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PREFACE

This volume finds its origin in a workshop which was held at the University of Groningen on December 12-13, 1997, entitled ‘Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini as a Transitional Figure between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance’. The organizers were fully aware that a short workshop could not do full justice to Piccolomini (1405-1464), the humanist, author, courtier, inveterate traveller, conciliarist and then papalist, priest, bishop and finally pope under the name Pius II (1458-1464), urban architect of Pienza, grand patron of the arts, and would-be crusader. Piccolomini’s scholarship, his literary and widely ranging humanist work, his political and ecclesiastical activities, but especially the personal, likeable style of his writings led Jacob Burckhardt to call him his ‘Liebling’ – his love –, a term he used only for one other person: the painter Raphael.¹

Given this estimation and that of others down to our own century, the workshop sought to understand Piccolomini and his work as a way to approach the Latin literature and culture of the fifteenth-century Renaissance. Hence a title was chosen for this book that would demonstrate the importance of Piccolomini to his contemporaries. It was taken from the words of the Milanese ambassador Agostino Rossi († after 1476) a year after Piccolomini’s death, which describe him as el più expeditivo, el più libero pontifice che fusse mai.²

Tom Izbicki, Keith Sidwell, Zweder von Martels and Benedikt Vollmann were participants in the original workshop; their papers were rewritten and expanded to the form in which they are published here. Furthermore, Dr von Martels and Professor

² See Professor Märtil’s article below, p. 145.
Vollmann were prepared to write two additional pieces which broadened the focus of this book. The editors are grateful to Giuseppe Chironi, Claudia Märtl, Margaret Meserve, Rolando Montecalvo and Marcello Simonetta for immediately with great enthusiasm agreeing to join this venture when they heard about it.

The editors have attempted to give some kind of logical order to the essays presented below. Central to Piccolomini’s concerns was surely the studia humanitatis, and it seems right to begin this book with Professor Vollmann’s essay on his educational programme. The importance that Piccolomini gave to geography and history as educational exercises is illustrated in the papers by Dr Meserve and again, Professor Vollmann on the Asia, and by Dr Montecalvo on especially the Historia Bohemica, the Historica Friderici and the Europa. The contributions by Professor Sidwell and Professor Märtl discuss various aspects of both secular and ecclesiastical court culture. Dr Simonetta and Dr Chironi examine Pius II’s close involvement in the history of the politics of Italian city states (especially of Milan) and that of ecclesiastical institutions (the establishment of the bishopric of Pienza). The final three articles treat ethical issues: Dr Izbicki evaluates Pius II’s self-examination, and Dr von Martels, in two essays, discusses the relation between Piccolomini’s verbal eloquence and his political ethic as well as his private, sexual morals. Full bibliographical references are given in the notes of each contribution. The index at the end of this volume gives the names of both ancient and modern authors.

The editors wish to thank the Netherlands Research School for Medieval Studies (then directed by Professor Alasdair MacDonald) for the sizeable grant which made the workshop of 1997 possible. The forbearance of the contributors to this volume has been greatly appreciated. We are pleased that Brill Academic Publishers (Leiden and Boston) is publishing this book in Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History.
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ENKYKLIOS PAIDEIA
IN THE WORK OF AENEAS SILVIUS PICCOLOMINI

Benedikt Konrad Vollmann

The title of this article requires some justification. Aeneas Silvius was no encyclopedist; he never even uses the term *enkyklios paideia* in his writings, neither in its Greek form – Piccolomini had no command of Greek – nor in the Latin version of Quintilian (*Institutiones*, i.10.1), *orbis doctrinae*. Nevertheless, this choice of topic is not ill-conceived, because from a certain angle it relates to the general subject of this volume of essays which treats Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini as a transitional figure between the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Era. *Paideia* was the goal of both medieval and humanist educators, although, of course, there are substantial differences with regard to its precise formulation as well as to the means and methods which were applied to reach it. Piccolomini was certainly well aware of these differences and reflected upon them in his writings; and, too, he sensed the tension implied in the combination of the Greek notions ἐγκύκλιος (*enkyklios*) and παιδεία (*paideia*), and that between ἐπιστήμη (*episteme*) and παιδεία (*paideia*). There is obviously no education without knowledge, and all kinds of knowledge have a moulding aspect. Yet, it still makes a difference whether knowledge is sought for as an end in itself, a *scientia pura* (cognition of the subject-matter as such), or whether it is desired and offered primarily in order to give the pupil or student that formation of his personality (*formazione*) useful for his environment, enabling him to behave properly within his social context.

Many medieval thinkers dealt with the problem of knowledge, our ability to know, and with our pursuit of knowledge. We can observe how hard it was particularly for the *scientia pura* – i.e. a thirst for knowledge not aimed at a subjective purpose and hence not related to personal salvation – to lose its
traditional image of a useless, even harmful curiosity.\textsuperscript{1} The objections of humanists to medieval ideas of encyclopedic knowledge were of a different kind. They resented the mostly uncritical massing of knowledge typical of medieval encyclopedias. More importantly, they had little interest in the foremost topics of those works: the \textit{ordo creaturae} and the systematics of the arts and sciences.\textsuperscript{2} Instead, humanists and encyclopedists of the Late Middle Ages, who were influenced by humanist ideas, brought into focus other subjects such as history, particularly ancient history, as well as ancient mythology, and geography.\textsuperscript{3}


\textsuperscript{3} Guglielmo da Pastrengo (ca. 1290-1362), \textit{De originibus rerum}; Giovanni Boccaccio, \textit{Genealogie deorum gentilium libri XV} (1369), \textit{De montibus, lacubus, fluminibus, stagnis et paludibus et de nominibus maris} (1355-1360); Domenico Bandini (1374-1418), \textit{Fons memorabilium universi}. Cf. also H. Meyer, ‘Das Enzyklopädiekonzept des “Fons memorabilium universi” des Domenico Bandini im Verhältnis zur Tradition’, \textit{Frühmittelalterliche Studien} 27 (1993), pp. 220-240. – As to the antagonism between the encyclopedic tradition and humanist culture see Stefan Rhein, ‘Die Cyclopaedia Paracelsica Christiana und ihr Herausgeber Samuel Siderocrates: Enzyklopädie als anti-humanistische
In this change of paradigm, an analysis of the role of ancient encyclopedism is essential. In order to understand Piccolomini’s position, it is not necessary to discuss the function of the *artes liberales* in Antiquity nor the formation of the notion of *enkyklios paideia*. What needs to be pointed out is the widespread antagonism in the ancients’ minds between *episteme* and *paideia* and, moreover, between the interference of the areas to which these terms are related. Certainly, there are ‘pure’ forms such as those of Aristotle’s works on the one hand and on the other Cato’s *Praecepta ad filium*, in which he taught his son what was expected of a landed gentleman, who was a Roman politician and a military leader. Later, Celsus’s books – though they covered the same subjects as Cato’s – to all appearances represent a mixture of an educational work and a textbook, as we may infer from the only preserved book on medicine. This mixed type culminates in Pliny’s *Naturalis historia*. Its contents prompt us to categorize it as *episteme*, that is to say: as a pure example of specialized writing. In spite of the huge mass of collected materials, this, however, was not the intention of the author. Pliny did not write for professionals: his real aim was to supply his noble, well-bred peers with some pleasurable reading matter and to allow them to share in his delight of the variegated and memorable things of nature. He offers a *historia naturalis*, i.e. stories, accounts and information about nature.

Fourteen centuries later we find a similar story-teller in Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini; but his is not a description of nature. In his letters, Aeneas Silvius chats about current events at and around the imperial court of Frederick III (1440-1493) and about political and ecclesiastical developments in Europe. He describes people and cities (Genoa, Basel, Vienna), often


referring to their historical background, and he elaborates on these approaches by writing proper historical and historico-geographical works: *Historia Austrialis, Historia Bohemica, Europa, Asia.*

Yet, even in his major works, Piccolomini is decidedly intent on presenting himself as a narrator; he is not a specialist and neither is he a textbook writer. This approach, then, was not a matter of course. In Piccolomini’s times, documented historiography had already long been established, and there were many universal chronicles of the *imago mundi* type, in which geography was an essential part of the *aetates mundi* doctrine which interpreted history as the history of salvation. Aeneas Silvius takes a very different route, and his reason for doing so is his understanding of *Bildung – formazione – éducation –*, education as contrasted with *episteme* – specialized or textbook knowledge. He has no high opinion of the latter, and even less of the scholars imparting it, as can be seen from his remarks on the subject which he had studied himself, law. On various occasions he ridicules jurisprudence and jurists, especially those who specialize in Roman law, although he deals with the canonists a bit more gently. He indiscriminately accuses the legists of authoritarianism, prolixity and arrogance. He writes about the blind belief in authorities in his *Dialogus de concilio* as follows:

---


7 Hartmann Schedel’s *Weltchronik* of 1493 still belongs to this type.
Our legists habitually cling to authorities. They worship every word of a legal text, nay, even of a gloss, like the oracle of Delphi.\(^8\)

In a letter to Wilhelm von Stein, he shows his exasperation with prolixity:

In his [a German legist's] presence you are allowed to listen but you do not get a chance to speak. I spent more than four hours with him but he did not give me a minute to get a word in edgeways.\(^9\)

As for the arrogance of the lawyers, he observes:

He [the same legist] is one of those blind and mindless people who, having memorized four or ten laws, no longer consider themselves humans but gods, and who regard all laws as divine revelations.\(^10\)

All of this might well be left at that but what matters here is the fact that Piccolomini linked his own ideas on true education to each of his criticisms. Thus, in his *Dialogus de concilio*, he contrasts the legist’s quibbles with an unbiased attitude:

Cultured people – and that’s what we want to be – should not argue on the basis of authorities. Young people do so [...] and par-

---


\(^10\) Wolkan, *Briefwechsel* (Fontes, 61), p. 328 (no. 144): ‘is est ex illis cecis et obtusis hominibus, qui postquam leges quatuor aut decem memorie commen-darunt, jam non amplius homines sed deos se putant legesque divina censent oracula [...].’
particularly contemporary legists. [...] Bright minds debate by way of reasoning.\textsuperscript{11}

In the area of justice, reason means turning back to the essence of the laws, to the spirit which is above the letter and quibbling and narrow-minded jurists, because ‘no-one can attain to perfection without philosophical studies.’\textsuperscript{12} Philosophy is the source of laws; for this reason, the best teachers of law are those whose writings reveal knowledge of philosophy and rhetoric.\textsuperscript{13} Philosophia et oratoria: this juxtaposition suggests that in talking about philosophy, Piccolomini does not mean the scholastic type of learning of the universities. It is exactly this way of cultivating and teaching philosophy that Piccolomini criticizes elsewhere, when he refers to the university of Vienna.\textsuperscript{14} To his mind, however, philosophy means training to think and to express oneself properly, i.e. teaching in the context of an extensive humanist education. Piccolomini’s conviction that an enkyklia paideia of this kind is the foundation of all professional arts and sciences and that it at the same time transcends professionalism is time and again expressed in his writings. In 1449 he praises his later enemy Gregor Heimburg for having – thanks to his humanist studies – ‘outgrown the jurist and the German’, and for ‘evoking Italian rhetoric and flow of speech.’\textsuperscript{15} In another letter, he criticizes the proximity of his former teacher Mario Sozzini, who had written a commentary of twenty books (!) on the decretals: ‘You should know

\textsuperscript{11} Libellus dialogorum, 766: ‘[...] viros doctos, ut videri nos volumus, non decet auctoritatibus disputare. Juvenum est hic mos [...] ac maxime nostri temporis legistarum [...]. Clara ingenia rationibus certant [...].’

\textsuperscript{12} Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 61), p. 328 (no. 144): ‘legibus tamen nemo perfectus fiet, nisi philosophie studii incubuerit [...].’

\textsuperscript{13} Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 61), p. 328 (no. 144): ‘[...] equitatem [...] nulli juriste discernere possunt, nisi ad fontem veniant, unde leges scaturiunt imitenturque peritissimos illos jurisconsultos, quorum scripta et philosophiam et oratoriam redolent.’

\textsuperscript{14} Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 61), p. 82 (no. 27): ‘[...] quibus omne studium in elenchis est vanisque cavillationibus [...].’

\textsuperscript{15} Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 67), pp. 79-81 (no. 25), esp. p. 79: ‘nam et legistam et Theutonem superabas et Italicam redolebas oratoriam facundiam-que.’
better than to do that, as you are not only a jurist but a poet and orator, too.’

Philosophia et oratoria, however, do not appear from nowhere. How are they to be acquired, or, in other words, which subjects have to be studied in order to gain this essential education? Piccolomini’s answer is, at first sight, disappointingly simple: study the artes liberales, the trivium and the quadrivium! The latter must have been on his mind when he remarked that the university of Vienna could boast two or three prominent truly scholarly theologians: Henry of Langenstein, Nikolaus of Dinkelsbühl, and, more recently, Thomas Ebendorfer. For the rest, as he saw it, there were only fruitless and overgrown dialecticians who cared neither for music nor for rhetoric or arithmetic. Throughout his life, Piccolomini himself seems hardly to have had much use for music and arithmetic. We may, therefore, suppose that his reference to these subjects is more or less topical and is not much more than a dutiful display of reverence for the constituent parts of the ancient enkyklios paideia. But even if it is nothing more than this, there is a conspicuous message in that topos: genuine education can be acquired only by turning away from medieval scholastic philosophy and by returning to the ancient arts and

16 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 61), pp. 238-239. (no. 101), esp. p. 238: ‘tu tamen, qui et oratoris et poete et juris consulti locum impleas, deberes ista metiri et modum pagine facere, ne scriberes in immensum [...].’

17 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 61), pp. 81-2 (no. 27): ‘duos hic clarissimecompertum habeo prestantes theologos, Henricum de Hassia [...]. alter fuit Nicolaus de Dinkelspuhel, Suevus, vita bona et doctrina multa clarus, cujus sermones hodie avide a doctis leguntur. est et illic hodie Thomas Hasselbach non incelebratus theologus, quem scribere historias non inutiles ajunt, cujus ego doctrinam laudarem, nisi duos et viginti annos Esaiæ primum capitulum legisset neque adhuc ad calcem venisset.’

18 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 61), p. 82 (no. 27): ‘maximum autem hujus gymniasi vitium est, quod nimis diutinam operam in dialectica nimiumque temporis in re non magni fructus terunt. qui magisterii artium titulo decorantur, hac una in arte maxime examinantur. ceterum neque musice neque rhetoricæ neque arithmetice curam gerunt, quamvis metra quedam et epistolœs ab alis editas imperite exhibentem magistrandum compellant. oratorica et poetica apud eos penitus incognita, quibus omne studium in elenchis est vanisque cavillationibus solidi hauad quaquam multum.’
above all to their spirit. The *trivium* had, of course, been part of the curriculum of late medieval faculties of arts, but this was not what Piccolomini envisaged when he called for training in grammar, dialectics and rhetoric. The rigid formality of late medieval grammar books and *artes dictaminis* is obvious. In his letter on education to King Ladislaus, Aeneas Silvius presents a different method of mastering Latin in speech and in writing. He pays no attention to the analysis of the *octo partes orationis*. What he stresses beyond the knowledge of the basic rules of grammar is the distinction between classical vocabulary and medieval neologisms, and the precision of expression. The essential way to becoming familiar with striking expressions is reading, reading and more reading. To be sure, the student’s choice of authors is vital. He should shun Thomas Aquinas, Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great, Peter of Blois, Nicholas of Lyra, Alan of Lille and the whole crowd of “modern authors” who, in spite of their erudition, are unable to teach others. Instead, the student should read the Roman classics, the poets, the orators – first and foremost Cicero – and selected Christian writers such as Augustine, Jerome, Leo the Great, and a selection from Gregory the Great. As for contemporaries, he recommends Leonardo Bruni, Guarino of Verona, Poggio and Ambrogio Traversari.

In addition to his reading list, Piccolomini briefly and dutifully deals with music, geometry, arithmetic and astronomy. He never fails to point out that each of these subjects should be studied in moderation. Specialized knowledge fosters one-sidedness; it is an obstacle to ‘philosophical’ education and it

---

19 Wolkan, *Briefwechsel* (Fontes, 67), pp. 103-158 (no. 40).


impedes one’s readiness to take decisions and put them into practice.\textsuperscript{22}

The core of Piccolomini’s educational programme is \textit{philosophia} as a training aimed at intellectual refinement as well as at virtue and eloquence. Teaching the \textit{artes liberales} is an indispensable part of this programme but not its entirety: ‘Philosophy comprises not only the \textit{septem artes} but also knowledge of all things and causes, both divine and human. Hence he who has completed the curriculum of the seven arts has made only a part of philosophy his own but he has not yet earned the name of a philosopher.’\textsuperscript{23} The subjects lacking are natural and moral philosophy. This mention of natural philosophy must be regarded as an act of lip-service made necessary by the fact that it was part of the ancient \textit{divisio philosophiae}. Piccolomini was not really interested in either natural philosophy proper or in descriptive natural history. In his reading list for Duke Sigismund he does mention Pliny, Ptolemy, Solinus and Isidore as authorities on geography,\textsuperscript{24} and he writes \textit{ioceun-}

\textsuperscript{22} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, 67), pp. 152-155 (no. 40). On music (p. 153): ‘[…] nimius usus excludendus est.’ On geometry and arithmetics (p. 155): ‘nimium tamen impendi temporis hisce artibus non suaserim, quia etsi sunt per illas transeuntibus utiles, diutius tamen circa eas herentibus noxie fieri possunt.’ On astronomy (p. 155): ‘Nec astronomiae moderata lectio regi puero negari debet.’ In general (p. 152): ‘non tamen hac in re quosdam Viennenses imitatione dignos dixerim; nimis enim multum tempus in sophisticis et cavillosis exponunt argumentis, ut apud eos logice studium non utilitate sed morte terminetur. ob quam rem non probat in officiis Cajum Sulpicium neque Sextum Pompejum Cicero, qui nimis magnum diligentiam nimisque multum operam in geometria posuerunt, neque qui se totos dialecticis ac juri civili dederunt. quamvis enim artes hujusmodi in veri vetigatione versentur, earum tamen studio a rebus gerendis abduci contra officium est, quia virtutis omnis laus, ut ille dicit, in actione consistit. fugienda est omnis artis supervacua imitatio, que licet nihil mali videatur habere, vanum tamen laborem deposite et ab utili negotio detrahit.’

\textsuperscript{23} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, 67), p. 157 (no. 40): ‘sapientia vero non solum artes septem amplexitut supra commemoratas, sed omnium divinarum humanarumque rerum ac causarum, quibus he res continentur, scientiam profitetur. ob quam rem non, quia septem artes percurrit, aliquis philosophus appellabitur, philosophie tamen partem adeptus est.’

\textsuperscript{24} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, 61), pp. 222-237 (no. 99), esp. p. 229: ‘vis orbis situm mentis oculis perlustrare et diversarum provinciarum situs ac mores
ditatis causa a small treatise on horse breeding, but apart from this he shows no interest at all in the realm of nature. It is rather significant that the names of Thomas of Cantimpré and Bartholomaeus Anglicus do not appear in his writings. Albertus Magnus is quoted three times, twice (very shortly) positively and once (in great detail) negatively. Vincent of Beauvais is mentioned once - as a cautionary example of inappropriate historiography. It is tempting to regard this as a manifestation of typically humanist conceit, but the matter is not this simple.

It is easier to understand Piccolimini's attitude after a second examination of his linkage of philosophy and rhetoric on the one hand and of his assessment of specialized literature and specialized scholarship on the other. There is an interesting passage in dialogue 11 of the Dialogus de concilio in which he acknowledges the achievements of a secretary and takes occasion to point out the difference between a secretarius and orator and a specialized scholar as follows:

It is much more difficult to train a secretary than a jurist, a physician or even a theologian. You know what I mean. The jurist goes up to the reading desk. Yet the speaker is not he himself but rather Azo, Cinnus, Bartholus and Baldo; instead of the professor of medicine the lecturers are Avicenna, Gentile, Forlivi and Hugo, and in place of the theologian, Thomas, Albert, Duns Scotus and Nicholas of Lyra. Oh Rhetoric! you are the only undistorted art among them all, you are beyond the reach of dull minds, you do not tolerate the glory of an underserving contender! You examine

intueri, et quid queque regio ferat et quid queque recuset, assit Plinius de naturali historia, assit Ptolomeus, Solinus, Isidorus Hispalensis.'

25 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 61), pp. 395-424 (no. 151).


28 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 61), p. 466 (no. 166).
people, you scrutinize their talents, you plumb anyone’s strength.  

This shows Piccolomini’s repugnance of all kinds of compulsory scholarship. Of course, he himself cannot go without sources and books of reference, but by shunning the scissors-and-paste method, and by digesting the material he reshapes, he achieves that association between knowledge and speech, between philosophy and rhetoric that is the aim and the fruit of the *enkyklios paideia*.

This educational programme shows its value most strikingly in Piccolomini’s historico-geographical works, the *Europa* and *Asia*. In Antiquity, neither history nor geography belonged to the *artes liberales*, and neither did they fit into the systematics of the philosophical disciplines. In the Middle Ages, they penetrate the encyclopedic *Summae* from the twelfth century onwards – those of Honorius Augustodunensis, Bartholomaeus Anglicus and Vincent of Beauvais, to name but a few – but Piccolomini’s writings can not be traced back to such works. His historiography does not primarily take its bearings from time – be it the universal time of the *historia salutis* or the particular (but even so, unilinear) time of reigns, bishoprics, monasteries, cities. Rather, he takes his starting point from sites and regions, and their inhabitants. This approach opens the door to much historical lore but it is not arranged in a historical continuum. Our author relates stories about peoples, cities, individual persons (including kings, princes and noblemen), about their natural environment, about the civilization they created and the historical events which shaped their lives. Hence Piccolomini has been labelled a journalist or, more benevolently, a conversationalist, and there is no doubt that his descriptions show his *ars oratoria* at its best. Does all of this

---

29 *Libellus dialogorum*, 754: ‘Nec Secretarius, uti jurista & Medicus, neque ut Theologus, est factu facilis. Scis, quid volo. Ascendit Cathedram legis doctor, nec ipse est, qui loquitur, sed Azo, Cinnus, Bartholus, Baldus; pro Medico, Avicenna, Gentilis, Forlivia, Hugo; pro Theologo, Thomas, Albertus, Scotus, Lyra. O sola omnium scientiarum illibata Rhetorica, quae nec hebepitus pates, nec ullum diu honoras imperitum! Tu homines examinas; tu ingentia trutinas; tu vires cujusque expendis [...].’
also come up to his standards for *philosophia*? Indeed, it does. *Philosophia* in Piccolomini's own meaning entails an unbiased, independent view of the world in accord with his intention of transmuting the knowledge acquired from its examination into personal experience and empathy, and consequently into activity. Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini is no systematist, much less a schoolman, and his haughty disdain of Thomas Aquinas must be seen in this light. Nevertheless, he is an open-minded and independent observer. He is not an *uomo universale*, but he successfully blends the knowledge he has gathered into his personality, his thinking and his feeling. In this respect, the knowledge which Piccolomini acquired and transmitted indeed is wisdom – *philosophia* – and his educational programme is actually an *enkyklios paideia*. 
FROM SAMARKAND TO SCYTHIA:
REINVENTIONS OF ASIA IN RENAISSANCE
GEOGRAPHY AND POLITICAL THOUGHT*

Margaret Meserve

The dawn of the Renaissance saw the decay of European contacts with the Far East. Western merchants, missionaries and ambassadors had travelled extensively through the countries of Asia under Mongol rule in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, but European relations with and knowledge about Asia diminished dramatically in the century after Marco Polo came home. Some early Italian humanists studied and wrote about the continent's geography, history and political circumstances; but the scholarly values of skepticism and critical inquiry for which the Renaissance humanists are justly famous often failed them when it came to questions of the Orient. Examining Renaissance views of the lands Marco Polo knew, it is difficult to detect many signs of intellectual rebirth – more accurate, perhaps, to speak of a period of decline, in which the medieval experience of contact and understanding faded into a twilight period of misrepresentation and myth, articulated at times unwittingly, at times with unmistakable intent.

Two factors contributed to the shift in European perceptions: political disruption in Asia and, perhaps just as important, profound changes in the intellectual culture back home. The collapse of integrated Mongol rule across Central Asia, hastened by the conquests of Timur at the end of the fourteenth century, closed off traditional routes of communication. The network of silk roads that had linked Europe to distant Cathay broke apart under the competing claims of rival Mongol khanates in Central Asia

* This is an expanded version of a short paper presented at the conference 'Marco Polo and the Encounter of East and West' held at the Centre for the Humanities of the University of Toronto, 24-26 May 2002.
and Iran and rising new dynasties in China and Anatolia. Missionary activity wound down. A few Europeans ventured as far east as Samarkand, the capital of Timur’s empire: the Castilian ambassador Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo, the Sienese merchant Beltramo de’ Mignanelli, and the Bavarian captive Hans Schiltberger left written accounts of their travels through West and Central Asia in the late years of Timur’s reign. But none of these men ventured further east. The sea routes to India, through the Red Sea or Persian Gulf, remained just passable for European traders; but again, only a very few undertook the journey. The Venetian merchant Niccolò de’ Conti, who spent more then two decades travelling through India and southeast Asia before returning to Italy in 1439 to inform Pope Eugenius IV of his adventures, is the notable exception. For most fifteenth-century Europeans, however, the countries of Asia were strange and foreign places – as remote, perhaps, as they had been in the centuries before the *pax Mongolica* brought them so briefly within Western reach.

Renaissance Europe’s estrangement from Asia was articulated in different ways, reflecting changes in contemporary literary and intellectual trends. Popular literature about the peoples and places of Asia saw a revival of interest in the marvellous, sometimes to the detriment of the matter-of-fact. The relatively sober reports on Asian lands and peoples by Marco Polo (1298), Hetoum (1307) and Odoric of Pordenone (1330) continued to circulate, but they were often copied into collections of oriental romance

and legend, alongside some fairly dubious companions. The burgeoning European book trade marketed the texts of the medieval explorers together with legendary tales of Alexander the Great and Prester John and contemporary travellers’ yarns—above all those of the fabulous Sir John Mandeville. All were cast as romantic heroes pursuing adventure against an exotic Eastern background. Renaissance readers seem to have read the medieval traveller’s tale as a tale—as a source of wonder and delight, whose veracity mattered hardly at all.

Some Renaissance scholars sought out true (or rather, apparently true) information about Asia. They tended to do so with their eyes focused on the distant past. In the early fifteenth century, Byzantine émigrés fleeing Ottoman expansion in the East had brought to Italy some precious manuscripts of Ptolemy and Strabo (texts at that point little known in the West), which they then helped their Italian colleagues to translate into Latin. The Italian humanists seized on the books as rich sources of information on the ancient world—copying, editing, excerpting and commenting on everything from basic details of physical topography to extensive ethnographic descriptions of ancient nations and tribes. It was all done in a spirit of enthusiastic academic curiosity; but the humanists’ concern for antiquarian minutiae did sometimes cross the line into mania. Eager to identify the proper ancient names for peoples and places, and then use these terms correctly in their own Latin prose, they sometimes neglected to

5 Reichert, Begegnungen mit China, pp. 191-212; J. Larner, Marco Polo and the Discovery of the World (New Haven and London, 1999), pp. 130-132. For the manuscript tradition of the Travels, including descriptions of individual copies and other texts they are bound with see C. W. Dutschke, Francesco Pipino and the Manuscripts of Marco Polo’s ‘Travels’, Ph. D. diss. (University of California at Los Angeles, 1993). ISTC records four incunable editions of Marco Polo against, for example, 34 of Sir John Mandeville, 22 of the Letter of Prester John, nine of Johannes de Hesse, nine of Ludolphus de Suchen (Ludolph of Saxony), and over two dozen medieval histories and romances of Alexander.

consider any other aspects of Asian geography, including how it might have changed in the 1500 years since Ptolemy and Strabo wrote. Humanist geographers called Central Asia, for instance, by an ancient name, Scythia, and identified Central Asian peoples as the direct descendants of ancient Scythian tribes. In doing so, they sometimes suggested that both the landscape and the peoples of the region had experienced little change since ancient times.

This divergence of Renaissance perspectives on Asia, towards either the romantic or the dryly antiquarian point of view, can be discerned most clearly in fifteenth-century cartography. On the one hand there is the medieval mappamundi tradition, thriving well into the second half of the fifteenth century, in which information on the kingdoms of Tartary and Cathay derived from medieval travellers' reports sits happily alongside more fantastic elements of far older pedigree: monstrous races, exotic beasts and marvellous landmarks like Noah's Ark, Jason's Golden Fleece or Alexander's Caspian Gates. Early printed maps, on the other hand, most of them produced to accompany humanist editions of Ptolemy's Cosmographia, offer a much more static and sterile view of Asia. Here vast stretches of land appear almost totally empty, marked by a few mountain chains and rivers and the names of long-vanished tribes—a landscape barely changed from that Herodotus described. Looking at either kind of map, it is hard to imagine these are the same territories known intimately and recorded matter-of-factly by the merchants and missionaries of Marco Polo's age; but it seems especially true in the case of the austere Ptolemaic tabulae. When humanist geographers

7 E.g., Abraham Cresque's Catalan Atlas (ca 1375-80) and the mappamundi of Andrea Bianco (1436), Andreas Walsperger (1448) and Fra Mauro (1459). See 'Marco Polo and World Maps of the Fifteenth Century', in: Larner, Marco Polo, pp. 191-194.

8 See, e.g., the world maps accompanying early editions of Ptolemy: (Bologna, 1477); (Rome, 1478 and 1490); (Ulm, 1482 and 1486); Francesco Berlinghieri, Geographia [Florence, 1482]; and Hartmann Schedel, Liber chronicarum (Nuremberg, 1493; although here contemporary names are used for the countries of Europe as far east as 'Tartaria'); conveniently reproduced in T. Campbell, The Earliest Printed Maps 1472-1500 (London, 1987), nos 95 (fig. 35), 121 (fig. 36), 148 (fig. 38), 179 (fig. 39) and 219 (fig. 33).
wiped the medieval *mappamundi* clean, they removed not just monsters but Mongols, too. Samarkand becomes an invisible city; only the wilderness of ancient Scythia remains.

The contrasts between the medieval and humanist cartographic traditions are so striking that it has sometimes been assumed that absolutely all humanist thinking about Asia was as resolutely purist, as oblivious to the passage of time – and to the testimony of recent travellers – as that articulated on the early antiquarian maps. The classic example adduced to support this contention is the treatise on the geography of Asia by Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, written between 1461 and '62, after his election to the papacy as Pius II.9 The work, which occupies over a hundred large folio pages in its sixteenth-century edition, serves as a sort of humanist *summa* of ancient geographical knowledge about Asia, drawn from an impressive range of classical authorities, including Strabo, Ptolemy, Pliny, Solinus, Diodorus Siculus and Justin’s epitome of the lost *Philippic History* of Trogus Pompey.10 The work traverses the continent from east to west, starting with the distant lands of the ancient Seres, passing through Scythia and the countries of the Caucasus, and ending with the ancient kingdoms of Parthia, Armenia and, closest of all from Aeneas’s perspective, the Mediterranean provinces of Asia Minor. (The book was unfinished; a projected second half would have made a similar east-west progress across the southern half of the continent, from Greater and Lesser India through Persia and Arabia to Syria and the Holy Land).11


10 Casella, ‘Pio II tra geografia e storia’, pp. 72-78.

11 *Asia*, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 282: ‘Scribendi ordo sic erit [...] Digeremusque singula per sua loca, et ab orientali plaga facientes initium, per medias provincias narratione deducta, ad occiduas nostrasque oras remeabimus.’
At the outset, Aeneas declares he will provide a comprehensive and up-to-date history for each part of the continent as he describes its geography. In practice, however, he very rarely includes information about peoples or events after the end of antiquity. Most of his entries offer little more than a rehearsal of ancient geographical data — the boundaries of a region, its mountains, rivers, landmarks and people, almost always identified by their classical names — with the occasional ethnographical curiosity or classical anecdote thrown in. Like the humanist antiquarian maps which his work closely resembles, Aeneas gives very little indication of how the continent of Asia has changed since Antiquity, or that such a topic is even worthy of interest. Notoriously, he makes no use of the book of Marco Polo, despite the wide circulation the work enjoyed in Italy at the time, nor of any of the medieval missionary reports.

Aeneas does cite some modern reports on Asia, however — above all the travel account of the merchant Niccolò de’ Conti. On his return to Italy in 1439, Conti had sought out Eugenius IV at the Council of Florence; there he related his experiences to the papal secretary Poggio Bracciolini, who later incorporated his story into the fourth book of his popular collection of observations De varietate fortunae (1447). It was probably Poggio’s elegant Latin style that made the traveller’s story at all palatable to the humanist pope. Even so, Aeneas often repeats Conti’s information only to express his doubts about it, seeming to prefer the authority of the ancient geographers to the testimony of a mere modern. He questions Conti’s claim that the River Dua (the

His division of Asia into six parts, three on either side of the Taurus range running the length of Asia, is at pp. 286-287. For the complicated structure of the work — as projected and as actually written — see Casella, ‘Pio II tra geografia e storia’, pp. 36-48.

12 Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 282: ‘[…] quae propter nostrum aevum gesta sunt memoratu digna (quantum cognovimus) enarrare curabimus, prisca nonnulla praemittentes […]. […] de locorum gentiumque natura et situ quae videbantur necessaria inserentes.’

Irawaddy) is longer than the Ganges, for instance, since the ancients had called the Ganges the queen of rivers. But it is debatable whether his conclusions are always the product of simple prejudice against the present day; for elsewhere in the Asia, Aeneas also queries statements made by his classical authorities. In a few cases he even quotes medieval sources at length (chronicles and cosmographies, that is, never the vernacular travel accounts), seeming to accept their testimony without question. Aeneas’s use of sources – how he weighs them up, what he chooses to believe and what he feels he must doubt, especially on the topic of Scythia – provides a key to understanding the overall purpose of the Asia. The prevailing spirit of the work is not one of scholarly criticism but rather of political polemic. Aeneas’s beliefs about the geography and history of Asia were informed by the precarious political situation Western Christendom faced from the present-day rulers of the western fringes of the continent, the Ottoman Turks. In his work he drew on ancient, medieval and modern sources alike in order to support tendentious claims about the various peoples of Asia, their national characteristics and their intentions toward the West.

Aeneas’s methods can be discerned early on in the work, in his discussion of the country of the Arimphaeans, an ancient tribe dwelling beyond the Jaxartes river in eastern Scythia – at the very limit of the world as Aeneas imagines it. He starts by rehearsing several ancient descriptions of the country’s topography and primitive, nomadic peoples. He then tries to reconcile these with two pieces of modern testimony which he has discovered contradict the older authorities: a mappamundi recently presented to the papal court; and the travel account of Niccolò de’ Conti. According to Aeneas, the map, about which he says tantalizingly little, identifies the distant eastern parts of Scythia as part of the kingdom of Cathay. A little legend of text further explains that Cathay and all the kingdoms around it are subject to a mighty emperor called the Can. Furthermore, Conti claims in his text

14 Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 288.
15 Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 291.
16 See the discussion by Casella, ‘Pio II tra geografia e storia’, pp. 78-80.
17 Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 291: ‘[...] qui nostra aetate orbis situm figurant Cathaium his in locis designant, quae ultra Iaxartem commemo-
that the capital of Cathay, the city of Gambaleschia (or Khan-Balikh, Marco Polo’s Cambalu, present-day Beijing) is a great metropolis with an enormous fortified royal palace, while the city of Neptai (Nanjing) is very populous, the largest in all the kingdom, surrounded by a wall thirty miles long. Conti claims that in both cities there are houses, palaces, temples and other ‘urban ornaments’ very like those in Italy, and the citizens enjoy immense wealth and deport themselves in civilized style.18

Now, having put the map and the traveller’s tale on the table for consideration, Aeneas must wrestle with the question of their credibility:

If we are to believe these reports, then customs [in that region] must have changed a great deal from those the ancients record, for they tell us that the Scythians are all shepherds and practically untameable.19

On a first reading, this seems no more than wilful anachronism, the sort of fanatical classicism that gives Renaissance humanists a bad name. How can Cathay exist, if Ptolemy never mentioned it? A map and a traveller cannot possibly discredit the authority of the ancient geographers. But Aeneas’s objections to the idea of Cathay are more subtle than this. He allows that the modern accounts could be true – that historical change and cultural progress might be possible in Scythia – but even so, there is a crucial flaw in the story as the modern sources tell it:

The rugged northern regions simply cannot produce the kind of culture for which ancient Greece was famous, or indeed which flourishes in Italy today.20

ravimus, multasque provincias et multa regna circunscribunt, quibus unus praesit imperator, qui apud eos Can appellatur.’


19 *Asia*, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 291: ‘Quod si credimus magna profecto morum mutatio facta est ab his quos antiqui prodiderunt, qui Scythas ferme omnes pastorales esse affirmaverunt, et propemodum intractabiles.’

So Aeneas does not doubt the existence of Chinese civilization, nor even its magnificence (though the idea does seem to challenge his Mediterranean pride), but simply its reported location on the map. He concludes by suggesting a compromise solution that both recognizes the claims of the modern witnesses and satisfies the theoretical precepts of ancient geography:

This land of Cathay, which people praise so much, must lie further south than it appears on the map.\(^1\)

Aeneas’s insistence on this point reveals his debt to ancient climatic theory – the idea that human physiology is determined by macrocosmic forces at work in the surrounding environment. The inhabitants of cold, dark and damp northern latitudes were physically incapable of reaching the high levels of intellect and action, of civilization and culture, achieved by the warm-blooded natives of the Mediterranean world.\(^2\) Thus Aeneas finds Conti’s enthusiastic reports of Chinese civilization dubious not because they conflict with the substance of ancient geography, but rather because they contradict the theory that underpins it.

His stance on these issues is confirmed by the fact that elsewhere in his work he is happy to trust Conti’s tales – provided they do not contradict his fundamental model of the northern latitudes as barbarous and the south as congenial to civilization. Aeneas repeats nearly verbatim Conti’s account of the marvels of the kingdom of Machin (Burma). There, he says, a fabulously wealthy king dwells in a splendid palace surrounded by an army of 10,000 war elephants, among whom his personal mount, a rare white elephant, is led about on a golden, jewel-encrusted chain. The inhabitants of the country cover their bodies with colourful tattoos, worship idols and feast on roast snake and ants pickled in

\(^1\) Asia, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 291: ‘aut certe Cathaium ipsum quod tantopere laudant, minus septentrionale est quam pictura demonstrat’ (italics mine).

pepper; and the land teems with rhinoceros and water buffalo.23 Aeneas doubts little of this.24 After all, as he himself remarks, Machin lies to the east and south of Scythia.25 In a milder climate, it seems, anything is possible.

Thus Aeneas’s critical approach to his sources is not fanatically purist; he does not mean to portray Asia exactly as the ancients had done.26 In fact, some of Aeneas’s ancient sources also challenge his conviction that the northern regions of Asia are barbarous, and he is not afraid to reject them when they do.

Aeneas’s vision of Scythia as an uncivilized place certainly reflects the rich complex of associations which ancient Greek and Roman authors commonly attached to ‘Scythia’ and the northern parts of the world – a characterization in which climate, topography and national character were all implicated. Geographers from Herodotus on had described Scythia as a harsh landscape of towering mountains and endless plains, brutally cold, empty and unfertile. There were no towns in Scythia, no cultivated fields, no olive trees or vines, none of the comforts of civilized Mediterranean life. The inhabitants either refused or were unable to settle in any one place, showing no interest in agriculture, urban life or organized government. They were hardy nomads and fierce warriors who lived on the meat and milk of their beasts (occasionally on human flesh), and wrested a living from their barren

23 Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, pp. 287-288.
24 But the figure of 10,000 elephants strikes him as high: ‘Nec illud dignum fide, decem millia elephantum belli causa regem alere, nec notum esse aut fama clarum […].’ (Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 288).
25 Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 288: ‘Haec de Macino Nicolaus tradidit, quam provinciam ad orientem versam inter Indiae montes et Cathaiaum collocans, haud dubie regionem Sericam denotasse videtur, quae Scytharum gentibus et a septentrione et ab occidente iungitur.’
26 In a few other places he shows himself willing to trust the reports of recent travellers: he quotes information from the Genoese bishop of Caffa on the topography of Lesbos (Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 356) and from an anonymous Franciscan missionary, recently returned from proselytizing among the ‘pagans’ of Russia, on the source of the Don (Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, pp. 303, 307-8). For his use of testimony on the Ottomans by the Venetian ambassador Niccolò Sagundino see below.
surroundings by breeding horses, attacking each other and plundering their settled neighbours to the south. Thus their very existence seemed to threaten the foundations of classical civilization. Such negative ethnographic commonplaces were widespread in ancient geographical writing, and it was precisely these that Aeneas meant to invoke when he insisted on the barbarous climate of northern Asia and the ‘untameable’ character of the shepherds who dwelled there.

There was also, however, a long tradition in classical literature of praising the barbarians of Scythia as noble savages, peaceful rustics whose ignorance of civilized life made them the happiest, most virtuous, uncomplicated and self-sufficient race in the world. Two of Aeneas’s main sources, the ancient histories of Diodorus Siculus and Pompeius Trogus, frequently advert to these tropes in their descriptions of the Scythian peoples. Trogus, for example, presents the Scythians as a hardy race whose primitive lifestyle offers a model of moderation and restraint which the civilized world could do well to observe. Aeneas finds such praise of northern barbarians hard to accept. In his résumé of the ancient sources on the Scythians he omits all the positive comments Diodorus and Trogus make about their bravery, virtue or abstemiousness, repeating only the passages that present them in a poor light: Diodorus’s story that they were descended from a monstrous creature, half woman and half viper, for example, and Trogus’s account of their violent invasions into the Mediterranean world. In the course of that story, Trogus also mentions (in order to establish the rugged independence of the Scythian character) that although the Scythians had ‘heard of

---


29 Trogus in Justin, *Epitome*, 2.1.1-4; 2.2.3-15; 2.3.1-18; Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historiarum*, 2.43-44.

30 Trogus, 2.2.14-15.

Roman arms, they never experienced them’. Aeneas repeats this passage, but only to object to it immediately afterwards. Scythians superior to the armies of Rome? It is no more than a pretty phrase. Trogus must have got it from a Greek source, and Greeks are known to exaggerate. In fact, Aeneas continues, the Romans celebrated several triumphs over the Scythians – their skill and cunning easily overpowered the brute force of the barbarians. If Rome never conquered Scythia itself, this was only because there was nothing in that frozen wilderness worth capturing. The Scythians were fierce, Aeneas allowed, but they were not invincible – like a herd of wild elephants or bulls, they could be tamed by a superior intellect.

