jagiellon brothers, mentioned in the manuscript. One of the goals of this family congress was the placement of Sigismund.⁷⁶ What this suggests is that the writer could have known something about this secret alliance and its projects. Finally, it is not impossible that one can find this closing section and its continuation in other manuscripts as the Trivulziana Codex is interrupted.

As we could see, the last charts of the Trivulziana Manuscript provide a succinct summary of two important years in Hungarian history. However,

⁷² *Idem.*

⁷³ Oskar Halecki: *A history of Poland*, London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1961: 101.

⁷⁴ Trivulziana Codex, folio 10v.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*: folio 10v.

⁷⁶ Pál Engel, András Kubinyi & Gyula Kristó: *Magyarország története 1301–1526*, Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, 2001: 335.

it hardly gives new pieces of information that we did not know before. In summary, almost all the important events of the two years are present in the narration. Nevertheless, many details, such as the funeral of Matthias or the condition of Wladislaus's election are missing. Moreover, the author's explanations are not based on the concrete historical situation but rather on remote agreements, such as that of Matthias with Frederick III in 1463, or on genealogical questions, as in the case of Wladislaus II's election. Unfortunately, we do not get any pieces of concrete information of either about the decision of the Hungarians concerning this election or about the supporters of John Albert. What this indicates is that the author did not know really know what happened in Hungary. He had probably consulted different diplomatic recounts and then summarized them.

In summary, the Trivulziana Codex is an important record of fifteenth-century Hungary. It contains a variant of the so-called "Landus report"; moreover, a previously unknown closing section also appears in the Marciana It. VI. 276. This closing section has two parts. The first one gives general information about medieval Hungary and the second one narrates the events following the death of Matthias Corvinus. In this paper, I compared the content of this latter part with other sources. As I proved, the writer of this closing section cannot be the same person who wrote the dispatch, until now known as the Landus report. We do not know when and who transcribed the two texts in one manuscript. Therefore, both the Trivulziana Codex and the other testimonies leave many open questions, which can be answered only by profound research in Italian libraries and archives.

Appendix

9v

20. La Regia M(aes)ta de ongaria ebe pri(n)cipio et fu i(n)stituida per el co(n)da(m) Ser(enessi)mo Re Stefano alora
21. fato christiano del 984 In tal forma ch de terre e luogi del Reg(no) cu(m) sue Iuriditio(n) uno
22. tercio fuse del clero et (per)sone ~~e~~le echlesiastice e uno tercio fuse de li Baroni e nobeli del
23. Reg(no) Elaltro tercio de la corona la q(ua)l Regia m(aes)ta pleno vivere potese co(n)ferir tuti i benefi

24. cij echlexiastici et i(n) co(n)ferir q(u)eli se intenda el Re havere podestate legati cardinali alete
25. re como dicono co(n)star per privilegio co(n)ceso al dito Re stefano e sucesori et cusi fin haora
26. ano oservata I qual sono XV prelati pri(n)cipali oltra el resto del ~~ele~~ chlero do arzipischopi zoe
27. strigonia et colocruse [XII] veschovi ariense []briense [va]radiense transilvane(n)se et il pre
28. posito de alba Regal El q(ua)l no(n) ne veschovo per ch se inte(n)de solum de esser soto el Re e no(n) soto ar

ior

1. zivescovo e pero celebra come vescovo el q(ua)le hano hobligo E cada u(n) secondo le portio(n) de
2. le intrade loro haver i(n)fra loro presti cavali 3600 el tercio stratioti e ligieri et I do ter
3. ci atute loro harme adogni richiesta del Re et bisogno del Regno similiter i baroni e
4. nobeli i q(ua)l per esser i(n) gra(n)de numero no(n) nomino particularme(n)te cognoseno tuto quello a(n)
5. no i(n) feudo da la corona E more(n)do qalu(n)q(ue) de i baroni e nobeli sencia legitimi eriedi
6. e desendenti de legitimo matrimonio e in arbitrio del Re tuor suo beni i(n) la corona o cu(n)
7. ferirli a pui (pro)simi legitimi del de fonto como ut plurimu(m) se oserva iqual baroni e no
8. beli seco(n)do le loro i(n)trade sono etia(m) obligati adogni Richiesta del Re et bisogno del Reg(no)
9. dar et i(n) persona cavalchar cu(n) le sue zente imagior numero ch no(n) sono i preti per esser an
10. ch loro i(n) pui numero
11. Morto El Re Matias ali 6 dapril 1490 solicitati subito fono iprelati del serenissimo Imperador
12. et Re de romani idoveseno elegier di[to] Re masimiano como quello haveva pleno iu
13. re a sucieder i(n) Regno per la co(n)ve(n)cio(n) soleme(n)te stipulata fra federigo Imperator et Re Ma
14. tias et co(n)firmata da la maggior parte de lbaroni e prelati dongaria ch ma(n)cha(n)do el Re