Aeneas thus jealously guards his vision of Scythia – indeed all of northern Asia – as a barbarous place lacking any redeeming virtues, in the face of both ancient and modern evidence to the contrary. He rejects modern accounts of Scythian cities and civilization as well as ancient claims of Scythian bravery and virtue and, perhaps most significant, Scythian invincibility.

Such stubbornness on his part is not simply the result of unwavering faith in Hippocratic climate theory. Aeneas was also convinced he could discern consistent patterns in the history of the Scythian peoples: from Antiquity through the Middle Ages and right down to his own day, Scythia had been a breeding ground for violent barbarian hordes who periodically emerged to

32 Justin, Epitome, 2.3.5: ‘Romanorum audire, non sensere arma.’
33 Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 306: ‘Pulchre Trogus, sed arbitramur Graecos eum aliquos sectum, quibus mos est omnia in maus extollere.’
34 Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 307: ‘Nec Scytharum robur insuperabile est, magis quam elephantum et taurorum, quos ingenio vincimus [...].’
35 There are other instances where Aeneas objects to his ancient sources’ praise of barbarian virtues. The Arimphaeans are said to be noble savages who love peace, have no enemies and offer asylum to any who ask for it. Aeneas is unwilling to reject the classical account entirely, but does express his reservations: ‘Sic forsitan olim fuit, nunc gentis huiusce nulla cognitio’ (Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 291, italics mine). He also (p. 290) has his doubts about the Hyperboreans, the gentle Scythian race whom Solinus places beyond the north pole, on an island of abundant fertility, living a life of peaceful ease and paying tribute to Delian Apollo. ‘Fabulosa haec,’ Aeneas remarks, ‘Nam quis credat?’
menace the civilizations of Europe: the ancient Sarmatians and Scythians, the Huns and the Goths, the Alans, Lombards and Hungarians and, most recently and worst of all, the ferocious Ottoman Turks. It was Aeneas’s hatred of the Turks, wedded to his dream of organizing a crusade to oust them from Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean, that caused him to doubt, and ultimately reject, the admiration his classical authorities expressed for the Scythians – whom he believed were the Turks’s ancient forebears.36

Aeneas’s reasons for inquiring into the geography and history of Scythia were in fact anything but academic: ultimately, his concern was to vilify the Turks as barbarian Scythians and thus strengthen his case for mounting a military expedition against them. Therefore it was necessary to prove that Scythia was inherently barbarous. Aeneas wrote the Asia in the early 1460s, a few years into his papacy, as he was trying to organize his crusade to avenge the Turkish capture of Constantinople. He had been agitating for European action against the Ottomans from the moment news reached him, in the summer of 1453, of the Byzantine capital’s spectacular fall.37 And throughout the 1450s and ‘60s, whenever he discussed the urgent threat the Ottomans posed to Christian Europe, in letters, crusade orations and sermons, he claimed that they were violent, untrustworthy and crude


barbarians who had invaded the civilized world from a distant, northern homeland.

Writing to Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa on 21 July 1453, for example, just after hearing of Constantinople’s fall, Aeneas lamented the loss of the city and its ancient heritage. The Byzantine Greeks had contributed so much to the recent revival of learning – preserving manuscripts, commenting on texts, teaching Italian students the rudiments of ancient Greek. But now,

it will all be very different under the Turks, who are a nation of savages and despise culture and literature [...]. They are Scythians come from the depths of Barbary. Aethicus the philosopher tells us that their original homeland lay beyond the Black Sea and the Pirrischean Mountains toward the Northern Ocean. They were an unknown, disgraceful race, promiscuous fornicators, lovers of debauchery, who ate disgusting foods and knew nothing of wine, grain or salt.\(^{38}\)

The Scythian ancestors of the Turks had cultivated only the most primitive form of religion before adopting the shameful superstition of Muhammad. What is more, Aeneas concludes:

There is still a little flavour of their origins about them, even though, having lived in Asia Minor for a long time, they have shed some of their original baseness and made themselves a little civilized; for they still shun wine and eat the meat of horses, bisons and vultures. They are steeped in lust, care little for the study of letters, and are incredibly haughty and proud.\(^{39}\)


\(^{39}\) See Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 68), pp. 209-210 (no. 112): 'sapiunt igitur adhuc alicuid originis sue, licet in Asia multis morati temporibus alicud
They were also hell-bent on the destruction of Western Civilization. In capturing Constantinople, the Turks had ushered in a new dark age, a second death for Homer and Plato.\textsuperscript{40}

The ethnographic commonplaces regarding the primitive diet, habits, social organization and culture of barbarians which Aeneas applies to the Turks were not the exclusive property of classical Greek and Roman geography. They survived – indeed, took on new life – after the fall of the Rome. Medieval authors applied them to the ‘barbarian hordes’ of Huns, Alans, Goths, Khazars and Mongols who terrorized Europe in later centuries; they dovetailed nicely with Judaeo-Christian traditions regarding Gog and Magog and the unclean nations locked in northern Asia behind the Caspian Gates – the barrier supposedly built by Alexander the Great across the Caucasus Mountains to keep them from pouring south over the civilized world trailing Armageddon in their wake.\textsuperscript{41}

Aeneas was well aware of these traditions; in fact, he deliberately meant to invoke them in his portrait of the Scythian Turks, even as he tried very hard to make his text sound like a work of pristine deformitatis amiserint seque non nihil excultos reddiderint; devitant enim adhuc vinum, carnes equorum, vesontium vulturumque comedunt, in libidinem provoluti sunt, litterarum studia parvi faciunt, incredibili fastu superbiunt.’


respectable ancient ethnography. His main source for the unpleasant habits of the Turks, 'the philosopher Ethicus', was in fact an eighth-century apocalyptic cosmography spuriously attributed to a non-existent ancient cosmographer, an account in which the terrible 'Turchi' are credited (in idiosyncratic, often incomprehensible vulgar Latin) with all sorts of monstrous attributes which Aeneas chose not to mention — black skin, supernaturally strong teeth, dogs the size of lions, and - described at great length - confinement behind the Caspian Gates at the hands of Alexander. All this Aeneas leaves out. In a speech to the Diet of Frankfurt in September 1454, he again decried the Turks' barbarous background, quoting 'Ethicus' and adding confirmation of their Scythian origin from another medieval work, the twelfth-century chronicle of Otto of Freising. Otto reported that the Turks had burst through the Caspian Gates in the middle of the eighth century to wage a ferocious battle against some neighbouring barbarian tribes. The bishop's chronicle must have seemed a more credible means of conveying an association between the Turks and the apocalyptic tribes enclosed by Alexander than did the bizarre confection of Aethicus. Finally, in 1456, Aeneas commissioned the Venetian diplomat and humanist scholar Niccolò Sagundino to compose a survey of Ottoman history from their origins in barbarous Scythia right up to their most recent conquests in the Balkans. The Turks, Sagundino


43 Aethicus, *Die Kosmographie*, ed. O. Prinz (Munich, 1993), pp. 119-123. Aethicus draws on the late seventh-century apocalyptic *Revelations* of ps.-Methodius, first composed in Syriac, translated into Greek and from Greek into Latin in the early 700s. His 'Turchi' are most likely the Turkic Khazars who occupied territory in the Caucasus, from where they made invasions south into Syria, in the 620s and 630s: Meserve, 'Medieval Sources', pp. 420-425.

44 This was a common theme among humanists: Flavio Biondo referred to it in his *Decades*, invoking the authority of St Jerome. See his *Historiarum ab inclinatione Romanorum libri XXXI* (Basel, 1531), p. 151: 'Fuerunt et ipsi Turci Scythae ex iis quos Alexandrum Macedonem intra Hyperboreos montes, ferreis clausisse repagulis, quum alii tradunt scriptores, tum beatus Hieronymus affirmat.'
explained, were descended from Scythians who dwelt on the
Asian side of the River Don, ‘with no settled home, no cities, no
fixed permanent abodes’. They had wandered about over the
broad plains for ages before invading Asia Minor in the ninth
century, and their Ottoman progeny still delighted in – and ex-
celled at – riding and archery and the military arts.45

Aeneas thus had little difficulty consulting and quoting medi-
val and modern sources on Asia per se, so long as they did not
conflict with his image of Scythia – and the Scythian Turks in
particular – as irredeemably barbarous. From the testimony of
Aethicus, Otto of Freising and Sagundino he created a seamless
historical narrative of Turkish origins and character into which
were woven genesis in the barbarous, frozen north; unclean and
disgusting habits; eruption through the Caspian Gates of the
Caucasus; and innate, perennial hatred of all things civilized. The
account had the appearance of an objective and critical piece of
humanist scholarship, but hinted at a darker truth: history and
geography suggested that the ‘Scythian’ Turks were in fact agents
of sensationally apocalyptic violence, whose presence in the
civilized Mediterranean world could only bode ill for the future.

Between 1453 and 1462, Aeneas drew on some or all of this
account of Turkish origins in at least seven crusade letters and
orations; he also referred to it in his own autobiography (as he
related how he had proclaimed a new crusade immediately after
his coronation as pope) and in his history of Europe.46 He also

45 Niccolò Sagundino, De origine et rebus gestis Turcarum, in Laonicus
Chalcocondyles, De origine [...] Turcorum libri decem (Basel, 1556), pp. 186-
190: ‘Turcarum gens [...] a Scythicis qui trans Tanaim Asiam versus, nulla
stabili sede, nullis urbibus, nullis certis aut perpetuis domiciliis, campos paten-
tes vage passimque incolere soliti sunt, originem traxit [...].’

46 Aeneas Sylvius, letter to Nicholas of Cusa, July 1453 (see note 39, above);
letter to Johannes Troster, July 1454, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 951;
681; oration at the Diet of Wiener-Neustadt, Feb. 1455, in: Orationes politicae
et ecclesiasticae, ed. J. D. Mansi, 3 vols (Lucca, 1755-59), vol. I, p. 308; oration
to Calixtus III, April 1455, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 926; oration at the
Congress of Mantua, Sept. 1459, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 906; Pii II
Commentarii rerum memorabilium que temporibus suis contigerunt, ed. A. van
Heck, 2 vols., Studi e testi 312-313 (Vatican City, 1984), vol. I, pp. 113-114;
repeated it *twice* in the *Asia*. Here Aeneas first inserts his account of Turkish origins into an early section on Scythia, as part of his survey of the barbarian invaders, both ancient and modern, who have emerged from its wastes over the centuries to menace the Mediterranean world. He then returns to the topic at the very end of the treatise, at the conclusion of his description of Asia Minor.47 The provinces of Asia Minor occupy more than two-thirds of the whole text as it survives – Aeneas clearly considered it the most important area of the continent he had yet discussed. Here he rehearses the whole tale of the Turks’ Scythian origins once again before going on to decry the savagery with which their modern descendants, from Osman to Mehmed II, have pursued the conquest of Byzantine Anatolia. He concludes with a long lament for the great cities of Asia, the cathedrals, shrines, churches, monasteries and relics, and the myriad monuments of classical antiquity, all now lost to the terrible onslaught of the Turks.48 With the closing words of the treatise Aeneas underscores his point yet again:

I have described all this at greater length than was perhaps necessary so that my readers would understand how much Christendom has lost; this is why I described Asia and its individual regions down to the most minute detail.49

Aeneas thus constructs his scholarly account of Asian history and geography to serve a larger political project. From the distant northeast of the continent, a barren landscape where civilization is impossible, he tracks the steady, destructive progress of the barbarian Turks west toward the Mediterranean. Drawing on classical, medieval and contemporary sources without prejudice,

48 *Asia*, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, pp. 385-386: ‘Nimis multum est, quod in Asia perdidit Christus, nobilissima provincia a nostra religione est alienata. Et quot populos, quot praeclarissimas urbes, quot insulas fama celebres, quot inclyta regna cum Asia perdimus! [...] Et quae unquam terra viros doctrina excellentes plures quam Asia protulit?’
he uses *Asia* both to demonize the Ottoman enemy and to generate sympathy for the crusade to liberate Asia Minor from their grasp.

Amidst all this talk of Asian barbarians, one group remains surprisingly absent from the pages of the *Asia*: the Mongols. The fact that there is no account of Mongol history – of their origins, conquests or empires – in Aeneas’s work is hard to account for; their widespread reputation for violence and ferocity could have provided strong support for his model of northern Asia as a perennial fount of barbarian hordes. But as he manipulated geography and history to support his political polemic against the Ottoman Turks, it seems Aeneas either did not want or felt he did not need to invoke the spectre of the Mongol conquests. Perhaps he feared they would distract attention from the more immediate problem he wanted his scholarship to address – the longstanding threat, which in his view long predated the rise of the Mongols, posed by the ‘Scythian’ Turks.

Whatever the reason, Aeneas was not alone among humanists in neglecting the topic of Mongol history. Over the course of the fifteenth century, as they witnessed a spectacular series of Ottoman conquests, Italian humanists compared the Turks to all manner of earlier conquerors, from Assyrians and Egyptians to Huns and Goths. But hardly anyone ever likened them to the Mongols, or even introduced the precedent of the Mongol conquests to the debate over the current Turkish threat. The Milanese rhetorician Andrea Biglia did treat Mongol history in some detail in his 1432 account of the decline of Eastern Christendom. But Biglia is an exceptional case: at the time he wrote – only a few years after the Ottoman interregnum brought about by Timur’s conquests and the capture of Bayezid I at Ankara in 1402 – Ottoman power in the Eastern Mediterranean seemed to have passed its peak, while memories of the ‘Mongol’ depredations of Timur were still raw.\(^5\)

In his work, the Mongols appear as bar-

baric savages while the Turks receive altogether more positive treatment.

Biglia's account of the emergence of the Mongols in the mid-thirteenth century draws on several familiar commonplaces: the unruly hordes descend from the frozen wastes of the far north of Asia, from beyond the Caspian Sea where Alexander was said to have confined them in antiquity.\(^5\) They are nomadic horsemen, living by plunder and with no knowledge of urban civilization, and as a result of their incursions, the Mediterranean world, both Christian and Muslim, falls into a humanist nightmare of anarchic civil unrest. Under Mongol rule, the citizens of Asia neglect the common good and, heedless of their ancient heritage, grow self-indulgent and ignorant, lacking all virtue and humanitas. 'All were turned into barbarians, whom neither law nor religion constrained.'\(^5\) The decline reaches its lowest point in the career of the Ilkhanid Timur, whom Biglia paints as a vicious, arrogant despot, a fitting heir to Genghis Khan. He describes Timur's sack of Damascus with horror and recounts his malevolent humiliation of Bayezid I with real indignation.\(^5\)

As the Ottomans regrouped over the middle decades of the


\(^5\) Ms. BAV Vat. Lat. 5298, fol. 87v: "Enimvero ob has causas datum etiam ultimis gentibus nova imperia facere, quippe hodie nomen est Tartarorum, quae gens fere hyperborea Oceano superfusa pene inter Aquilonem atque Orientem, qua parte fere Hyrchanum mare alluit, vix ullo discrimine, si vitam spectes, a bestis differens. Regio latissima verum rigore coeli parum culta. Hinc enim, hoc est ab occidente, habent Caucasum, a meridie Taurum, ut qui Armeniam Parthi-ample effugiant, has magnus Alexander cum exercitu maximis laboribus peragravit, nulla pene ex eo tempore gentium memoria ad hanc usque etatem [...] nomine fere Moulgi barbarica appellatione dicebantur.'

\(^5\) Ms. BAV Vat. Lat. 5298, fol. 109v: 'Nec virtus, nec humanitas in toto orbe, facti omnes barbari, quos nec lex, nec religio contineret.'

\(^5\) Ms. BAV Vat. Lat. 5298, fos.106'-107'. Biglia portrays Bayezid as a relatively civilized Asian prince and a martyr to Timur's barbarian wrath, '[...] hominem quantum infidelis esse potest, mediocri humanitate preditum.'
fifteenth century, however, Western observers came to see Timur's victory over Bayezid in a different light. The Battle of Ankara did not represent the triumph of Mongol savagery so much as a glorious opportunity for solving the Ottoman problem which the West had failed to grasp. Timur was not an unprincipled Scythian warlord but a great oriental king with whom Christian Europe should have joined forces, striking together against the real barbarians – the Ottoman Turks. In his crusade exhortations, the humanist Francesco Filelfo, a contemporary of Aeneas Sylvius and another vociferous advocate of the Scythian origins of the Turks, gives Timur the ancient-sounding title of 'Thomyris the Massagete'; he stresses his valor and cunning, and condemns the West for failing to adopt him as an ally. In the oration he delivered on behalf of his employer Francesco Sforza at the Congress of Mantua in 1459, Filelfo claimed that Christ himself had sent Timur, at the head of a mighty army from the East, to rescue the Byzantine Greeks. As a result, Bayezid I (who is portrayed by Filelfo as a cowardly deserter) expired in ignominious captivity, while his sons, scattered in battle, struggled to marshal the remnants of the broken Ottoman army. Timur's victory was truly providential: without it, the Turks surely would have captured Constantinople then and there. And yet, the Western powers made no move to capitalize on the Ottomans' moment of crisis:

Dear God, what miraculous providence! What incomprehensible, boundless power! What infinite charity which you embraced us with! Yet still we wretches did not understand, still we paid no heed!53

54 Filelfo, oration before the Congress of Mantua, 18 Sept. 1459, in his Orationes, [Milan, 1483-4], sig. H3*: 'Ni repente Christus Ihesus qui se de inimicis suis cum inimicis item suis ulcisci dignatus est, Thomyrin Massagetam cognomento Tamberlanum [...] cum innumerabili firmissimoque misisset exercitu, ipsa inquam nova Roma Constantinopolis ex illo usque tempore et capta vi esset et versa in praedam.' See also his letter to King Charles VII of France, 17 Feb. 1451, in his Epistolae (Venice, 1502), fos. 55'-59', at 58'.

55 Filelfo, oration at Mantua, sig. H3*: 'Oh mirabilem dei providentiam, oh incomprehensibilem immensamque potentiam, oh caritatem, qua nos complecte-ris, infinitam! Et nos miseri nondum perspicimus, non respicimus!'
Other humanists in Aeneas Sylvius’s circle, including his secretary Flavio Biondo and the Venetian humanist and diplomat Niccolò Sagundino (who calls Timur a ‘most powerful king of the Scythians’) appraised the significance of Timur’s career in similar terms.\(^{56}\)

Aeneas, too, discusses the conquests of Timur. He does so in the *Asia* – not in his account of the history of Scythia or any other part of northern Asia but, rather, in the section devoted to Parthia – the country lying just south of Scythia and just within the boundaries of the world of classical civilization. Under the rubric of Parthia, Aeneas actually ventures to treat much ancient Persian history, explaining how the Parthian Arsacids assumed the mantle of Asian hegemony previously held by the Assyrians, Medes and Achaemenids.\(^{57}\) He then introduces Timur as the latest scion of the ancient Parthian race.\(^{58}\) His nation had not ruled without interruption: the Arab conquests in the seventh century had obscured the name of Parthia for over 750 years. Only in very recent years had Parthian fortunes at last begun to revive, in the person of Timur.\(^{59}\) As Aeneas recounts the Ilkhanid ruler’s sweeping campaigns through the East, he portrays him as a fearsome and violent figure, to be sure; nevertheless, he remains silent on the subject of his devotion to Islam, and seems to regard

\(^{56}\) In the account Sagundino wrote for Aeneas in 1456, he explains that the Byzantines defending Constantinople against the Ottoman siege of 1402 ‘perissentque nimirum ac in hostis saevisissimi potestatem venissent, ni Tamerlanus ille Scytharum praepotens rex, instar torrentis […] Baiazetem […] in Asiarn revocasset […].’ (*De origine et rebus gestis Turcorum*, p. 187). See also Flavio Biondo, oration to Alfonso of Aragon, 1 August 1453, in *Scritti inediti e rari di Flavio Biondo*, ed. B. Nogara (Rome, 1927), pp. 31-51, at 33: ‘Timurbeus Parthorum vel, ut aliqui volunt, Persarum rex potentissimus.’


\(^{58}\) Aeneas derived much of his information on Timur from Poggio’s *De varietate fortunae*, ed. Merisalo, pp. 107-108; but Poggio does not put any particular stress on the damage inflicted by Timur on the Turks.

\(^{59}\) *Asia*, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, pp. 312-313: ‘[…] neque postea nomen Parthicum auditus est quasi magnum, usque ad tempora nostra. Anno circiter decimo priusquam nascenemur, Thamerlanes genere Parthus, gregarius miles, adeo inter suos […] excelluit, ut brevi multarum gentium dux ficeret, quibus Parthorum imperio potitus Scythas, Iberos, Albanos, Persas, Medos sibi subegit.’
his victories over the Muslim peoples of the East – in particular the Ottomans under Bayezid I – with some satisfaction. Having laid waste to all of Asia from the Don to the Nile, Aeneas concludes, the Parthian conqueror retreated with his captives and spoils to establish a splendid imperial capital at ‘Marchantis’ or Maracanda, the ancient name for Samarkand. The Central Asian oasis becomes, in Aeneas’s account, a metropolis of imperial Persia: after all, there can be no cities in Scythia. Timur nearly succeeds in restoring the ancient empire of the Parthians; but, fatally, the dissipation and quarrelling of his sons prevent a complete revival – a failure which Aeneas seems to regret.  

Renaissance humanists and politicians alike could imagine zones of good and evil within Asia, from which good and evil nations could spring. On the whole, they perceived the distinction in terms of cultural attainment rather than religion; they manipulated their historical and geographical scholarship to emphasize the presence or absence of cultural virtues as they saw fit. This habit of mind sometimes extended into the conduct of diplomacy and policy decisions. Aeneas Sylvius patronized the obscure Franciscan friar Ludovico da Bologna, who appeared in Rome in 1460 promising to bring the Christian rulers of Trebizond, Mingrelia and Georgia (whom he styled the ‘King of Persia’), along with the Turkish prince of Karaman and the Turcoman chieftain Uzun Hasan, to the aid of a Western crusade.  

Aeneas’s efforts met with little success, but Western hopes for Uzun Hasan, in particular, persisted long after the pope’s death in 1464. Hasan was lord of the Akkoyunlu or ‘White Sheep’ confederation of Turcoman tribes; he ruled vast stretches of eastern Anatolia and western Iran and was an indirect successor of Timur. The Venetian Senate pursued secret negotiations with

---

60 Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 313: ‘effecerunt, ne Parthorum imperium rursus posset emergere.’


62 Hasan’s domains spread from Anatolia into Armenia, Iraq and western Iran; he commanded huge numbers of fighting men and so posed an enormous
him through a series of ambitious ambassadorial exchanges and in late 1472 at last confirmed the terms of an alliance. Hasan’s Turcoman armies would mount attacks against the Ottoman frontier in southeastern Anatolia, supported by a Venetian fleet lying off the Cilician coast.\textsuperscript{63} News of the alliance caused great excitement throughout Italy, where Uzun Hasan was generally hailed as the King of Persia; humanists in Venice, Milan and Rome celebrated his bravery and valour. At Carnival in Rome in 1473 he was the subject of an elaborate triumphal festival and tournament, in which ‘Zuncassanu’ was crowned King of Macedonia (i.e., like Alexander, a conqueror of Persia) before a sumptuous banquet attended by prominent cardinals, bishops and ambassadors. The next day crowds filled the piazza before SS. Apostoli to witness the ‘Persian’ king vanquish the Turkish sultan in an elaborate chariot contest; a commemorative medal was also struck in his honour.\textsuperscript{64}

In Milan, Filelfo eagerly seized on news of the Venetian alliance as evidence that Europe might yet take advantage of a ‘Persian’ threat to the Ottoman East, making up for the opportunity missed under Timur. In letters written in late 1473 he congratulated his Venetian friends on their new Persian entente, calling it a wonderful, splendid and holy alliance, bound to bring about a change in Christian fortunes.\textsuperscript{65} Only a few years earlier, after the threat to the eastern Ottoman frontier. See J. E. Woods, \textit{The Aqquyunlu: Clan, Confederation, Empire} (Minneapolis, 1976); V. Minorsky and C. E. Bosworth, ‘Uzun Hasan’, in: eds H. A. R. Gibb \textit{et al.}, \textit{The Encyclo-paedia of Islam}, 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1960-), vol. X, pp. 963-967.


\textsuperscript{64} A. M. Piemontese, ‘La Repr\'esentation de Uzun Hasan sur Sc\'ene \`a Rome (2 mars 1473), \textit{Turcica} 21/23 (1991), pp. 191-203.

\textsuperscript{65} Filelfo to Ludovico Foscarini, 23 Feb. 1473, in \textit{Epistolae}, fo. 256\textsuperscript{v}: ‘Mira-bile est quod [...] exposuisti [...]. Splendidissimum est et sanctissimum opus vestrum, quod divina providentia non modo non deseret sed amplexabitur potius, magis magisque in dies et optatissimo exitu terminabit.’
Ottoman capture of Negroponte in 1470, Filelfo had darkly condemned all Muslims as untrustworthy and villainous. But he was willing to make allowances for Uzun Hasan for, although a Muslim, he imagined the prince to be first and foremost a Persian. In November 1473, after hearing the discouraging news that the ‘Persian’ army had been overwhelmed by Ottoman troops in eastern Anatolia the previous summer, he wrote to a Venetian friend:

Just now I have heard the sad news of the victory of the Turks over Assam, King of the Persians. For although both sides follow the same impious Muslim religion, all right-thinking people nevertheless wanted to hear of a Persian victory rather than a Turkish one, inasmuch as the Turks both threaten us more closely and are of a far more savage character than the Persians [...]. What else can you expect from a bunch of rude shepherds and brigands, but affronts and destruction? Yet if we look at history, we find that the Persians spring from a most noble race and are in no way wild or uncivilized.

The loss was a tragedy not only for Venice but also for Hasan himself, Filelfo concluded, since he had received many kindnesses from Venice and would deeply regret his failure to repay them. For it was an ancient belief of this noble race, Filelfo knew, that ingratitude was the worst of all vices.

---

66 Filelfo to Bernardo Giustiniani, 13 Sept. 1470, in Epistolae, fos. 226'-228', at 228': ‘Quae pax enim certa Christianis esse cum Mahometanis unquam possit, in tanta animorum diversitate [...]? Profecto Mahometani omnes, ut mea fert opinio, ab illo sunt spiritu, qui ob ingratae ac dirae mentis superbiam et inviidiam creatori suo impudentissime adversari per omnem immanitatem est ausus.’

67 Filelfo to Marco Aurelio, 10 Nov. 1473, MS Milan, Biblioteca Trivulziana 873, fos. 452'-453': ‘Repente tristis admodum nuncius est ad nos permutus de Turcorum victoria in Assam regem Persarum. Nam esti utrique ex eadem sunt impia secta Mahometana, maluissent tamen omnes qui recte sapiunt Persarum audire quam Turcorum victoriam, quandoquidem hi et urgent nos propius et moribus sunt quam Persae longe immanioribus [...]. Enimvero de hominibus rusticiis genere et pastoribus eisdemque latronibus quid expectari licet praeter pemporiciem et contumeliam? Nam Persae, si velimus vetera meminisses, et nobilissimo genere orti sunt et nequaquam efferatis aut incultis moribus.’

68 Filelfo to Marco Aurelio, 10 Nov. 1473, MS Milan, Biblioteca Trivulziana 873, fol. 453': ‘Adde quod de vobis hoc est Venetis bene meruerat rex Assam,
It is an extraordinary reversal of fortunes: the Turcoman chieftain, leader of a confederation of nomadic tribes on the mountainous fringes of Anatolia and Iraq, is hailed as the civilized King of Kings, the heir of Xerxes and Darius, in whom the traditional virtues of Persian civilization inhere. Meanwhile the Ottomans – then rebuilding Constantinople, among many other achievements – are condemned as shiftless northern barbarians, irredeemably base and bent on the destruction of the civilized world. The European habit of perceiving Turk and Persian as cultural opposites continued through the Renaissance, reaching a climax of sorts in the early sixteenth century when reports of the rise of Shah Ismail Safavi in Iran and the Shi’ite challenge to Ottoman orthodoxy raised hopes in the West once again that a civilized, possibly quasi-Christian Persian champion would come to its rescue against the forces of Ottoman barbarism. In all this we see the subtle persistence of the myth of Prester John, a character whom the humanists ought, by most estimations, to have left behind in the wonderland of the medieval mappamundi.

Humanist geography – like humanist political thought – was a composite enterprise, drawing on ancient, medieval and contemporary sources in equal measure. Composite, too, were its aims. The critical analysis of literal ‘facts’ was central, but could never take place at the expense of the larger moral or political point of the work, in support of which elements of myth and legend, the allegorical and the marvellous, could all be invoked without scruple. Wise men and monstrous races still haunted the humanist map of Asia. What justified their presence (cleverly disguised as it was) was the humanists’ sense of political engagement – the conviction that history was a form of

noscce debuerat ex illo vetere Persarum instituto nullum esse ingratitudine detestabilius vitium.’

rhetoric, and rhetoric must address the pressing political issues of the day. It could be argued that nearly all of the research early Renaissance humanists undertook into the history, geography and ethnography of Asia was intended to address the current political crisis in Europe, a situation in which Asian – or at least Ottoman – politics played an integral part. Elements of classical antiquarianism and oriental romance, political agitation and racial polemic, all combined in the image of Asia and its peoples which the Renaissance humanists developed and which they bequeathed to the orientalist scholars of early modern Europe.
AENEAS SILVIUS PICCOLOMINI
AS A HISTORIOGRAPHER: ASIA*

Benedikt Konrad Vollmann

Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini set such a high value on his earlier historiographical work that he continued it, composing his Asia and the Commentarii, even after he became Pope Pius II. Remarkably, these works have not very much aroused the interest of modern scholarship. To be sure, we have recently been supplied with the valuable editions of the Commentarii by Adrianus van Heck¹ and by Ibolya Bellus and Iván Boronkai² and of the Historia Bohemica by Dana Martinková.³ The Historia australis, however, is only partially available in printed form,⁴ and for studying the Europa and Asia we have to rely on the Basel Opera omnia text of 1551⁵ or on Sustermann’s edition of 1707.⁶ Only little research has been done on this mate-

* This is a revised version of my paper ‘Piccolomini als Geschichtsschreiber: die Asia’, for the conference ‘Heilsgeschichte oder Geschichte des Menschen?’ at the Catholic University of Eichstätt, 4.-5. Mai 1995. The proceedings of this conference are in the press.

¹ Pii II Commentarii rerum memorabilium que temporibus suis contigerunt, ed. A. van Heck, 2 vols., Studi e testi 312-313 (Vatican City, 1984).
⁴ Only the second draft has been completely published: ed. A. F. Kollar, Analecta monumentorum omnis aevi Vindobonensis, 2 vols. (Vienna, 1762-1763; reprint Farnborough, 1970), vol. II. A critical edition of the Historia australis comprising every redaction known, is being prepared by Julia Knödler, University of Regensburg.
⁵ Aeneae Sylvii Piccolominei Senensis [...] Opera que extant omnia [...], (Basel: Henrich Petri, 1551; again 1571; reprint Frankfurt 1967).
⁶ Enee Sylvii Piccolominei postea Pii Pape opera geographica et historia cum praefatione de eiusdem vita et libris tum editis tum manuscriptis (Frankfurt / Leipzig: J. M. Sustermann, 1707). The 1707 edition is a reprint of an earlier
material. In the last decades, there was a translation of the Asia into Spanish; several articles dealt with particular questions, and two essays discussed the formation and the sources of the Europa and Asia. We lack studies on Aeneas Silvius’s concept of history, on the incentives which brought him to the writing of historiography and geo-historiography, and on the purposes he had in mind when doing so. The present paper on the Asia does not aspire to a comprehensive study of this kind, but it restricts itself to developing some preliminary remarks on the problems hinted at above.

When I was selecting the basic text from which to elicit my argumentation, I decided for the Asia, and not the Europa, for edition (1699), also by Sustermann: Aeneae Sylvii Piccolominei postea Pii Papae opera geographica et historia (Helmstadt: J. M. Sustermann, 1699). A critical edition of De Europa with German translation and commentary by B. K. Vollmann et al. is far advanced and should be available in 2003.

But see in this volume the article by Margaret Meserve.


two reasons. First, its author is no longer Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini but Pope Pius II (1458-1464). Most of the copyediting of the *Asia* was probably done in 1461,\(^\text{11}\) whereas the *Europa*, finished in 1458,\(^\text{12}\) must have been planned and executed mostly during the reign of Pius’s predecessor Calixtus III (1455-1458)\(^\text{13}\). This leads to an intriguing question: how does the religious leader of the Latin church cope with at least twelve centuries of Christian historiography which had as its guideline the *oeconomia salutis*, i.e. the idea of a sequence of events, pre-known and predisposed by God, beginning with the creation of mankind and ending with Doomsday? The *Europa*, at least, seems to be the product of a ‘secular’ mind: there is no theological *Sinngebung* of history in the traditional patristic and medieval way. Instead, in the *Europa*, we more often than not encounter plain and not rarely humorous descriptions of territories, peoples and events. The question is whether Pope Pius can treat his material just as Aeneas Silvius did, and if so, what does this mean for the development of his strikingly new concept of history? My second reason for choosing the *Asia* is that it links up history with geography even more uncompromisingly than the *Europa*, and it is particularly this linkage that I will comment upon.

There is a long tradition of historiography connected to geography. It begins with the Ionic logographers and Herodotus, reappears again, remarkably altered, in the *Imagines mundi*-encyclopædias of the Middle Ages, and lingers on in the sixteenth century in works such as Hartmann Schedel’s *Weltchronik*\(^\text{14}\) or Sebastian Münster’s *Cosmographie*.\(^\text{15}\)

At the same time, however, historiography is making efforts

15 *Cosmographei oder beschreibung aller laender / herschafften / fünnemsten stetten / geschichten / gebreüchen / hantierungen etc. jetzt zum dritten mal trefflich sere durch Sebastianum Munsterum gemeret vnd gebettert / in weldlichen vnd natürlichen historien [...]* (Basel: Henrich Petri, 1550).
to rid itself of its Siamese twin. These efforts, of course, can also be traced back as far as Herodotus. It is true that Herodotus starts from geographic realities, but he then concentrates on the events which occurred in the region with which he is dealing. When Thucydides describes the particular physical features of Attica in the opening chapter of his Peloponnesian War, he does so in order to explain its attraction to immigrants, which thus caused the growth of Athens and its subsequent rise to power. On the other hand, Ptolemy and Strabo intersperse much historical lore into their writings, as Pliny does in his Naturalis historia. No-one, however, would on this account call them writers of historiography: obviously the former are geographers, and the latter is a naturalist. In the medieval imago mundi literature, history and geography are again tied together but more strongly as a result of the Christian attitude towards both fields of knowledge, given the high esteem of the world as God’s creation. The form of the world was shaped in the six days of creation, and it is this world in which the history of human salvation takes place. The oeconomia salutis starts in the earthly paradise (paradisus terrestris) of the Euphrates and the Tigris, and it moves on to Noah’s three sons who are the ancestors of all peoples and tribes of the world according to the Biblical table of peoples (Genesis 11). This historia salutis is then intimately connected to the series of empires whose historical evolution is insolubly linked with their geographic position: Babylon and Assyria, Persia, Macedonia and, finally, Rome. For the Last Judgment, Christ will descend from the Heavens to Jerusalem, the geographic centre of the earth, in order to put to an end all earthly reigns and even history itself.

To write universal history as the history of salvation, as the history of God’s love for mankind, allows the fashioning of a comprehensive system into which everything can be integrated. It is, therefore, not surprising that the humanist Hartmann Schedel, when he devised his late fifteenth-century Weltchronik, still employed the well established pattern of the six aetates mundi as a frame to be filled in with Biblical narratives as well as with geographical and historical information. The latter he took mostly from authors of classical Antiquity but also occasionally from contemporary sources such as Aeneas Silvius
Piccolomini. Thus the Biblical story about the streams of Paradise not only occasions the description of the Euphrates and the Tigris but also of the Ganges, the Nile and the oceans and all of this with reference to Strabo, Solinus and Pliny. In another example, Schedel concludes his description of the recolonization of the earth after the Flood with a paragraph on the *hominès monstruosi* of India and with the Ptolemean world map. The story of the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11) is followed by an elaboration on the Scythians and the Amazons. The history of Abraham leads to the history of Trèves because this city was founded at about the same time by Trebeti, brother of King Ninus, and so on. Schedel’s concept is very simple, and yet very ingenious. He conveys to his reader the well-known and therefore trust-inspiring fundamental pattern of history as the history of salvation, and at the same time he communicates the old and new geographical and ethnological knowledge which he had gleaned partially from travel books such as Niccolo de Conti’s, partially from rediscovered or newly translated sources such as Strabo’s *Geographica*. It stands to reason that the attractive union of old certainty and intriguing novelty which was besides illustrated opulently made the book such a success.

Piccolomini’s *Asia* is different. He calls it a *historia* and he really means it to be regarded as such; but he consistently renounces the *historia salutis* pattern. This must have been unusual, even strange to fifteenth-century readers. Certainly, they were used to dispensing with a religious framework in the histories of cities and princes, bishoprics or monasteries, but not in a *historia* or *chronica mundi*.

Pope Pius II was well aware of his deviation, and, according to the preface of the *Asia*, he expected to be harshly criticized, in the first place because as a pope he should have known better than to waste his time with earthly things, and secondly because the contents and the form of his work would appear to his clerical brethren to be less than satisfactory.

16 Schedel, *Buoch der Cronicken*, fos. 7v-8r.
17 Schedel, *Buoch der Cronicken*, fos. 12r-13r.
19 Schedel, *Buoch der Cronicken*, fos. 20v-23r.
A brief glimpse at the contents and the method of the book shows the following. Taking up more than 100 pages of the Basel Opera omnia edition, the Asia gives a description of countries and their populations from Asia Minor to China. The author segments Asia into six parts: three parts to be found above the ‘Taurus’ mountains, and three parts below – meaning by ‘Taurus’ the continuous chain of mountains on Ptolemy’s world map which, running parallel to the latitudes, extends from Asia Minor to China and comprises in modern nomenclature: Taurus, the highlands of Iran and Afghanistan, the Hindu Kush, Karakoram, the Himalayas and the mountains of West China. Piccolomini knew quite well that these mountain ranges east of Turkey had proper names in ancient sources as well as in contemporary literature, but in his opinion all mountains of the world hang together. For this reason he also interprets the African ‘moon mountain’ – the lune mons: ‘Kilimanjaro’? – and the European Pyrenees, the Alps and the Carpathians as spurs of the Taurus. In the north of the Asian ‘Taurus’, there are three regions: 1. the region of the Seres (inhabitants of North China); 2. the territory between the Caspian Sea and the Sea of Azov; 3. the provinces of Parthia and Media (North Iran), Armenia and Asia Minor north of the Taurus. The three southern regions comprise: 1. India, Taprobane (Sri Lanka) and the country of the Sinae (South China); 2. the territories between the Indus and the Tigris, i.e. Afghanistan, South Iran, East Iraq; 3. the region between the Tigris and the Mediterranean, i.e. West Iraq, North Arabia, South Arabia, Syria, Palestine and Asia Minor south of the Taurus.

21 *Asia*, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, pp. 286 f. (ch. 8).
22 Cf. L. Pagani’s Facsimile of the Ptolemy Codex Naples, Bibl. Naz., Cod. lat. V F. 32: *Ptolemäus, Cosmographia. Das Weltbild der Antike*, (Stuttgart, 1990), pl. I. According to Pagani (p. x) the Codex was probably manufactured in 1466; it can, therefore, not have been used by Pius II. He must, however, have had at hand not only the designs of the cartographer Girolamo Bellavista, who was in the pope’s service from 1460 onwards, but also a Ptolemy manuscript; see Casella, ‘Pio II tra geografia e storia’, pp. 78-80.
Any geographer – probably not only the modern geographer – will discover incongruities in a partition of this kind: for example those of North and South China, and of North Iran and Iraq, and South Iran and Iraq. Most remarkably, however, Asia Minor is neither regarded nor treated as a physical and cultural unit; perhaps even the author himself took offence at the artificial Taurus borderline. In any case, he changed his own modus procedendi at the end of the book. According to the partitioning given above, there should have been two ‘journeys’ from east to west: firstly, the northern route from North China to northern Asia Minor – this route was realized in chapters 9 to 86 – and, secondly, the southern belt from South China to southern Asia Minor. Instead, Piccolomini treated the latter from chapter 87 on, immediately after describing northern Asia Minor, thus unifying both regions. The rest of the southern belt of Asia from China to Palestine is lacking, and likewise the description of Africa which had originally also been an objective is omitted. Sickness, weariness and a lack of time may have played a part in this omission, but that the papal author was so resolute on doing Asia as a whole may also be explained on different grounds, and this explication has to do with the fundamental intent of his work. This issue will be discussed below.

The division of the Asia given above might give the impression that Piccolomini wrote a cosmographia, a descriptio habitabilis orbis, and not a book of history. A glimpse at the method of description adopted by him seems to confirm such an impression. Here is a token paragraph from chapter 33 (De maiori Media, i.e. North Iran).  

Media lies between the fourth and the fifth zone. The latitude which intersects the Dardanelles touches the northern part of Media and traverses the region around the Caspian Sea. The country of the Medes was once very rich; this is evident from the tribute they paid to the Persians, coming to twice that which the latter collected from the Cappadocians. In any case, Strabo asserts that besides silver they annually delivered 1500 horses, 2000 mules

---

24 Cf. the original closing of Asia in: Casella, ‘Pio II tra geografia e storia’, p. 47.
25 Asia, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 315.
and 5000 sheep. The Macedonians founded several Greek cities, i.e. Laodicea, Apamia and Rhaga near Rhages, the former Aropolis. According to Apollodorus of ADRAMYTHION the Parthians built Arsacia about 500 stadia to the south of the Caspian Porte. Pliny claims that Media’s capital Ekbatana was founded by Seleucus some twenty miles from the Caspian Porte. The same author also seems to transmute the region of Margiana into Media, whereas Strabo plainly separates Margiana from Media. Pliny\textsuperscript{26} claims this region to be marvellously sunny and to be the only part of this province to produce wine. It is, he says, surrounded by lovely mountains and enclosed by a belt of 1500 stadia in perimeter, which is almost impenetrable on account of a scarcely viable sand desert which contains the city completely within a circuit of 120 miles. Alexander the Great was so enthralled by the lie of the land that he founded on it the first of his Alexandrias. Immediately after having been destroyed by the barbarians, it was reconstructed by Seleucus’s son who called it Seleucia after the name of his house. The perimeter of this city is 70 stadia; the river Margus runs through it.

This is clearly a \textit{cosmographia}: the cartographic definition of a region, the site and age of cities with exact indications of distance, including information about their foundation, size and geophysical qualities, and all of this with reference to Strabo and Pliny, two great authorities of classical antiquity. As to the former, we have to bear in mind that the Latin version of Strabo’s \textit{Geographica} was a novelty when Pius II began to write his \textit{Asia}. The translation had been commissioned by Pope Nicholas V (1447-1455), but it was not until 1458 that Guarino of Verona completed it. A preliminary version by Gregorius Tifernas in 1456 contained only books 11 to 17.\textsuperscript{27} Marginal notes in Pius II’s own hand prove that he had copies of both translations before him: the Guarino text in Vaticanus Reginensis latinus 1989, and the version by Gregory of Città di Castello in Vaticanus latinus 2051.\textsuperscript{28} It is thus not surprising that Aeneas Silvius leans heavily on this very author: we count no less than 78 quotations from Strabo in the \textit{Asia}.

\textsuperscript{26} Pliny, \textit{Naturalis historia}, pp. 6, 46 f.
\textsuperscript{27} Casella, ‘Pio II e gli Straboni latini’, p. 63.
\textsuperscript{28} Casella, ‘Pio II e gli Straboni latini’, p. 63.
Cosmography everywhere, and we cannot but ask ourselves whether Piccolomini knew what exactly he was promising when he decidedly spoke of his work as historia. He does so already in the second phrase of the preface — *historiam cum ueterum aliquorum tum nostrorum temporum* 29 — and shortly thereafter, where, using a well-known topos, he stresses the difference between poetry and historiography:

We shall not dish out falsities for truth because we are aware that there is nothing so contrary to historiography as lying. In poetry we expect fiction, in historiography, on the contrary, we expect truthfulness and earnestness.

In chapter 61 of *De maiori Phrygia* he writes:

In addition to this, Ptolemy mentions many more other cities. It would, however, be rather meaningless to enumerate them without telling their history. 30

Piccolomini, at the end of the preface, claims it to be his purpose to report ‘memorable things which have come to pass in our times, insofar as they came to our knowledge, premising some ancient lore’ in order to produce a history of the world segmented into geographic units. 31

Measured against our concept of history and historiography, Piccolomini misses his target. He not only lacks the fundamental impulse of the historian to explain why something happened,

---

29 Asia, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 281.
30 Asia, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 341: ‘quorum insipida est absque historia nominatio.’
31 Asia, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 282: ‘Scribendi ordo sic erit: quae propter nostrum aenium gesta sunt memoratu digna (quantum cognouimus) enarrare curabimus, prisca nonnulla praemittentes, quae uel cognitionem maiorem rerum, uel ornatum afferant. Digeremusque singula per sua loca, & ab orientali plaga facientes initium, per medias praunicias narratione deducta ad occiduas nostrasque oras remeabimus de locorum gentiumque natura & situ, quae videbantur necessaria, insentes. Et quoniam rerum, quas scribimus quase mortales agitant, campus est ipse terrarum orbitis, quatenus colitur cum interiectis & circunfusis aquis, paucu de ipso in communi attingenda sunt, priusquam parteis eius & locorum historiam aggrediamur.’
but he even renounces a continuous enumeration of the facts, that is to say, a chronologically arranged sequence of known and verifiable events relating to a certain city or territory. It is true that such a thing was largely impossible to accomplish in this special field at that time, and no-one will seriously fault him for not having enumerated the Chinese dynasties. Yet, Piccolomini does not give historical summaries even of those regions and places of which the necessary facts would have been easily available. He could have alleged that short summaries of this material would have made his work too voluminous, as might well have been the case. Nevertheless, the historical information which he does give often creates the impression of being rather casual, and it pictures an author jumping freely from one historical period to another. The geographer Sebastian Münster, whose Cosmographia was printed at the same time and in the same place as Piccolomini's first Opera omnia edition, is much more of a historian. He regularly inserts complete series of rulers into his geographical description of the territory in question, together with the years of their accession to government.

The question must be repeated: did Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini shipwreck as a historiographer? We would have to answer this question in the affirmative if it were to turn out that his selection of the things reported — every writer of history must necessarily select from the multitude of res gestae and res memoratae — was indeed incoherent, unspecific and meaningless, that is to say, that it would not allow for a universal vision of history. In my opinion, this is not the case. Many details which at first sight seem to be no more than 'interesting', when looked at more closely reveal the contours of a picture. The lines of this picture are neither the lines of historical evolution necessarily tending to a certain aim, nor are they the lines of a deductive-pragmatic explication of events. They are rather the lines of constantly recurring historical processes — such as the rise and fall of reigns — held together by the unifying idea of what history should come to, to be strictly distinguished from what history would come to.

No doubt Piccolomini's interpretation of history is also permeated by his belief that God created the world and mankind,
that evil and sin exist, and that Jesus Christ is our Saviour. There is, however, a big difference between Piccolomini’s idea and the patristic and medieval one. Piccolomini does not derive from these fundamental convictions an aetates structure of history. He does not describe history as a sequence of clearly defined periods which are directed towards specific goals. History does not have a recognizable, predictable or calculable aim in itself. The aim of history is to summon to moral activity because it is the sum of human activities on the stage of the inhabited earth: ‘The inhabited globe is the field where men accomplish the deeds we are going to describe.’\textsuperscript{32} Since Adam – who, incidentally, is mentioned only in connection with the geographical origin of mankind; original sin is not discussed – the activities of men are essentially the same, partially good, partially evil. These, however, do not take place on an earth whose surface is the same everywhere and which is, so to speak, devoid of differentiating factors. On the contrary, men act in certain larger or smaller spaces whose geographic and climatic proprieties contribute a great deal to the formation of different civilizations which, in turn, exert a decisive influence on the activities of each individual.

Now, if the \textit{Asia} intends to picture the variety of human actions, and if those actions are mostly determined by man’s natural predisposition (\textit{natura}) and by his natural and cultural surroundings, it is unnecessary to establish a chronological continuum in order to display human behaviour in history (\textit{res gestas}). If this is true, one may confidently jump from one epoch to another and glean models of behaviour with ‘random access’ now from this, now from that period. This does not imply a complete avoidance of the idea of \textit{oeconomia salutis}. History is still the history of salvation insofar as one may – as did pagan Antiquity – put a physiologically and morally sane world at the beginning in Paradise, whose vestiges are still detectable everywhere. History may also be interpreted as the history of salvation insofar as the redemption by Jesus Christ – never mentioned but ever presupposed – would make possible

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Asia}, ‘Praefatio’ in: Piccolomini, \textit{Opera omnia}, p. 282: ‘rerum quas scribimus quasque mortales agitant campus est ipse terrarum orbis, quatenus colitur.’
\end{footnote}
mankind's renewal if Christians were to live according to their faith and if the propagation of the Christian faith were not impeded by realms and peoples antagonistic to it. Thus Piccolomini pictures the earth as a place whose originally auspicious nature is still partially recognizable. At the same time he sees it as a place which expects the Gospel of Christ to be universally announced, and a place, also, where the sporadic good dispositions of men of different civilizations could be developed and made the starting point for achieving spiritual welfare.

These ideas, however, are not pronounced programmatically. We have to infer them from the insistency with which the above mentioned characteristic features are outlined in a variety of chapters. Piccolomini finds relics of paradisiacal times, or the ancient *aetas aurea* not only with peoples from a distant past such as the Hyperboreans or their neighbours, the Arimpeans, who fed from berries, hurt nobody, loved the quiet, took in asylum seekers and lead the lives of saints, but also in those of his own times such as the Albanians or the inhabitants of the region of Aria:

Each vine produces about ten gallons of wine, each figtree fifteen bushels. Corn grows out of the kernels which drop from its ears; honey originates from trees, oozing out of the leaves without human effort. From the towering cliffs, water spurs out in such a high arc over the small strip of beach into the Caspian Sea that the beach itself remains unaffected. The Arians go there for eating and sacrificing. They camp in the coves of the cliffs, they sunbathe below the cataract and sport in various ways. On one side extends the vast sea, on the other the coast stretches out, which, through its humidity gives birth to plenty of herbs and flowers.

Similar things are told of the Atocians in chapter 10, and we have already touched on the amenity of Seleucia. Again and again, Piccolomini mentions the fertility of a province and its

33 *Asia*, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 291 (ch. 15).
34 *Asia*, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 297 (ch. 19). The Albanians mentioned here live on the northwestern shore of the Caspian Sea. (See Ptolemy [mentioned in n. 22], pl. XVIII.) They are not to be confused with the Albanians of the Balkans.
peacefulness, the sense of justice and the hospitality of certain peoples. He detects traces of a once unspoilt nature among the Chinese – *hominis inter se mites et quietissimos*36 – nor does he forget to mention that the Semantini – who settle between the Chinese and the Indians – though all of them are servants of the pagan gods, in early morning, after having risen, turn to the sun, pray with folded hands and ask in their prayers for the help of the divine trinity: [...] *iunctisque manibus orare, in oratione trini Dei opem petere*.37

Piccolomini points out the function and importance of priests in the various cultures which he describes. Interestingly, he never does this in a pejorative way. He is able everywhere to find traces of a former, righteous human nature. Regrettably, however, these are clouded by moral corruption: cannibalism, robbery, economical and social exploitation, and most of all, stresses Piccolomini, by promiscuous sexual behaviour. If the Gospel of Christ were to be freely preached everywhere, man’s positive traits might be enhanced and made fruitful. The pagan priest would then learn to serve the true God. Men would be educated to justice, love and purity. Yet, even more than in the past, access to Asia has in the present been blocked: ‘the endless barbarian lands and a multitude of rulers bar the way; this will satisfy neither the friend of peace nor him who wishes to acquire knowledge of the shape of the earth.’38 Initially the Tatars had been a hindrance, now it is the Turks and Muslims together.

The Turks also dominate Asia Minor, that is to say, the region to which Piccolomini dedicates more than half of his book. The reason for his prolixity in this regard and for his deviation from the original disposition is not found only in the vaster resources of historical lore. He was especially able to demonstrate through this issue what had been foremost in his mind throughout the whole of his work: the disturbance of that process of the natural and divinely intended evolution of creation

36 Asia, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 287 (ch. 9).
37 Asia, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 288 (ch. 10).
38 Asia, in: Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 287 (ch. 10): ‘immensa barbaries iter claudit et imperantium multitudo, quam nemo probarit pacis amicus et qui orbis situm nosse cupiat.’
which is the propagation of Christian faith. Piccolomini mentions the important men and women of Antiquity for every city of Asia Minor: poets, philosophers, historiographers, naturalists. He then reports how a given city was won for Christianity and how Christian life subsequently blossomed there. Both classical and Christian cultures were extinguished by the Turks who forced Islam on its inhabitants and who, by cultural insouciance together with sexual licentiousness, destroyed once flourishing provinces. The reader of the Asia was supposed to feel shame and horror and to be induced to work to emend this regrettable course of history.

The vision of history in Piccolomini’s Asia is of fascinating modernity. No hint of an imminent apocalypse, no interpretation of the Turks as forerunners of the Antichrist, no calculation of the years left till Doomsday nor of the future in general. The Turkish expansion is a secular event: one of the numerous forays of nomadic tribes known to world history. It is an advance which can and must be met with wordly means. Piccolomini decidedly refuses to press facts into a preconceived system of interpretation, and he can thus achieve an elegance of writing which effortlessly brings together knowledge of Antiquity, medieval travel books and contemporary news. In this way he also conveys to the reader the liberty of reaching a judgment of his own. Piccolomini concedes to human nature more value of its own, both individually and socially, than do medieval chroniclers, and he permits himself a greater distance to his sources than they do. There is no trace of the crude fables not uncommon in Schedel’s Weltchronik, younger by half a century. The Asia is an impressive but not obtrusive piece of writing. Schedel made use of it as a quarry; but he did not allow himself to be inspired by it.

Certainly, after five centuries and a half, we cannot simply take over Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini’s positions as a whole. Still, his concern with human rights and the dignity of man evident in the Asia show our kinship to this well-read, wise and humane spirit, who after a day’s work as Pontifex Maximus, employed the nightly hours for meditating and writing on the history of men in east and west.
THE NEW LANDESGESCHICHTE:
AENEAS SILVIUS PICCOLOMINI ON AUSTRIA AND
BOHEMIA∗

Rolando Montecalvo

In June 1458, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini retired to the baths of Viterbo in search of relief from his gout. To while away the long summer hours, Aeneas – who within two months would be elected pope as Pius II – turned to his most beloved pastime, the writing of history. The fruit of his labors1 was the Historia

∗ This is an expanded version of a short paper presented at the second International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle, Utrecht, 16-21 July 1999.


Works of particular relevance to the Historia Bohemica include Fr. Palacky,
Bohemia, a stylish and concise account of that nation’s history, from its founding by the legendary Zechius (Czech) to the present, culminating in the tragic death of the young King Ladislaus in 1457.

Aeneas was able to compose a polished literary product in the short span of a few weeks, because his musings on Bohemia were shaped by many years of reflection on the subject and a continual engagement with the political vicissitudes of Central Europe during a twenty-year diplomatic career. His interest in Bohemia may have been sparked as early as 1433. As a young and ardent participant in the Council of Basel, he had witnessed the negotiations between the Council and the Bohemian delegation which arrived in that year to uphold their Hussite beliefs—beliefs the Hussites had defended successfully in more than a decade of military confrontation. Aeneas treated the Bohemian problem extensively in his history of the council, De rebus Basiliae gestis Commentarius. In later years, he frequently came into contact with Bohemian political life as a member of

Würdigung der alten böhmischen Geschichtsschreiber (Osnabrück, 1896); H. Kaminsky, ‘Pius Aeneas among the Taborites’, Church History 28 (1959), pp. 281-309; and, most recently, H. Rothe, ‘Enea Silvio de’ Piccolomini über Böhmen’, in: eds. H.-B. Harder and H. Rothe Studien zum Humanismus in den böhmischen Ländern (Cologne, 1988), pp. 141-156. There are also several commentaries in Czech, which were not accessible to me.

2 Aeneas’s first attempt at a literary rendition of Bohemia’s history, in the form of a letter (now lost) to his first employer, Cardinal Capranica, dates back to this conciliar period; cf. Opera quae extant omnia (facsimile reprint Frankfurt a. M., 1967), p. 83.

3 Although it is not clear whether Aeneas was present himself on this occasion, in both the Historia Bohemica and his De rebus Basiliae gestis Commentarius (see vol. 67, pp. 164ff. of Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini, ed. R. Wolkan, Fontes rerum Austriacarum: Österreichische Geschichts-quellen. 2. Abt., Diplomataria et Acta, 61 / 62 / 67 / 68 (Vienna, 1909 / 1909 / 1912 / 1918)) he describes the arrival of the delegation in Basel vividly, and Cardinal Cesarini’s exchange with them in detail.

4 This text (see n. 3 above) was written in 1450, well after Aeneas had abandoned his youthful conciliar convictions. In 1440 he had written a very different version, De gestis concilii Basiliensis Commentariorum libri II, which, however, did not touch on the Bohemian problem. The latter text is available in a critical edition with English translation by D. Hay and W. K. Smith (Oxford, 1967).
the imperial chancery of Frederick III. In 1451, he traveled to Bohemia and attended the diet at Beneschau (Benešov) as imperial spokesperson. In a detailed account of his journey,\(^5\) he described his stay at the Hussite stronghold of Tabor and his encounter with the regent,\(^6\) George Podiebrad, in Beneschau. In 1452, Aeneas was named apostolic legate for Bohemia by Pope Nicholas V; during his cardinalate (1456-1458) he shaped the Curia’s policy on the projected reconciliation with Hussite Bohemia.\(^7\) Aided by his keen memory and by his extensive correspondence, from which he was wont to cull descriptions and discussions for his lengthier historical works, Aeneas was able to draft his *Historia Bohemica* swiftly, as if this text had been stowed in his mind for years, fully formed and ready for issue.

Printed for the first time at Rome in 1475, the *Historia Bohemica* was widely read by historians in both Germany and Bohemia, and it influenced the understanding of Bohemian history, especially of the Hussite movement, for many generations. It enjoyed numerous editions during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and was translated into German, Czech and Italian.\(^8\) Today it is sometimes labeled a landmark in European historiography, the first humanist *Landesgeschichte* devoted to a region outside Italy.\(^9\) This essay will address primarily the formal innovations that the *Historia Bohemica* represented for the genre of the *Landesgeschichte* or regional history – innovations that stemmed both from Aeneas’s knowledge of contem-

\(^5\) In the form of a lengthy letter to Cardinal Juan Carvajal, dated 21 August 1451; see Wolkan, *Briefwechsel* (Fontes, vol. 68), pp. 22-57.

\(^6\) Podiebrad was only *de facto* regent of Bohemia in 1451. He was not officially granted this title by the Bohemian estates until April 1452.

\(^7\) Cf. Kaminsky, ‘Pius Aeneas among the Taborites’, p. 300.

\(^8\) Scholars have identified at least 26 manuscript copies of the *Historia Bohemica*; three printed editions in the fifteenth century and 19 more be-tween 1503 and 1766. For a catalogue of these, see H. Rothe, ‘Über die kritische Ausgabe der *Historia Bohemica* des Enea Silvio de’ Piccolomini’, in: eds. H.-B. Harder and H. Rothe, *Studien zum Humanismus in den böhmischen Ländern. Ergänzungsheft* (Cologne, 1991), pp. 29-48. The text was translated into German by P. Eschenloher in 1464; into Czech by Johann Huska in 1487, by Nicolaus Konac in 1510, and by Daniel Adam von Weleslawin in 1585; and into Italian by S. Fausto in 1545.

\(^9\) Thus, for example, Widmer, *Enea Silvio Piccolomini*, p. 90.
poratory humanist literary forms in Italy and from his interpretation of local chronicle traditions. As Hans Rothe has remarked, however, the *Historia Bohemica* cannot be understood in isolation, but rather ought to be interpreted with Aeneas's other literary works in mind, particularly his *Historia Friderici III imperatoris*, a complex unfinished text on which he labored between 1452 and 1458. Charting the changes in both content and historical approach between the *Historia Friderici* and the *Historia Bohemica* will reveal the manner in which Aeneas arrived at the definitive historical form which I am labeling *Landesgeschichte*.

The *Historia Bohemica* consists of a preface, in which the work is dedicated to King Alfonso of Naples, and seventy-two chapters. Chapter 1 provides a succinct geographical description of Bohemia. Chapter 2 discusses the origins of the Bohemian nation. Chapters 3-34 cover the early, medieval and recent history of Bohemia by following the successions of its rulers, down to the reign of Wenzel IV (1378-1419). The rise of the Hussite movement and the wars that followed occupy chapters 35-51. In this section, as in the remainder of the work, Aeneas is already narrating contemporary history, of which he had first-hand knowledge through his diplomatic activity. After a few pages on the death of Emperor Sigismund and the brief reign of Albrecht II, the story turns exclusively to the life and times of

---

11 On the *Historia Friderici* see V. Bayer, *Die Historia Friderici III imperatoris des Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini* (Prague, 1872); the introduction in Th. Ilgen’s translation, *Die Geschichte Kaiser Friedrichs III.*, in: *Die Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit* 85 and 87 (Leipzig, 1889); and H. Kramer, ‘Untersuchungen zur “Österreichischen Geschichte” des Aeneas Silvius’, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 45 (1931), pp. 23-69. The *Historia Friderici* was not included in the *Opera omnia* of 1551; it was not printed until 1685. The most dependable edition, which I use here, is edited by A. F. Kollar, *Analecta monumentorum omnis aevi vindobonensia* (Vienna, 1762), vol. II.
12 In the earliest surviving manuscript copies and in the *editio princeps* of 1475, the *Historia Bohemica* is divided into five books rather than into chapters. The division into chapters seems to have been applied in the 1489 Basel imprint, and was adopted in all subsequent editions, including the *Opera omnia* (Basel, 1551), used here. See Rothe, ‘Über die kritische Ausgabe’, pp. 34f.
the young Ladislaus Posthumous (ch. 58-72), concentrating on
the struggle between Austrian, Bohemian and Hungarian baro-
nial factions for control of his person (ch. 60-72), after he was
released from Emperor Frederick III’s wardship in 1452.

The Historia Bohemica is a biased and tendentious work in-
tended primarily to indict the evils of the Hussite heresy, as
Aeneas stated plainly in his preface. The narrative is also
plagued by numerous factual errors: František Palacky com-
plained that a whole book would have to be written merely to
correct Aeneas’s mistakes and inventions.\(^{13}\) Aeneas’s distor-
tions were in part deliberate, supporting either his condemna-
tion of the Hussites or the narrative exigencies of the text. 
Other errors, however, can be imputed to the shortcomings of
the sources he used to compose his history.

This brings us to the important issue of source criticism: for
the bulk of the early history of Bohemia (chapters 3-26),
Aeneas relied heavily on the fourteenth-century Chronicon Bo-
hemiae of Pulkawa (in its Latin version), and he took additional
information from the earlier rhyme chronicle of Dalmil.\(^{14}\) These
are most likely the same chroniclers to whom Aeneas referred
in his treatise De liberorum educatione, which he composed for
Ladislaus in 1450:

Beware of wasting time over such a subject as the history of Bo-
hemia or the history of Hungary. For such would be but the pro-
ductions of mere ignorant chroniclers, a farrago of nonsense and
lies, destitute of attraction in form, in style, or in grave reflec-
tions.\(^{15}\)

In the Historia Bohemica, he is no less critical of these sources.

\(^{13}\) Palacky, Würdigung. p. 246.

\(^{14}\) Aeneas obtained a copy of Pulkawa from Johann Tušek, head of the Pra-
gue chancery. Dalmil’s chronicle, completed in 1314, was a passionately na-
tionalist (i.e., anti-German) text in Czech, which Aeneas could not have read in its
original version: Tušek must have translated a few excerpts; cf. Palacky, Würdi-
gung, pp. 237 f. Pulkawa’s chronicle is available in a critical edition by J. Em-

\(^{15}\) This passage from W. H. Woodward’s translation of De liberorum edu-
catione in his Vittorino da Feltre and Other Humanist Educators (New York,
In chapter 2, following some ironic remarks on the habit of Bohemian historians to trace their ancestry as far back as the tower of Babel, he complains that

they report neither who their princes were at that time, nor who their king was [...] nor under which leader and by which adventures they came to Europe, nor at which time. The Scelavones [ancestors of the Bohemians] were there, they say, when the language of the earth entire was confused. A vain and laughable claim.16

In the subsequent chapter, which recounts the arrival in Bohemia of the founder of the nation, Czech, Aeneas moves on to a more exhaustive critique of Pulkawa’s text:

We do not agree with the chronicle of the Bohemians, according to which Czech and his whole family [...] survived entirely on chestnuts and wild fruit, because by then the use of nuts [for nourishment] had been abandoned; nor would I believe that such was the livelihood of men after the Great Flood. It seems more likely that Czech found a few farmers who subsisted on hunting and milk, and taught them to till the land, produce wheat, harvest crops and to eat bread; and thus subjected to himself these rough, wild men after having restored them to a more civilized life. Nor again do I lend credibility to the idea that all property was held in common then, and that both men and women walked about naked, for the climate in those regions is not such that a man could survive naked [...].17

In this passage Paul Joachimsen, the German historian of humanism, saw ‘ein Blick in eine neue Welt.’18 And indeed it is tempting to ascribe a flavor of ‘modernity’ to this excerpt, because textual criticism of this sort was practiced quite rarely north of the Alps in the 1450s.

We must be wary, however, of mistaking this passage for the painstaking source criticism that became characteristic of hu-

---

16 Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 84. All quotations from the Historia Bohemica are taken from this edition; the translation is mine.
17 Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 84.
18 Joachimsen, Geschichtsauffassung, p. 29.
manist scholarship in the sixteenth century, and which was being practiced, in rudimentary form, by Aeneas's contemporary, Flavio Biondo, who went to some lengths to collate his sources and solicited historical records from several Italian princes as he was composing his *Ab inclinatione imperii Romanorum decades*. Aeneas, although infected with an eagerness to uncover classical and medieval sources that was typical of early humanism, lacked the time, dedication and scholarly diligence to attempt a comprehensive study of source material. Moreover, when he had to cross-reference his sources with classical or medieval texts, he often relied on hastily written notes and on memory because he could not afford to purchase or commission copies of codices and rare manuscripts. Aeneas's brand of historical criticism, then, arose less from careful scrutiny and compilation of sources than from an acute awareness of historical *decorum* or propriety, that is, an innate sense for historical verisimilitude, for what could reasonably be believed in the context of a particular age. The belief in verisimilitude as a route to verity in both historical narration and historical critique was of course a hallmark of the early Florentine humanism of Coluccio Salutati and Leonardo Bruni; it was also the basis of Valla's common-sense approach in his celebrated attack on the so-called *Donation of Constantine*. These humanists relied heavily on Roman rheto-


20 Cf. Aeneas's letter to Johann Hinderbach, dated 1 June 1451, in which he reports that he had found a history in the library of St Paul cathedral in London, which he erroneously believed to be a Latin translation of Thucydides (Wolkan, *Briefwechsel* (Fontes, vol. 68), p. 11). Or, again, a letter to Cardinal Juan Carvajal a few years later, in which he informs him that he found a copy of Jordanes's *History of the Goths* in the Gottweih monastery library (Wolkan, *Briefwechsel* (Fontes, vol. 68), p. 115).


23 In *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione*, Valla used conjecture to estimate how Constantine's heirs, the Roman senate and Pope Syl-
ric in their practice of history, subordinating historical narration to the art of epideictic oratory. And no rhetorical precept was more closely observed than Quintilian's requirement that, for best effect, historical narration ought to be above all plausible, more readily believable than truth itself. It was primarily on this assessment of plausibility that Aeneas's examination of medieval chronicles relied.

This suggests merely that Aeneas's approach to historical inquiry was in line with that of his Italian contemporaries. His execution, however, demonstrates the limitations of the verisimilar technique as a mode of historical analysis. The verisimilar approach was most useful when applied to the remote past and to the fabulous tales of origin: in this case, it showed that the ancient Bohemians could not have subsisted on nuts, and could not possibly have survived without garments. But it yielded no results for the later periods of Bohemian history. Indeed, after this promising beginning, the critical impetus disappears altogether from the Historia Bohemica. As Palacky noted, in the remainder of the early history of Bohemia, Aeneas accepted and repeated all the fables and errors supplied by his sources, without questioning or correcting them. For example, he recited without comment the popular story of Libussa, who foretold and orchestrated her own marriage to the plowman Premysl, thus founding the dynasty of the Premyslides. Similarly, he retold in its entirety and with great narrative gusto the fable of Valascia and her followers, who ruled Bohemia for seven years more Amazonum – an episode that must have piqued his interest because of its precedents in classical literature.

It remains unclear why Aeneas did not pursue his criticism of
Bohemian accounts beyond pre-history. Perhaps this required too great an effort from him and would have hindered the rapid completion of his text, the focus of which was predominantly on contemporary events relating to the Hussite issue. For the most part, Aeneas seems to have been content to peruse and re-cycle one or two medieval sources, criticizing the inconsistencies and distortions in their treatment of the earliest times, but ultimately perpetuating their fables. This is especially clear in the Historia Friderici, the immediate precursor to the Historia Bohemica. In the Historia Friderici, Aeneas began his history of the Austrian duchy by subjecting a popular local fourteenth-century chronicle – the so-called Chronik von den 95 Herrschaften by Leopold of Vienna – to a relentless critique. Here Aeneas’s invective against his source is more virulent and extensive, including pejorative remarks directed at its author, whom he calls a ‘two-legged ass’. Aeneas censures him for his lack of geographical accuracy in stating whence the first inhabitants of Austria came; for asserting that these first Austrians, pagans who had come from ‘beyond the sea’, had Jewish and Christian names like ‘Abraham’ and ‘Susanna’; for giving them titles, such as ‘count’ and ‘margrave’, which were unknown in those distant times; and for labelling regions with modern names, such as ‘Bohemia’ and ‘Hungary’, which had not come into use until after the demise of the Roman empire. Despite this display of critical acumen, however, Aeneas admitted: ‘I do not know who first cultivated Austrian soil: my

26 The inability to carry out real research on the intermediate period between origins and contemporary events was characteristic of much Greek and Roman historiography, i.e. of Aeneas’s stylistic paradigms; cf. A. Momigliano, The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography (Berkeley, 1990), pp. 80-108.

27 Authorship of this text, also known as Chronica patriae in the fifteenth century, is still disputed. Recent scholarship attributes it to the Augustinian monk Leopold of Vienna, who most likely wrote it in the early 1390s. For a concise but thorough discussion of this issue, see P. Uiblein, ‘Die Quellen des Spätmittelalters’, in: ed. E. Zöllner, Die Quellen der Geschichte Österreichs (Vienna, 1982), pp. 100ff. A critical edition of the Chronik von den 95 Herrschaften edited by J. Seemüller is available in Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Hannover, 1909), vol. VI.

28 Kollar, Historia Friderici, p. 17.
inquiries into this matter have yielded no definitive results. He had no other sources with which to correct Leopold’s text. Forced by the chronological demands of his narrative, he ultimately reiterated Leopold’s version of history, at least up to the events of the late eleventh century, for which he could turn to Otto von Freising’s *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus*. His last comment on Leopold’s text introduces as ‘fabulous’ the story of the eleventh-century feud between Leopold II of Austria and his brother Albrecht (Adalbert), but after reporting it almost word for word, Aeneas gives no indication why this story should be considered false.

Texts such as the *Historia Bohemica* and the *Historia Friderici* may have suggested the need for assessing the trustworthiness of medieval chronicles, but Aeneas’s message was no doubt limited by the absence of a consistent method for such a text-critical undertaking. In both works, his critical methodology – his ‘flüchtige Manier’, as Ilgen put it – consisted of a mixture of common sense reliant on verisimilarity, etymological probes, and the occasional reference to classical or medieval texts, when he felt them applicable. Thus, his critical remarks on the sources he consulted, while perspicacious and indicative of a sharp sense for historical *decorum*, remained inimitable.

30 Aeneas’s appreciation of Otto is well documented: he is credited with ‘rediscovering’ this author and bringing his works into the mainstream of German historical discourse; cf. Worstbrock, ‘Piccolomini’, p. 663, and, more exhaustively, the first chapter in B. Schürmann, *Die Rezeption der Werke Ottos von Freising im 15. und frühen 16. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden, 1986).
32 The closest Aeneas ever came to spelling out a method for source criticism was in his little-read *Dialogus* of 1453, in which one of the interlocutors (Bernardino da Siena) states that not all that is written ought to be be-lieved: one must first consider who the author was; what his beliefs were; which other records agree with his version of events; and whether what he says is plausible within the context of the time and place he describes. The *Dialogus* was printed at Rome in 1475, but escaped the attention of future editors of Aeneas’s works. It is printed with the title *Tractatus* in: ed. J. Cugnoni, *Aeneae Silvii Piccolomini Senensis […] opera inedita*, Atti della reale Accademia dei Lincei, III, 8 (Rome, 1883), pp. 234-299, the relevant passage on page 255. About the *Dialogus* see also Voigt’s comments: *Enea Silvio de’ Piccolomini*, vol. II, pp. 292ff. and 312.
Above all, Aeneas was primarily a rhetorician, to whom factual accuracy in historical narration mattered less than the meaning (political or ethical) with which history could be endowed. The Petrarchan dictum that ‘it is better to will the good than to know the truth’ is certainly descriptive of Aeneas’s historical oeuvre. The goal of the Historia Bohemica was to demonstrate the mischief of heresy and, to a lesser extent, to position Aeneas as the foremost expert on this crucial political and religious issue on the eve of the new conclave. His historical writing was thus primarily rhetorical in nature, revealing his indebtedness to Leonardo Bruni’s school of thought, i.e., to the belief that history’s most fundamental quality was its exemplary utilitas as a vehicle for the inculcation of moral and spiritual values and the inspiration to right conduct.  

Surely, if Aeneas’s work represents an original contribution to fifteenth-century history-writing, this must lie in the form of the Historia Bohemica rather than in its unfulfilled source criticism, namely, in his interpretation of the genre of the Landesgeschichte (or Landeschronik). The difficulty of translating this term into English – alternatives include national history, territorial history, regional history – points to the elusiveness of the very notion of a regional historiography. Peter Johanek concluded that ‘vorerst […] muß man sich für den Begriff regionale Historiographie mit einer eher vagen Umschreibung


34 To wit, Bruni was the only humanist included in Aeneas’s unfinished De viris illustribus, written between 1440 and 1450. It has been printed recently in a critical edition by A. van Heck (Vatican City, 1991).

35 This ‘rhetorical’ history was deplored by Burckhardt as ‘insipid and conventional’, so preoccupied with classical form as to be lacking in sincerity (The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy (1860), New York, 1995), p. 178). More recently, however, it has been rehabilitated by several scholars as a valid form of historical writing capable of a compelling representation of the past. See especially D. J. Wilcox, The Development of Florentine Humanist Historiography in the Fifteenth Century (Cambridge, 1969). For a review of the notion of utilitas in fifteenth-century theoretical discussions of history, see G. Cotroneo, I trattatisti dell’ ‘ars historica’ (Naples, 1971).
begnügen.³⁶ Regional historiography in the later Middle Ages appears in too many different guises (city chronicles, histories of convents, genealogical tables, etc.) to warrant a concise definition. By any account, however, it is misleading to group together Landesgeschichte and city history under the generic rubric 'local history'³⁷ because of the fundamentally different political institutions which these genres represent. The history of the city was the principal historiographic model furnished by Antiquity; its dependence on a single institution – the urbs – provided history with a natural chronological framework (from the foundation of the city to the present) and a readily identifiable focus. Although city history could encompass events in the territories subject to the urbs, such events were mere extensions of the inner political dynamic of the city. This model was revived, with great success, by Leonardo Bruni in the fifteenth century. To the extent that they were available to them, historians of the late Middle Ages and the early Renaissance could also borrow other historiographic models from classical literature, such as biography (Suetonius, Plutarch), and the chronicles of campaigns and momentous events (Thucydides, Xenophon, Caesar, Sallust). What Antiquity did not provide, however, was a precedent for the Landesgeschichte: the history of a region and the ruling dynasties associated with it.

The origins of regional history-writing in Germany have been traced to the development of territorial sovereignty – and, consequently, localized dynastic interests – in the High Middle Ages.³⁸ The consolidation of dynastic territorial rule in the later Middle Ages brought about an ever closer identification of the


³⁷ See, for example, H. Grundmann, Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter. Gattungen-Epochen-Eigenart (Göttingen, 1987), pp. 45-48; and Momigliano, The Classical Foundation, p. 85, who suggests that Renaissance historians were not cognizant of the distinction between the history of a city and that of a nation or territory.

political elite with their territories – a feeling of regional or national identity that found expression in territorial historiography.\textsuperscript{39} Regional chronicles thus became the most characteristic historiographic product of the time,\textsuperscript{40} alongside the ever popular universal historical compendia, which were often organized along parallel papal and imperial genealogies.\textsuperscript{41} But, as Johanek has shown, most regional histories of this period were written against the conceptual backdrop of universal history, i.e., they were conceived as inserts or appendices in universal chronicles that spanned all human activity, from creation to the present. Leopold’s chronicle, for example, which Aeneas used for the \textit{Historia Friderici}, adopted the traditional division of history into seven ages, five before and two after the birth of Christ. It began with Adam’s and Eve’s expulsion from the earthly paradise, and only midway through the first book did the author turn to ‘das edel land ze Oesterreich.’ From Book II onwards, the sequel of Austrian ‘Herrschafen’ ran roughly parallel to passages on papal and imperial succession.

Other regional chroniclers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, such as Hans Ebran von Wildenberg and Ulrich Füetner, also wrote their territorial chronicles in conjunction with Roman or Biblical history. Andreas von Regensburg is no exception: his \textit{Chronica de principibus terrae Bavarorum} was intended as an addendum to his earlier \textit{Chronica pontificum et imperatorum Romanorum}; Andreas himself underscored this connection in the prologue to the Bavarian chronicle.\textsuperscript{42} Similarly, Aeneas’s contemporary Thomas Ebendorfer wrote his \textit{Chronica Austriæ} to complement his \textit{Chronica regum Romana-}


\textsuperscript{40} Grundmann, \textit{Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter}, p. 46.

\textsuperscript{41} The primary model for a universal history divided into seven ages of man and four universal monarchies, and patterned according to a theological world order, was the \textit{Speculum historiale} by the Dominican monk Vincent of Beauvais (†1264). The corresponding prototype of imperial and papal chronology was furnished by another Dominican, Martin von Troppau (†1278); cf. Joachimsen, \textit{Geschichtsauffassung}, pp. 3ff.; and Grundmann, \textit{Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter}, pp. 18ff.

\textsuperscript{42} Johanek, ‘Weltchronistik und regionale Geschichtsschreibung’, p. 292.
norum: the Austrian text was meant to be the seventh and final book of the imperial chronicle. But when his patron, Frederick III, complained about the excessive length of the Chronica regum Romanorum, Ebendorfer was forced to write a summary of it, which he appended to the lengthy original. This left no room for the Chronica Austriae, which thus became an independent text.\footnote{Cf. A. Lhotsky’s introduction to his critical edition of Chronica Austriae, in: Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, Nova series 13 (Berlin, 1967).}

When Aeneas Silvius set about writing his territorial history of Bohemia, he could not look to Antiquity for a template. The works of his humanist contemporaries in Italy (Bruni, Valla, Biondo) may have served as examples of new approaches to historiography: purposeful and eloquent in Bruni’s case, detailed and scholarly in Biondo’s, critical in Valla’s. Above all, however, Aeneas turned to local sources, as he had done for the Historia Friderici, and tried to shape their crude form into a new historical mold, first and foremost by garnishing his writing with that condimentum scripturarum so dear to his humanist taste. In both the Historia Bohemica and the Historia Friderici he preserved the dynastic pattern of his sources, proceeding through time by way of each land’s rulers. But he deviated from them significantly by rejecting the universal-historical framework as a basis for regional history. Indeed, the chronology of Bohemia begins when Czech arrives in the geographic space—thoughtfully delineated in the initial chapter—that will become Bohemia. The history of the barbaric Germans who inhabited those regions prior to Czech’s arrival is unimportant to Aeneas. This despite his earlier remark, in chapter 1, that ‘[this] region was once German, and was gradually taken over by the Bohemians’, for which he had found confirmation in Strabo.\footnote{Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 83.}

The life of Czech and his clan prior to their migration to Bohemia is also given short shrift: following Dalmil and Pulkawa, Aeneas merely notes that Czech was ‘fleeing both judgement and vengeance for having committed murder at home.\footnote{Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 84.} However, whence Czech came is never discussed, whereas Dalmil
and Pulkawa had given Croatia as his home and traced his ancestry back to the Slavones or Sclavones, who had inhabited the fields of Sennar when the tower of Babel was built. Indeed, Aeneas wrote off altogether the question of the origins of peoples:

The Bohemians, desirous, like other mortals, of declaring as ancient an origin as possible, claim to be the descendants of the Sclavii, who are believed to have been among those who built the famous tower of Babel after the Great Flood [...]. I have not yet read another author [...] who ascribed so remote an origin to his people. Many among the Germans consider themselves noble enough to have originated from the Romans, the Romans in turn pride themselves on having descended from the Greeks. The Franks, who were also Germans, said that they were of Trojan blood. Likewise it is the pride of the Britons to affirm that a certain Brutus, having set out in exile, engendered their lineage. But the Bohemians begin much earlier, and boast that they are descended from the very confusion of the tower of Babel [...] Those who wish to outdo the Bohemians by seeking the nobility of their origins in such ancient times, will easily trace their beginnings not just to the tower of Babel, but to Noah’s ark, to the earthly paradise, to the first parents, to the very womb of Eve, whence we all came. We shall dismiss such old wives’ tales [...].

The very notion that the chronicles of old and the time-honored fables of origination that they perpetuated must be viewed with a skeptical eye and challenged in their every assertion had few precedents. Nevertheless, judging from the rich repertory of territorial histories written in Germany in the decades following Aeneas’s mission there, his reproach of such fables found only unwilling listeners. Matthias von Kemnat and Veit Arnpeck,

46 The tradition of tracing Bohemia’s ancestry to the tower of Babel dated back to Cosmas, its earliest chronicler (see below). However, it was Dalmil who introduced Croatia as Czech’s place of origin, and provided a reason for his departure from that region. Cf. Fr. Graus, Lebendige Vergangenheit: Überlieferung im Mittelalter und in den Vorstellungen vom Mittelalter (Cologne, 1975), p. 91.
47 Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 84.
48 On Matthias von Kemnat see K. A. Hofmann, Quellen zur Geschichte Friedrichs I. des Siegreichen, Kurfürsten von der Pfalz (Aalen, 1969 reprint);
to name but two historians who read and extensively used the *Historia Bohemica*, remained faithful to the Bavarian myth of Bavarus, who had come from Armenia (long before the birth of Christ or the war of Troy, according to Matthias), and of the second colonization of Bavaria by Norix, the son of Hercules.

However, with his contemptuous dismissal of the fables of origination from historical discourse, Aeneas did more than introduce skepticism into the evaluation of popular *origo gentis* myths; more importantly, he proposed a new configuration for the genre of regional history. As Leonardo Bruni had done for urban history, he stressed that a *Landesgeschichte* ought to begin not with Creation, nor with Biblical events, nor with the Trojan war or other myths of classical Antiquity, but rather with the point in time at which a geographic region was first occupied by the ethnic group that inhabited it in the author’s present. The true beginning of Bohemia was the arrival of Czech and his kinfolk in that territory so accurately described at the outset. Thus the *Landesgeschichte* was rendered independent of the prevailing universal-historical model, which was replaced as the basis for historical narration by a new matrix: geography.49

Aeneas’s geographical description of Bohemia was neither a vain display of erudition nor an indulgence in a personal scholarly interest, but rather a functional element in the history of a kingdom – indeed the defining parameter of this historical genre. The description of Austria in the *Historia Friderici* was unprecedented: the author of Aeneas’s main source, the *Chronik von den 95 Herrschaften*, had made no attempt whatsoever to provide a physical definition of the duchy. Bohemian historiography, on the other hand, had been endowed with a geo-


49 The archetype of humanist geography was, of course, Flavio Biondo’s *Italia illustrata*, a work with which Aeneas was no doubt well acquainted. Aeneas was also a careful reader of Biondo’s history of the Middle Ages, the *Decades*, of which he wrote an abbreviated version (*Supra decades Blondi epitome*, pp. 144-281 in Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*). As Rinaldi (‘Pio II e il soggetto nella storia’, p. 283) has suggested, Aeneas’s own work represents a fusion of Biondo’s historical and geographic interests.
graphical description by one of the earliest known Bohemian historians: Cosmas, deacon of St Veit cathedral in the early twelfth century. At the beginning of his Chronica boemorum, Cosmas had offered a vague definition of Bohemia as an eastern portion of Germany, 'encircled all around by mountains', followed by a vision of the land in its most pristine state, untouched by man or plough, abounding in forests, fresh water, fauna, as it appeared to its first ruler Boemus (Czech), who took possession of it after a panegyric rich in Virgilian and Biblical overtones.