15. Matias sine liberis legitimis como tuno era ocorso el Reg(no) aspetase al Imperador E suoi
16. legitimi desendenti parse no(n) dimeno ai eletori de elegier per suo Re il ser(enissi)mo ladislao
17. Re di Boemia p(ro)zenito de Casmiro Re di polana e de la fia del q(uondam) alberto Re di Romani
18. de ongaria e de boemia publicato per Re a di XV luio per co(n)sentime(n)to precipue de la Rei
19. na Beatrizie Relita del Re matias induta da li baroni in spera(n)cia de esser moglie
20. dil Re di boema El vene i(n) buda a di 9 auosto aceptato da tuti quelli apresentavano el
21. Regno Et a di 10 el di seguente si apresento per megio buda sul danubio zua(m) alberto fiolo
22. sego(n)do del Re di polana prete(n)dendo esser eleto nel Regno chiamato per ava(n)ti da qualu(n)q(ue)
23. dil Reg(no) il qual intexo il zongier del fradelo nel Castel de buda se ritrase cu(n) le sue ze(n)
24. te e mese campo a casonia terra p(ri)ncipal dongaria vers[o] i(n) confini de polana fu il sete(m)
25. brio In coronato il dito ~~lase~~ ladislao i(n) alba Regal E tornato i(n) buda Masimiano il
26. nove(m)brio prexe alba Regal Il Re dongaria era andato co(n)tra el fradelo per liberar ca
27. sonia fece co(n) lui pace e ritornato ando a recuperar alba regal la q(ua)l da poi zerto tempo
28. auta apati tande(m) etia(m) co(n)duxe pace co(n) Maximiano ch dito Regno dongaria pleno Iu

IOV

1. re avese el Regno dongaria dando a Maximiano ducati 100 mila in 4 termeni ogni 6 mexi ducati
2. 25 mila obligandose masimiano ma(n)dar adogni bisogno del Regno e rechiesta del Re co(n)tra turchi
3. cavali 4 mila atal modo el Re ri[ma]sto pacifico e q(u)eto i(n) dito regno El q(ua)l Ser(enissi)mo Re Valadislao fo fio
4. p(ro)zenito del Re de Polana zauno an(n)o morto E stato gia [. .] Re de boemia co(n) gra(n)de

5. laude e gloria sua Re gratia de tuto q(ue)l Regno si de eretici ch sono asai como de catolici
6. naque del 1456 de statura pui ch medio chre e di gratissimo aspeto tanto be(n) proportiona
7. nato i(n) ogni parte de la p(er)sona soa qua(n)to dir si posa La madre fo fia del Ser(enissimo)mo Alberto Re
8. de Romani el q(u)al ebe per moglie una unicha fia del q(uondam) Serenissimo Sigismo(n)do Imperador E re donga
9. ria e de boemia il fradelo zua(n) alberto hera ~~e~~ Ser(enissi)mo Re de polana ch esendo morto il
10. padre de dito et aspeta(n)do el Regno Iure hereditario al dito Re dongaria e de boemia
11. per esser el p(ro)zenito sponte e libere apriego dela ser(enissi)ma madre del fradelo asenti ch el dito
12. fradelo sucedese a lui in tal paterno regno il tercio fradelo e ducha dela tisiafia no(n)
13. minore paexe de q(ue)lo de polana il quarto he arcivescovo de cra[vio]via et hora fa
14. to cardinal de i qual do beneficij oltra il capelo ha de intrata duchati 35 mila il quinto fra
15. delo e lo principe sigismondo fino a qui sancia stato ma per la grande union e fra
16. Iditti fradeli facil cosa he il Re dongaria gli dara stato