Aeneas had only an indirect acquaintance with the chronicle of Cosmas, in that it formed the basis of Pulkawa’s. The latter, however, lacked any attempt at a geographical description upon which Aeneas might have based his own. In any case, Aeneas went well beyond the simple delineation of boundaries offered by Cosmas. The geographical descriptions that open the Historia Bohemica and the Historia Friderici not only outline the respective territories in terms of their bordering nations, mountains and rivers; they also contain information on the agricultural and natural products of each region; and portrayals of the major cities (Prague and Vienna), followed by (mostly disparaging) remarks on the social mores of their inhabitants, both noble and common. Aeneas’s particularly explicit depiction of Vienna in the Historia Friderici became quite famous in his

50 There are, however, partial traces of a much earlier geo-political identification of Bohemia; cf. J. Dobiaš, ‘Seit wann bilden die natürlichen Grenzen von Böhmen auch seine politische Landesgrenze?’, Historia 6 (1963), pp. 5-44. On Cosmas, see Palacky, Würdigung, pp. 1-35; and, more recently, N. Kersken, Geschichtsschreibung im Europa der 'nationes': Nationalgeschichtliche Gesamtdarstellungen im Mittelalter (Cologne, 1995), pp. 573ff.
52 Here, too, Aeneas brought to bear on German territorial historiography one of the most recognizable traits of Florentine humanism (which had in Brunì’s Laudatio florentinae urbis a paragon of urban description), and of Biondo’s Italia illustrata. Aeneas was also known for his description of Basel (the first version of this in a letter to Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini, dated July 1434; cf. Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 67), pp. 28-38). His earliest description of
own time, offering a vivid image of life, social customs and commerce in the Austrian capital. With a keen eye for detail, Aeneas described the streets, churches and houses of the city; the university; the composition of the city council; the tremendous influx of victuals, especially wine, into the city, including an estimate of the emperor’s income deriving from taxation of wine sales; and the social and sexual habits of the citizens. In the more succinct Historia Bohemica, he limited his sketch of Prague to a few essential facts, but also highlighted in brief Kutna, Pilsen, Litomerice, Budweis, Broda, and other towns. Aeneas thus aspired not to a mere topography of his subject, but to a comprehensive cultural and ethnographic sketch – a sketch that would enable the physical contours of the land and the character of its people to contribute to the history of a nation, otherwise dominated by the deeds of its rulers.

In his ethnographic endeavor, Aeneas was no doubt inspired by the Germania of Tacitus. The only known codex of this text had arrived in Rome from the Benedictine abbey at Hersfeld near Fulda in 1455, and Aeneas was one of the first scholars to have access to it. In 1457, in response to the accusations of extortion and greed leveled at the Roman Curia by Martin Mayer, the secretary of the Archbishop of Mainz, Aeneas drafted his own Germania.53 He praised the cities, bishoprics and principalities of Germany, and Germany’s cultural and religious accomplishments, hospitality, and industriousness. His attempt at capturing the traits of its land and people mirrored that of Tacitus while underscoring the tremendous progress (effected by the influence of Christianity) made by the Germans since the savagery of the barbaric times about which Tacitus had written. Significantly, the social and cultural change undergone by Germany was accompanied by an equally dramatic shift in its geographic form: Germany was now a powerful nation that had by far exceeded the limits set on it by the geographers of Antiquity. The traditional boundaries formed by the Rhine, Da-

Vienna dates to his first visit to that city in April 1438 (cf. the letter to an unidentified friend in Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 67), pp. 80-84).

53 In Piccolomini, Opera omnia, pp. 1035-1086; also available in A. Schmidt’s German translation, Deutschland. Der Brieftraktat an Martin Mayer (Cologne, 1962).
nube and Elbe rivers had been surpassed as Germany grew in might and wealth, forming a vast and homogeneous geographical unit. Thus Aeneas’s Germania – which was to have a profound effect on German national consciousness, second only to the that of Tacitus’s text – stipulated a geographic and ethnographic basis for national identity, much as the Historia Bohemica did for national history.

That Aeneas viewed the history and the geography of nations as intimately connected is also confirmed by his Europa, a text completed shortly after the Historia Bohemica, in which he undertook the task of describing all the nations of Christian Europe, and narrating the memorable events that had taken place in each in recent memory. Here, too, he pursued his criticism of the ambitious tales of origination – albeit less adamantly. He refuted, for example, the claim that the Saxons were descended from the Greeks, although he reproduced, without comment, the popular myth that the French were descended from the Trojans. For the most part, however, the Europa suggests that Aeneas viewed the nations of Europe as defined

54 Discussions of this topic abound. See for example Paul, Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Nationalbewusstseins, pp. 24ff.; Widmer, Enea Silvio Piccolomini, pp. 90ff.

55 In the Europa, Aeneas treats Bohemia only briefly, referring his readers to the Historia Bohemica, which he has written his diebus.

56 The Europa was often grouped and printed together with the Asia, which Aeneas completed during his pontifical years, with the assumption that they were two parts of an intended cosmography of the world. N. Casella (‘Pio II tra geografia e storia: la Cosmografia’, Archivio della società romana di storia patria 95 (1972), pp. 35-112), demonstrated how different these texts really are and suggested that they were in fact separate literary enterprises. The Asia is an erudite text, extensively informed by classical scholarship, especially by the works of Herodotus, Strabo and Ptolemy, which were available to Aeneas (in Latin translations) once he had become pope. It is also carefully planned and moves systematically from the easternmost reaches of the continent to Asia Minor. Moreover, as the essay by B. K. Vollmann in the present volume suggests, the Asia is imprinted with a carefully articulated interpretation of historical change. The Europa seems to lack an organizational or rhetorical structure entirely, and relies mostly on Aeneas’s own observations and knowledge of the continent’s history.

57 Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 422.

58 Piccolomini, Opera omnia, p. 433.
by their geographical locus and their recent history and customs, rather than by their alleged origins. For example, in the case of Hungary (the first nation to be discussed in the Europa), the narrator devotes only the briefest of remarks to the successive occupations of Pannonia by Huns, Goths, Lombards and, lastly, Hungarians, and he moves directly to a comprehensive treatment of the recent vicissitudes of its history.

If, as I have argued, the compositional structure of the Historia Bohemica is a novel aspect of the genre as Aeneas conceived it, then its traces may also be discernible in Aeneas’s first attempt at a Landesgeschichte, the Historia Friderici. This motley work underwent three revisions over several years but remained unfinished. It began with Aeneas’s desire to record the events of the Austrian rebellion against Frederick III in the summer of 1452, but metamorphosed into a much more enterprising piece when Frederick commissioned him to write an official account of that unfortunate affair. The preface to this second and wholly separate redaction reflects the change in purpose, and justifies the broader scope of the revised text: it will do justice to the emperor’s image by showing his love of peace; and by widening the horizon of the narration to include other episodes from Frederick’s life and his times, which – reading between the lines – will offset the blemish of his shameful surrender to the Austrians. The Historia Friderici is further complicated by Aeneas’s personal protagonism, as he increasingly magnified his own role in the political events he described, and by his irrepressible flair for biographical and anecdotal insertions.

59 Piccolomini, Opera omnia, pp. 387-391.

60 On the transformations undergone by the text see Kramer, ‘Untersuchungen zur “Österreichischen Geschichte”’, especially 41ff., where he discusses the modifications in the third redaction, which had been analyzed by neither Bayer (Die Historia Friderici III) nor Ilsen (Die Geschichte Kaiser Friedrichs III.). In this final version, the Historia Friderici is expressly entitled ‘History of Austria.’

61 Kollar, Historia Friderici, pp. 3-6. Kramer, ‘Untersuchungen zur “Österreichischen Geschichte”’, 30, noted that the second preface was in fact a dedicatory letter that accompanied the work.
Studies by Victor Bayer and Hans Kramer have established that Aeneas intended to write a history of Austria rather than a biographical tribute to his employer. And indeed the narrative sequence of the second redaction of the Historia Friderici presages the outline of the Historia Bohemica: it begins with a geographical description of Austria, then runs through the early history of the duchy, viewed with stern criticism through the lens of a local source (Leopold’s chronicle), and, after a curious gap of about 180 years, which Aeneas probably intended to plug, focuses on contemporary events in the 1450s. The episodes included here are all intimately linked to Aeneas’s personal career, including Frederick’s coronation and nuptials at Rome in 1452; and the rebellion of the Austrians upon his return. After the rebellion, the story shifts entirely to the fate of the young Ladislaus, and this last section is virtually identical to the final chapters of the Historia Bohemica.

Unlike the expanded preface to the second redaction contains no indication that the Historia Friderici was a commissioned piece, but merely comments on the educational value of history. Aeneas enumerates those works that are essential to comprehend history and to learn from its examples: the books of Moses, Judges, Kings, the books of the prophets, Esther, Judith, the Maccabees. With the rhetorical question, ‘what is the Gospel, if not history?’ he includes the life of Christ, the Acts of the Apostles and the letters of St Paul as vital sources of historical exempla. He then touches on the salient contributions of profane history: the Trojan war, the deeds of Alexander the Great, the empires of the Assyrians and the Egyptians, the accomplishments of the Greeks, the Carthaginian wars, the triumphal days of the Romans.

All this amounts to a fairly conventional invitation to appre-

62 However, Kramer, ‘Untersuchungen zur “Österreichischen Geschichte”’, p. 69, found an illuminated manuscript that had belonged to Pius II’s condottiere, Federigo of Urbino, which he suspected to have been copied directly from the third redaction of the Historia Friderici. This suggests that Pius had allowed the third redaction to be transcribed; in other words, that he considered the text finished despite the chronological break.

63 Printed in Bayer, Die Historia Friderici III, pp. 206-208.
ciate the lessons of history, magistra vitae, and seems appropriate for the preface to a historical work. But this passage may at the same time be interpreted as a polemic about the proper content of the Landesgeschichte. The succession of historical ages outlined by Aeneas in the preface corresponds schematically to the content of the late medieval universal chronicle, which remained extremely popular throughout the fifteenth century. (Aeneas was well acquainted with this scheme through his careful reading of Otto von Freising’s Chronica.) While he acknowledged the canon of universal history in the preface, Aeneas omitted it entirely from the narrative of his Austrian Landesgeschichte, suggesting to his readership that the events of Biblical and classical times could be gleaned directly from their respective sources, and that they had little bearing on the history of a German territory. And indeed, after a geographical description of Austria, Aeneas set about deconstructing the fabulous pre-history of Austria as told in the Chronik von den 95 Herrschaften, but did not comment on the extensive parts of that chronicle dedicated to universal historical events, nor those that reproduced imperial and papal annals. These parts of the late medieval historiographic tradition had no role to play in his regional history.

As in the Historia Bohemica, Aeneas did not speculate on the place of origin of the first settlers. As we have seen, he subjected Leopold’s text to vigorous and derisive criticism, ridiculing the myth of Abraham of Theomanaria, a Jew who had come from fabulously-named regions ‘beyond the sea’, but offered no alternative version of Austria’s earliest history. Possibly he believed that in the absence of reliable accounts about that remote age, the conscientious historian ought to refrain from conjecture. Perhaps, as I have already suggested, his historiographic approach was restricted to negative criticism: the verisimilar method could deconstruct the past, but rarely reconstruct it.

64 Examples of widely read universal chronicles include, in Italy, the Chronicum universale (1459) by Archbishop Antonino of Florence; and the Supplementum chronicarum (1483) by the Augustinian friar Jacobus of Bergamo; in Germany, Hartmann Schedel’s Liber chronicarum (1493). Cf. Joachimsen, Geschichtsauffassung, pp. 80ff.
A comparison between the *Historia Bohemica* and the earlier *Historia Friderici* reveals a continuity in our author’s preoccupation with the form of territorial history. What renders the *Historia Bohemica* a more homogeneous (though perhaps less entertaining) piece of historical literature is the author’s retreat from the narration, the absence of that preponderant personal protagonism that characterizes the *Historia Friderici* – and it is in this respect that we can recognize a genuine development from one work to the other. The events that Aeneas chose to highlight in the three redactions of the *Historia Friderici* were closely associated with his own political career. It has often been said that the *Historia Friderici* was first and foremost a program of personal aggrandizement for its author. Narrating the events surrounding the imperial bid for control of Milan after the death of Filippo Maria Visconti, for example, Aeneas greatly magnified his own role in the diplomatic proceedings. He would have us believe that largely due to his oratorical skills the citizens of Milan were ready, indeed eager, to recognize Frederick as their sovereign. Yet, Bayer concluded that “eine “kaiserlich gesinnte Partei”, [...] gab es überhaupt nicht in Mailand’, and that Frederick himself was prepared to commit only minimal effort and resources to secure Milan.65

Aeneas also insisted on incorporating his own speeches into his account. For example, his lengthy oration, held before the pope and the emperor, advocating a crusade against the Turks, is given in full.66 He also managed to insert his *Oratio adversus Austriales*67 – which he had written to censure the Austrians for their insurrection, but was wisely persuaded to withhold – in a fictitious speech ostensibly delivered by Frederick as he stated his case against the Austrians before the pope.68

---

65 Bayer, *Die Historia Friderici III*, p. 87. Bayer also notes (*Die Historia Friderici III*, p. 82) that other contemporary chroniclers of Milan’s history make no mention of Frederick’s three embassies to Milan (in two of which Aeneas was involved), possibly because they considered them insignificant.


In the *Historia Bohemica* Aeneas had ample opportunity to include himself in the narrative, but, unlike in the *Historia Friderici*, he mostly refrained. He mentions himself only on a few occasions. After depicting the Hussite citadel at Tabor, he assures the reader that ‘we described the city as we saw it’;\(^69\) in a brief aside on Kaspar Schlick, his friend and superior in the imperial chancery, who was also his source on the events surrounding Emperor Sigismund’s death;\(^70\) and again in chapter 58, where he recounts his role in the imperial embassy to Beneschau, including the speech he delivered there. This speech resembles the *Oratio adversus Austriales* in at least one respect. Aeneas, who reproduced it from memory in the *Historia Bohemica*, embellished it greatly, giving it more vigor and defiance than it had had originally.\(^71\) With this exception, Aeneas seems to have renounced his own role as ‘subject of history’, which had been so prominent in the *Historia Friderici* and would later be manifest in his *Commentarii rerum memorabilium*. The Austrian rebellion, which enters the narration here, too, because it effected the release of Ladislaus, is not treated as extensively as in the *Historia Friderici*. The narrator describes vividly the skirmishes between the imperial forces and the rebels, but conceals the lengthy deliberations in the emperor’s privy council, in which he had taken active part, and he gives no reason for Frederick’s surrender. Aeneas mentions that he traveled as one of the emperor’s spokesmen to the congress of Vienna, which assembled after the siege to settle Frederick’s differences with the Austrians. He notes that he and his colleagues were listened to by the Austrians ‘as the vanquished are heard by the victors’, but says nothing more about his own participation.\(^72\)

Even more surprising is the fact that the author says nothing of his own involvement with the Hussites, of his disputations with the Taborites and with George Podiebrad, although he had abundant written material readily available for this.\(^73\) Nor in his

\(^{69}\) Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, pp. 109.
\(^{70}\) Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 124.
\(^{71}\) See Palacky’s discussion of this passage in his *Würdigung*, pp. 240-246.
\(^{72}\) Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 132.
\(^{73}\) See n. 5, above.
account of the life of Ladislaus does he mention his own efforts to impart a classical education to the young prince. For the sake of narrative homogeneity and brevity, all these elements were forsaken.

In the Historia Bohemica Aeneas also resists the temptation to digress into biographical and anecdotal modes of writing, a temptation to which he had often succumbed in the Historia Friderici. In the latter text, for instance, the Milanese affair becomes an occasion for an extensive biographical digression on Francesco Sforza, who took the city by force in 1450. Aeneas also reports with novelistic flair the turbid story of the murder of Sforza’s lover at the bidding of his estranged wife, Bianca. Frederick’s sojourn in Naples after his wedding affords Aeneas the opportunity to present a portrait of King Alfonso’s mistress and courtesan, Lucrezia d’Alagna; his reception by Borso d’Este in Ferrara is accompanied by a brief history of the Este family. The list of personalities who are represented in short biographies reads like a fifteenth-century Who’s Who: the Franciscan preachers Bernardino da Siena and Giovanni Capistrano; the condottiere Braccio da Montone; the erstwhile Duke of Milan, Filippo Maria Visconti; the pontiff Nicholas V. Other biographical cameos were motivated by Aeneas’s ill-will toward his personal and political enemies: the learned lawyer Gregor Heimburg, the Viennese theologian Thomas Ebendorfer and Johann Ungnad, Aeneas’s rival at the emperor’s court: all suffer sardonic portrayals. The shady Count Ulrich von Cilli and his father are also easy targets for Aeneas’s corrosive pen.

Anecdotes and newsworthy incidents unrelated to Austrian history are interspersed in the narrative as well, including the memorable events connected to the jubilee of 1450 and also Stefano Porcari’s attempt in 1453 to rouse the Roman people against papal rule. In such instances, the Historia Friderici becomes no more than a jumbled memoir, which Voigt dismissed as ‘Aeneas Denkwürdigkeiten vor seiner päpstlichen Periode.’

All such extraneous particulars were omitted from the Historia Bohemica. In a very few instances, Aeneas indulged his

74 Between 1440 and 1450, Aeneas had also written a series of biographies of prominent men (see n. 34), so much of this material was on the tip of his pen.
75 Voigt, Enea Silvio de’ Piccolomini, vol. II, p. 325.
pensant for story-telling – for example in the narration of the young nobleman Styridus, who was tricked into capture by one of Valasca’s followers, and tortured to death.\textsuperscript{76} However, even this tale, which he inherited from his sources, is an integral element in the overall narratological design of the work and it remains pertinent to Bohemian history, because it encapsulates a unique moment, namely, the amazon-style reign of the Bohemian women. The \textit{Historia Bohemica} also contains several colourful and poignant portraits of its protagonists. Yet here, too, Aeneas never digresses: only those directly involved in the fate of Bohemia are given biographical presence. Some of these portraits, for better or for worse, influenced the later reception of certain historical figures. Emperor Wenzel, for example, is presented as a drunk and an incompetent fool, and the blind Taborite leader John Ziška as a fearsome and invincible field general. Even Aeneas’s insistence on repeating the folk myth that Ziška’s skin was made into a drum after his death, at the sound of which the enemies of the Hussites fled in terror, must be understood as the purposeful development of Ziška into a Bohemian icon rather than evidence of the author’s gullibility.

The preceding remarks suggest that in the \textit{Historia Bohemica} Aeneas had recognized and set aside both his fondness of narrative digression and his tendency to place himself at the center of historical events. This may have had a lot to do with his changing personal circumstances. As a cardinal in Rome he wielded considerably more power than as a foreign consultant at the imperial court, and he probably no longer felt the need to draw attention to his political presence. It is, nevertheless, clear that the form of the \textit{Historia Bohemica} owed much to the lessons Aeneas had learned in the unfinished \textit{Historia Friderici}. The \textit{Historia Friderici} failed as a \textit{Landesgeschichte} because of (a) the excessive protagonism of the author, (b) his habit of incorporating and recycling his earlier writings into it, (c) his tendency to digress into other genres, such as biography and the novella, and perhaps (d) the difficulty of reconciling the text’s agenda with the interests of its patron. Frederick’s commission probably obliged Aeneas to portray his master somewhat fa-

\textsuperscript{76} Piccolomini, \textit{Opera omnia}, pp. 87-88.
vourably and to rescue him from historical opprobrium, although this concern must have become less pressing after he left Frederick’s service in 1455.

In the Historia Bohemica, Aeneas succeeded in avoiding these pitfalls. In many ways, it represented his improvement on the shortcomings of the Historia Friderici, and an opportunity to express many of the political ideals latent in the Historia Friderici in a more worthy and readable textual product. Thus the Historia Bohemica can be regarded as the crowning historiographic achievement of Aeneas’s pre-papal career; thereafter, he would return to his favorite literary mode—autobiography. In the Commentarii, he could finally write the text that he seemed to have been preparing all along: a history on a grand scale, with himself as the pivotal point.

The differences between the Historia Friderici and the Historia Bohemica indicate that there was a progression in Aeneas’s use and interpretation of historical material. This in turn points to his ongoing preoccupation with the issue of form, especially as applied to territorial history. Aeneas arrived at a new form of historical writing, represented by the Historia Bohemica, by gradually identifying the proper subject matter of territorial history. Already in the Historia Friderici, he had rejected the traditional universal-historical framework that characterized the late medieval Landeschronik, and used instead geography and ethnography in order to determine the boundaries of his narrative. While he continued in this vein when he turned to Bohemian history, Aeneas in the Historia Bohemica also discarded other historical information that was not pertinent (personal, biographical and anecdotal narratives), thus finally achieving a unity and coherence of subject matter that characterizes the new form of territorial history exemplified by the Historia Bohemica.

The two works are not only closely related in form, they also have much in common at the ideological level. Access to the thematic similarities between the two histories is afforded by the final section, almost identical in both works: the story of Ladislaus’s troubled reign after his liberation (1452-57). Powerful baronial factions in Austria, Hungary and Bohemia vied for control of his person, sought to influence his decisions and to
determine his place of residence. Count Cilli, who was Ladislaus’s kinsman, held the most sway over the young ruler, but Ulrich Eizinger, the upstart leader of the Austrian aristocracy, managed to engineer Cilli’s fall from grace, only to see him return triumphantly and to suffer the same fate himself. Cilli was later murdered by the elder son of John Hunyady. Upon Ladislaus’s tragic death in Prague – foul play on the part of George Podiebrad was suspected – Hunyady’s younger son Mathias was elected King of Hungary, and Podiebrad became King of Bohemia. Aeneas comments on these events and brings both the *Historia Friderici* and the *Historia bohemica* to a close thus:

Two most powerful kingdoms were deprived of their ruler simultaneously, and from a most noble and ancient lineage went over to men of lower birth. [...] In both cases many complained that the elections had been determined by force and that what had been extorted with intimidation could not be considered lawful. For our part, we are convinced that kingdoms are acquired by the force of arms, not by lawful right.\(^77\)

These few lines epitomize some of Aeneas’s most pressing political concerns, which he voiced repeatedly in both the *Historia Friderici* and the *Historia Bohemica*. The first is his dismay at the fact that men of lowly birth and illegitimate children of rulers are increasingly able to secure territorial rule for themselves. Although in the beginning of the *Historia Bohemica* he had repeated the humanist cliché that ‘virtue alone begets true nobility’,\(^78\) portions of that text as well as several passages in the *Historia Friderici* belie this assertion. For example, Aeneas was clearly disdainful of the fact that the leadership of the Bohemian nation during the early fifteenth century had fallen to men of low birth, such as Hus and Zíška. Similarly, in the *Historia Friderici* he frequently remarked on the illegitimacy or base pedigree of many Italian rulers, including Francesco Sforza of Milan, Borso d’Este of Ferrara, and Ferrante of Naples.

\(^77\) Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 143.  
\(^78\) Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, p. 84.
Aeneas's second, more prescient observation concerns the relationship between political credibility and territorial power. In the final sentence of both the Historia Friderici and the Historia Bohemica, Aeneas called attention to the vital importance of securing political and military control of a territorial state, by whatever means. In the unstable political constellation of fifteenth-century Europe, only a firm basis of territorial power could provide access to political assertion at the highest level – a lesson especially germane to the troubled state of imperial hegemony in Germany. Aeneas's concluding statement had direct bearing on the recent history of Bohemia, of course. Through sheer military prowess the heretics had maintained control of their nation in the face of widespread European hostility. Their struggles were rewarded when a Hussite – albeit a moderate one – became king, and subsequently vied for the imperial crown. In one of the more sententious passages of the Historia Bohemica, Aeneas blamed Emperor Sigismund for not having nipped the Hussite cancer in the bud:

Queen Sophia [...] summoned Sigismund with frequent letters and emissaries, and asked the neighboring princes for help [...]. But Sigismund was badly advised and willful to move his forces first against the Turks, who had already retreated, rather than to head for Bohemia [...]. Because had he led his army to Prague before the forces of the heretics had grown strong, never would those flames, which we later saw, have consumed Germany. But as he prepared to challenge the Turks, he lost Bohemia, and did not defend Hungary.

Fending off the encroaching Turks was a task suitable for the

79 Cf. Rinaldi, 'Pio II e il soggetto nella storia', p. 283, who sees the Historia Friderici as an overall assessment of the imperial institution.
80 Increasing dissatisfaction with Frederick's passive imperial tenure led to a half-hearted plan to elect Podiebrad in his place. Among its supporters was none other than Aeneas Silvius, by then Pope Pius II, who would have liked to enlist the military support of the Bohemians against the Turks. Cf. J. K. Hoensch, Geschichte Böhmens (Munich, 1992), p. 160.
81 Piccolomini, Opera omnia, pp. 107-108.
Holy Roman emperor,\textsuperscript{82} defender of the Christian commonwealth. Yet Aeneas, who was himself a fervent supporter of such crusading efforts, deemed this a less urgent responsibility than the suppression of the Hussite revolt. He probably regarded the establishment of an independent kingdom in the east, a heretical dominion within the Christian community, as more threatening than the advance of the Turks.\textsuperscript{83} But Aeneas also faulted Sigismund because his failure to assert control over Bohemia undermined his claim to universal leadership as emperor. He stressed this again when he reported (inaccurately) that, after years of strife, Sigismund was prepared to come to terms with Zíška, indeed bribe him in return for being recognized as king – ‘a truly great disgrace for royal majesty and imperial glory’,\textsuperscript{84} averted only by the providential death of Zíška. The same lesson – that imperial authority must be built upon territorial might – was all the more obvious for Frederick III in the \textit{Historia Friderici}. Here the central segment of the story juxtaposed the emperor’s tasks and functions to his lack of control over his own territory, Austria. In 1452, Frederick decided to undertake his journey to Italy despite the growing turmoil in Austria and repeated demands that Ladislaus be released from his wardship. His coronation in Italy was an imperial necessity, and it was accompanied by other imperial duties, such as fostering peace in the war-torn peninsula and cementing a collaborative alliance with the pope. Undermining it was the untimely rebellion of the Austrian nobility, who were Frederick’s subjects due to his wardship over their prince, Ladislaus.\textsuperscript{85} The interdependence of these two dimensions of the emperor’s role is

\textsuperscript{82} Sigismund had been elected King of the Germans in 1410, but his imperial coronation at Rome did not take place until 31 May 1433.

\textsuperscript{83} Rothe, ‘Enea Silvio de’ Piccolomini über Böhmen’, p. 148.

\textsuperscript{84} Piccolomini, \textit{Opera omnia}, p. 114.

\textsuperscript{85} The last scion of the Albertine line, Ladislaus was the heir to the Habsburgs’ Danubian territories. The Leopoldine lands were split between Frederick, who controlled inner Austria (Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, the Adriatic possessions), and Duke Sigismund of Tyrol, who ruled over Tyrol and the Vorlande. With the death of Ladislaus in 1457, the Danubian lands reverted to Frederick, although he temporarily lost them to his brother Albrecht during the wars of 1458-1463.
underscored in the *Historia Friderici* by the very structure of the narrative: Frederick’s activities in Italy are continually disturbed by the repercussions of political unrest in Austria, fomented by Eizinger’s inflammatory speeches, as if to demonstrate how Frederick’s uncertain hold over the duchy damaged his imperial stature in Italy.

It is in this interpretive vein that we ought also to read the short but powerful speech delivered by Ziška in Chapter 44 of the *Historia Bohemica*. There are few direct speeches in this text – a departure from both the *Historia Friderici* and from Roman models – perhaps again in observance of its crips *bre-vitas*. Thus Ziška’s speech (his only oration reported by Aeneas) appears particularly relevant within the economy of the text as a whole. It is a vehement speech, in which Ziška exhorts his men to persevere in the siege of Prague, even though those defending the city are Hussites themselves, and are regarded by many as a less pressing menace than Sigismund. But Ziška has no hesitation and no scruples in the matter:

> Domestic wars must be feared more than external ones, and it is necessary to destroy all civil mutinies. We must conquer Prague and exterminate its seditious citizens before word of our divisions reaches Sigismund.86

Ziška’s forceful speech eloquently confirms one of the main lessons of Aeneas’s historiographic work: there can be no political or military assertion without firm local control of a territory, its capital and citizens. This lesson seems tailored to Frederick’s predicament in the 1460s and 1470s, when his imperial reputation suffered repeated blows as he failed to protect his own territories against the internal challenges from his brother Albrecht and the external encroachment of the ambitious Mathias Corvinus.

Thus both the *Historia Friderici* and the *Historia Bohemica* comment on the particularist makeup of European politics in the fifteenth century. It is not at all surprising that a keen political observer such as Aeneas would have remarked on this fundamental sign of his times. It is relevant, however, that he saw

86 Piccolomini, *Opera omnia*, pp. 113-114.
it as fit to devise an elegant new form of historiography – based in part on local chronicle traditions – that would both describe the process by which territorial states had risen to the forefront of European affairs, and represent them independently from universal or imperial history, reflecting the political reality of the day.
AENEAS SILVIUS PICCOLOMINI'S
DE CURIALIUM MISERIIIS AND PETER OF BLOIS

Keith Sidwell

In 1978, Berthe Widmer drew attention to the use made by Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini of Peter of Blois in his De curialium miseriiis. Widmer began her investigation from the casual observation, also made by Claus Uhlig, that chapters 34 and 35 of the De curialium miseriiis were little more than 'a slight reworking', of the 14th letter of Peter of Blois, done without any explicit mention of Peter's name.

Peter of Blois, a twelfth-century Latin poet, worked for some years at the court of Henry II of England, before eventually returning to the clerical life as Archdeacon of Bath. From here he wrote two letters about the life of the courtier. Letter 14 is a grave indictment of the life of the courtier. But its central message is that clerics should not serve at secular courts, since their task is to concentrate on the riches which await the soul in Heaven. Letter 150 is briefer, and recants on the main theme:

4 Petri Blesensis Opera omnia, ed. J. P. Migne, Patrologiae Latinae Tomus 207 (Turnhout, 1904), cols. 42-51 and 439-442.
the cleric does have a duty to serve the king, after all (and this is proved with a number of Biblical citations), yet in this each must follow his conscience. Here I set out the passages from Peter of Blois’s letter 14 which Aeneas Silvius ‘plagiarises’ in chapter 45 of De curialium miseriis. The ‘borrowings’ are italicised in Aeneas Silvius’s text and the translation.

**Peter of Blois:**

Per multas siquidem tribulationes intrant justi in regnum caelo-­rum. (= Acts 14)

It is through many tribulations that the just enter the kingdom of heaven.

Sic pallium cum Joseph, cum Mattheo telonium, sindonem cum Joanne, cupiditatis hydrium cum Samaritana relinquere et abju-­rare decrevi.⁵

Thus did I decide to leave behind and forswear my cloak with Joseph (Genesis 39), with Matthew, my tax-office (Matthew 9), and the water-jar of lust with the Samaritan woman (John 4).

**Aeneas Silvius:**

nullus est cui non sint infinite molestie. atque, ut breviter dicam, *per multas tribulationes intrant justi* in gloriam dei. curiales vero cum multis cruciatibus acquirere sibi gehennam student. nichil de clericis et religiosis dixerim, qui *cum Joseph pallium, cum Mat-­theo thelonem, cum Johanne sindonem et cum Samaritana cupiditatis idrium sunt jussi relinquere.*⁶

There is no-one who does not suffer infinite troubles. And to sum it up, *it is through many tribulations that the just enter* into the glory of God. But the courtiers are eager to acquire Hell for themselves with many torments. Let me say nothing of the clerics and

---

⁵ *Petri Blesensis Opera omnia*, cols. 43C-D and 44C.
religious who have been ordered to leave behind their cloaks with Joseph, their tax-office with Matthew and the hydria of lust with the Samaritan woman.

Despite the fact that part of this is a Biblical citation, there really cannot be any doubt that this is Aeneas Silvius's direct source. It is too much of a coincidence that the passage from Acts is located next to the other in a context where the life of the courtier is the central theme. Other material collected by Widmer backs up this conclusion. No-one who reads the two works side by side can readily draw any other conclusion. A common source or an intermediary using Peter might in part explain the closeness, but this would be an inefficient explanation for two reasons. First, despite the plethora of works on the theme in the late-medieval period, there is no trace of anything like this. Second, Aeneas Silvius did the same thing even more strikingly on the basis of Poggio Bracciolini’s De infelicitate principum, as Widmer discovered when she decided to search further for sources.

Take for example two passages in which Poggio and Aeneas Silvius use the same material from Valerius Maximus and Lucian. Poggio begins with the story of Gyges, King of Lydia, who considers himself the most fortunate of men and so asks the oracle whom Apollo judges to be truly happy. The god’s reply is disconcerting: it is a poor Arcadian farmer called Aglaus. In fact, Valerius Maximus counts no ruler happy, only one private Roman citizen. The same moral emerges from Lucian’s Menippus. The protagonist, confused by the inconsistency between the gods’ deeds and human laws, goes to the Underworld to consult Teiresias and is told that the life of the private citizen is the happiest. It is virtue that leads to happi-

---

ness, but kings’ courts are designed to keep the virtues firmly outside. Aeneas Silvius reverses the order of the extracts, and makes them the substance of a piece of advice given by his father to two Sienese lads who had come to ask him, as a man who had served at the court of the Duke of Milan, whether it was a good idea to serve a king. Menippus learned that the private life was best, and this judgement was backed up by the answer given to Gyges’s question to Apollo’s oracle. Virtue is the thing that makes life happy, and virtue is excluded from

8 Poggio Bracciolini, *Opera Omnia* (Basel, 1538), p. 417-418: ‘Legistis (ut opinor) quem olim Apollinis oraculum felicem esse responderit. Nam cum Gyges Lydorum rex, qui sibi prae caeteris fortunatissimus esse uidebatur, Apollinem consuluisset, quis eo tempore felix esset, contempsit oraculum regias opes atque apparatus, et Aglaum quendam Arcadem paruuli ruris cultorem, qui metas agelli sui numquam cupiditatem exsesserat, felicem iudicauit. Repressit Apollo regis superbiam, et qui se felicissimum arbitrabatur, a rustico Dei iudicio superatus est, qui nullum regem, nullum Imperatorem, nullum Principem, sed priuatum quendam agricolam felicem iudicauit. Ante Valerium Maximum reges multi, uidelicet et imperatores nonnulli fuerant, nullum ex his, ne diuim quidem Augustum posuit inter felices, sed unum tantum priuatum cuiem Romanum Quintum Metellum, ut nulla dubitatio in nobis residere non est principibus, sed in priuatis uiris felicitatem aliquando esse repertam. Hanc et Lucianus in suo Menippo sententiam probat. Menippus enim cum adolescentes legisset apud Homerum, Hesiodumque et aliis poetas Deorum bella, adulteria, furta, rapinas, stupra, aliaque eiusmodi mala facinora, credebat esse atque honesta, postquam Deorum autoritate atque exemplo corroborearentur. Deinde adolescentiam egressus, cum audisset ea a legum latoribus tanquam inhonesta et iniqua suis sanctionibus prohiberi, incertum animi, seu rectius sentirent, philosophos adjit, ut ab eis sciscitaretur, quaenam esset uita optima. Sed cum illos quoque conspiceret, admodum sibi ipsis dissentientes, nam hi uoluptatem, hi uacuitatem dolorum, uirtutem alii, quidam animi corporisque et fortunae bona utiam beatam efficere uoluerunt, incertor multo quam ante, ac diffusis uiiorum sapientia, mortuos consulere decreuit. Igitur ad inferos penetravit, sciscitaturos a Tiresia, qui et ipse uates et diuinator fuisset, sententiam quam quaerebat. At ille primo cum id nephas esse scitu respondisset, tandem monitus Menippi uerbis, ad aurem insusurran apud priuatos uiores optimam utiam, hoc est felicitatem inueniri dixit. Si quo uigur in loco habitat, inter priuatos diuersorium habet, procul a culmine et fastigio imperandi. Virtutes enim effectrices sunt uitae felicis, quae a principum domiciliis exclusae, si quando casu, aut errore linem ingrediantur, et uestigio coguntur auffugere, perterritae moribus sinistris quibus apud eos uiuitur.’
courts. All men who serve at court when they need not are fools.9

In Poggio, the citations come late in the work. Their point is that the private life, the simple life, is happier than the life of

9 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 454-5 (no. 166): 'genitor meus Silvius, qui mortuo patre postumus natus est paternumque nomen tulit, adolescetie sue florem apud antiquum ducem Mediolanensem, hujus moderni ducis patrem peregit, affectusque tandem curie tediis domum reedit, uxorem duxit, filios genuit et usque in hanc diem vitam quietam laudatamque degit. is cum se duo Senenses juvenes admodum nobiles accessissent et an regi servire conduceret percontati fuissent, sic respondit: Menippus cum adolescentes apud Homerum Exiodumque diversa deorum scelera legisset, ea licita esse atque honesta credebant. nam quod dii faciant, quis non arbitretur honestum? hic vir postea factus, cum illa tanquam turpia prohiberi legibus animadverteret, incertus animi philosophos adiit, sciscitaturus ab eis, quenam esset optima vita. sed neque philosophi satisfecerunt, cum inter se dissentirent, et alii voluptatem, alii vacuitatem doloris, virtutem alii, quidam vero animi corporisque et fortune bona simul juncta vitam dicerent prestare beatam. incertior igitur ille multo quam anteam, ut verbis utar Terentii, consulere mortuos decrevit et ad inferos penetravit, ac ex Thyresia, qui et ipse vates divinatorque fuit, ubi vita foret beata, perquisivit. cui cum vates diu respondere negasset in aures tandem insusurrans apud privatos viros optimam vitam hoc est felicitatem inveniri dixit. Gyges quoque Lydorum rex, qui se ceteris fortunatisseimus reputabat, Apollinem consultuit, quis suo tempore felix esset, contemptis oraculum regias opes et apparatus atque Aglaum quendam Archadem modici ruris cultorem, qui metas agelli sui cupiditate nunquam exessaret, felicem esse respondit. vos igitur, juvenes, si quo modo vivatis optime queritis, minime reges adibitis. nam cum ipsi felicitatis expertes sint, felices, qui sibi dicati sunt, nullo modo possunt efficere, quippe quod principibus servientes nichil sibi libertatis relinquunt, ut ea consequi possint, quibus potiti multo sint quam antea miseriores. virtutes enim, o juvenes, felicis vite sunt effectrices, quae a principium domiciliis excurse, si quando casu aut errore limen ingrediuntur, e vestigio coguntur fugere, perterrite sinistris moribus quibus in altis palatis vivitur: quod si tempus disse rendi daretur, monstrarem vobis, omnes homines stultos esse, qui vitam hamentes aliam, in qua possint honeste versari, in curiosis principum se precipitant. sed abest otium, ideo vos tantum moneo, ut agrum hunc histriones et adulatores et aliis nebulones metere sinatis [...]. sic Silvius genitor. illi vero ab insano proposito revocati domi manere ac sibi et musis vivere decreverunt. at paterna vox minus in filio quam in extraneis potuit, nec enim me pater ab obsequiis curie potuit avocare [...]. sed expertus sum postea, quod prius non credidi veramque patris sententiam invenio, de qua libet me nunc in hac epistola dissertare, gravique tuo judicio cuncta remittere.'
kings and they serve to sum up the argument of the dialogue. Aeneas Silvius reverses the order of the extracts and sets them out very near the beginning of his piece (chapter 2). However, both the focus and the context of the extracts is altered. Aeneas maintains that his father used the passages to put off two young Sienese noblemen from entering courtly life. In a sense, the tract he writes is both an admission that his father was right, though he had had no success in persuading his son not to enter court, and a fulfilment of his father’s expressed desire in this passage to prove that men who have another way of earning their bread are fools to enter court.

It is the same with Poggio as it is with Peter of Blois. No-one who seriously studies the De curialium miseris can miss the massive reuse of earlier material – again without explicit reference. Paparelli noted this back in the 1940s.10 Davide Canfora, who has just completed an edition of Poggio’s De infelicitate principum, has recently independently discovered and written about the use Aeneas Silvius made of it in his De curialium miseris.11

The very obviousness of this ‘Plagiat’ drew Widmer’s attention. She found Aeneas Silvius’s brazen theft absolutely astonishing, given the satire that awaited other contemporaries at the hands of a Poggio when they plagiarised, and inexplicable, given one’s feeling that he had no need to lean on others.12

Her conclusion does not, I think, help us to answer this puzzle. Her view is that his plagiarism is clear and goes beyond what was suitable for a humanist. The reason for it is his lack of

12 Widmer, ‘Zur Arbeitsmethode Enea Silvios’, p. 183: ‘In der Tat aber ist es immer wieder erstaunlich, mit welcher Unverfrorenheit sich dieser Humanist literarische Diebstähle geleistet hat, [...] beinahe auch unerklärlich, warum er sich zu verschwiegenem Kopieren herabliess, wo man doch meint, er habe soviel Witz und Wortgewandtheit besessen, um selbständig zu denken und eine eigene Feder zu führen.’
opportunity, north of the Alps, to keep his Latin in good form, partly because he had little chance to speak it. The necessity to prove himself now and again led him to construct this thematic ensemble out of what he had at hand.\footnote{13}

Was Aeneas really bereft of Latin conversation? In De curialium miserii\footnote{13} (ch. 42), he suggests such Latin intercourse as normal: ‘but the uneducated are upset when they see that learned men have entered the court speaking Latin, since they cannot understand them’.\footnote{14} This professed lack of practice does not seem to have precluded him from writing excellent Latin in many of his works of this period, not least his letters. Can we really speak of this extraordinary level of ‘Plagiat’ as his ‘Arbeitsmethode’? What Aeneas Silvius did in De curialium miserii\footnote{13} was quite exceptional, though presently we shall use two examples of something similar to help us get to the bottom of the problem. There is another strange thing about this tract: the style. It has not yet been properly studied, but my feeling is that in certain sections, especially those which deal with the details of court life (33-45), it contains a good many more straight medievalisms, especially in vocabulary, than one finds elsewhere in his works.\footnote{15} In particular, the style of his other letters to Johann von Eich, the addressee of De curialium miserii, is


\footnote{14} Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 485 (no. 166): ‘sed est etiam illitteratis sua turbatio, cum viros in curiam doctos ac Latine loquentes venisse vident, quos ipsi nequeunt intelligere.’

\footnote{15} For example, the following purely medieval Latin words appear: marescallus ‘marshall’, bladum ‘corn’, feudum ‘fief’; moscatellum ‘Muscatel’, temula a fish (calqued on Italian temolo), asperiolus ‘squirrel’ (cited by Du Cange from a text of 1298), zinzala ‘mosquito’ (probably calqued on Italian zanzara).
strikingly different.\textsuperscript{16} Why did Aeneas Silvius write a work full of medievalisms to a man he had elsewhere addressed in a higher style?

\textit{Other approaches}

There are three areas, which Widmer did not investigate, but which interlock to help us find a way to understand the literary method which she has so clearly uncovered. The first concerns the circumstances of composition; the second the use of this method elsewhere in Aeneas. Finally, the purpose of the work must be re-examined.

(1) Circumstances of composition

Aeneas Silvius was at Bruck an der Mur from November 5, 1444, where he had gone to escape an outbreak of the plague at Wiener Neustadt, the site of Frederick's court. He stayed there until at least November 30, the date given in most manuscripts for our letter. Before December 13, he returned to Wiener Neustadt. His party had left in a hurry and he was, it seems, at leisure in this little town. Aeneas had time to write five other letters besides the \textit{De curialium miseris}.\textsuperscript{17}

Given his hurried departure and the probability that Aeneas was able to take only a few books with him, we might suppose that he had a Juvenal,\textsuperscript{18} a Poggio and a Peter of Blois. Already, though, this is too much of a coincidence, and it does not explain why he adopted the method described by Widmer. If he did \textit{not} have the sources he needed with him, though, he would

\textsuperscript{16} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 558-561 (no. 190; 21.10.1445); Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 67), pp. 3-4 (no. 1; 1.1.1446) and pp. 162-163 (no. 43; 23.7.1450).

\textsuperscript{17} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 446-448 (no. 161 to Johann Lauterbach); pp. 448-449 (no 162 to his father Silvius Piccolomini); pp. 450 (no. 163 to Piero da Noceto); pp. 450-451 (no. 164 to Giovanni Campisio); and pp. 452-453 (no. 165 to Giacomo de Castro Romano).

\textsuperscript{18} Juvenal's fifth satire is the major source of the section of the tractate devoted to the courtier's expectations of good food (18f.), but he is constantly cited throughout.
have had to rely on memory. There is some evidence that this is what he did. First, there is one of the five other letters from Bruck. He tells Johann Lauterbach on November 13:

I think you know the town called Prugk, between the rivers Mura and Murza which join before this town and flow in a single stream into the Savus. There is a market here which lasts through the octave of St Martin. I have relaxed completely and divide my time between looking at the goods which are brought here from all around and walking into the countryside, where I take in the sunny hills, the thick woods and the clear waters of the river with exceptional enjoyment.

'Sunny hills' occur in Virgil *Eclogues*, 9.49. Aeneas goes on to praise his lot in what is essentially a prosification of Horace, Epode 1: 'Beatus ille qui procul negotiis [...]'. Are we to assume that he had also managed to pack a Horace? Again, one of the things most noticeable about *De curialium miserii* – in direct contrast to Poggio's *De infelicitate principum* – is its constant quotation from the Bible. Some of the references are shared with – most likely taken directly from – Peter of Blois, but many are not. Yet we know from a letter to Johann Tuschek in Prague, dated October 31, 1444 – only five days before the flight to Bruck – that he did not possess a copy of the Bible. If Aeneas was working from memory at Bruck, this has important implications for the care with which Latin works were studied and the extent to which they stayed in the minds of readers. We may also have here the reason for the dating discrepancy between the Chigi ms. and others. In Chigi J VIII.287, the date reads: *Ex Pruck, pridie kalendis Februearii anno salutis 1445.*

---

20 Wolkán, *Briefwechsel* (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 447 (no. 161): 'opidum tibi notum arbitror, Prugk nomine, inter duas aquas Muram atque Murzam que hic ante oppidum copulantur et unum facientes flumen in Savum feruntur. hic nudinae sunt que per octavam Divi Martini solent perdurare. ego remissis omnibus curis nunc merces, que undique huc afferuntur contemplor, nunc in agros egredior montesque apricos et silvarum latibula ac fucidas fluminis limphas non absque singulari mentis oblectatione intueor.'
The work was written in Bruck, but Aeneas may have decided to check it against the texts before launching it into the world.

(2) the use of this method elsewhere in Aeneas

We have already seen Aeneas using a kind of ‘transposition’ from Horace, Epode 2 in his letter to Johannes Lauterbach. This surely reflects a school exercise; the poet’s meaning must be transferred in such a way that difficulties are explained by expansion. For example, Horace’s lines 7-8

\[
\text{forumque vitat et superba civium} \\
\text{potentiorum limina}
\]

he avoids the forum and the arrogant doorsteps of the more powerful citizens

become:

\[
\text{forum vitat et litigantium iurgia. Non visitat superba divitum atria,} \\
\text{non fastidiosis curialibus est supplex [...].}
\]

he avoids the forum and the quarrels of the litigants. He does not visit the arrogant atria of the rich, nor is he a suppliant before disdainful courtiers [...].

It is worth noting how the exercise would have helped a student rework classical material which was specifically chosen with a view on supporting moralistic arguments. It is interesting that Aeneas chooses to gloss Horace’s ‘superba [...] limina’ ‘arrogant doorsteps’ with ‘non fastidiosis curialibus est supplex’ ‘nor is he a suppliant before disdainful suitors’ in the same month in which he writes the *De curialium miseriis.*

But there is more to be said. Did Aeneas expect Lauterbach not to recognise his transposition? Surely not. Horace was a school author. Lauterbach was an educated man and a close friend of Aeneas. Part of the point of the letter is the literary enjoyment Lauterbach will have on recognising how Aeneas has seamlessly joined his own experiences with those of the ancient poet. There may be more. In Horace, the extravagant
praise of the country ends with the revelation that these are the words of the faenerator Alfius ('Alfius the usurer'). Lines 67-70 read:

Haec ubi locutus faenerator Alfius,
iam iam futurus rusticus,
omnem redegit idibus pecuniam,
quærit kalendis ponere.

When usurer Alfius had spoken these words, intending immediately to become a countryman, he called in all his money on the Ides, and is now looking to invest it again by the Kalends.

If Lauterbach recognised the source of the passage, he will surely have wondered why Aeneas cuts off with a curt sentence exactly at the point where in the Epode Horace reveals his literary trick:

multa sunt ruris gaudia quae nunc singula persequi non est epistolae angustiae.

The countryside holds many joys, but to list them now would transgress the narrow boundaries of the epistolary genre.

Is this all a joke? If so, we must read it as follows. Aeneas is stuck in the country at Bruck and he realises that Lauterbach will know how irritated this will have made him. By writing as though he loves the country, but at the same time usurping what Lauterbach or any learned reader will know is a speech by a man who does not believe a word he says, Aeneas pokes fun at himself.

Another example of the same procedure may be given with the same poet, but to a different addressee and with a different tone and effect.22 This letter is to Gaspar Schlick, the chancellor of Frederick's court, who is mentioned twice with great approval in De curialium miserii (ch. 10, 3823).

23 De curialium miserii 10 (Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 461 (no. 166)): 'non omnibus tantum arriedit fortuna, quantum cancellario nostri
Various are the pursuits of men through which they bring themselves into the circles of princes and live their lives. Some like running in the stadium and gathering Olympic dust and with the hot wheels of their chariots, winning the noble palm. The man who has once been raised up in the theatre by the cry of the mob, or who has defeated a rival by wrestling or by striking him with his spear, can with difficulty be persuaded to live a different life. Attalus, king of Pergamum, who made the Roman people his subjects, wrote carefully about farming. Anyone who, following in his footsteps, has hidden in his barn a great store of corn and has once rejoiced in breaking his ancestral fields with the hoe can never be shifted or persuaded to become a sailor cutting through the Myrtoan sea in a Cyprian vessel. Yet when someone has had a bad experience in his occupation, he soon praises the life-style of another, though he will not take it on. After a merchant has experienced the winds wrestling on the open sea and has felt the fear of an approaching storm, he praises leisure and the countryside around his home town, and swears that when he gets back to his native-land he will never leave again. Yet when the storm has abated, he soon refits his shaken ships and entrusts himself to the sea once again, unable to learn how to put up with poverty. There are men who spend their whole day drinking, now with their limbs stretched out beneath a green arbutus-tree, now with their heads near a gently flowing stream. Some like the army-camp, the sound of the trumpet mingled with that of the serpent (otherwise known as the curved war-horn), and wars which mothers hate. The hunter whose faithful hounds have spotted a doe or whose thin nets were broken by a strong boar of the sort you find among the Marsi will stay out all night under a freezing Jupiter (which we can call ‘the air’), without a thought of his home and young wife. Why go into details? Nothing delights me more than the ivy, the reward given to learned brows. The cool grove gives me pleasure, and being with the Muses, not with the people, is what I like. Let the Muse Euterpe – whose name we translate as ‘well pleased’ – show me her pipes, and let Polyymia – the Muse called ‘much praise’ or ‘possessed of a good memory’ – give me her in-

cesaris Gaspari Slik, quem vel miranda fati clementia vel singularis virtus atque prestantia, que in paucissimis hominibus reputitur, apud tres cesares inter primores potentem reddidit'; 38 (Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 482 (no. 166)): 'multa sunt, propter que magnifico domino Gaspari cancellario teneor, sed in hoc quoque sue magnificentie sum obnoxius, quia me non patitur salario meo frustrari sicut alios video [...].'
strument – made the way a lyre is, and called the barbitos – and my name will never be unknown among later generations. And especially if you give me your approval, Gaspar, protector of my life and my sweet glory. Farewell.²⁴

Manifestly, this letter prosifies the first ode of Horace’s first book, the theme of which is that different people have different pleasures: the poet’s is poetry. If the Muses favour him, he will be immortal. If Maecenas ranks him with the canon of Greek lyric poets, he will touch the stars with his head! Aeneas immediately shows his own colours by announcing that the letter’s theme is the diverse enthusiasms by which men make themselves agreeable to kings and live their lives. He then proceeds

to transpose Horace with little alteration until the end. Here he addresses Gaspar Schlick:

Et potissime, si tu mihi, Caspar, fauebis, uitae praesidium et dulce decus meum.

And especially if you give me your approval, Gaspar, protector of my life and my sweet glory. Farewell.

As with the Lauterbach letter, it is inconceivable that Aeneas cannot have intended Schlick to recognise the source of the ideas here, not only because Horace’s first ode must have been known to every schoolboy, but because the letter’s whole point lies in the assimilation of Schlick to Maecenas. The letter is a panegyric, as is shown by the transposition of the address to Maecenas from the start to the end and by the substitution of Schlick’s name for Maecenas. The point is not grasped unless the reader uses Horace as an ‘intertext.’

It is clear that Aeneas uses classical material in a highly sophisticated manner and that he assumes that his audience knows the original and is able to set on it a defined ‘meaning.’ This requires a comment. A function of medieval Biblical interpretative techniques was to determine ‘meaning’ as something extractable from texts so that it could be both simply grasped and then reapplied to new situations. Knowing literary material comes with a mindset which extracts its juice and compresses it into an easily assimilable form. This technique differs from the use of classical or Biblical material by Aeneas and Poggio. This may be conveniently divided into two classes: an author, whose name is usually given, is used as authority; or an author’s information is reused without reference to his name. Poggio sometimes even extracts material from his library books without giving the source if it is merely a matter of what he sees as an historical fact.25 We are now ready to turn to our third area.

25 E.g. Poggio, Opera omnia, p. 408: ‘Apud Adrianum certe Imperatorem adeo valueret delatorum uoces, ut amicos quos ad summum perruexerat, postea habuerit hostium loco’, which comes from Aelius Spartanus, Hadrianus 15.2 (a copy of this was among Poggio’s effects at his death: E. Walser, Poggius Florentinus: Leben und Werke (Leipzig / Berlin, 1914), p. 420 (no. 30).
(3) The purpose of the work

At the end of her article, Widmer makes the following observation: ‘And no-one asked from where exactly Aeneas had taken – not to say stolen – his best thoughts and phrases.’ We have now seen that there is reason to doubt his ‘borrowing’. But we might reformulate: Assuming that his readers were expected to recognise the main sources he is using here, what purpose will they see emerging from the work? We can ask this question even without being able to prove that Johann von Eich, Aeneas’s addressee, knew these works of Peter of Blois and Poggio. However, Aeneas, isolated in the intellectual outback at Wiener Neustadt – as Widmer would have it – knew both. Why should von Eich not? He was professor of Law at Vienna, only 50 kilometres from Wiener Neustadt, and he was a close friend of Aeneas. Widmer severely underestimates both the general enthusiasm among the literati for novelty and the network of contacts which kept them abreast of new works. We do these men an injustice if we do not allow that they made every effort to be in touch with the latest as well as with the most ancient writing.

In fact, there was a constant interchange not only of letters, but of works as well. One pertinent example will suffice. In May 1440, Poggio himself had promised to send to Richard Petworth, secretary to the Cardinal of Winchester, a copy of his most recent work, the De infelicitate principum. In passing, the letter reminds us of the interpretative schemes that humanists considered central to their enterprise.

I have recently published a book called On the Unhappiness of Princes, in which I teach by reason and examples that princes both good – if there ever were any such – and bad are cut off from all happiness. None of those held to have been so was actually happy. Happiness – I’m speaking about the human type – exists

---


more among private individuals than among those who rule others. I am arguing thus to show that virtue is the origin and the foundation of happiness and that without it no-one can be happy. But so rarely are princes in company with virtue that they may be considered cut off from this happiness. I will give the book to your penitentiarius to be transcribed, so that when you have read it you may spurn the portals of the powerful and prepare yourself to pursue the happy life. I fear, though, that you may not have enough perseverance to read the book right through. Believe me, you must consider your old age and your whitening hairs. These will encourage you to read and learn from the book.\footnote{Poggio Bracciolini, Lettere, p. 379: ‘Edidi nuper librum De infelicitate principum docens tum ratione, tum exemplis et bonos, si qui fuerunt, et malos principes omni felicitate privari; neminem vero eorum, qui habiti sunt, felicem fuisse. Felicitatem vero, de ea autem loquor que inter homines versatur, magis in privatis viris esse quam in eis, qui ceteris dominantur. Id agitur a me, ut ostendam virtutem esse felicitatis omnis originem et firmamentum, sine cuius possessione nullus esse felix potest; sed ita rara videtur societas principantibus cum virtute, ut seclusi ab hac felicitate esse putentur. Dabo libellum transcribendum penitentiario tuo, ut spreitis potentium liminibus te compares ad consequendum felicem vitam, cum legeris libellum. Sed vereor an ita constans sis futurus, ut totum libellum perlegas. Si mihi credes, consules cani tem tuam et albentes capillos. Hi enim te hortabuntur ad lectionem et ad doctrinam libelli invitabunt.’}

The argument is laid out succinctly. Petworth is to read it, consider its central lesson, apply it to his own life, and to leave the court and be happy.

What happens, then, when we apply to the De curialium miseris the observations already made in other cases where the reader is expected to spot an ‘intertext’? The first thing to notice is, as Widmer remarks, that in the opening chapter the defence of service to kings uses exactly the same passages as Peter of Blois’s Letter 150, which is the recantation of his attack on courtiers.\footnote{Widmer, ‘Zur Arbeitsmethode Enea Silvios’, p. 198 n. 40 lists them as follows: 1 Peter 2.13-14; Matthew 22.21; Mark 12.17; Luke 20.25; 1 Timothy 2.7; Romans 13.1.} Regarded as an ‘intertext’ rather than plagiarism, this signals to the reader that Aeneas is making a response to Poggio’s onslaught upon rulers. In particular, it suggests at the outset a defence of precisely the sort of service that Aeneas has given for several years to Frederick III.
theme with which Aeneas begins is the folly of those who serve kings, and not an attack on kings themselves. Poggio’s work, on the other hand, had concentrated on demonstrating the unhappiness of kings and other rulers, and he had relegated the folly of courtiers to a passage near the end. Aeneas’s message could hardly be clearer: God’s word enjoins us to obey kings but to follow one’s conscience in serving them. Poggio (whatever he says to Petworth) put the emphasis in his anti-court protreptic the wrong way round: on the rulers and not on their servants. For Aeneas, the miseries of courtiers stem from the folly of those who misunderstood the relationship between the duty to obey kings and their own duty to serve God. As if to hammer this point home further, it is here that Aeneas inserts the passage (mentioned earlier) in which his father cites Lucian’s *Menippus* and Valerius Maximus’s Gyges anecdote in an anti-courtier context, examples which were certainly taken from Poggio (along with a passage on virtue as the cause of happiness and its incompatibility with the court). They had formed the peroration of the attack on the happiness of kings in Poggio’s work: the afterthought about courtiers which had followed Aeneas now adds to the reformulated passage. In consequence, what Aeneas’s father says now concentrates on the folly of the courtier, not on the unhappiness of the king. So far, then, the meaning of the piece is firmly based on reaction to the Poggio intertext, read in the light of the Peter of Blois intertext.

The personalisation of Poggio’s material by the fiction that the Lucian and Valerius Maximus passages were part of a successful apotreptic by his father to stop two young Sienese from entering courtly life contains another significant reminder of Poggio’s *De infelicitate principum*.

[Poggio is speaking:] I began to complain. I articulated a preference for the life others led above that of people like myself, who are always wandering, with no fixed abode, like the Scythians […]. [Marsuppini replies:] The life you are condemning, Poggio, is one we see many people seeking with great zeal and in which we see very great rewards for hard and diligent work set forth. It appears to be happier than the other available lives, both because
it is stuffed with many pleasures and advantages and because it is
free from those difficulties and worries with which the rest are
rife. I consider both you and the rest of those who serve prelates
to be blessed. You are far away from our unending struggles with
income and taxes.  

The opening of this passage centres upon Poggio’s own distaste
for the moveable life of the court, in this case the curia Ro-
mana, not a king’s court. Poggio did not serve a secular prince
and he came from the republic of Florence, where he was to
become chancellor in 1444 on Bruni’s death. He had no qualms
about attacking the function of secular princes. But he also
makes clear, with a sniff of irony, that he does not consider
even clerical princes to be possessed of happiness. His mouth-
piece Niccolò claims that pope Hadrian had said no-one was
more unhappy than the bishop of Rome.  

This critique of the curia Romana is conspicuously absent from Aeneas’s work.
This conspicuousness is once again a function of the intertext.
Aeneas, like Poggio, is signalling his wish to leave the court,
but he has, like the prodigal son, come to see the error of his
ways with respect to what his father has told him. If we ask the
question, ‘where can he go, then?’, neither the answer ‘to the
religious life’, nor ‘to the curia Romana’ is excluded.

Let us now reexamine the impact of Peter of Blois’s 14th
Letter. It first appears – according to Widmer – in chapters 12
and 13 of De curialium miserii, returns in chapter 20, 30, 34
and 35, and climaxes with the citations given above from
chapter 45. In most of these cases, we are dealing with an ele-
gant variation of Peter’s themes and language rather than direct
‘plagiarism’; but in chapter 45, the wording is strikingly simi-
lar. The reader who recalls that this is Peter of Blois’s material

---

30 Poggio, Opera omnia, p. 392: ‘coepi [...] queri, caeterorum uitam
nostrae praeferens, qui Scytharum more semper instabiles uagaremur [...] Tu
[...] eam damnas uitam [...] Poggii, quam multos summo studio appetere, in
qua maxima laboris et industriae praemia uidemus, quae felix prae caeteris
esse uidetur, cum multis uoluptatibus et commodis referta, tum his molestij
curisque [correxii ex curiosis] uacua quibus caeteri affliguntur. Ego enim et
te et reliquos qui Pontificibus obsequuntur [...] beatos iudico, procul ab his
notris census et tributi continua uexatione constitutos.’

31 Poggio, Opera omnia, pp. 396-7.
will also recall the central argument of his piece: leave the king’s court and enter a place where true peace can be had, that is, the church. There can be no doubt in this reader’s mind that the call to himself and Johann von Eich in chapter 46 to take another road and to leave *hoc pelagus inquietum*, ‘this restless sea’, was modelled on Peter’s warning to his clerical friends in the king’s court at the end of Letter 14. The *alia via* was the religious life, perhaps the *curia Romana* which Poggio had so eagerly sought to leave.

There is one more intertext which might have had an effect upon Aeneas’s writing and upon the reader’s interpretation. In 1438, Lapo da Castiglionchio, *il Juniore*, had written a Socratic dialogue *De curiae commodis*, in praise of the *curia Romana*. Work has not been done on the relationship between this work and that of Poggio. Yet, the passage quoted above, where the life of the *curia* is mentioned as *multis voluptatibus et commodis referta* (‘stuffed with many pleasures and advantages’), seems to make it likely that Poggio, who is mentioned in Lapo’s work, was at least partly reacting to it in the opening of his *De infelicitate principum*. The silence about the *curia Romana* in *De curialium miseris* together with the deafening intertext of Peter of Blois and the argument with Poggio’s text suggest that the reader who knew Lapo might well have read his posture into Aeneas’s work.

**Conclusions**

Is Aeneas in using Peter of Blois and manifesting a medieval style, then, to be adjudged a ‘late Medieval’ rather than a ‘humanist’ writer? My provisional conclusion is that such a categorisation is unhelpful if not false. The style and ‘Arbeitsmethode’ of the treatise are integral parts of how the author constructed this specific text to have meaning for its audience. The closest thing Aeneas wished to hint at was available only in the text of a medieval writer. By appropriating Peter’s attack on

---


clerical courtiers, interweaving it with significant parts of Pog- gio’s argument, and using a register of Latin clearly closer to that of Peter than of Poggio, he alerted the learned reader to the direction he wished to travel.

It is curious, and may be significant, that his addressee, von Eich, was elevated to the see of Eichstätt in 1445. Aeneas was himself reconciled with Pope Eugenius IV in the same year and he was promised the see of Trieste in 1446; he took holy orders, finally, and was elevated in April 1447. If he was not thinking of the curia Romana in November 1444, he certainly was in September 1445, when he wrote:

I wish I had never seen Basel [...] If the fates had not led me to Basel, perhaps I might have made my way into the curia Romana and found an honourable position.

We all know what ‘honourable position’ he did finally find.

---


35 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 542 (no. 185): ‘o utinam nunquam vidissem Basileam! [...] nisi fata mea duxissent me Basileam, fortasse in Romanam curiam me recepissem locumque aliquem honestum reperissem [...]’
ALLTAG AN DER KURIE
PAPST PIUS II. (1458-1464) IM SPIEGEL
ZEITGENÖSSISCHER BERICHT

Claudia Märtl

Wir haben Martin V. gesehen und Eugen IV. und Nikolaus den ebenfalls Fünften und Kalixt III.: alle diese hat das Volk, solange sie lebten, verurteilt, als sie aber tot waren, mit Lobsprüchen überhäßt. [...] auch Papst Pius II. wird von bösertigen Zungen nicht verschont, er wird angeklagt, getadelt, solange er unter uns weit; wenn er aber gestorben sein wird, so wird er gelobt und herbeigewünscht werden, wenn man ihn nicht mehr habea kann [...], dann wird Pius unter die berühmten Päpste zählen.

Diese Worte, die lange als nachträgliche Zutaten galten, hat Pius II. selbst seinen Commentarii vorangestellt, die erst in jüngster Zeit kritisch herausgegeben wurden – dies allerdings nicht weniger als dreimal innerhalb eines Jahrzehnts.¹ Der Aufschwung editorischer Bemühungen um das Werk des Enea Silvio Piccolomini² wird begleitet von einem Anstieg an Publi-


kationen, die das Bild dieser zentralen Gestalt des 15. Jahrhunderts auf der neu gewonnenen sicheren Textgrundlage zu umreißen suchen. Dabei bewegt sich die Forschung oft unbewusst im Fahrwasser der älteren, mit Spezialfragen beschäftigten Arbeiten, die in ihrer Mehrzahl entweder aus den literarischen Quellen oder aus der archivalischen Überlieferung zu seinem Pontifikat schöpfen, bei deren Erschließung ebenfalls bedeutende Fortschritte zu verzeichnen sind. Eine umfassende Ge-


samt Darstellung, welche die in ihrer Quellenverarbeitung immer noch grundlegenden Werke Voigts und Pastors ersetzen wollte, müßte die Facetten der Biographie des Humanisten auf dem Papststhron zusammenfügen, hätte dabei angesichts seiner rastlosen Aktivität mit einer Unmenge an Material zu rechnen und ist wohl aus diesem Grund bislang ungeschrieben geblieben. Der vorliegende Beitrag möchte aus historischer Perspektive darauf aufmerksam machen, daß es durchaus möglich ist, das Schwergewicht der Quellen, das sich in übergreifenden Darstellungen fast stets wie zwangsläufig zugunsten der Commentarii einpendelte, anhand der archivalischen Überlieferung etwas auszugleichen. Um die Commentarii kommt gewiß nicht herum, wer sich mit dem päpstlichen Literaten befaßt, aber es wird häufig übersehen, daß wir über Pius II. auch ohne sie ganz ausgezeichnet informiert wären dank der Berichte italienischer Beobachter, in denen man den sechsjährigen Pontifikat dieses Papstes Tag für Tag verfolgen kann. Gesandtenberichte und verwandte Quellen liefern einen wenig beachteten Kommentar zu den Commentarii, aus dem etwa deren chronologisches Gerüst genauer herausgearbeitet werden könnte, und mehr noch: sie bieten sozusagen einen Gegentext, vor dessen Folie die Selbstdarstellung Pius’ II. in seinem Werk deutlich hervortritt. Doch nicht um solche Fragen soll es hier gehen, oder


jedenfalls nicht in erster Linie; es soll vielmehr umrissen werden, was gerade diese Quellen aufgrund ihrer Eigenart zum alltäglichen Leben der Kurie unter Pius II. auszusagen vermögen.

Angesichts der Entstehungsumstände derartiger Dokumente ist hier der Alltag noch weniger von der hohen Politik zu trennen als sonst, wenn vom ‘Alltag bei Hofe’ die Rede ist. Trotz der geistlichen Reformbestrebungen, die Pius von Anbeginn seines Pontifikats an den Tag legte, trat unter ihm die Rolle des Papstes als Territorialherr weiter in den Vordergrund, was sich nicht nur in seinen militärischen Unternehmungen zeigte, sondern auch im Aussehen der Kurie, das sich immer mehr an weltliche Höfe anpasste, wie sich anschaulich aus dem Zeremonienbuch des Agostino Patrizi Piccolomini belegen läßt, das dieser aus seiner reichen Erfahrung mit Pius und dessen Nachfolgern schrieb. Seit unter Federführung Nikolaus’ V. 1454/55 die italienische Liga begründet worden war, war der Papst das Oberhaupt dieses Staatenbundes von Neapel, Venedig, Florenz und Mailand. Sein Hof stand im Zentrum einer sich intensivierenden Diplomatie, eine Entwicklung, die durch die Bemühungen Pius’ II. um einen Kreuzzug auf europäischer Ebene weiter gefördert wurde. Spitzenreiter des italienischen Gesellschaftswesens war Mailand, wo der ehemalige Condottiere Francesco Sforza nicht nur die diplomatischen Traditionen der


Visconti fortführte, sondern durch die systematische Plazierung von Gesandten bei den wichtigsten Mächten Italiens auch seine zweifelhaft legitimierte Herrschaft festigen wollte. Am Papsthof hatte Francesco Sforza seit 1456 einen ständigen Residenzen sitzen, den Dr. legum Ottone del Carretto, einen Adligen aus Ligurien, der fallweise durch den Dr. utriusque iuris Agostino Rossi aus Parma unterstützt wurde, welcher dann auch Carrettos Nachfolge in Rom antrat. Wie die Lohnlisten des Sforza ausweisen, erhielten diese beiden Spitzenkräfte das höchste Jahresgehalt von allen mailändischen Gesandten. Die politische Zusammenarbeit zwischen der Kurie und Mailand war nie enger als unter Pius II., denn die beiden Mächte sahen ihr gemeinsames Hauptinteresse darin, die Franzosen aus Italien fernzuhalten, womit sie in einem Gegensatz zu den franzosenfreundlichen Florentinern standen, was gelegentliche Diskrepanzen in der inneritalienischen Politik allerdings nicht verhinderte.\(^9\) Das Aufkommen ständiger Gesellschaften hatte erhebliche Auswirkungen auf den diplomatischen Schriftverkehr, der im Falle Mailands eine geradezu atemberaubende Dichte erreichte.\(^10\) Ottone del Carretto verfaßte während seiner


Tätigkeit an der Kurie durchschnittlich mindestens einen Bericht pro Tag, wobei die auftretenden Lücken ausgeglichen werden durch Tage, an denen Ottone zwei-, drei-, sogar viermal zur Feder griff oder seinen Sekretär Paganino zum Diktat rief. Diese Mitteilungen – oft nur im heutigen Postkartenformat, nicht selten aber mehrere Seiten lang – liegen zur Hauptsache im Mailänder Staatsarchiv, wo die Zeit Pius’ II. heute 20 Kartons mit durchschnittlich 300 Dokumenten füllt.\footnote{11} Im Gegensatz zu vergleichbaren Mailänder Beständen sind die Berichte von der Kurie nur zu einem Bruchteil verstreut gedruckt und meist allein für Fragestellungen der politischen und Kirchengeschichte im engeren Sinn ausgewertet worden; aber auch in den gedruckten Texten sind vermeintlich unwichtige Passagen häufig hinter drei Punktzeichen verschwunden.\footnote{12} Von unschätzba-
rem Wert für die Alltagsgeschichte der Kurie Pius’ II. ist ein weiterer Bestand, der größenteils auch noch nicht gedruckt, aber besser bekannt ist: nämlich Gesandtenberichte und Briefe aus der *Familia* des Kardinals Francesco Gonzaga, die im Mantuaner Staatsarchiv liegen.\(^\text{13}\) Markgräfin Barbara aus dem Hause Brandenburg, an die mindestens die Hälfte der Mantuaner Berichte geht, war eine äußerst wissbegierige Person, die über jedes Detail informiert werden wollte, zumal als 1461 ihr erst 17jähriger Sohn zum Kardinal erhoben wurde, weswegen die Gonzaga Bartolomeo Bonatto an die Kurie entsandten. So kommt es, daß in Mantua über dieselben Ereignisse häufig mehrere Berichte von unterschiedlichen Absendern vorliegen, die sich gegenseitig ergänzen oder auch wechselnde Perspekti-


ven vermitteln.\textsuperscript{14} Schließlich bleiben noch die Gesandtenberichte und Briefe aus der engsten Umgebung des Papsts zu erwähnen, die in seiner Heimatstadt Siena einliefen; trotz vergleichsweise lückenhafter Überlieferung sind sie immerhin so umfangreich erhalten, daß sie nicht nur Aufschlüsse über die problematischen politischen Beziehungen bieten, sondern vor allem für die langen Aufenthalte Pius’ II. auf sienesischem Gebiet auch so manches Schlaglicht auf die Alltagsprobleme des reisenden Papsthofs zu werfen vermögen.\textsuperscript{15}

Es dürfte deutlich geworden sein, daß diese Quellen durch ihre Dichte hervorragend geeignet sind, dem sonst schwer faßbaren alltäglichen Zeitablauf auf die Spur zu kommen, mit anderen Worten Aufschluß zu geben über ‘die Augenblicke, die in ihrer Summe Alltag und dessen Strukturen ausmachen’.\textsuperscript{16} Sie

\begin{footnotes}


\end{footnotes}
zeichnen sich durch unmittelbare Frische aus; dafür sorgt der rasche Rhythmus der Berichterstattung, der die Verfasser auch daran hindert, allzusehr an der Stilistik zu feilen. Selbts das wahrhaft Gewöhnliche und Triviale kommt hier zu seinem Recht; wenn die große Politik nichts hergab, mußten die Seiten eben anderweitig gefüllt werden, um die Empfänger zumindest zu unterhalten: mit Klatschgeschichten, mit Preislisten lebenswichtiger Güter und notfalls mit dem Wetterbericht. Doch nun zu den Routinesachen, von denen die Aufmerksamkeit der Gesandten normalerweise in Beschlag genommen wurde!

Der Horizont selbst des aufmerksamsten Gesandten ist notgedrungen beschränkt. In unserem Fall erfahren wir hauptsächlich vom Leben des geschlossenen Zirkels der höheren Kurialen. Rom und die Römer treten selten und meist nur dann in den Blick, wenn es Unangenehmes über sie zu berichten gibt; questi Romani bleiben fremde, potentiell stets gefährliche Ureinwohner, von denen sich die kuriale Enklave nach Möglichkeit fernhält.17 Der Alltag, wie er aus den Gesandtenberichten entgegentritt, ist zuerst einmal der Alltag der Berichterstatter selbst, der unterhalb der großen Politik von zwei Standardthemen beherrscht wird: den ständigen Geldproblemen, die für Gesandte kleinerer Mächte in der Verweigerung des Kredits durch die Banken gipfeln konnten, und den unablössigen Wohnproblemen, die durch den laikalen Status vieler Gesandter noch verschärft wurden. Wo sollten sie Frau und Tochter in einer Stadt unterbringen, in der nur gewisse Viertel bewohnbar wa-


ren, weil man in den meisten Gegenenden Überfälle und Brandstiftung fürchten mußte, wohin mit der Familie während der Sommerreisen der Kurie aufs Land, wo alles noch sehr teuer war?\textsuperscript{18} Schließlich kannte der Alltag des damaligen Gesandten auch keine Bürostunden; er hatte sich ständig zur Verfügung zu halten für den Fall, daß er zum Papst gerufen wurde, während auf der anderen Seite der Dienstherr auf möglichst umfassende Information drängte und äußerst ungnädig auf vermeintliche Nachlässigkeit reagierte.\textsuperscript{19} Kein Wunder, daß der ob seiner Intelligenz, Umgänglichkeit und Sorgfalt von Kollegen hoch gerühmte Carretto nach einem Jahrzehnt derartiger Mühen an einem Magenleiden starb, in dessen letzten Wochen er nur Frauenmilch zu sich nehmen konnte.\textsuperscript{20}

Auf der anderen Seite ist es natürlich der Alltag des Papstes und seiner engsten Umgebung, von dem man hier erfährt. Pius II. glaubte sich in der Vorrede seiner Asia verteidigen zu müssen gegen den Vorwurf, er vernachlässige die Aufgaben seines Amtes über seiner Schriftstellerei: seine literarischen Arbeiten

\textsuperscript{18} Zu den Klagen über Geldprobleme vgl. Margaroli, Diplomazia, S. 296; Beispiele bei Cl. Märzl, Kardinal Jean Jouffroy († 1473). Leben und Werk, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters 18 (Sigmaringen, 1996), S. 149 (Anm. 8); Kreditverweigerung durch die Medici-Bank: ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 57 (Bonatto an Barbara Gonzaga, 25. April 1461); zur Unsicherheit in Rom vgl. Farenga, 'I Romani', S. 291 ff.

\textsuperscript{19} Vgl. das Rechtfertigungsschreiben Carrettos und Rossis bei Pastor (Ed.), Akten Nr. 171 (S. 245 ff.).

nähmen nur seinem eigenen Schlafbedürfnis Zeit weg.\(^{21}\) Tatsächlich stand Pius II. in dem Ruf, seine Zeit vorbildlich einzuteilen und optimal zu nutzen, wobei er aber nicht starr an einer Studententafel festhielt, sondern frisch auftauchende Probleme nach Möglichkeit sofort, für den Geschmack seiner Umgebung manchmal sogar übereilt erledigte. Der Papst, der in seinen Räumen eine Uhr stehen oder an der Wand hängen hatte, umriß seine Zeitökonomie einmal mit den Worten, ‘ch’el tempo bastava ad expedire tucte le occurentie: et chi lo aspectava, ch’el non veniva mai; et chi non l’aspectava, ch’el era sempre presente.’\(^{22}\) Die Mitteilungen literarischer und ähnlicher Quellen zum Tagesablauf Pius\(^{23}\) werden durch die Gesandtenberichte voll bestätigt: meist empfing er die Gesandten nach dem Mittagsschlauf oder nach dem Abendessen, manchmal ließ er sie rufen, aber häufig findet sich auch der Vermerk, der Gesandte sei ‘sofort’ (subito / statim) nach Erhalt eines Briefes zum Papst gegangen und vorgelassen worden, was für dessen Flexibilität spricht, und bisweilen zogen sich die Unterredungen bis zu später Stunde hin. Diese Flexibilität war erkauf mit Nacharbeit; Pius nahm seine eigenhändigen Aufzeichnungen im Bett sitzend auf der Schreibunterlage eines dicken Holzbretts vor, wenn er nicht einem Privatsekretär angeblich bis zu vier Stun-


Nach dem kurialen Kalender war mindestens die Hälfte des Jahres religiösen Funktionen vorbehalten: an diesen Tagen ruhte die Arbeit der Behörden, und es gab auch keine Audienzen oder Konsistorien. Wie seine Biographen betonen, hat Pius jedoch niemals versäumt, genügend Termine für Suppli-

24 ‘[Pius II.] evigilabat inde ad noctem multam suffulto et compacto tabulato ibique scribebat, dictabatque [...] et meridiana scripta nocturnis lucubrationibus attexebantur’; Campano, Gedächtnisrede auf Pius II., in seinen Opera omnia, fol. XCVIIIv (das Detail der Schreibunterlage fehlt in Campanos übrigen Werken); zur Beanspruchung des Privatsekretärs Agostino Patrizi Piccolomini vgl. Campano, Vita, S. 62 (mit Anm. 6).

25 ‘[…] li signori cardinali busognano la matina avante il giorno a pallazo andare a li lor concistorii. Cosi vole la Santità del Nostro Signore. […] quelli signori che la matina soleno dormire volenteri […] ce ne sono alcuni che non so se tanto despi acqua a li garzoni la scola quanto ad alcuni ditto exercicio’ (Carlo Franzoni an Barbara Gonzaga, Rom 7. Dez. 1460; ASMnAG, b. 840, c. 420).

26 ‘[Francesco Gonzaga] dice che a lui pare haver fatto competente exercitio […] che stando in Roma necessario è che tre giorni della septimana cavalchi a palazzo’ (Giacomo d’Arezzo an Ludovico Gonzaga, Tivoli 13. Aug. 1463; ASMnAG, b. 842, c. 227).

Die Vormittage der anderen drei Werktage der Woche waren der Supplikensignatur vorbehalten, die tendenziell jeden zweiten Tag stattfand, wie die Biographen berichten, was durch die Gesandtenberichte und nicht zuletzt durch die päpstlichen Register bestätigt wird; vgl. D. Brosius, ‘Das Itinerar Papst Pius’ II.’, Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken 55/56 (1976), S. 421-432, besonders 422.

27 Paravicini Bagliani, La vita quotidiana, S. 219 f.
kensignatur, Konsistorien und Audienzen bereitzuhalten, und tatsächlich handelte es sich hierbei auch nach den Gesandtenberichten um die *quotidianae occupationes* des Papstes; ausgefallene Termine waren trotz seines schlechten Gesundheitszustands nur selten zu verzeichnen. Pius begann am Tag nach seiner Wahl Suppliken zu signieren, wie aus den entsprechenden Registern im Vatikanischen Archiv hervorgeht, aber diese Register enthalten ja nur die genehmigten Bittschriften. In den Gesandtenberichten wird hingegen (worüber sonst kaum etwas bekannt ist) auch die abgelehnte Supplik verzeichnet und die Begründung, die der Papst für die Ablehnung gibt, woraus sich Rückschlüsse auf seine Kenntnisse des Kirchenrechts und sein Reformverständnis ziehen ließen, die beiseite gesetzt seien. Hier interessiert mehr das Verhalten des Piccolomini in solchen Situationen, sozusagen seine Körpersprache, auf welche die mailändischen Gesandten auftragsgemäß zu achten hatten: ‘Wenn Ihr dem Papst diesen Brief vorlest, so merkt genau auf alles, was Seine Heiligkeit sagt, und wie er es sagt und auf seine Gesten, und berichtet uns klar darüber.’


Während seiner Erkrankung im Frühjahr 1460 sorgte Pius für die Fortführung der Supplikensignatur, indem er diese Aufgabe zum Ärger des Vizekanzlers Rodrigo Borgia nicht einem der diesem unterstellten Referendare, sondern Kardinal Berardo Eroli übertrug; Bonatto kommentiert: ‘Vole regere la barcha lui a suo modo’ (an Barbara Gonzaga; Siena 7. April 1460; ASMnAG, b. 1099, c. 461). Vgl. auch Brosius, *Itinerar*, S. 422.


‘Misser Otho: quando Nostro Signore legerà la littera li scrivemo et quando vuy li legerete questa scrivemo ad vuy, la quale in ogni modo li legerete de verbo ad verbum, notarete tucto quello dirà la Santità Sua et li modi et
Sforza eigenhändig geschrieben hatte, las der Papst natürlich mit gebührenden Lobsprüchen selbst, und sein Wohlwollen demonstrierte er auch dadurch, daß er trotz großer Gichtschmerzen wenigstens die eigenhändige Unterschrift des Mailänder betrachten wollte.\[32\] Pius zeigte auch sonst ein fein abgestuftes Verhalten: Einem seiner eigenen Familien nahm er die bereits genehmigte Suppik weg, nachdem der mailändische Gesandte die betreffende Pfründe für einen Günstling Sforzas verlangt hatte, und zerriß sie vor den Augen Carrettos. In einem anderen Fall, in dem Pius eine Supplik des Mailänder Herzogs abschlägig beschied, ließ er das Schriftstück dem Gesandten zurückgeben, damit dieser es selbst gemäß den päpstlichen Vorstellungen verändere.\[33\] Audienzen, auch damit haben die Biographen recht, gab der Papst nahezu in jeder Situation, nicht nur in den Empfangsräumen des Palastes, sondern auch im Bett, im Bad, unterwegs, und das jedenfalls für die Mailänder oft eine Stunde, eineinhalb Stunden, zwei Stunden lang; ‘Wartenlassen’ oder Verweigerung einer Audi-


‘Presentay la lettera de Vostra Signoria sottoscripta de mano propria, de la quale sottoscrizione Sua Beatitudine essendo a lecto per lo malle de le gotte volse vedere dicta sotoscrizione’ (Bartolomeo Rivieri, 17. Dez. 1461, ASM, Sforzesco 52).

\[33\] ‘Sua Santità mi disse che de quello qual havea datto a quel suo capellano era contenta compiacerne a Vostra Excellentia, perchè de li suoy de casa poteva Sua Santità disponere a suo modo et così fece che quello suo me díe la supplicazione signata per luy, la qual me vidente Sua Santità scarpò dicendo che ello havesse patientia per quella volta’ (Carretto, 9. Sept. 1458; ASM, Sforzesco 47).

‘La Santità Sua refiutò ditta supplicatione dicendo che era cosa exorbitante et inconveniente dare ad uno simplice chierico chi non avesse altramenti meritato in ecclesia Dei una prepositura con quatro canonici et che seria mal exemplo etc. et rimandòmi la supplicacione’ (Carretto, 14. März 1459; ASM, Sforzesco 258).
enz war eine Zermürbungstaktik, die Pius offenbar nur selten bewußt anwandte.³⁴ Um unnötige Verzögerungen zu vermeiden, verschob Pius die Verlesung allzu langer oder wenig dringender Schriftstücke auf den sozusagen ‘privaten’ Teil des Tags, eine Aufgabe, die meist Iacopo Ammannati Piccolomini zu übernehmen hatte, über den man deshalb indirekt an den Papst herankommen konnte.³⁵ In anderen Fällen versuchte er bereits während der Audienz, das Gehörte logisch zu ordnen und seine Antwort entsprechend zu formulieren.³⁶ War eine sofortige Entscheidung möglich, so ließ Pius gerne auf der Stelle die Ausfertigung der entsprechenden Schreiben in die Wege lei-


³⁶ ‘[Pius II.] poi disse: “Queste non sono cosse da rispondere che non se ge pensi”, et stato cussi un pocho supra di se disse: “El Marchese tocha tre cosse. A le due ne pare poter satisfare, la terza non sapiamo”’ (Bonatto an Ludovico Gonzaga, Rom 23. Febr. 1461; ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 18).
ten. \(^{37}\) Der Papst verstand es auch vielfach, seine Audienzen in einem rationellen Gesprächsmanagement so zu staffeln, daß mehrere Aktionen parallel abgewickelt werden konnten. \(^{38}\) In besonderer Erinnerung blieb Giovanni Caimi ein Gespräch, zu dem ihn Pius ins Bad hatte rufen lassen, um dann, während er entkleidet wurde, über den jüngst verstorbenen Legaten in den Marken, den Mailänder Giovanni da Castiglione, in einem Ton loszulegen, daß der Gesandte, der eigentlich das ehrenvolle Begräbnis des Leichnams hatte betreiben sollen, seinen Ohren nicht traute. Caimi berichtet über dieses Gespräch haarlein, fügt jedoch hinzu, er glaube nicht, daß es dem Papst recht wäre, wenn diese Äußerungen in die Öffentlichkeit gelangten, denn Pius habe wohl vertraulich gesprochen. \(^{39}\) Nicht selten fanden

\(^{37}\) So berichtet ein sienesischer Gesandter aus Mantua: ‘Et essendo per salire le schale di palazo mi fu data – non so da chi che non lo conobbi – una [d. h. lettera] de le Vostre Signorie [...] et subbito a dcta hora entrai a palazo et a l’anticamera et fatta la mia inbasita immediate omnibus postpositis fui messo a Nostro Signore [...] innanzi exponesse altro, [Pius II.] fe’ chiamare el segretario et commisse che si scrivesse al governatore di Perugia la contenzia de la domanda Vostra’ (Giovanni Mignanelli, 16. Juli 1459; ASS, Concistoro 1994, c. 72); zwei Wochen später: ‘[...] et examinata un poco la materia et dente alcune piacevolezze, tandem [Pius II.] conchiuse che si scrivesse strictissime a l’arcivescovo [...] et così subbito fu commesso el breve all’arciveschovo’ (1. Aug. 1459, ASS, Concistoro 1994, c. 87). Vgl. auch unten Anm. 89!

\(^{38}\) Ein Beispiel für den Ausfall einer Audienz und die Bewältigung des dadurch verursachten ‘Staus’ durch Pius: ‘non potemo essere quella sera con la Santità de Nostro Signore, perchè volendo er recevere certe pilolle come fece, sera posto [!] a dormire per tempo. Poi here dopoi che la Santità Sua hebe manzato et possato, li primi domandati foremo nuy [...] et con la Santità Sua stetemo più de due hore. Per havendo il patriarcha [Ludovico Trevisan] asp ectato uno gran pezo per parlare con la prefata Santità del papa, ne disse che andassemo uno pocho a discutere queste cosse insieme con il cardinale de Thiano [Niccolò Fortiguerre], fin che odiva il patriarcha, et poi faressero conclusione et coessi fecemo. Partito il patriarcha intrò il cardinale de Thiano et dopoi uno pezo fossemo domandati [...]’ (Francesco Cusani, 15. April 1460, ASM, Sforzesco 259).

\(^{39}\) ‘La Santità del papa intrando nel bagno me fece domandare dentro; non guardandose de mi ad farse spogliare, me disse: “Se qualchuno de quillle de quello cativo homo vene da ti ad recommandarse, acdis che tu savi que respondere, informete da d. Giliforte [Giliforte Buonconti, Thesaurar] li soy
solche Audienzen nur unter vier Augen statt, solus cum solo, besonders für Carretto, der sich häufig a li piedi di Sua Beatitudine einzufinden hatte, was wörtlich zu verstehen ist, denn der gewöhnliche Sterbliche hatte vor dem Papst zu knien, es sei denn, er war zu schwach.40 Pius flüsterte Carretto bei Gelegenheit auch wichtige aktuelle Mitteilungen ins Ohr, wenn andere anwesend waren.41 Meist befanden sich die Nepoten des Papstes im Raum, und letztlich bleibt an der Kurie für diejenigen, welche die Zeichen zu deuten wissen, natürlich nichts geheim: selbst aus den Geheimkonsistorien dringen Nachrichten nach außen, besonders auf dem Weg über die Kurtisanen, die nach Bartolomeo Marasca, dem etwas frömmlerischen Haushaltsvorstand Kardinal Gonzagas, auch an der Kurie Pius’ II. immer am besten informiert sind.42

tradimenti ch’el ce ha facto, che per soy libri trovamo ne ha robata la camera de più de Xmila ducati.” Et ne disse tanto male che me parse una grande admiratione. Pur per honore de la nostra patria et ch’el se diceva ch’el era el cardinale de Lombardia et de la Signoria Vostra, io pregay ch’el fosse contento ch’el corpo fosse sepelito secundo ch’el haveva ordinato, cioè in Anchona [...]. Me rispose cose stupende in modo ch’io non ebbe ardire più de parlarne. [...] Illustissimo Signore, io credo però che Soa Beatitudine habia parlato domesticamente cum mi et che non seria però contenta che queste parole andassero a le orecchie de altri’ (an Francesco Sforza, 4. Mai 1460, ASM, Sforzesco 259).

Vgl. das Urteil Pius’ über Castiglione in Commentarii, IV, 12!

40 Alessandro Gonzaga, der Oheim Francesco Gonzagas, über eine Audienz in den vatikanischen Gärten: ‘Stati [...] in spacio de meza hora e più continuamente in zenughione, nonobstante volesse far sedermi suso una banchetta cardenalesch, la quale Sua Santità feci portar lì e mi non l’acceptasse per far del galiardo, [...] tolesseo licentia. Veda mo’ la Vostra Signoria che differenza è haver quello capello rosso a non haverlo: che stavano el papa e monsignor nostro [Francesco Gonzaga] [...] a sedere comò se fusseno fratelli e nui altri in zenoghione como schiavi venduti’ (an Barbara Gonzaga, Rom 28. März 1462; ASMnAG, 841, c. 794).

41 ‘Herui mi chiamò la Santità de Nostro Signore cossi da parte e dissemi a l’orechia [...]’ (Carretto, Santa Fiora, 30. Juni 1462, ASM, Sforzesco 262).


‘Et licet Nostro Signore habia commandato a cardinali sub pena excommunicationis [...] che non dicano sua intentione circha la expedizione contra il
Zu den regelmäßig wiederkehrenden großen Zeremonien, wie Papstmessen, feierlichen Einzügen oder Prozessionen, deren Ablauf an sich aus den zeremoniellen Ordnungen zu erfassen ist, bieten diese Quellen zusätzliche Aufschlüsse, und sei es nur, daß sie die trivialen Begleiterscheinungen des Massenandrangs erwähnen: daß der aufgewirbelte Staub die Sicht bei der Fronleichnamsprozession behinderte oder daß man im Stimmengewirr des öffentlichen Konsistoriums die Worte des Papstes nicht verstehen konnte.\textsuperscript{43} Etwas überraschend kommt freilich die Rüpelposse, die nach der feierlichen Exkommunikation aller Feinde der Kirche am Gründonnerstag 1460 aus Siena berichtet wird, wo sich die Menge um die von Papst und Kardinälen entsprechend dem Zeremoniell von einer Tribüne zu Boden geschleuderten Kerzen balgte.\textsuperscript{44} Die Schilderung der konkreten Gestaltung solcher Zeremonien bildet ein Vorzugs-thema der Berichte nach Mantua. Sie liefern hübsche Momentaufnahmen, wie etwa die Beobachtung, daß die \textit{sedia gestatoria} des Papstes, die beim feierlichen Einzug in eine Stadt von den höchsten weltlichen Würdenträgern getragen werden mußte, höchst ungleichmäßig auf den Trägern lastete, so daß der längste unter ihnen bisweilen fast ganz allein das Gewicht auszu-

\textbf{Turcho, nichilhominus per alcune rimule e signi visti in diversi lochi, ma presertim in palazzo, pareme intendeere che esso Nostro Signore voglia andare personaliter per mare}’ (Marasca an Barbara Gonzaga, Rom 10. Okt. 1463; ASMnAG, b. 842, c. 198).

\textsuperscript{43} ‘\textit{Polvere che quasi non se ge vedea}’ wird bei der Fronleichnamsprozession 1461 erwähnt (4. Juni 1461; ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 89); zum Lärm in öffentlichen Konsistorien vgl. den Bericht Alessandro Gonzagas bei Signorini, \textit{Opus hoc tenue}, S. 93, rechte Spalte (an Barbara Gonzaga, Rom 24. März 1462; ASMnAG, b. 841, c.791-792).

\textsuperscript{44} ‘[Pius II.] se feci portare suso uno pozo supra la piazza [...] et li, tenendo esso una candela grossa biancha in mane acesa et tucti li cardinali una de altra cera non biancha, per uno feci legere una bulla de le excomuniche se fanno in forma [...]. Geto zoso del pozo la candela tenea in mane et il simile fecero li cardinali et li de sotto per li astanti se feci una batruola [?] de pugni et bastoni per guadagnare queste candele che era più piacere a vedere non era de haver le candele, che non ge ne era chi ne havesse pezo non lo havesse cum qualche bastonata’ (Bonatto an Barbara Gonzaga, Siena 12. April 1460, ASMnAG, b. 1099, c. 468).
halten hatte und sich darunter vor Anstrengung krümmte, oder auch jenes freundlichere Bild, daß die Frauen von Siena beim Einzug Pius’ II. so viele Rosenblätter aus den Fenstern auf ihn herab warfen, daß sie auf der Krempe seines Hutes liegenblieben und dort eine Art Girlande bildeten. Das waren gute Zeiten für Pius, der sich über das Gedränge seiner Landsleute freute, jedem, der es wollte, die Hand gab und dabei ‘beständig lachte’; selbst die Pestgerüchte im Sommer 1462 konnten ihn nicht zu größerer Reserviertheit bringen. Aber es gab auch schlechtere Zeiten, da ihn Husten, Gicht und Rheuma plagten, so daß ihm beim feierlichen Ostersegen der Arm geführt werden mußte. Bisweilen traten unvermutete Zwischenfälle ein,

45 ‘[Pius II.] se fece portare dentro in scragna et era portato da suoi scuderi e li prefatti signori in Romagna aiutero ancora lor continuamente a portare e sempre andoreno a pede fin a Sancta Maria Novella, dove Sua Santità allogia. Ma el signor Hestor [Astorgio II. Manfredi von Faenza] ne hebe più che de parte per esser più grande di altri, che più volte vidi Sua Signoria haverlo tuto adoso e storevasse molto’ (Antonio Donato an Ludovico Gonzaga, Florenz 26. April 1459; ASMnAG, b. 1099, c. 340). Vgl. Commentarii, II, 26 (am Ende)!


46 ‘[Pius II.] montò a cavallo et cussì è intrato [...] et volendoli mostrarle queste done senese alegrezza, da le fenestre getavano zoso da ogni banda rose sfogliate in modo ne havaea tucto caricho el capello, che come cascavano zoso de la testera del capello suso l’ala faceano una ricolta che parea li hávesse una girlanda’ (Bonatto an Ludovico Gonzaga; Siena 31. Mai 1460; ASMnAG, b. 1099, c. 504).

47 ‘La Santità de Nostro Signore da martedi in quà se ha facto portare al domo la sera e la matina a li officii et non può deffendersi che non sia strecto a le volte da homini e done, che se fanno inanti per tochargli la mane. Sua Santità ne ha gran piacere e tocha la mano a cadauno ridendo continuamente’ (Antonio Donato an Barbara Gonzaga, Siena 24. März 1459; ASMnAG, b. 1099, c. 315).

‘El papa niuna guarda fa a la sua persona [...] imo più domesticamente va a solazo e tocha la mane a ceschuna persona se appressa’ (Marasca an Barbara Gonzaga, Viterbo 5. Juni 1462, ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 744).

48 ‘Questa matina facta la messa et offitio in capella, a la quale esso [der Papst] non fue, viene fori a dare la benedictione che non credo ge fusse senza
die Pius in seiner labilen physischen Verfassung zu unpäpstlichen Reaktionen hinriissen. Beim Vesporgottesdienst am Pfingstsonntag des Jahres 1460 gelang es einem Kind aus Siena, sich unter den auf einem hölzernen Gerüst stehenden Papsthron zu schmuggeln; als es sich nun nährte, um besser sehen zu können, stieß es mit dem Kopf heftig an das Brett, auf dem der gichtgeplagte Papst seine Füße hatte, worauf diesem der laute Ausruf entfuhr: *Via col malanno!* (Hau ab, verdammt!), worüber die umstehenden Kardinäle und Gesandten sehr lachten – den Papst hingegen zwangen die Folgen dieses Zwischenfalls zu einer mehrtägigen Bettruhe.49

Die Abwechslungen, die sich der Papst von seinen Amtspflichten gönn te, bestanden hauptsächlich aus Lektüre, Schreiben, Reisen und Baden. Via Carretto gab er Francesco Sforza den Rat, es doch genauso zu halten wie er selbst, hohe Staatsachen immer abzuwechseln mit angenehmen Tätigkeiten, denn so würde man am längsten leben, und ‘wer lange lebt, wird mit allem fertig’.50 Auf Störungen reagierte er dann bisweilen äu-

affano. Bisognava che li fusse tenuto il brazo et certo non ha bon viso’ (Bonnatto an Barbara Gonzaga, Rom 5. April 1461; ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 48).

49 ‘Essendo la Santità de Nostro Signore la vigilia osia el sabato de la pentecoste in gesia al vespero et posto la sedia al loco suo secondo usanza, che come sa la Signoria Vostra sta in alto, un puto per vedere se li caciò sotto che alcuno non lo viti [] et andando remesendose per vedere, non so in che modo dedi de la testa sotto l’asse che tene el papa sotto lì pride [...] et la getò in suso et a lui dedi una bona botoa, tale che non si potè tenere non cridasse, dicendo: “Via col mal anno!”, in modo che cardinali et ognuno ne risi’ (Bonnatto an Barbara Gonzaga, Siena 3. Juni 1460; ASMnAG, b. 1099, c. 509). Nach Meinung des Gesandten war dieser Zwischenfall an der folgenden Bewegungsunfähigkeit des Papstes schuld, während Pius, *Commentarii*, IV, 16 den Transport aus Macereto (‘ob eum motum’) als Grund nennt.

50 ‘L’altra particularità che Vostra Excellentia mi commisse non se maravegli se non sono ancora exequite, nam la Santità de Nostro Signore da pocha audientia se non de cose de stato. Poy attende a starsi in camera o a scrivere o a legere per suo piacere o ad andare a solazo per queste silve et in tali lochi non si parla quasi d’altro che de cose da piacere et qualche volta me ha ditto ch’io conforti Vostra Excellentia a fare il simile, et quando habi dato audientia a li fatti del stato, attendi ancora a darsi qualche recreatione per vivere longamenti, nam mediante la vita longa se provederà a tutto’ (Carretto, Monte Amiata 8. Juli 1462; ASM, Sforzesco 262).
ßerst unwirsch, aber umgekehrt konnten sich Eingeweihte in solchen Augenblicken der Entspannung auch unverhoffte Vorteile verschaffen, da sich im allgemeinen seine Laune bei Ausflügen sichtlich besserte.51 ‘Andare a solazzo’, ‘darsi piacere’ – so werden die Freizeitbeschäftigungen des Papsts und der Kurialen in den Berichten meist registriert, hin und wieder mit einem kritischen Unterton. Unter den hohen Kurialen war die kirchenrechtlich für Geistliche eigentlich verbotene Jagd mit Hunden und Jagdvögeln sehr beliebt. Bereits bei der Anreise der Kurie nach Mantua wurde Ludovico Gonzaga angekündigt, er solle sich vorbereiten, um mit den begeisterten Jägern Estouteville und Coetivy mithalten zu können; die anderen Kardinäle, so heißt es etwas ironisch, würden sich lieber durch den Besuch der Stationskirchen Bewegung machen.52 Aber auch Rodrigo Borgia ging gerne auf die Jagd; ihm kam es haupt-


51 ‘Ogni di el [Pius II.] se fa portare in uno prate et li sta ad piacere et non vole li sia dato impazo. Pur uno ambassatore de la comunità de Rieti li andò. Lo recacciò a bruto comiatò e cominciò poi a quelli fanti de Pazalia [Söldnerführer] a dirli quello non se dira per un laico’ (Bonatto an Barbara Gonzaga; Siena 17. Mai 1460; ASMnAG, b. 1099, c. 495).

‘Accadendomi a le mane una supplicatione de uno secretario del Reverendissimo Cardinale di Spoleti [Berardo Eroli] […] hebi modo per bona via impedire il fatto suo per fare che ditto beneficio pervenesse in me et cossì segui che, essendo la Santità de Nostro Signore a li bagni, stando una sera a spacio, ricommandandomi a Sua Beatitude se dignò conferirrmelo motu proprio’ (Paganino an Bianca Maria Sforza, 4. Juni 1460, ASM, Sforzesco 260).

‘La Sua Beatitude adtende ora a fare quello perché è venuta, cioè piglarà piacere con andare la mane et la sera a solacço per questi castagneti, che già due di non c’è piovuto come faceva prima ogni di verso la sera, et così sta di buona vogla’ (Niccolò Severini, Monte Amiata 5. Juli 1462, ASS, Concistoro 2004, c. 5).

52 ‘Il cardinale Ruano und Avignone vanno volentieri a caza; me hanno di mandato come se ne dilete el signore, si che bisogna Sua Excellentia se metti in ordine. Li altri si tolgono piutosto exercitio de andare per la terra visitando le statione ha posto Nostro Signore qui ad alcune chiesie cum quelle indulgentie che sono a Roma’ (Antonio Donato an Barbara Gonzaga, Siena 17. März 1459; ASMnAG, b. 1099, c. 307).


Vgl. Commentarii, IV, 4: ‘Erat hyems admodum frigida et omnia gelu niveque Ianuario mense iam inclinante rigebant.’

55 Bei einer Einladung des päpstlichen Söldnerführers Pazaglia für Mantuaner Besucher der Kurie ‘li hè stato chi sonava uno clavacinbalo et [...] uno chitarino et uno chi cantava, che hera una zentil cosa [...]’. Poy dreto cena parechi de quelli scuderi anno [ballato] al son di morganete et messer Antonio
Trevisan geladen, so mußte man zuerst die blitzsauberen Ställe besichtigen, auf die der Kardinal besonders stolz war, konnte danach in seinem Garten die in Galeerenform geschnittenen Büsche bewundern und bekam nach einem vier Stunden dauernden Essen von elf auserlesenen Gängen die Hunde und Pferde des Hausherrn vorgeführt.\textsuperscript{56} Außer diesen in lockerer Abwechslung erfolgenden Unterhaltungen gab es ein Fest im Jahr, das die Kardinalsfamilien aufwendiger gestalteten: den Karneval. Die Familia des Papstes krönte einen Kaiser, dem die anderen Familiae unter jeweils gewählten Königen huldigten, wobei sie zum Teil in Verkleidung erschienen, etwa als wilde Männer oder mit heraldischen Figuren auf den Gewändern, worauf ein großes Essen mit 22 Gängen für mehr als 250 Personen folgte.\textsuperscript{57} Wie um die angesichts solcher Nachrichten

\textsuperscript{56} 'Andassemo a disnare cum Monsignor Camerlo [?], el quale ce dette un disnare solemnissimo soto una sua loza adherente a un bellissimo zardino ch'el ha, nel quale sono mille zentileze facte de erbe polidissimamente: galee, nave, pavoni, leoni [...]. Lo disnare fu de quelli da le quatro hora secondo è usanza del patriarcha; undece volte se andò a la cuisina [...] Finito el disnare quando piacque a messer Domenedio se fece menar una brigata de cani, livreri, fausi e brachi molto ordinatamente, reservando sempre indreto li più belli, poi una frotta de belli corsirotti, polledri e cavalli [...] Havevamo perhò [...] inanti che disnassemio viste tute le prenominate bestie perché el Camerlengo volse andassem ad ogni modo a le stalle per vederli [...]. Invero non so quando mai vedesse la più bella stalla; tuta salegata de prede [?] vive, pollita e netta quanto serait una sala de un signore’ (Alessandro Gonzaga an Barbara Gonzaga, 30. März 1462; ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 795v).

\textsuperscript{57} 'Fu el di de la coronatione de la Cesarea [...] de messer Tomoe [Thomas Piccolomini], il quale sotto quella corona haveva uno degno viso da Re. Per [...] li altri Re de cardinali et de Corte fu visitato et unitamente hane la ubediencia. Ceshuno cardinale mandò la famiglia sua cum uno Re ad visitarlo et realegrarsi de la coronatione. Quelli de monsignor de Rohano [Estoutville] venero tuti vestiti ad una livrea de morello cum ziglii d’oro suso et calce bianche et nere e il viso in maschare. Quelli de monsignor de Sena [Todeschini Picco-
aufkommenden Zweifel an der Wirksamkeit der Reformbemühungen Pius’ II. zu bestätigen, schreibt der Vorsteher der weltlichen *Familia* des Gonzaga, daß gerade die Maßnahmen zur Einschränkung des öffentlichen Aufwands insgeheim häufig das Gegenteil bewirkten [...] 58

Aus dem Bereich der materiellen Kultur seien hier einige Beispiele zum Speisezettel der Kurie vorgestellt, wobei darauf hinzuweisen ist, daß die Hauptquelle für die päpstliche *Familia*, die penibel geführten Haushaltsrechnungen Pius’, praktisch noch gar nicht ausgewertet ist. 59 Pius II. galt als sehr frugal in seinen Eßgewohnheiten, und in den Einkäufen seines Major-

[...]

58 'Credo la Illustissima Signoria Vostra la sentesse ch’el fu tolta l’usanza de fare la chollacione hordinatamente a la famiglia di signori cardinali, quanto [!] uno signore va a chasa dil altro. L’è vero che la se observa che non vano in tinello, ma perché li forestieri non habiano che marmorare [!] , vano honestamente in altro luoco et a le volte a le chanerie e qui se gode meglio che prima' (Carlo Franzoni an Barbara Gonzaga, Rom 18. Jan. 1462, ASMNAG, b. 841, c. 618).

domus lassen sich die Spuren von Ratschlägen damaliger Ärzte entdekken, nicht nur in den eindeutig als *medicina* deklarierten Ankäufen von Kamillenblüten, Ziegenmilch und Branntwein, sondern auch in der Bevorzugung von Geflügel und in der Anschaffung von Wacholderholz, dessen Verbrennung die Luft reinigen sollte. Jeder, so erklärte der Papst einmal, müsse darauf achten, gesund zu bleiben, um so mehr diejenigen, von deren Gesundheit das Wohl vieler abhänge. Geschenke in eßbarer Form, die er ebenso wie andere hohe Kuriale häufig erhielt, gab er zum Teil weiter, zum Teil mußten sie aber auch rationiert und vor dem gierigen Zugriff der päpstlichen *Familia* in Sicherheit gebracht werden. Solche Lebensmittelgaben wurden bisweilen zusätzlich durch die Art ihrer Überreichung aufgewertet; Marasca berichtet befriedigt an die Markgräfin von Mantua, welch guten Eindruck es gemacht habe, daß er dem Papst die übersandten elf Fische durch elf gleichgekleidete Diener auf Silberplatten präsentieren ließ. Fische (*carpioni*) und Käse wurden aus Mantua überhaupt in großen Mengen angeliefert und nach sorgfältig zu beachtenden Listen verteilt, wobei einflußreiche Persönlichkeiten sich auch nicht scheuten,


61 Pius ermahnte Francesco Sforza ‘ad havere più cura de la persona Vostra [...], perché olla che ognuno propter sese deve cercare de stare sano, molto più lo deveno cercare quelli da la cui salute depende la salute de molt’altri’ (Carretto, 2. Sept. 1461, Nachschrift, ASM, Sforzesco 51).


62 ‘Ho ritrovato messer Thomeo [Th. Piccolomini, Kubikular] et temptato quello vollesse fare de la marinata. A me respose volirling dare a Nostro Signore de scatola in scatola, perché portandola tuta la brigata se ne torebe la parte sua’ (Marasca an Barbara Gonzaga, Tivoli 15. Juli 1463; ASMnAG, b. 842, c. 234).

eindeutige Bitten auszusprechen.64 Bisweilen erfolgten neben den üblichen Danksagungen Rückmeldungen anderer Art, so wenn Bonatto schreibt, bei einer Einladung seien ihm gewässerte Mantuaner Trockenfische vorgesetzt worden, die aber viel besser geschmeckt hätten als in Mantua selbst, weswegen er sich bei dem Koch des betreffenden Kardinals um das beigefügte Rezept bemüht habe.65 Zwei Episoden seien ausführlich vorgestellt, da sie in mehrfacher Hinsicht aufschlußreich sind. Johann Lochner, ein Nürnberger Kliriker, der es zum päpstlichen cubicularius gebracht hatte und an der Kurie den Spitznamen il doctorissimo führte, wurde eines Sonntags Ende August zu einer Abendunterhaltung eingeladen, die alla calata (bei Sonnenuntergang – cussi dicono questi Romani) in einem der Weingärten stattfinden sollte.66 Dies erfuhr Kardinal Alain

64 Der Kämmerer Ludovico Trevisan bittet um ‘una peza de formazo de le grande’; am nächsten Tag ‘[...] poi me disse che ge ricordasse di carzioni et ch’il voria una de quelle forme de formazo belle belle’ (Bonatto an Barbara Gonzaga, 11. und 12. Febr. 1461; ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 8 und 10); eine ‘Verteilerliste’ der Mantuaner Fische findet sich in b. 841, c. 40 (26. März 1461; der Papst hatte bereits 20 Fische an den Despoten von Morea weitergegeben); eine Liste für den Käse wird erwähnt in b. 842, c. 40: ‘[...] formagio el quale farò presentare secundo che è notato su la lista’ (Francesco Gonzaga an seine Mutter; Rom 21. Mai 1463).


65 ‘Essendo stato heri a manzare cum il Rmo. Monsignore de Roano [Estouteville], havea de li bulbari de Vostra Signoria, de li quali ge ne fa honore et laudali per il megliore salame de pesce manzasse mai [...], ma sono etiam meglio cusinati non si fa a Mantua. El suo coco dice li mette in molia in l’aqua teveda et poi li bate un pocho cum una bacheta et poi li muta l’acqua et lassali cussi ben per due hore; se ingrossano che pareno quasi freschi’ (an Barbara Gonzaga, Siena 25. März 1460; ASMnAG, b. 1099, c. 443).


67 Vgl. Commentarii, IV, 41: als Pius II. unangemeldet in einem Dorf erscheint, wo nichts vorbereitet ist, ‘quesita sunt a rusticis, que fames auferrent, panes et cepè.’

\(^6\) 'Nostro Signore venne quà mercori e fece consistorio in lo più stomacoso loco de casa. Dopo ho inteso secretamente dal Rmo. Monsignor mio che fra le altre cosse furono tratate se rasonò de formazo et Nostro Signore disse asai de le forme grande havea habuto [...] et breviter fu laudato lo caso mantuano' (Marasca an Barbara Gonzaga, Sant’Anna a Camprena 26. Sept. 1462; ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 717); das Folgende nach b. 841, c. 715 (15. Sept. 1462); Marasca bemerkt gegen Ende: ‘li fanti [...] diceano: “Pater sancte, havite fatto bene a fare questo signore cardinal. El se a fatto honore, perchè l’è gibellino. Li gelfi non fano mai cossi.” Nostro Signore ridea grandemente.’
diesem nicht besonders gut versorgten Ort anscheinend normalerweise enthielten, und bemerkenswert bleibt auch, wie selbst bei dieser improvisierten Mahlzeit in beengten Verhältnissen die Rangunterschiede gemäß dem Zeremoniell gewahrt wurden. Angeblich waren sogar die Leibwächter zufrieden, denn Marasco hörte, wie sie beim Abschied zum Papst sagten, er habe gut daran getan, diesen Ghibellinen zum Kardinal zu machen; bei den Guelfen würde man nie so verköstigt, und 'Unser Herr lachte darüber sehr.' Bei anderer Gelegenheit, als der Papst angekündigt zum Essen erschien und auch keine Fastenzeit war, berichtet Giovanni Pietro Arrivabene, der Sekretär des Gonzaga, zugleich stolz und mißbilligend, wie sich die Kurialen die Taschen mit Überresten von der Tafel des Kardinals vollstopften. Der Papst hatte nämlich einen Besuch in Monte Oliveto auf's Programm gesetzt und angeordnet, daß man sich mit dem normalen fleischlosen Essen dieses streng regulierten Klosters begnügen werde, was er sich in seinen Commentarii sehr zugute hält; die Vorsorgemaßnahmen seiner Umgebung scheint er nicht bemerkt zu haben!69

Auch zu dem Thema 'Reisen der Kurie' lassen sich aus den Gesandtenberichten noch einige Beobachtungen beitragen. Die Reiselust Pius’ II. war für einen Teil seiner Umgebung gewiß eine Belastung, aber andererseits mußte jeder zugeben, daß Rom im Sommer unerträglich war, wenn im Juli dichter Nebel über der Stadt stand, vollends wenn im August der in das Bett des Tiber gekarrte Unrat angezündet wurde und der stinkende Rauch tagelang die Luft verpestete.70 Da zog es ein Teil der

69 'Heri la Santità de Nostro Signore disnoe quà. Haveva cum se comitiva de più di trecento persone. L’apparato invero foe honorato e splendido e quantunche fossero gente sregolate, nondimeno a ciascuno foe provisto dignamente [...] e perchè la sera andavano ad allogiare a Monte Oliveto, dove non mangiavano carne, molti vedendo l’abundantia de la robbia che ce era se facevano provisione da canto per la cena' (an Barbara Gonzaga, Sant’Anna a Camprena 29. Sept. 1462; ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 680). Vgl. Commentarii, X, 20!

70 'L’è vero che la stantia et aere de qui non poria essere più estremo. Ogni matina g’è la nebia grossa se piglia cum manet et doppo il mezo di un caldo se arde et [...] intra avosto pezorarà, perchè metono a li letami fino portati al fiume fogo che rende puza terribile’ (Bonatto an Ludovico Gonzaga, Rom 13. Juli 1461; ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 129). Vgl. Iacopo Ammannati Piccolomini an
Kurie doch vor, den Papst zu begleiten, zumal – wie Bonatto schreibt – ein Kardinal ohne Papst ‘wie ein Fisch ohne Wasser’ war. Pius wollte anscheinend nur mit einer Notbesetzung der Kurie in die Sommerfrische gehen und gab sich redlich Mühe, seinen Anhang kleinzuhalten; deswegen brach er unterwegs wiederholt überraschend auf, um die weniger Hartnäckigen abzuschütteln. Seine Absicht war es gerade, durch die Verminderung des Andrangs Entspannung zu finden. Die Pestwelle des Sommers 1462, um die sich Pius für seine Person wenig kümmerte, lieferte ihm einen weiteren Anlaß zum Rückzug in die Einsamkeit des Monte Amiata. Allerdings erzwang auch hier die Seuche eine überstürzte Abreise, die den commissari, den Siena abgeordnet hatte, um für das Wohlergehen des Papstthos zu sorgen, vor nicht geringe organisatorische Probleme stellte. Umgekehrt tauchte der Papst bisweilen unver-

Kardinal Estoutenville: ‘Colite nunc Urbem ut vultis, et contemplamini nebulae matutinae et odorare fiumum ad flumen incensum et ite ad pontificem et haurite pulvere a praeecedente comitatu excitatum [...]’ (10. Aug. 1465; Lettere, hg. von Cherubini, Nr. 163, S. 749, Zeile 13 ff.).


71 ‘[...] uno cardinale da longe al papa è come uno pesce senza acqua’ (an Ludovico Gonzaga, Rom 8. März 1462; ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 543).

Mit Pius’ Naturerleben übereinstimmende Äußerungen aus dem Mantuaner Material vgl. bei Esch, Herrschaftspraxis, S. 133.


Pius teilte den genauen Termin der Abreise nach Petrioli nicht mit: ‘credesi lo facci perché la brigata non se avii inanzi a pigliare ivi logiamento, nam vole pocha gente appresso’ (Carretto, 26. Sept. 1462; ASM, Sforzesco 263).

73 ‘[...] gli [d. h. a li bagni] starà per sa recreatione et per havere più libertà de aymre et anche per non havere tanti tedi di audientie’ (Giovanni Caimi, 16. Mai 1460; ASM, Sforzesco 259).

Carretto meldet aus Monte Amiata: ‘[Pius] dimorasi volunteri in questo loco per fugire la multitudine de cortesani per lo suspetto de la peste’ (1. Juli 1462; ASM, Sforzesco 262).

74 ‘Non scripsi per non avere tempo, però che ad hore quattordici fu deliberato el partire et a le vinti parti et in quello meçço ebbi assai che fare di
mutet auf, um sich den Umständlichkeiten eines offiziellen Empfangs zu entziehen; im Falle Francesco Gonzagas, der mehrere solche Besuche zu ungewohnt frühen Zeiten erhielt, darf man sogar annehmen, daß ihn der Papst ein bißchen in seiner Lebensführung überwachen wollte, und fast wäre es ihm auch gelungen, den frischgebackenen Kardinal im Bett zu überraschen.75 Wer Pius begleitete, mußte sich auf Strapazen gefaßt machen: die teueren Unterkünfte reichten nie aus, die kurialen Behörden mußten in verschiedenen Dörfern untergebracht werden, auch die Kardinäle und Gesandten mußten ihre Habe auf mehrere castelli verteilen, so daß Ottone del Carretto einmal zehn Tage nicht an seine Papiere kam.76 ‘Wer den Papst

scrivare et advisare le comunità vicine, che si trovassero a loro confini per portare Sua Santità et con difficultà si fece, perché ciascuno si trovava fuori in su l’aye, et [...] giognemo quà ad una hora di notte, che con difficultà allogiay’


jedoch braucht, der muß geduldig sein’, so Bonatto, als Pius mit seinen Badereisen begann; befand sich Seine Heiligkeit in motu, mußte die Expedition von Bullen und Breven eben notgedrungen warten! Pius selbst und seine Biographen verweisen darauf, daß die Geschäfte der Kurie auch auf dem Land weitergeführt wurden, doch finden sich in den Gesandtenberichten häufig Klagen über Verzögerungen, die vor allem wegen der Ausflüge des Papsts eintraten. Allerdings betraf das nörgelnde Qui non se fa niente der Gesandten vielfach nur ihre eigenen Anliegen, denn der Papst war auch in der Sommerfrische politisch aktiv und oft mit lokalen Angelegenheiten beschäftigt. Besondere Beschwerden liest man über Tivoli. Pius wohnte im Franziskanerkonvent, wo Ratten so groß wie Kaninchen durch die Gänge huschten, wie er selbst schreibt, aber Bonatto sagt uns noch mehr: Der zur camera del pappagallo bestimmte

77 ‘Questo nostro papa che viene tanto zoioso et cum tante rose, questa matina a le sei hore se ha facto portare in sbara per andare a Petriolo – dico in sbara, aciò che la Signoria Vostra non tolesse per [?] scragna a modo usato. Molti dubitano de lui, pur s’el finirà el bagno et ch’el bagno non finischa lui, andarà poi a Corsignano [...]. Chi ha bisogno de lui, habia patienza; et s’el mondo se voltasse cum damno a chi la tocha, esso vole attendere a vivere’ (Bonatto an Barbara Gonzaga; Siena 4. Juni 1460; ASMnAG, b. 1099, c. 513).

78 Bereits vor dem Aufbruch der Kurie aus Rom meldet Bonatto: ‘Non è setimana che non si faza portare fora duo e tria miglia a la ventura a qualche silva et li si fa portare il manzare et poi ritorna la sera et aliquando etiam la matina si fa pocho’ (an Barbara Gonzaga, Rom 8. Juli 1461, ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 119). Carretto berichtet aus Orvieto, es sei erst am nächsten Tag wieder möglich, den Papst zu sprechen, denn dieser sei heute beschäftigt ‘in curando corpore et ad attendere a ditti citadini et andare vedendo figure et altri ornamenti de questa chiesa’ (27. Sept. 1460, ASM, Sforzesco 48; zum Besuch des Doms von Orvieto vgl. Commentarii IV, 36). Aber auch wenn Carretto den Papst sprechen konnte, gab es Verzögerungen: ‘[...] per essere Sua Santità in motu et in pigliare piacere, ben ch’io La visitassi e fusse in longhi rasonamenti et per la via caminando et poy in camera con Quella, tamen non fu fatta conclusione alcuna in rebus agendis’ (Carretto, Santa Fiora 30. Juni 1462; ASM, Sforzesco 262); vgl. auch die oben Anm. 50 zitierte Stelle und ein weiteres Beispiel bei Märtl, Jousfroy, S. 137 (Anm. 76).

79 ‘[...] andassimo a casa di Monsignore de Rohano [Estouteville], il qual dorme cum una letera postiza in uno loco dove se tenea la scola et ancor g’è la scragna del maestro et questa g’è assignata per la più gloriosa casa che sia in cità presso quella de Nostro Signore [...] la camera sua dal papagalo è tanto per
Raum war so klein, daß nicht einmal das aus Rom mitgebrachte Bettzeug des Papstes ausgebreitet werden konnte, und die Decke konnte man mit der Hand berühren; das päpstliche Schlafzimmer war angeblich kaum als hölzerne Zelle eines Bettelmönchs geeignet. In demselben Ort hatte sich Guillaume d’Estoutenville, einer der reichsten und mächtigsten Kardinäle, den besten Raum gesichert: es war das Schulzimmer von Tivoli, und der Kardinal schlief auf einem Klappbett neben dem Katheder des Lehrers. Die Hauptschwierigkeit aber bestand stets darin, genügend Platz und Stroh für die Pferde zu finden. Von den Zahlenverhältnissen kann man sich ungefähr ein Bild machen, wenn man 1460 aus Siena hört, es sei ja gar nichts los, man könne gar nicht von einer Kurie sprechen, es seien ja nicht einmal 1500 Auswärtige da.\textsuperscript{80} Pius bekam von all diesen Begleiterscheinungen wohl wenig mit,\textsuperscript{81} er reiste begeistert zu Pferd, zu Schiff, in der Sänfte, auf der Bahre, wobei die aus den Dörfern abkommandierten Träger alle 500 Schritte wechseln mußten.\textsuperscript{82} Aber er ließ sich auch besondere Vorrichtungen anferti-


\textsuperscript{80} ‘Qui non si pò dire sia Corte; ognuno manda via li cavalli et retene le persone et poche. Tengo opinionone non li sia 1500 persone forestere’ (Bonatto; Siena, 27. Februar 1460, ASMnAG, b. 1099, c. 393).

\textsuperscript{81} Mehrfach fallen Äußerungen der folgenden Art: ‘Credemo [...] [Pius] starà più parte de questa estate in villa, il che quantunque a sua sanità et diletto para utile, tamen a tutta la Corte è di grande incomodità. Ma vole sopratutto cercare de vivere’ (Giovanni Caimi und Carretto, Macereto 16. Mai 1460, ASM, Sforzesco 259), oder: ‘al presente se ritrova pur a la badia de San Salvatore [Monte Amiata] et li se da recreatione assai, non però senza incomodità et senestro di molte persone; [...] qui è carestia di strame ne per alcun modo ce pouiano star bene li cavalli’ (Giacomo d’Arezzo an Barbara Gonzaga, S. Anna a Camprena, 9. Juli 1462, ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 643).

\textsuperscript{82} Vgl. Campano, Vita, S. 31. ‘In viaggio Nostro Signore sempre se ha fatto portare suo uno cadelietto – neanche lor lo chiamano altramente – con uno letto e stavasene avolto come in letto e nel paese dove se passava erano comandati li homini che havevano a portare’ (Arrivabene an Barbara Gonzaga, Viterbo 8. Mai 1462; ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 728).
gen. Für die Reise nach Mantua 1459 ist mehrmals die Rede von einer camara oder casa de coro, einem Ledergefäße mit Fenstern, in dem er sich zusammen mit zwei bis drei Personen tragen lassen konnte; dieses Ledergefäße wurde mit einer Flasche sowie Schinken und Speck als Reiseproviant ausgestattet. Und später wird eine noch einfallsreichere Erfindung beschrieben, ein von Pferden getragener hölzerner Aufbau, der sich rundherum drehen ließ; außerdem, ‘mit Verlaub gesagt, befindet sich darin eine Möglichkeit, körperliche Bedürfnisse zu verrichten’. ‘Er will versuchen zu leben’, so und ähnlich umschreiben Mailänder wie Mantuaner im Frühjahr 1460 die Motivation des Papstes bei diesen Reisen, als ob er die normale Routine im Papstpalast nicht als Leben betrachtet hätte.

Eines dürfte klar geworden sein: daß die Gesandtenberichte auch eine hervorragende Handhabe bieten, den Einfluß auszuloten, den die Persönlichkeit des jeweiligen Papstes auf die

Auf Sieneser Gebiet hatten Kommissare für die Bereitstellung der Träger zu sorgen; vgl. oben Anm. 74; dies wird auch am 5. Juni 1460 aus Macereto und am 16. Febr. 1464 aus Pienza berichtet; ASS, Concistoro 1997, c. 67 und 2007, c. 89 (‘feci chomandamento che lunedì a mattina ognuno di buona hora fusse a loro chonfino appigliare la Sua Beatitudine’). Daß Pius sich spazierentragen läßt, wird noch einen Monat vor seinem Tod vermerkt (Paganino, Macerata 15. Juli 1464; ASM, Sforzesco 146).

83 ‘Se ha facto fare una camara de coro, in la quala se farà portare quanta fiata non potesse cavalcare’ (Galeazzo Cavriani, Bischof von Mantua, an Ludovico Gonzaga, Rom 16. Jan. 1459; ASMnAG, b. 840, c. 376).

84 ‘Sua Santità cavalca gagliardamente. Tutavia ha fatto ordinare una casa di coro, in la qual pò stare con due et tre persone serrato con le fenestrelle et ordinata in modo che se porta commodamente; la qual usarà quando bisognasse’ (Carretto; 22. Jan. 1459; ASM, Sforzesco 48). Die Ausstattung wird in Florenz, 4. Mai 1459, abgerechnet: ‘I fiasco per mettere in I casa de chuoio per portar a camino’ sowie ‘prosciutto’ und ‘lardo per portare a camino’ (Rom, Archivio di Stato, Camerale I vol. 1473, fol. 53r).

84 Ein gewisser Jo. P. berichtet, daß Pius ‘si sea fato fare una careta senza rote, la quala [!] dui cavalli la porta [!] in forma de sanbuga et è una cosa molto dextera et utilla et in quella lui si pò star a sider et destiso [!] disteso] et quella careta se pò zirare de intorno intorno senza mover li caval et como reverentia el g’è fato dentro l’asio [l’agio] d’andar del corpo, se pur ge ne vegnese volentate’ (an Alessandro Gonzaga, Rom 18. July 1461; ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 362). Nach Ausweis der Haushaltsrechnungen Pius’ II. gehörten ‘urinali’ zu den am häufigsten angeschafften Gegenständen.
Atmosphäre des Papsthofes hatte, mit anderen Worten, wie selbst die festgefügten, differenzierten und lang erprobten kurialen Strukturen je nach Papst ein anderes Gesicht annnehmen konnten. Unter Pius II. hat es an Kritikern wahrhaftig nicht gefehlt; selbst der vergeistigte Bessarion verließ einmal ‘unzufrieden murrend’ ein Konsistorium.\(^85\) Und doch vermitteln die Gesandtenberichte eher das Bild einer entspannten Atmosphäre, wozu nicht zum wenigsten beitrug, daß der Papst Humor besaß, so daß Audienzen mit geeigneten und politisch genehmigen Gesprächspartnern manchmal recht kurzweilig verließen.\(^86\) Daß päpstliche Familiaren den Besuch eines Pfründenbewerbers bei Pius II. in Petrioli nutzten, um ihn überraschend in die infernalisch stinkenden Schwefelquellen zu werfen, wäre unter anderen Päpsten vielleicht nicht möglich gewesen, und es gibt zu denken Anlaß, daß diese beff a ein Mitglied der Familia Kardinal Estoutevilles, des 1458 erfolglosen Mitbewerbers um die Papstwürde, traf.\(^87\) Daß Pius lächelte oder lachte, wird sehr oft berichtet; es wäre eine eigene Untersuchung anzustellen, worüber dieser Papst lachte, und die Liste der von den Biographen berichteten Bonmots Pius’ könnte noch wesentlich verlängert

\(^85\) ‘È fatto uno longissimo consistorio et è creato legato Niceno ad andare a Venecia [...]. Esso cardinale usi male contento molto brontolando. Altri se rideano.’ (Marasca an Barbara Gonzaga, Rom 29. Juni 1463; ASMnAG, b. 842, c. 193).


\(^87\) ‘[...] quando el fu a li bagni, da quelli del Nostro Signore fu gittato in essi e per tale via fu bagnato, che in Corte per parechi giorni s’a haute che ridere’ (Carlo Franzoni an Barbara Gonzaga, Siena 15. Mai 1462; ASMnAG, b.1099, c. 594).

werden. Hier nur ein Beispiel, das die Atmosphäre an der Kurie während der Sommerreisen illustriert. Am Morgen nach einem ausgelassenen Fest der höheren Kurialen, bei dem sie zu fortgeschrittener Stunde die Obergewänder zum Ballspielen abgelegt hatten, zitierte Pius die Teilnehmer zu sich, und es entspann sich ein scherzhafter Wortwechsel mit Francesco Gonzaga und dem Erzbischof von Benevent. Der Gonzaga meinte: 


Besonders gegenüber vertrauten Personen hielt Pius auch mit negativen Emotionen nicht hinter dem Berg. Er zeigte Unsicherheit, Verwirrung, Verärgerung und führte eine deutliche Sprache. *Schau einer an, was dieser schlechte Kardinal macht!*, schimpfte er über Pietro Barbo, als der beim Ordenswechsel eines Klosters nicht zustimmen wollte, wobei seine Lippen vor Wut zitterten; er werde sich aber notfalls unter Zuhilfenahme seiner päpstlichen Machtmittel durchsetzen, da

88 *Fatto lo zorno Nostro Signore sepe la cossa et cessi mostrando gignare li represse tutti. Quando venne al nostro, respose lui: "Beatissime pater, io ho fatto questo per non parire più savio de questi mei mazori e vechi." Poi vene lo papa a lo arcivescovo e disse: "E vui, domine beneventane, vechio de 60 anni, dovereste dare bono exemplo." Rispose lui: "Beatissime pater, io non volia già. Ma lo cardinale de Mantua disse se non me spoia, mai non me darebe il suo voto. Per questo io disse me spoiaia etiam la camisa se lo commandava." Tunc Nostro Signore disse: "Bene, havite peccato dupliciter, in pacezare et in ambitione. Nui scriveremo a la marchesana e si se excusaremos che non potiamo governare il suo cardinale."* (Marasca an Barbara Gonzaga, Viterbo 8. Mai 1462; ASMnAG, b. 841, c. 737).
könne der Barbo mit dem Kopf gegen die Wand rennen, wie er wolle!\footnote{In seiner Impulsivität ließ Pius zumal bei Themen, über die er sich ärgerte, des öfteren die Gesandten gar nicht ausreden, und seinen Ärger sah man ihm häufig sofort an; meist handelte es sich um mißliebige Entwicklungen der italienischen Politik, auf die er in dieser Weise reagierte.\footnote{In seiner Impulsivität ließ Pius zumal bei Themen, über die er sich ärgerte, des öfteren die Gesandten gar nicht ausreden, und seinen Ärger sah man ihm häufig sofort an; meist handelte es sich um mißliebige Entwicklungen der italienischen Politik, auf die er in dieser Weise reagierte.} Doch auch wenn seine Reisepläne gestört wurden, konnte Pius sehr sarkastisch werden.\footnote{Doch auch wenn seine Reisepläne gestört wurden, konnte Pius sehr sarkastisch werden.} Insbesondere machte diese Offenheit den Umgang mit ihm einfacher. Der Papst hat ‘ein umgängliches und ehrliches Wesen’, so Ottone del Carretto,\footnote{In seiner Impulsivität ließ Pius zumal bei Themen, über die er sich ärgerte, des öfteren die Gesandten gar nicht ausreden, und seinen Ärger sah man ihm häufig sofort an; meist handelte es sich um mißliebige Entwicklungen der italienischen Politik, auf die er in dieser Weise reagierte.} der freilich auch einen Stein bei ihm im Brett hatte. Nach den Grundsätzen der mailändischen Diplomatie sollten stets Gesandte verwendet werden, die dem zu besuchenden Machthaber persönlich angenehm waren.}


\footnote{Mit Pietro Barbo hatte Pius II. bereits kurz nach seiner Krönung Zusammenstöße; vgl. \textit{Commentarii}, II, 8.}
Dies war bei Carretto und Pius in höchstem Maß der Fall: der mailändische Gesandte wurde für Pius im Laufe der Zeit nicht nur aus politischen Gründen zum unentbehrlichen Gesprächspartner, sondern geradezu zum Freund, dem er auch Dinge anvertraute, die nicht in die Ohren des Herzogs gelangen sollten, womit er den Gesandten gegen Ende seines Pontifikats in Loyalitätskonflikte gestürzt zu haben scheint, da Francesco Sforza die Kreuzzugspläne nur sehr halberzig unterstützte. Aus den Berichten des Mailänders spricht eine wachsende, jedoch nicht unkritische Sympathie. Dabei vergaß Ottone seine politische Rolle nicht: er wußte, welche Stichworte er dem Papst liefern mußte, um einen von dessen großen Lageberichten zu provozieren, welche ‘Gegenmittel’ er ihm einflößen konnte, um dem Einfluß der nicht mit der politischen Linie Mailands übereinstimmenden Nepoten entgegenzuwirken, und er verstand es nicht zuletzt, den Papst zum Lachen zu bringen.93

Vergleicht man Pius II. mit seinem Nachfolger Paul II., so springt der sozusagen atmosphärische Unterschied beider Pontifikate bei der Lektüre der Gesandtenberichte sofort ins Auge. Davon, den Papst wohl oder übel begleiten zu müssen, blieben die Kurialen jetzt verschont, denn Paul II. bewegte sich nicht aus Rom fort. Aber er war von äußerst mißtrauischem Charakter, wollte nichts delegieren, zog dadurch alles in die Länge und gab absichtlich verwirrende Auskünfte, um sich Hintertüren offen zu halten. Er hielt nicht nur viel weniger Audienzen ab als Pius II., sondern glaubte auch, aus Gesundheitsgründen diese Termine mitten in die Nacht verlegen zu müssen, wobei die Kurialen und Gesandten aber oft erfolglos antichambrierten und nach stundenlangem Warten wieder abziehen mußten, ohne den

Papst zu Gesicht bekommen zu haben. Bereits drei Monate nach der Wahl Pauls II. hieß es über ihn, dieser Papst sehe seinen Lebenszweck darin, so wenige Angelegenheiten wie nur möglich zu erledigen; die gesamte Kurie sei unzufrieden, so die Mantuaner, und Agostino Rossi meinte kaum ein Jahr nach dem Tod des Piccolomini, jetzt sehe man doch erst richtig, was man an papa Pio gehabt habe: el più expeditivo, el più libero pontifice che fusse mai – den umgänglichsten, den effizientesten Papst, den es je gab! ‘Wenn Pius gestorben sein wird, so wird er gelobt und herbeigewünscht werden, wenn man ihn nicht mehr haben kann’ – mit dieser Prognose hatte Pius ins Schwarze getroffen.

94 ‘Qui se pò cantare quello verso “Noctem verterunt in diem” [Job 17,12] [...] Tuta la Corte è male contenta’ (Marasca an Barbara Gonzaga, 26. Okt. 1464; ASMnAG, b. 842, c. 280).
‘La vita sua [Pauls II.] è di spazare facende manche ch’el pò’ (Marasca an Barbara Gonzaga, 12. Nov. 1464; ASMnAG, b. 842, c. 283).
‘Hora me par comprendere che questo Nostro Signore non farà tante volte consistorio quanto è de usanza’ (Giacomo d’Arezzo an Barbara Gonzaga, 13. Nov. 1464; ASMnAG, b. 842, c. 389).

PIUS II AND FRANCESCO SFORZA.
THE HISTORY OF TWO ALLIES

Marcello Simonetta

Francesco Sforza, Duke of Milan, upon receiving a dispatch from Ottone del Carretto, his ambassador in Rome, communicating the election of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini to the Holy See, under the name of Pius II, wrote:

In this very hour we received your letter of August 19 [1458], which announced the happy news of the creation of the new pope olim Cardinal Aeneas from Siena, and now Pius II. Ottone, you could not believe how much pleasure and consolation we have had, and – God help us! – he has been the one we desired the most or more than any man alive, since we met him a long time ago and we know that for his kindness he has always loved us

* All the original documents are quoted from the Ilardi Renaissance Diplomatic Documents Microfilm Collection, preserved at Sterling Library, Yale University. I wish to express my gratitude to Professor Vincent Ilardi for his steady support of my research. I also wish to thank Stefano Baldassarri, Paul Dover, Richard Keatley and Tom Mauro for their friendly advice. Finally, I am grateful to Prof. Riccardo Fubini for his careful reading of the last draft. Material support for this research was provided by a Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library Fellowship in Summer 1998.

Abbreviations used in this article:
- Amb: Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milano, Z 219 sup.
- ASMi: Archivio di Stato di Milano, Archivio Sforzesco Ducale, Potenze Este-re, Roma
- C: Pii II Commentarii rerum memorabilium que temporibus suis contigerunt, ed. A. van Heck, 2 vols., Studi e testi 312-313 (Vatican City, 1984).
very deeply. In every place he has been, he behaved like a good father, and after he was elected cardinal, he wrote to us such humane and sweet letters and sent us the loveliest words so that we will be most obliged to His Holiness. We thank God for His infinite mercy in giving us such a worthy and desired new pope.\footnote{Francesco Sforza to Ottone del Carretto, Milan, 23 August 1458 (ASMi, c. 47): ‘In questa hora havemo recevuto la vostra lettera de di xviiiij del presente: la quale ne haveva annunciata la felice novella de la creazione del novo Summo pontefice olim Reverendissimo Monsignore Misser Enea Cardinale de Sena et mò Pius secundus. Misser Otho, non poestre credere quanto piacere et consolazione ne havemo havuto, et così Dio ne adiuti, ch’el l’è stato quello che nuy desydravamo tanto o più che persona che viva perché nuy tempo fa cognoscemlo Signore et sapemo che per sua humanitate ce ha sempre portato singolare amore. In ogni logho dove el si è stato el ha usato verso nuy l’officio de bono padre, et dapoy che Sua Santità fu creata Cardinale el ce ha scritto troppo humano et dolci littere et facto dire molte amorevolissime parole che ce ne trovaramo obligatissimi ad Sua Santità. Rengratiamo l’omnipossente Dio che per sua infinita misericordia ce haby dato si degno et si desidrato summo pontefice.’ On the shrewd Ottone del Carretto, cf. Dizionario biografico degli Italiani, vol. 36 (Rome, 1988), pp. 436-439.}

The letter goes on for a while in an emphatic style. Was this only simulated happiness and formulaic complaisance? Aware of the intrigues perpetrated by the duke behind the scenes of this election,\footnote{V. Ilardi, ‘Crosses and Carets: Renaissance Patronage and Coded Letters of Recommendation’, The American Historical Review 92 (1987), pp. 1127-1149 (esp. pp. 1139-1142).} we could answer positively to this Machiavellian doubt. However, Sforza’s reference to a long and paternal friendship may contain some truth and sincerity. Pius II in his Commentaries described the conclave in realistic and humorous terms (C 97-106), also writing – not without a hint of egotistic irony – that Francesco Sforza ‘etsi alium pontificem expectabat, Ene tamen cognita gavibus est, quem olim in castris contra Mediolanum honorasset’ (C 108, italics M. Simonetta). Why does he add this little detail in the moment of triumph?

Some background on their personal relationships may help to answer this question. The two had met for the first time exactly nine years earlier, in August 1449. At the time, Piccolomini was Emperor Frederick III’s secretary and bishop of Trieste. He had been sent to Milan in order to persuade the Ambrosian re-
publicans, then besieged by Sforza and endangered by the Venetians, to accept imperial protection. Aeneas describes vividly his risky trip from Como to Milan. He traveled through the night to avoid Sforza’s soldiers who were — in Piccolomini’s slightly exaggerated version — instructed to bring him before the besieger in chains. Staying within the city, he soon realized that many people were already on the side of the condottiere. This atmosphere of deception is well represented by the ambiguous figure of the thrice-traitor Carlo Gonzaga (brother of Lodovico, Marquis of Mantua). He encouraged the Emperor’s ambassador to remove the Milanese people’s uncertainty with a coup d’Etat. Aeneas prudently answered that he had chosen the religious habit in order to live piously.

Unsatisfied with the diplomatic results of his mission, Piccolomini decided to meet the enemy himself and he went to Sforza’s camp, with a promise of the magnanimous support of Frederick III. It would have been very interesting to have records of this secreta audientia. Even before this time, Aeneas had always been a go-between in the diplomatic relationship of the future duke of Milan and the emperor. Piccolomini’s Pentalogus (1443) exhaled Frederick III to claim his dynastic rights in Lombardy, when the old Duke Filippo Maria was to die. In fact, the zealous secretary was sent on his first mission to Milan immediately after Visconti’s death in August 1447.

3 See the two versions by Piccolomini: ‘atque honorati ab eo dimissi sunt’ (C, 70, italics MS); ‘atque his dictis remisit legatos’ (Historia Friderici III Imperatoris, in: A. F. Kollar (ed.), Analecta Monumentorum omnis aevi (Vienna, 1762), vol. II, pp. 1-550, esp. p. 152).

Aeneas pronounced an oration addressed to the Milanese people on October 21, 1447, but the republicans rejected the imperial mediation. At the same time, the ambassador made contact with the various factions in the city: among them, he had secret talks with Giovanni Orlandi, who proposed that Francesco Sforza become the captain-general for the empire in Lombardy. In modest exchange, he would gain the title of Count of Pavia and Cremona and receive the appropriate stipends.

The situation shifted swiftly; in the summer of 1449, as we have already seen, Sforza was besieging Milan on his own, and he would have eventually entered the city and been proclaimed duke by the people who had cursed him only a few months earlier. Piccolomini rapidly sketches this turn of events in his long 'historical' epistle to Cardinal Carvajal, grinningly punning on the double meaning of the word *dux, dductor* and *ducere.* Des-
pite these sharp comments, involving a rather gratuitous judgement on Sforza as the spoiled child of a condottiere, Piccolomini managed to preserve a good relationship with the new dux. It was very clear to him that Milan was to be the strategic key to a balanced peace in Italy and Europe.

In April 1451 he met Sforza’s ambassador Sceva da Curte with whom he worked on the compilation of the Capitula of an agreement on the concession of imperial privileges. When the emperor came to Italy in the next year, there was a flurry of diplomatic activity; the bishop of Siena met with the Milanese ambassador Niccolò Arcimboldi, who negotiated the ‘price’ for the imperial investiture. Aeneas refers to this meeting in a letter to Sceva da Curte, written in Vienna on January 22, 1454, in which he also makes a prophetic remark on the Sforza dynasty.

In the meantime, Sforza had concluded his political master-

(Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 67), p. 84; italics MS); see also the letter to Francesco Filelfo, Vienna, 26.11.1449: ‘nescio quod tibi tuique similibus super-sit spei’ (Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 67), pp. 93-94).

8 The document is in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Italien, c. 1585, fos. 192-193. In the same codex are to be found many dispatches from Sceva to Sforza, partially published by Lazzeroni (see note 5).

9 ‘mihi semper visum est ex usu esse tuo principi, ex imperio titulum habere. neque enim filii sui eam semper vel fortunam vel peritiam in bellis habebunt, que nunc in eo est; multus adhuc sub pennis aquile favor adest. credo te cognovisse ex viro gravi et doctissimo, domini Niccolao Arzimboldo, quod sit desiderium cesaris. ego illud sibi Florentie ante duos annos exposui. si tuo principi ad eam rem animus est, poterit legatos mittere Ratisponam et ibi fortasse negocium conclutetur. puto autem etiam ob causam Turchorum eundem principem requirement, ut eo legatos mittat. sed quid fieri contra Turchos potuerit, si cor Christianitatis Italia bello premitur?’ (Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 68), pp. 430-431, italics MS). The first reference to the idea that Sforza could be the captain of the crusade is contemporaneous: it is relevant to establish that this proposal was made a few years before Aeneas became Pius II; cf. to Johannes de Lysura, 15.2.1454: ‘comes Cilie domi quiescit; habet tamen cum Venetis tractatus varios, ut adversus comitem Franciscum capitaneus assumatur; nihil adhuc conclusum intelligo’ (Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 68), p. 445); to Niccolò Arcimboldi, 7.3.1454: ‘Franciscus Sforcia, nutritus in armis, rei militaris expertus, dux fortunatus, ceteris preferendus est, quibus credendus exercitus contra Turchos putatur. si rationes adjiciam, rumpam caput meum nec proficiam.’ (Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 68), p. 456).
piece, the peace of Lodi (1454). Following with sympathetic anxiety the Italian events, on 20 May 1454 Aeneas wrote a long and respectful letter addressed to ‘Francisco Sforzie, duci Mediolanensi (Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 68), p. 486; italics MS). In December 1455 they even secretly met in Milan, and after Aeneas was created Cardinal of Siena (December 1456), the relationship became even more ‘intimate.’ Some unpublished letters exchanged between the Milanese chancery and Aeneas give us a sense of complete political agreement.

Returning to Sforza’s dispatch of August 1458 from which we started, we may now explain the reference to the ‘sweet letters’ and ‘loveliest words’, typical of a diplomatic (and not erotic!) correspondence. It has been euphemistically argued that the duke knew that he could make good use of Piccolomini. In

10 The significance of the Peace of Lodi is already present in the letters to Procopio von Rabenstein of 12.12.1453: ‘legati principum et communitatum Italic Rome sunt pacemque agitant. comes tamen Franciscus multo superior Venetis est eosque admodum premit neque pacem amplecti vult, nisi sibi et suis honorificam’ (Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 68), p. 377); 17.12.1453: ‘pax Italie egre tractatur; comes Franciscus Venetos urget’ (Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 68), p. 391); 22.1.1454: ‘comes Franciscus in bello premit, Florentini filium regis Aragonum magnopere urgent. rex ille hoc anno, qui sibi tertius et sexagesimus est, proximus morti fuit, nunc convaluisse fertur. raro illum etatis annum sine maxima calamitate homines prettereunt. ob eam rem Cesar Augustus, cum sexagesimum quartum natalem suum feliciter attigisset, mirum in modum exultavit’ (Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 68), p. 421).

11 All the originals are preserved in Amb. Two come from Milan: 28.3.1457: Quantum leticie et voluptatis; 1[?]6.1457: Experientibus nobis. The others come from Rome and are autographs by Aeneas, Cardinal of Siena: 10.6.1457: Summa liberalitas et affectio; 1.7.1457: Superioribus diebus accepi; 1.2.1458: Reddite sunt mihi humanissime littere; 10.3.1458: Andreas de Vicecomitibus; 7.4.1458: Etsi pares gratias. See also Epistolae in Cardinalatu editae (Rome, 1475): to Scea 3.2.1457; to Crivelli 26.2.1457; to Scea, to Crivelli 22.10.1457; to Sforza, to Scea, to Arcimboldi 2.12.1457.

12 Luigi Fumi, ‘Chiesa e Stato nel dominio di Francesco I Sforza’, Archivio storico lombardo, Serie VI, a. LI (1924), pp. 1-74, esp. 33. See the transcription ‘Ex zifra’ of a dispatch by Ottone del Carretto, the Milanese ambassador in Rome, to Francesco Sforza, on February 4, 1458: ‘mando a la S. V. alcune copie de lettere del Cardinale Fermo [Capranica] mandate al papa; le ho havute dal ambax.re de Sena che dice che el Cardinale de Sena [Piccolomini] li ha monstrato l’originali quali il papa li haveva dato’ (ASMi, c. 47).
fact, he was also passing confidential information to Sforza against Domenico Capranica, his former mentor, who at the moment of the conclave was the duke’s favorite, and who died in August 1458. The sentence referring to ‘more than any man alive’ is therefore now explained. Sforza had reason indeed to thank God for giving him ‘such a worthy and desired new pope.’

Towards Mantua

These two men represent the ideal models of the Renaissance man: the man of arms and the man of letters. Francesco Sforza, the condottiere become statesman, was a prince by virtue and not by fortune, according to Machiavelli (Prince, chapter VII); Piccolomini, the self-made humanist, worked his way to the top of the intellectual ladder, becoming pope after having been secretary to the anti-pope Felix V and to Emperor Frederick III. Their importance as exemplary figures, however, is outweighed only by the particularity of the long and complex relationship which connected these two. This is a relationship which would exert influences on the papacy in its connections to civil powers and would play a crucial role even in the remapping of Italy.

Upon Piccolomini’s accession, the papacy had been troubled by years of councils and weakened by internal conflicts. The dispatch sent by Ottone del Carretto to Sforza on August 20, 1458 gives a clear sketch of the situation.\(^\text{13}\) The pope invited the

\(^\text{13}\) ‘Sua Santità benignamente accettò le parole mie, dicendo molte cose in laude de Vostra Excellentia, pregandomi volesse scrivere a quella et raccomandarli il stato suo et de santa chiesa come cosa vostra, dicendomi che non solum in le cose de Italia, la quale Sua Santità se confida infra pocho tempo mitigare mediante il favore de Vostra Signoria, ma ancora in la impresa contra il Turcho spera l’aiuto et favore de quella [...]. io a questa cosa dissì Vostra Excellentia sempre apparecchiato con animo promptissimo. [...] molti stimano, che in le cose sue debia essere molto austerio et iustificato, come monstra, et così credo io, che sempre se hesternarà in le facende, ma pur io credo, che a pocho a pocho anderà largando la mano’; published in: Ungedruckte Akten zur Geschichte der Päpste, ed. L. von Pastor, 1. Band: 1376-1464 (Freiburg i. Br., 1904), pp. 94-95. For a still valuable historical recollection based on first-hand documents: L. von Pas-
duke to consider the Church as ‘cosa vostra’, in exchange for military aid ‘in le cose de Italia.’ The two were to cooperate in the securing of Ferrante d’Aragona on the throne of Naples against the French pretensions of René d’Anjou, and the new pope needed help in reclaiming ecclesiastical territories taken by Iacopo Piccinino, during his war with Sigismondo Malatesta. More importantly, Pius requested economic support ‘in la impresa contro il Turcho’, i.e. the crusade. After the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the Western powers were to consider a crusade against the Turks: this idealistic mission had to take into account the economic interests of the various Italian and European states linked with the East. In exchange for this help the pope would become progressively more attentive to Milanese interests (‘a pocho a pocho anderà largando la mano’). It is not surprising, then, that from his first days as a pope Pius II based his politics on his relationship with Sforza.

14 Sforza wrote to his ambassador in Vienna, Giovanni de Ulesia, that Piccolomini had been elected mainly under the influence of the king of Naples: 15.9.1458: in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Italien, c.1588, fol. 131: ‘ne congratulamov con la sua M. tà quale se può glorier haverlo [Pio II] conducto ad tanta sublimitate, non dubitando puncto che sera stata divina et salubrisissima provisione a li tempi nostri.’ The political sense of Ferrante’s support to Piccolomini was an anti-French policy, shared with Sforza (I owe this remark to Riccardo Fubini). In the same dispatch are mentioned the ‘novitate contra el Stato di Sacinta Chiesia’ perpetrated by Piccinino.

15 The shifting role of Venice was central; see the detailed monograph by G. B. Picotti, ‘La Dieta di Mantova e la politica de’ Veneziani’, Miscellanea di storia veneta, s. III, 4 (Venice, 1912); see now the reprint, a cura di G. M. Varanini, introduzione di R. Fubini (Trento, 1996).

16 For instance on August 31, 1458, Ottone del Carretto wrote to the duke that the pope ‘ce pare tutto dedito a Vostra Illustrissima Signoria et fare un grandissimo ymo principalissimo fundamento del Stato suo piu che d’altra potentia’ (Amb). Did this ‘fundamento’ work? A letter relates facts concerning the mission of Galeotto Agnesio sent from Milan to ask the duke’s help against Piccinino; Sforza’s rival condottiere was unwilling to return its territories to the Church State. The duke readily agreed support, stating: ‘et questo faremo con effetco, non tanto perché siamo obligati per virtute de la lega universale [i.e. Lega Italica] ma per amore et devotione che portiamo ad Sancta Chiesa et in specialità per reverentia et summa affectione che habiamo ad la propria persona
However, Ottone del Carretto’s dispatch to the duke on November 11, 1458, shows the hesitation of Pius II to dedicate himself fully to this alliance. This dispatch concerned Sforza’s proposal to assign a bishopric in Lombardy to the pope’s nephew Francesco Piccolomini. The Milanese ambassador, a man of keen perception, astutely praises the offer of the duke: ‘very well done, since this is the way to have your way with this pope’ (‘molto ben fatto perché questo è il modo de stringersi questo papa per tuto vostro’; Amb). He is right when he says that Francesco ‘would be the one to most benefit from this papacy’ (‘debba essere chi caverà più frutto di questo papato’), because he will eventually become Pius III. For now, he is still too young to be made a bishop (‘non merita ancora tanta dignità’); the pope says he does not want to set a ‘bad example for others’, but perhaps he did not want to oblige himself to Sforza.

This dispatch also provides an amazingly detailed scheme of the courtly favoritism of the new pope, who planned, at least in the beginning, to reduce the blatant nepotism of his Borgia predecessor, Calixtus III. For instance, the two secretaries Gregorio Lolli and Jacopo Ammannati, ‘quorum spectata virtus ab omni labe procul aberat’ (C 121), were carefully chosen for their qualifications by Pius II, who for his entire life had been a secretary. Professional affinity takes precedence over family ties, even though Ammannati will eventually inherit Piccolomini’s family name. Above all, Pius II’s central strategic concern, beyond internal tactics, was the crusade.

At the same time, Sforza was no less cautious in his diplomacy than the pope. On February 24, 1459, he informed Ottone del Carretto of the visit of Francesco Coppini, bishop of Terni, apostolic envoy to France and England. Coppini was to become a double agent for Sforza and, as we will see in detail below, he would work against the English peace that the pope had ordered him to seek. At present, we should keep in mind Sforza’s phrase ‘we will make the effort to do and actually do more than
we say in words’ (‘ce sforzaramo de fare et faramo molto pur in effecto che non dicamo con le parole’; ASMi 48): the tactics of promising was the basis of Sforza’s politics.

The duke was preparing himself for the great moment of negotiation at the Congress of Mantua. In March, he sent his son Galeazzo, attended by a retinue of about 500 horsemen, to accompany the pope on his travel through Italy (C 148ff.). The beautiful letters by Galeazzo – fifteen years old at the time – provide a personal account of these events.\(^{17}\) Galeazzo’s welcome in Florence was even warmer than the one given to the Sienese pope. In fact, Cosimo de’ Medici had his good reasons to be tepid toward Pius II.\(^ {18}\)

---


\(^{18}\) See Fr. Cardini, ‘La Repubblica di Firenze e la Crociata di Pio II’, in Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia, III (1979), pp. 455-482. Cardini illustrates the opposition of Florentine merchants to the crusade, which they feared would interrupt commerce in the East. Cosimo’s role is slightly overemphasized in this article, whereas the military and political stand of Milan is underestimated. Cf. V. Ilardi, ‘The Banker-Statesman and the Condottiere-Prince: Cosimo de’ Medici and Francesco Sforza (1450-1464)’, in: V. Ilardi, Studies in Italian Renaissance Diplomatic History (London, 1986). The skeptic attitude of the Florentine and the Milanese leaders is witnessed even earlier by a letter of Sceva de Curte to Sforza, Florence, 20.10.1458: ‘[Cosimo] m’ha dicto como hogi fa uno di el papa fece consistorio publico de tuti li cardinali et divulgo como Sua Sanctità, la qual è pratica molto del pays de Ungaria et de quelle bande, vede et intende expressamente la christianità e la fede nostra stare in pezmi termini se non se li mete remedio. Et che a cinque di de zugno sua Sanctità è deliberata transferirse a Mantua aut più tosto a Udene [...] et volle fare li pratica cum tutti li principi et potentie de christianità de modo observando [...] et dice etiamdio che intende la Sanctità de nostro Signore transferire cum essa tuta la corte [...] li dixi che forsi el papa quando haverò communicato cum Sua Santità el parere de la Vostra Signoria circha li facti del Turco, modererà questa sua sententia et considererà che nanti se faza la caxa et nanti che Sua Sanctità se mova da la propria sede
At the end of May, the pope arrived in Mantua. The entire Sforza family – with the exception of the duke – welcomed him (C 169-170; cf. UA 102-103), but none of the kings and rulers he had invited appeared. The congress, scheduled to start on June 1, had to be postponed. The pope’s repeated invitations to the duke to participate in the congress – he wrote him on July 7 and again on August 25 – finally paid off, and on September 17 Francesco Sforza solemnly entered Mantua.

In his Commentaries19 (C 193ff.), Pius II devoted several interesting pages to a description of the dynamics of this event, considered the most important political success of his project. Sforza is celebrated as ‘unus nostra etate visus, quem fortuna diligeret’ (C 197). The subtle implications of this apparent eulogy, however, call attention to Sforza’s debt to God: ‘ille felix est, quem pa ca urgent incommoda’ (C 198). Such a ‘negative definition of happiness’ as Burckhardt once remarked, expresses all the ambiguity of this relationship, where admiration and envy (Sforza was a very healthy man, Pius II had gout), political interest and personal honor were at stake. It should not go unnoticed, though, that in his speech delivered in front of the Mantuan assembly, the pope praises maliciously the fortuna of Francesco’s father and the virtus of the son (C 199).

It is harder to imagine Sforza’s perception. In the two letters that the duke sent to Duchess Bianca from Mantua on September 26 and 29, he informed her of the talk and the work (‘oratione’ and ‘occupazione’) that prevented him even from eating. He seemed to be in a hurry to leave that eloquent company, which he does on October 3. Did they reach a general agree-

---

19 Among the many biographical portraits of Francesco Sforza written by Piccolomini, the one in the Commentaries is the longest and most detailed. See also Kollar, Historia Friderici, pp. 152ff.; De viris illustribus, ed. A. van Heck (Vatican City, 1991), pp. 17-21; De Europa, chs. 49, 59. The variants in these various portraits deserve a comparative study on their own merit.
ment on internal and foreign policies? They did discuss 'cose private et particolare' in a personal meeting on October 1, with results generally propitious to the duke. On that very day, Sforza signed manu propria – with the other princes and envoys – the solemn Instrumentum in causa defensionis fidei, redacted by the Roman and Milanese secretaries. This long text opens with a pious evocation of Christ's sufferings on the cross filled with pathos, and then lists all the concrete promises in support of the crusade.

A few days later, the pope informed the consistory of his intention to establish a tax on all church revenues in Lombardy, which would be passed directly to the duke of Milan. Interestingly, Sforza's name was not mentioned in any of the transactions: 'Et nemine contradicente fu obtegnuto.' This meant that all the money coming from the Lombard 'benefici' would remain in the duchy. The pope ended the congress on January 14, having concluded much business of this type.21

Red Hats and Black Humors

The clergy, however, proved unwilling to accept this situation. On March 5, 1460, while in Siena, the consistory claimed that the duke had been granted excessive privileges. Sforza gave a rapid response: 'We do not want cardinals to fatten up personal friends, who are very often our mortal enemies, in our own


21 Cf. G. B. Picotti, 'D'una questione tra Pio II e Francesco Sforza per la ventesima degli ebrei', Archivio storico lombardo, S. IV, 40 (1913), pp. 184-213. Here is an interesting case in which Pius II's idealism and Sforza's realism came to an unexpected end: 'Francesco Sforza, ottenendo che la contribuzione degli ebrei alle spese della guerra santa fosse posta su basi più razionali e più eque, aveva, forse senza saperlo né volerlo, reso un servigio alla difesa della fede' (203).
The struggle had begun, and no one spared energy in attacking the other side. On April 7, 1460, Sforza said that he knew about the complaints. This exhibition of intolerance needed sometimes to be moderated, in order to balance the do ut des. When the bishop of Pavia, Castiglioni, died in April 1460, Pius wanted to replace him in that ‘liberalium artium schola insigne’ with the learned Jacopo Ammannati (C 271).

22 Sforza to Ottone del Carretto, Milan, 27.3.1460: ‘Nuy non desideramo che ad nostro dispeto cardinali ingrasseno questo et quello ad casa nostra et molte volte dellin imici nostri mortali’ (Amb). This postscript is slightly misquoted by Fumi; Ansani extensively quotes the long letter, which gives many other details on the business.

23 ‘Ve dicimo d. Otho che qui bisogna aprire li ochij et aguzare lo intelceto per adaptare queste cose de benefici con la Santità de nostro Signore perché tutto questo male vene delli per instigatione de li nostri sonno in corte [...]. Queste sono inventione fanno ad suo modo quelli nostri sono li in corte alli quali non riuscirà el pensiero che credeno con loro arte et malicie prevertire li ordeni nostri con la Santità de nostro Signore per mezo di alcuni ill. Cardinali per potere usare expectatione et togliersi li benefici nel dominio nostro ad suo modo. Il che non gli comportarimo may.’ (Amb).

24 Cf. G. Calamari, Il confidente di Pio II, cardinal Jacopo Ammannati Piccolomini (Rome / Milan, 1932). Here is an occasion for a footnote to the Commentaries; we may look into the background of this struggle through the dispatch from Siena, dated April 15, 1460: ‘Mi disse sua Beatitudine: “Nuy have-mo domino Jacobo da Luca nostro secretario caro et dilectissimo quanto se ce fusse figliolo, il qual desideriamo locare in parte dove poy di noy sia ben locato. Et perché sapiamo che luy ama lo III.mo S. duca et è di maiore condicione che Sua Signoria oltre il respetto nostro per sua virtù ancora l’haria ben caro, nuy siamo avvisati che il Cardinale de Pavia sta molto male, onde accadendo la sua morte, voriamo che quello III.mo Sig.re fusse contento che dessemo quello ves-coato al prefato domino Jacobo; et quantunque in nostra facoltà sia le colatione et benefici, et tanto più quando questo vaca in corte, tamen non voriamo farlo se non de sua bona voglia et accettabiamo questo da Sua Signoria per gratia singulare. Unde scriveteli quanto strictament possedi, certificando Sua Eccellenza haverà persona de la qual si potrà ben fidari et valersì forsi più che de prelato alcuno che li potesse mettere et nuy ancora li scriveremo in questa mattina duo breve.” Io vedendo con quanta instantia rechideva questa cosa presenti li R.mi Cardinali de Thiano et di Spoleti non li risposi altro salvo che con ogni diligen-tia exequiria quanto Sua Santità mi domandava. Lo R.mo Cardinal di Thiano [Forteguerri] poy andando io fuori de la camera del papa mi segui et strinsemi molto ch’io confortassi Vostra Excellentia a compiacere al papa de questa cosa qual non li potria essere più a core, et se tenesse certa Vostra Excellentia che
But the struggle on ‘benefici’ was far from being resolved and in a long dispatch on April 26, Ottone made a highly detailed report concerning the reactions of the college of cardinals, which opposed the ‘mal facto et mal exemplio’ of consenting to the duke’s pressures. This acquiescent behavior could cause, they argued, the resentment of the other ‘temporal lords’ (Amb).

The pope’s response to the cardinals was at first conciliatory, then threatening. Afterwards, he called Ottone and reported to him all that had happened. So, we have to keep in mind that all the scene is recreated ad partem, as in a theatrical play, by the pope himself, who of course emphasized his friendly feelings for Sforza, while stressing nonetheless that the cardinals’ claims were legally consistent. Del Carretto answered that not all the consistory supported this hostile position towards the duke, but that only some of the red hats disguised their desire to encourage ‘discrepantia’ between the two allies by using the authority of the entire college of cardinals (‘mantello de tutto il colegio’). After the ambassador’s subtle reply, the pope continued to insist on Ammannati’s promotion, if not to Pavia, at least to Parma. Sforza ended by granting Pius’s wish, and on July 18 Ammannati was officially elected Bishop of Pavia. Eventually, he would become cardinal of the same city.¹²⁵

The pope was now less concerned with the crusade, because he had to wage an internal religious and political war. While solving the Neapolitan crisis, Pius had to deal with the troubles created in his state by the impious Malatesta.²⁶ As Del Carretto

---

²⁵ Cf. Iacopo Ammannati Piccolomini, _Lettere (1444-1479)_ , ed. P. Cherubini, Pubblicazioni degli Archivi di Stato, Fonti XXV (Rome, 1997), pp. 138; 329-362. After his promotion to Bishop of Pavia, Ammannati became so intimate with the Sforzas, that the duchess sent him secret cyphers, and the duke recommended him to the cardinale.

wrote to Sforza on January 3, 1461, *Sua Santità* was ‘in all ways ready to pursue this enterprise and to revenge himself on Sigismondo until his destruction, and that every other matter should be put aside’ (‘disposta in tutto a proseguire questa impresa et vendicarsi del prefato signor Sigismundo fin a la sua destructione, etiam se dovesse mettere da parte ogni altra cosa’: UA, 133). The excommunication issued against the violent lord of Rimini did not end the aggression or the reciprocal poetic mockery. In this conflict, Sforza tried to tone down his impulsive reactions of the pope, even if he had many serious reasons to oppose Sigismondo (he had killed Sforza’s daughter Polissena, Malatesta’s first wife), but for the sake of the peace of Italy, he managed to put his personal *vendetta* aside.

On the other hand, the duke was no abstract peace-lover, as a consideration of the diplomatic activities surrounding the Church State will show. As seen earlier, Francesco Coppini, bishop of Terni, had been in England since the spring of 1459, having received the official legation from Rome and the secret mission from Milan. Although an anti-French foreign policy was common to both Pius and Sforza, Coppini passed the bounds of his mission. Instead of negotiating peace between France and England, he promoted the Yorkists’ cause in the English struggle for the throne, so that they would be able to defeat their Lancastrian-Angevin enemies and then invade France. This Machiavellian maneuvering would make the French king too busy at home to support the Angevin invasion of Naples.

It is not surprising, then, that on February 22, 1461, Sforza wrote a letter requesting Coppini’s promotion to the red hat; on


March 20, 1461 he repeated his request. To understand why the duke was recommending him, we need only a brief sample of Coppini’s ‘bombastic style’, from a letter of April 17, 1461: ‘I know the secret and I know the truth about the Curia. [...] Pardon me, Your Lordship, if I speak so boldly – for it appears that thus the Creeds of the Church a long time ago bade men speak – especially now that, just as I have been from infancy your servant, partisan, and son, so should you be a father to me; and this is the time to show it, to the honor of God and to the Church’s glory and yours.’

On May 16, 1461, Sforza wrote to Coppini reassuring him that: ‘we shall no more neglect anything that we can do in your behalf than we would if we were soliciting on our own behalf’, having sent to the pope Agostino Rossi with ‘strict instructions.’ Coppini expressed his impatience about the Roman resolution in a couple of letters to Sforza. But the Curia would oppose his promotion, and not without cause. When Coppini returned to Rome on February 1462, Sforza recommended him to Pius in the highest terms. Also in the ducal request on March 14, 1462 to grant Coppini the archbishopric of Florence, he promised to ‘make an effort of doing this with honesty and without any blame for us’ (‘sforzandovi de farlo con honesta et senza nostro caricho’: ASMi 53), clearly revealing Sforza’s unwillingness to risk anything for the bishop of Terni. The effectiveness of this recommendation was not exactly the expected one, for on July 10, 1462, Coppini wrote to Sforza from Castel Sant’Angelo jail: ‘if your lordship does not help me soon, I will die in despair. I can no longer write nor live through this misery, for all the humiliations I have to bear would not fit in a notebook’ (‘se presto V. S. non m’aiuta jo morrò disperato [...] Jo non posso più né scrivere né vivere in questa miseria ch’in uno quaderno non caperebbero le inuirie et le miserie ch’io patisco’: ASMi 53). Despite Sforza’s last minute appeal, Coppini was deprived of his bishopric for his unfaithfulness to

---

28 *Dispatches*, 276. The duke’s ‘gloria’ was to be placed before the Church’s if Coppini was sending an original letter for the pope to Sforza, ‘so that his lordship can see it and, if he thinks it good to do so, send it on’ (Coppini to Cicco Simonetta, Saint Omer, May 7, 1461, 320).
the papal cause, and he died a year later having made ‘monachus melior quam episcopus’ (C 645).

Sforza’s ‘gran rifiuto’

Meanwhile, Pius II had not forgotten Sforza’s major concern for the imperial investiture. In a letter to Frederick III on February 9, 1461, he strongly recommended the duke.\(^{29}\) This intervention, once again, failed. On the other hand, the political situation of the Church had hardly improved. On March 12, 1462, Ottone del Carretto sent Sforza a long and detailed report on his ‘private’ talk with the pope about all political issues currently at stake in Europe. This is one of the most fascinating dispatches ever written, through which we can appreciate the thorough political skill of Pius. The premise is that one cannot stand without the other: the duke being alone, surrounded only by enemies or hostile friends. The pope, in turn, overtly admits the Church’s catastrophic condition: ‘We find our state in total confusion in temporal as well as in spiritual matters’ (‘nuy si trovamo il stato nostro tutto frachasato cassi in tempore, come in spirituale’: UA 152). He goes on to review every ruler in the West. The king of France was to lead this ambitious

\(^{29}\) *Epistolae in Pontificatu editae* (Milan, 1473), epist. XXI, pro investitura ducatus; see the copy in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Italien, c. 1588, fol. 289: ‘Age igitur prudentissime princeps, noli propter defectum alicuius pecuniae investituram hanc negare, quae imperium servabit in Italia et romanae ecclesiae plurimum consulet. Si non moveris Francisci precibus, moveant te filii eius, qui ex sanguine Philippi prodeunt, quem tui predecessores investiverunt. Moveat te imperium, quod nisi hoc feceris, ex Italia pelletur. Moveat te pauper Italia, que invita corona et fasces imperii deserit. Moveat te nostra rogamina, quae pluris esse debet, quam requisitae pecuniae.’ See also the following letter of March 1461. The first papal letter in recommendation of Sforza was written by the humanist Pier Candido Decembrio on October 22, 1458 (Cusin, ‘Le relazioni tra l’Impero e il ducato di Milan’, 25) Another letter with the same content was addressed to the emperor by Pius II on November 1, 1460 (Cusin, ‘Le relazioni tra l’Impero e il ducato di Milan’, 45, 98). Also Ferrante addressed a letter to Frederick III and to the imperial electors with the same purpose: cf. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. Lat. 2070, fos. 52v-53r (the codex contains Panormita’s epistles written for Ferrante d’Aragona, king of Naples).
crowd of statesmen (‘turba’), eventually provoking a major schism in the Church (‘fare scisma grande in la chiesa de Dio’: UA 155). In order to avoid this great trouble (‘grandissima tribulatione’), del Carretto suggested that they should lull the king to sleep with words pretending to yield to him but substantially not letting him suffocate these ‘two lights of Italy’ (‘lumi d’Italia’). Otherwise, he would acquire Italy and move the papacy to France.

Pius II was extremely sensitive to these arguments. The whole point of the crusade was to maintain the central role of the Church. But the Milanese ambassador added another consideration: instead of pursuing ‘thousands of pleasures’, the prince was to seek honor and not the ‘utile’ – like little men and petty rulers do. The pope would soon realize how ambiguous this ethic of sacrifice was to be. This awareness of the troubled situation of the Church makes the diplomatic game intriguing: Piccolomini, who knew the weight of words, was preparing himself for the final battle. In the fall of 1463, he addressed the duke in a long and eloquent epistle,30 in which he listed all the gifts that God had granted him, which gave him the divine grounds for his personal leadership of the crusade.

Sforza’s response took no lower tone. Dated October 24, 1463, the letter’s elegant Latin, probably written by a court humanist, was full of historical examples and rhetorical evasiveness. The duke praised the noble purpose of fighting ‘pro salute publica in Mahomethem monstrum spurcissium’, but he re-

fused to lead the holy army, and proposed rather Duke Philip of Burgundy. Sforza added a couple of personal remarks; he had always considered 'otium' as 'abhorrendum':

Neither my wife's or my sons' affections, nor princely pleasures and luxurious leisure will force me into idleness. Neither efforts and dangers to which I am used to will make me abhor waging this war, nor councilors' or friends' advice will divert my mind from the enterprise of following Christ's Cross.\(^{31}\)

In conclusion, he promised to send his son Galeazzo to the holy war and self-servingly he praised the pope's supreme cleverness, his mundane experience and divine wisdom.\(^{32}\)

*Intelligenti pauciae*. Pius understood the message, and in his *Commentaries* adds this vitriolic note:

> [the pope] sent the Duke a long letter which has been published with others of his. In it he tried to persuade Francesco to accompany him on the crusade in the capacity of commander-in-chief of the whole apostolic army with the certainty of winning undying fame and the salvation of his soul, and the assurance that he would be acting for the best interests of his descendants in the principate of Milan. But his efforts were in vain. A mind enslaved

\(^{31}\) 'Neque uxoris igitur aut natorum blandimenta, neque delectatio principatus, neque delitiarum mollities in oicium me compellunt, neque labores et pericula quibus assuetus sum a capessendo bello hoc abhorrebut, neque necessarium aut amicorum consilia mentem ab instituto divertent, quin Christi crucem sequar.' See also the next footnote.

\(^{32}\) 'Novi enim sicut acumen ingenii, ita et maximarum rerum experientiam, ita singularem ac prope divinam sapientiam tuam.' This letter is published in Piccolomini's *Opera Omnia* (Basel 1571), pp. 865-868. A copy of the original, along with an Italian version, is preserved in Amb. It is hard to establish who actually wrote it: given the importance of the matter, maybe the author was Cicco Simonetta, the chief secretary in Milan. Also the following letter to Bianca Maria, *ne obstet viro deliberanti ire pro fide* (pp. 868-869; see epist. L) with the date of 26.9.1463 is preserved in Amb, where we find the unpublished reply of the duchess, both in Latin and Italian. Sforza's wife claims to be obedient to the divine will, in the hope of 'celestial glory', and to be happy that her beloved husband will gain this eternal gift.
by the pleasures of this world scorned those to come and he made far-fetched excuses.  

Finally, the ‘utile’ and the ‘crapula’ seemed to overwhelm Sforza’s promises. But the anger against the duke was hopeless; as we see in the breve sent to Sforza by Pius on December, 19 1463:

We were informed not without sadness by your ambassador Ot-tone of the continuous obstacles which in many ways interfere with this holy enterprise.

The position of the Milanese ambassadors at Rome was becoming more untenable by the day; however: pia spes ultima dea. From Ottone’s dispatch of January 25, 1464 we learn, for instance, that the preaching of the crusade was forbidden in Sforza’s dominions, using the plague as a pretext. The Milanese ambassador underlined, moreover, the extreme stakes involved: were the pope to be defeated, the Church itself would risk being swept away. In short, this dispatch vividly depicts Pius’s situation: ‘afraid of the council or other troubles, he had been driven mad and was forced to enter this dance, and to dance’) (‘il timore de concilio o altre novità contra di Sua Santità [...] tanto l’hano facto trabucare qua et intrare in questa danza, sicchè li sia forza balare’: UA 270). The pope had been reduced to beg for Sforza’s help. We can now recall the letter that the duke, ex-

33 ‘[...] longam ad eum [Sforza] epistulam misit, que inter alias eius inserta est. in ea conatus est homini suadere ut secum in expeditionem iret totius exercitus apostolici dux futurus, eternam inde famam et anime salutem consequatur posteritatique sue in principatu mediolanensi consulturum. sed frustra conatus est: delitiis iam presentibus devinctus animus futuras contempsit excusationes-que procul quesitas obtendit’ (C 784); for the English translation, see Fl. A. Gragg (trans.) and L. C. Gabel (introd. and notes), The commentaries of Pius II, Smith College studies in history , vol. 22 (nos. 1-2); vol. 25 (nos. 1-4), vol. 30, vol. 35, vol. 43 (Northampton, Mass, 1937-1957), esp. vol. 43, p. 835.

34 ‘Communicavimus non sine tristitia cordis cum oratore tuo Otho impedi menta continua que per nonnullos ingeruntur huic operi sancto’ (Amb).

35 ‘conforta che havendo Vostra Excellentia più rispetto a Dio, cuius causa agitur, et etiam al papa, il quale sempre ha portato e porta amore a quella, se
actly four years before, had sent to Ottone: ‘ce sforzaramo de fare et faramo molto pur in effecto che non dicano con le parole perché cossì è nostro debito’. How ironic these words now sounded!

Sforza’s efforts became true political blackmail, as in the case of the promotion of Stefano Nardini.36 He was Sforza’s stepbrother, who had been elected Archbishop of Milan by Nicolò V. On the design and desire to elect him Cardinal of Milan (‘desiderio magior habia al mondo per una cosa’), much insistence was made. On the other hand, the duke remained insensitive to the sacred smell of the Golden Rose – the award granted to pious condottieri –, evoked by the pope in another vibrant letter of April 1464.37

degni fare dal canto suo quello favore che pó a questa sancta impresa’ (UA 273).

36 Sforza to Pius II, Milan, 10.3.1464: ‘Io non dubitay may Padre Beatissimo del singulare amore et pietà de Vostra Santità verso de mi suo devotissimo figliolo per molti et evidentissimi argumenti et veri effecti me ha continuamente demonstrato. Et maxime al presente per quello me scrive Messer Otho de la optima sua dispositione ha in farme gratis et exaudirme del desiderio magior habia al mondo per una cosa, cioè de creare Cardinale lo Reveren.mo Arcivescovo de Milano de la qualcosa ne regratato infinitamente V.ra S.ta et confessato quanto altro debito non havesse con quella per questo esserle obbligatissimo in eterno. Et perché Padre Sancto questa è cosa non solo opportuna ma necessaria grandemente al Stato mio et anchora a le cose se hanno ad tractare per questa sancta Impresa como diffusamente esso Messer Otho referirà ad V. S.ta, supplico ad quella se digni sencia più indugia contentarame de questa gratia desiderata da me magiormente che né per littere né a bocha potesse may exprimere, la quale jo insieme cum madonna Biancha et questi mei figlioli tucti devotissimi de V. S.ta expectiam in summa alegreza et consolatione [...]. Et jo dal canto mio farò intendere ad tucto il mondo non havere figliolo né più obsequeute et devotissimo de mi verso quella ad contraporse quando bisogniasse el Stato li figlioli et la propria persona’ (Amb). The letter is signed: ‘Servitor devotissimus Francisus Sfortia Vicecomes manu propria’, and by the unfailing ‘Cichus.’ On June 6, Ottone del Carretto wrote to Sforza: ‘per infermità del papa [...] non è stata ancora l’oportunita del tempo ad introdurre questa cosa, la qual bisogna pur de un pocho de industria et non se pò far tutta insieme. Nam per indirectam bisogna fare questa opera ch’el papa motu proprio se mova a chiamar il prefato Monsignor a questo’ (ASMi, c. 56).

37 This letter is published in Cugnoni, Aeneae Silvii [...] opera inedita, pp. 457-458. On the significance of the Pontifical Rose, see L. Fumi, ‘Una nuova
In Rome, the situation was worsening from day to day. It is worth quoting the letter by Ottone del Carretto on June 16, 1464: ‘Even if it seems bad to predict bad events, despite the fervent desire which his Holiness has to go on his crusade regardless his poor health, we can truly fear for his life and there is already secret talk of a new pope’ (‘Benché para male indovinarsi el male, tamen per lo fervente apetito che ha la Santità de nostro Signore d’andare non obstante l’infirmità sua, se pò dubitar assay de la sua vita et già se ragiona secretamente de novo papa.’). He went on to suggest that the cardinals were preparing themselves for the new conclave, so that ‘to buy them would be a good investment – but perhaps I speak too boldly, and may the faith excuse me’! (‘comprarseli nam [...] potria far gran frutto [...] forsi io parlo troppo presumptuosamente, ma la fede me scusi’: Amb). We are brought back to the situation at the beginning of this essay, but the meaning of the ‘faith’ being at stake is something different from the Christian sense and it does not here refer to the Muslim threat!

Nardini, sent to follow the pope personally in order to persuade him of his promotion, wrote a long dispatch from Ancona on July 22 about the rumors of ‘spiritual and temporal scandals’ (UA 320). Nardini’s two last letters to his stepbrother (August 11 and 13) describe the pope’s constantly worsening condition and express a futile prayer that the Christian faith restore Pius II ‘ad pristinam salutem’ (UA 326) – but this was not to be. Pius II died in the night of 14 and 15 August. Like Piccolomini’s *Tale of Two Lovers,* the history of these two allies has a tragic ending. Like Eurialus and Lucretia, they were separated by distrust and eventually by death. Cosimo de’ Medici had passed away on August 1, 1464. Sforza died on March 8, 1466, leaving Italy at a critical turning point of its history, as Machiavelli sharply remarks in his *Istorie fiorentine* (VII, 9).

---

Secret historiography and propaganda fide

In this chronological sketch of the various stages of the relationship between Piccolomini and Sforza, I have attempted to give an accurate ‘portrait in movement’ of their alliance, beyond any idealistic contempt expressed by Voigt or moralistic apology expounded by Pastor. Pius II was by no means a naive politician, blinded by dreams of eternal glory. The call for the crusade was a necessary ploy in the efforts to reestablish the Church’s central role in European spirituality. It served also to distance all the schismatic tendencies of the councils, which Piccolomini had known personally in the early part of his career.

We may recall Aeneas’s Dialogus written around 1453.\footnote{Published in Cugnoni, Aeneae Silvii ... opera inedita, pp. 550-615. Cf. R. Fubini, ‘Papato e storiografia nel Quattrocento’, Studi medievali 17 (1977), pp. 321-351, 342.} After going through all the religious debates, the secretary provides an indirect response to Valla’s De falso credita et ementita Costantini donatione, which argued that not only on philosophical, but also on historical grounds the Donation was a proven forgery. He reversed Valla’s position, claiming that the power of the Church resided in its divine investiture. It is with such an awareness of the temporal and spiritual role of the Holy See, that he became Pius II. At that point, he was forced to seek an alliance with Sforza, whose aggressive and cunning conduct he had already experienced years before. On the one hand, Piccolomini shows the energy of a man who is convinced that all his ideas will be realized by virtue of their truth; on the other, Sforza’s Realpolitik is that of a consummate condottiere and statesman. The dialogue between the man of letters and the man of arms ended in tragic failure.

Finally, a later episode which somehow enlightens this essay might be mentioned. Giovanni Simonetta, brother of Cicco, Sforza’s chief secretary, wrote in his Sforziade that Pius II never intended to go on the crusade alone.\footnote{See G. Ianziti, Humanistic Historiography under the Sforzas. Politics and Propaganda in Fifteenth-Century Milan (Oxford, 1988).} As Ottone del Carretto confidentially revealed to Sforza’s biographer, the pope...
would have sailed from Ancona, but he planned to interrupt his voyage in Southern Italy to blame the Italian princes for their inadequate support of the holy war. Simonetta’s text also emphasized the political and military indecision of the pope in instances such as the Neapolitan war, as opposed to Sforza’s powerful realism. It is interesting to recall that Iacopo Gherardi, former secretary of Pius’s secretary Ammannati (who died in 1479), when he was in Milan around 1488, asked Simonetta to rewrite these parts of his work, since Cristoforo Landino’s Italian version was being printed in Florence at the time. The old chancellor, heavily threatened by Cardinal Francesco Piccolomini, did eventually compose a *Compendio* of his history, cutting out most of the unpleasant remarks on Pius II, but not changing a word of the ambiguous passage on his ‘happy death’, which vaguely resonates in the ‘amoris exitum [...] non ficti neque felicis’ of the *Historia de duobus amantibus*. The secretaries jealously guarded the secrets of their patrons, continuing to fight their battles of armed propaganda through their own letters.

---

41 Dispacci e lettere di Giacomo Gherardi, ed. E. Carusi (Vatican City, 1909), *ad indicem*.

PIUS II AND THE FORMATION OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL INSTITUTIONS OF PIENZA

Giuseppe Chironi

The subject of this article is the creation of the bishopric of Pienza and the foundation of its related institutions, the Chapter and the body in charge of the construction and upkeep of the cathedral, the Opera. This present research was made possible through the reorganisation of the diocesan archives in Pienza.\(^1\)

It might legitimately be asked to what degree the events and institutional matters to be examined here are directly related specifically to Pius II and not more generally to the canonist practice of the Roman Curia in the fifteenth century. It is usually supposed that the most important and even the bulk of the legal instruments promulgated by the papal chancery (apart from the original ‘political’ impulse by the pope or his closest assistants) in form and content followed procedures and models that had long been settled by tradition.\(^2\)

Without a doubt, the creation of the bishopric of Pienza in 1462 is the most notable example of a pope’s special will by which a modest village was transformed into a city.\(^3\) Corsi-

\(^1\) See G. Chironi, *L’Archivio diocesano di Pienza. Inventario* (Siena / Rome, 2000), with an appendix containing documents to which this article refers: the bull of the creation of the bishopric (Archivio Segreto Vaticano (from here on ASV), Registro Vaticano 487, cc. 187r-190v), pp. 515-518; the bull of the reservation of the patronate (ASV, Registro Vaticano 487, cc. 280r-282r), pp. 518-521; and the bull of the conferment of the prebends on the canons of Pienza (Archivio Diocesano di Pienza (from here on ADP), Diplomatico 1463 Jan. 29), pp. 525-527.

\(^2\) On the structure and working of the Apostolic chancellery, see the study by P. Rabikauskas, *Diplomatica pontificia* (Rome, 1968), in particular pp. 99-106.

\(^3\) The qualified term of ‘city’ in the Italian tradition must be exclusively attributed to a bishop’s see: cf. G. Chittolini, “Il nome di ‘città’”. La denominazione dei centri urbani d’oltrealpe in alcune scritture italiane del primo
gnano was demographically modest, had no ecclesiastical institutions of any importance, was not the see of a prepositura nullius nor was it an important centre in the Sienese territory with an autonomous communal tradition (as was Montalcino). It could never have aspired to a bishop’s see. Interesting questions arise about the way and with what purpose, Pius II created this new bishopric. Rather surprisingly, the voluminous bibliography on Pius II considers his institutional creation as merely an almost obvious appendix to the building activities he stimulated in his native town. Yet, both the title of ‘city’ and the name ‘Pienza’ itself depend directly on the bull of the creation of the bishopric.

There are reasons to believe that the intervention of the pope was not limited to the decision of creating a bishopric but that he also exerted his influence on the practical procedures and the final result. Firstly, there is the exceptional character of the modification of the boundaries of a bishopric. Such action obviously interferes with ancient rights and for this reason it was rarely done unless a territory exempt from the authority of the diocesan ordinary already existed, as in the case of a pre-


4 Cf. M. Ginatempo, Crisi di un territorio. Il popolamento della Toscana senese alla fine del Medioevo (Florence, 1988), p. 191, who estimates the population of the village between 800 and 1200 for the period immediately after the transformation of Corsignano into Pienza. Ecclesiastically, Corsignano was part of the diocese of Arezzo, and it had two ancient churches, the old pieve of Santi Vito e Modesto and the church of Santa Maria, situated respectively, as was the norm, outside the village and within its walls.

5 The bibliography on Pius II is enormous. Among the most recent studies, reference may be made to J. Pieper, Pienza. Der Entwurf einer humanistische Welsicht (Stuttgart / London, 1997), pp. 609-616. As far as I am aware, the creation of the ecclesiastical institutions of Pienza has not been specifically treated before. From Pastor onwards, the construction of the buildings self-evidently seems to coincide with the formation of the institutions: L. von Pastor, Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1904); see vol. II: Von der Thronbesteigung Pius’ II. bis zum Tode Sixtus’ IV, pp. 44, 215). Although recognised as exemplary, only a cursory remark was dedicated to the case of Pienza by D. Hay, La Chiesa nell’Italia rinascimentale (Rome / Bari, 1979), p. 18, and G. Greco, Le chiese locali, in: eds. G. Greco and M. Rosa, Storia degli antichi stati italiani (Rome / Bari, 1996), p. 166.
*positura nullius* or a monastery in which the abbot exerted a quasi-episcopal jurisdiction.  

The most recent example of the creation of a new bishopric before Pienza is Mondovi, created in 1388 at the request of Marquis Theodore of Monferrato in the context of the conflict between Rome and the French antipope Clement VII. Afterwards, the boundaries of some bishoprics were considerably changed, and in 1451 the patriarchate of Venice was created.  

After the foundation of Pienza and from the beginning of the sixteenth century, examples of the creation of new bishoprics become more frequent. It is difficult to discover that the bull for Pienza, on a strictly formal level, was a model for a whole series of creations, starting from Sixtus IV’s creation of the bishopric of Casale Monferrato of 1474. The *arenza*, the ideological preamble, in particular, shows a different attitude in comparison to preceding ones which follow the example of the bull by Pope John XXII *Salvator noster* inserted into the *Ex-

---


9 In the period after the death of Pius II until the Council of Trent, all the bulls of diocesan formation in Italy use the Pienza phrasing (Casale Monferrato in 1474, Saluzzo in 1511, Borgo San Sepolcro and Lanciano in 1515, Vigevano in 1529). Afterwards, until 1717, this formula was used for another four formations out of ten (San Severino in 1586, Borgo San Donnino in 1601, San Miniato in 1622 and San Angelo in Vado in 1635). Cf. Ughelli, *Italia sacra*, vols. I-IV and VI.
travagantes communes. I do not here want to analyse the differences between the two texts. It is sufficient to observe that while John XXII declares that he is acting as a locum tenens, and also explains the conditions of his authority to create bishoprics (ubi ergo superex crescere messem, videlicet populi multitudinem, viderit) the bull for Pienza contains an arrogant proclamation of the superiority (praeminentia) of the Apostolic See, a sign of anticonciliarist reaction. From his superiority, the pope directly derives his authority (dignissima) to create new bishoprics.

Let us then analyse the route Pius followed by examining the relevant documents. It is not known when he decided to create the diocese of Pienza. The construction of the church as a signum pietatis began immediately after Piccolomini had ascended to the Holy See, but this is no proof that he had already had the intention of making it into a see (rather than a collegiate


11 On the role of Pius II as the champion of anticonciliarism and on his conception of his own papal role: P. Prodi, Il sovrano pontefice. Un corpo e due anime: la monarchia papale nella prima età moderna (Bologna 1982), pp. 45, 92-93.
church for his clergy). This intention appears only with the publication of his decision in the consistory on February 15, 1462. In the following months the pope’s agent in Siena, Giovanni Saracini, knight of the Order of St John of Jerusalem, acquired real estate in the Sienese territory for the endowment of the Chapter. On August 13, the papal bull founding the new diocese was issued. First, the pope states that he was building the palace and other buildings of Pienza out of love for his native village; then he confers sees on the churches of Santa Maria in Corsignano and San Salvatore in Montalcino (formerly a nullius dioecesis), grants both villages the title of city and gives them the names Pientia and Ilcinum so as to form two dioceses with separate Chapters but with one bishop directly subject to the Holy See. Montalcino can not be discussed here; it is sufficient to note that the territory was already exempt from the bishop’s authority because it was under direct control of the abbot of Sant’Antimo. In fact, the new bishop took the title of abbot of Sant’Antimo, and he received the remaining properties.

The simplicity of this ecclesiastical structure in Pienza gave rise to a number of problems that were solved over the span of some years by a complex arrangement of the collateral institutions necessary to a cathedral: its Chapter and the Opera. From a formal point of view, the bishopric had been founded by allocating an episcopal see to a church and by submitting a certain number of parish churches to it; but since this church was under the secular patronage of the pope, the role of his family as heir to the patronate came into question. This problem was so serious that it required a specific bull, the ‘Bull of the reservation of the ius patronatus’ for the benefit of the eighteenth-

12 Indeed, given its size and form, it could not have been a simple church. In any case, the pope clearly wished to prove his piety, as is clear from the bull of foundation: ‘[...] cogitavimus, post quam ad summum Apostolatum sumus assumpti, signum aliquod pietatis Nostre ostendere [...]’ (cf. Chironi, L’Archivio diocesano di Pienza, pp. 515-516.).
13 ADP 2824, pp. 36-37. The Sienese Signoria sent a letter of thanks on March 6, cf. Archivio di Stato di Siena (from here on ASS), Concistoro 1680, c. 21v.
14 See note 26 below.
century lawyers who disputed it.\textsuperscript{15} It describes the authority that the patrons possess over all the institutions founded by Pius II, that is to say: the Chapter, the Opera and the bishopric or, more precisely, the person of the bishop.\textsuperscript{16}

In Pius II's bull the number of canonries is fixed to eight, with joint properties (the Massa) and personal prebends; the provost has the obligation of the spiritual care of souls.\textsuperscript{17} All the canons are subject to the \textit{iuspatronatus} of the Piccolomini family, in the first place to that of the male descendants of the Piccolomini Todeschini, who are resident in the diocese, secondly to the unmarried female descendants, and thirdly to the women who have married into the original Piccolomini family. If there are no such descendants, the \textit{iuspatronatus} passes to the


\textsuperscript{16} The construction of a church required an endowment in proportion to the maintenance of the building, the dignity of the cult and the support of its clergymen. Cf. L. Ferraris, \textit{Prompta bibliotheca canonica, juridica, moralis, theologicca}, 8 vols. (Paris, 1861-1866), at the entry 'Ecclesia', III.34. The construction and endowment of a church with a private patrimony determined whether it fell under the secular patronage of the founder, independently of his ecclesiastical or secular status (Ferraris, \textit{Prompta bibliotheca}, at the entry 'Iuspatronatus', I.14). It is necessary here to understand that the secular \textit{iuspatronatus} is the right over an ecclesiastical benefice granted to a secular person who is held to have founded, donated and maintained it. There are two types of \textit{iuspatronatus}: active and passive. The former gives the patron the right to put forward the member of the clergy who will hold office; in the case of passive patronage the right to present a candidate is merely honorific, but the patron keeps control over the estate of the benefice. On the various types of patronage see Ferraris, \textit{Prompta bibliotheca}, the entry 'Iuspatronatus', I, in particular section 7 on noble \textit{iuspatronatus}. With regard to the continuing control exercised by the patrons on the patrimony of the benefice and to the profit from that control, see G. Greco, 'I giuspatronati laicali in étà moderna', in: eds. G. Chittolini and G. Miccoli, \textit{La Chiesa e il potere politico}, Storia d'Italia Einaudi, 9 (Turin, 1986), pp. 538-541.

\textsuperscript{17} The prebend associated with a canonry is a benefice, usually with the obligation of the spiritual care of souls. A canon with a prebend, therefore, carries out his duties together with the other canons in the Chapter and he receives payment from the revenues of the Massa. He also receives the revenues of the prebend, in exchange for which he autonomously reads masses and has spiritual jurisdiction. Cf. Ferraris, \textit{Prompta bibliotheca}, at the entry 'Canonica-tus', I.31-34.
Piccolomini family as represented by two senior members of the family resident in Pienza, or, in the case that there are no members in Pienza, to those in Siena. This *iuspatronatus* not only gives the right to present the eight canons, but also requires the patrons' consent for any barter or sale of the real estate of the bishop and of the Chapter. It also provides for the nomination of a canon as *camerlengo*, treasurer of the *Opera*, for the election of two *operai*, directors of the *Opera* (out of three citizens put forward by the municipality of Pienza who had to be confirmed by the bishop), and finally, for the nomination of the sacristan in consultation with the bishop. This means that the *Opera* was subordinate to the Chapter; and, in fact, the Chapter records contain decisions regarding the *Opera* administration. The bishop, too, came under the patrons from whom he had to ask permission in order to take possession of his office. As a token of this passive patronage, the patrons received the horse the bishop rode to the cathedral for the taking-of-possession ceremony, which the patrons attended. Finally, it should be remembered that up to the second half of the sixteenth century, the Piccolomini succeeded in managing the nomination of the bishop autonomously, shamelessly using the system of the *resignatio in favorem tertii*.

---

18 This is a case of perfect family patronage: ‘Primo ex fundatione in qua fundator illud relinquit descendentibus et successoribus de sua agnatione, famiglia seu domo secundo ex praesentationibus factis a solis masculis, exclusis feminis et extraneis’; see note 16, above.

19 A. Strnad, ‘Francesco Todeschini-Piccolomini. Politik und Mäzenatentum im Quattrocento’, *Römische Historische Mitteilungen*, 8-9 (1964-1966), pp. 101-425, esp. p. 160, refers to the family patronage of the bishopric. It is significant that traditionally there was a similar ceremony when the bishop took possession of the see of Siena, whose cathedral came under the patronage of the families Forteguerri, Antolini, Bostoli and Ponzi; cf. Archivio dell’Opera della Metropolitana di Siena (from here on AOMS) 8, cc. 83v-85r, 1333, ‘Memoria della ragione che anno nel Vescovado di Siena quatro chasati, cioè Fortighuerra, Bostolini, Antolini e Ponzi, padroni del Vescovado.’ I thank Monika Butzek for bringing this to my attention.

20 This canon law right offered the beneficiary the possibility of renouncing his benefice in favour of his chosen successor, who then had to be confirmed by his superior. During the Renaissance this activity was extraordinarily diffuse, also in episcopal benefices: see P. G. Caron, *La rinuncia all’ufficio ecclesiastico*
Pius’s task was not yet completed. In August 1462 all the institutions named in the papal bull existed only in theory, except for the Opera, which at that time was completely controlled by the pope’s nephews, in particular by Giacomo, who nominated operai until 1464.\(^{21}\) The bishop nominated on September 1, 1462, was Giovanni Cinughi and the Chapter was immediately constituted.\(^{22}\) On September 7, the properties of the former church of Santa Maria in Corsignano, now a cathedral, were handed over to the Chapter by a bull promulgated in Pienza. Its revenues were granted to the former priest, Tedaldo di Mariano, who probably became its first canon.\(^{23}\) Then, as promised by the bull of August 27, the prebends were donated to the canons.

The papal bull of January 23, 1463\(^{24}\) regarding the grant of these prebends has caused some confusion about the number of the canons since only five are named.\(^{25}\) Probably, however, the Chapter had not yet become effective, because not only was the

\^[21\text{Cf. Archivio dell’Opera della Cattedrale di Pienza (from here on AOC)}] {829, p. 90.}

\^[22\text{Giovanni Cinughi had been nominated bishop of Chiusi in 1460. Cf.}} \text{Ughelli, Italia sacra, vol. III, cols. 644-645. There had been efforts from the Signoria of Siena to influence the pope’s choice in favour of a citizen of Montalcino: ASS, Concistoro 1680, c. 57r, letter to card. Ammannati, May 4, 1462.}}

\^[23\text{ADP, Diplomatico, 1462 Sept. 7. Tedaldo di Mariano was also the first general vicar general of the diocese; cf. ADP 18, c. 21r (April 15, 1463).}}

\^[24\text{Cf. Chironi, L’Archivio diocesano di Pienza, pp. 525-527.}}

\^[25\text{The canons cited in the bull are those already in charge. Tedaldo di Mariano should be added; on him had been conferred the property that he had previously owned as rector of the church of Santa Maria.}}
number of canons incomplete, but also the patrimony of the *Massa*, essential for the budget of their religious functions, did not exist. This problem was solved by a legal document drawn up in Rome on March 9, 1463 in the presence of the cardinals Francesco Piccolomini and Giacomo Ammanati and of Alessandro Miraballi, the papal steward. Pius II donated to the Chapter the real property, comprising shops and farms, that his procurator Giovanni Saracini had privately acquired for him in Siena and its territory.\(^\text{26}\) This choice of a private instrument of endowment was necessary in order to ensure the secular character of the patronate in spite of the ecclesiastical position of the donor. Hereby it became possible to transfer the patronate to his heirs, and thus it is the legal premise of the bull of the reservation of the patronate.

Pius’s busy life and bad health probably precluded him from completing the full institution of the Chapter. In particular, some aspects of the regulations had to be defined, above all the rôle of the old baptismal church of Santi Vito e Modesto, positioned outside the walls of the village. The definitive establishment of the Chapter and also of the *Opera*, was made by Bishop Cinughì through the Chapter’s Constitutions of November 28, 1464,\(^\text{27}\) some months after the pope’s death at Ancona on August 14 of the same year. As recorded by Bishop Cinughì in the preamble, he acted as the executor of the pope’s last will, from which ‘vive vocis oraculo esse audiverit, inviolate servari decrevit.’ Two decisions by the pope which were put into effect by the bishop are most significant on an institutional level. The first is the definitive transfer of control over the *operai* of the

\(^{26}\) In reality, after the act of donation the acquisition of properties by the pope continued in a way that did not require additional acts: Giovanni Saracini acquired them with papal funds. The final contract was signed on April 24, 1464 (ACCP I.1, cc. 63r-66v). The sum of money used by the pope for the endowment of the canories comes to 8,318 florins and 100 ducats, equal to 33,872 lire, even more than the patrimony in Siena of the Piccolomini-Todeschini in 1465, which according to the Lira of 1465 was a little less than 30,000 lire: cf. R. Mucciarelli, ‘I Piccolomini di Siena nobili e gentiluomini in una città comunale alla fine del Medioevo’ (doctoral thesis, Università di Perugia, Dottorato di Storia urbana e rurale, IX cycle, 1992-1993), p. 469.

Opera from the family – which had kept that control, as already mentioned – to the Chapter in the person of the ‘camerlengo, cui Operarii tenentur oboedire et morem gerere.28 The second important institutional decision designated the benefice of the baptismal church of Santi Vito e Modesto as a prebend of the Provost, thus bringing together the jurisdiction of the care of the souls within and without the walls of the village.29

As can easily be seen from the structure of the connections between the ecclesiastical institutions according to the original plan of Pius II, this essentially guarantees that control is exerted by the Piccolomini family.30 This anomaly, unique in Italy, draws its legitimacy from the already mentioned exceptional point of departure, namely that Pienza was a village originally devoid of ecclesiastical institutions of any importance; it is surely also the fruit of the particular conception Pius II had of his family. This is clear from the general purpose of the operation. It is not an isolated phenomenon but part of a consistent plan carried out during his entire pontificate and directed towards both lay and ecclesiastical institutions; its focus was the Consorteria Piccolomini.

A lack of documents on the birth of the Consorteria allows us only to formulate hypotheses on its institution and structure. The family tradition that accredits the origin of the Consorteria to Pius II is more plausible31 than recent interpretations that support the fundamental role of Giacomo Piccolomini, or rather of his testament of September 21, 1507.32 Such an assumption is certainly corroborated by the fact that the Consorteria en-

29 The first Provost mentioned in the sources is Leonardo di Niccolò da Radicofani, who in that office attends the first synod of the church of Pienza in April 1463; cf. ADP 18, c. 20r. It is likely that he exercised the spiritual jurisdiction formerly pertaining to the church of Santa Maria.
30 See the table in Chironi, L’Archivio diocesano di Pienza, p. 23.
31 This thesis has been put forward most recently in the introduction to the archive of the Consorteria, Archivio di Stato di Siena, Guida Inventario dell’Archivio di Stato, vol. III (Rome, 1977), p. 134.
joyed property under its direct administration only after the
death of Giacomo. Special clauses of inheritance established by
Pius II both in the bull of the reservation of the patronate and in
other documents regarding his personal patrimony, and the use
of those same clauses in the testament of Giacomo – and espe-
cially the principle expressed in that bull that invests and
pledges the whole clara propago of the Piccolomini33 – clearly
support the traditional hypothesis.

That the pope was the ‘author’ of the Consorteria seems
clear also from other general considerations. In the first place,
the close relation must be underscored between the typology of
the Consorteria and the ideas and problems that originated from
humanist circles in the first half of the century, in which ponders
ings over the varietas temporum merge with imagery of the
ancient world. These collective and shared ideas and problems
were put into practice, however imperfectly, through the role of
pope as performed by Pius. Thus a comparison with Alberti’s I
libri della famiglia, probably the most organic contemporary
treatise on the matter, can easily be made, although not in direct
terms.34 The idea of a compact and united family, closed to the
outside but able to interact with institutions and to strengthen
itself by its best members, forms the basis of the Albertian
utopia. This is also clearly the basis of the Consorteria, and
probably a contemporary answer to the need to preserve family
affairs from that fortuna iniqua e maligna of which Alberti in
his Prologue deplores the devastating effects.35 This ideal was –
as has been recognised – not politically neutral but organically
associated with a ‘society with aristocratic inspirations, in

33 Chironi, L’ Archivio diocesano di Pienza, p. 519: ‘Laudibus et honore
dignissima de Piccolominius clara propago, quae inter praecepua urbis
Senarum vetustissimasque familias, diversitate vertutum semper emiquit, non
tam patrio, quamvis ex ea secundum carne et humanam propagationem
originem duxerimus, quam avorum et proavorum claritatis, meritorumque
intuitu, nostrae mentis arcanum non indigne excitat et inducit ut illius alumnos
quemadmodum par est interna et efficaci dilectione prosequentes condignis eos
attollamus honoribus et Apostolicae sedis munificentia probequamur.’
34 L. B. Alberti, I libri della famiglia, eds. R. Romano and A. Tenenti
(Turin, 1969).
35 Alberti, I libri della famiglia, p. 4.
which the *optimates* always have to voice their opinions, discuss public affairs, take useful decisions. It is easily understood that although this political ideology may have been alive at the time of Pius II, half a century later, when Giacomo made his testament, it was completely outdated. The *cardine* of what can be defined as the right to engage in public affairs was based upon an image of oligarchic nobility which could not fail to mirror itself in republican Rome. It is inherent in a model of nobility in which there was a strong relation between the individual and the group, between individual virtues and honour of the *gens*. This right of public service was certainly claimed by that *Familia Picolomineorum ex Roma in Senas translata, inter vetustiores et nobiliores civitatis, habita dum optimates rexerunt, et litteris et armis claruit*, which was subsequently humiliated by the *plebe* that expelled it from government together with the other noble ‘houses’. Notwithstanding the linguistic waverings of the pope, the conceptual difference between *gens* and *familia*, where the former term refers to a common origin and name, while the latter refers to members


38 This differs profoundly from medieval models, which were usually developed to administer the feudal or noble rights that hereditary succession inevitably tended to divide into often petty parts, on which all grip was lost. Cf. Francioni, *La Consorteria*, pp. 7-31, and his bibliography.


40 He rather carelessly uses the wording *familia, domus*, but also *propago* and *progenie*.

41 In the definition of Isidoro ‘Gens est multitudo ab uno principio orta.’ Cf. eds. G. Wissowa *et al.*, *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertums-
of a family who are entitled to a shared patrimony which is logically connected with the inheritance, finds its genesis here.\textsuperscript{42} This difference corresponds to the subsequent division of the Piccolomini into \textit{Originari} (the kinsmen of Pius II) and \textit{Aggregati} (the kinsmen of Pius III). The latter, descendants of Pius’s sister Laudomia participated in the Consorter\'ia by privilege and they were favoured both directly by numerous properties and fiefs and indirectly through inheritance. Honour also had to be ensured for the present and future of the numerous branches of the Piccolomini, some of whom in the middle of the fifteenth century found themselves in a seriously impoverished situation.\textsuperscript{43} The creation of an ecclesiastical patrimony – a system of benefices submitted to secular patronage – was thought to be the solution to these problems. Firstly, this patronage had a honorific nature,\textsuperscript{44} and secondly it extracted part of the Piccolomini property from the destiny of the family patrimony, from the civil jurisdiction of secular courts and from common taxes,\textsuperscript{45} redirecting it so as to enable its beneficiaries to continue their ecclesiastical career. How important it was to have easy access to the benefices must certainly have been clear to those who, in order to advance their ecclesiastical careers, had been forced to address themselves to some ecclesiastical or secular power.

Although from a strictly political point of view Pius II’s ideology underwent a rapid decline, the economic implications of his strategy led to a growing fortune in the following centu-

\begin{flushright}
\textit{wissenschaft} (\textit{Neue Bearbeitung}) (Stuttgart, 1894-1996), Band VII, at the entry ‘\textit{Gens}’. \footnote{Wissowa, \textit{Paulys Realencyclopadie}, Band VI, at the entry ‘\textit{Familia}’. I think the consorter\'ia of the Tolomei, which comprises the various owners of their palace, can be interpreted in this way.}
\footnote{In 1453, 24 heads of the family presented a registration of their patrimony for the property tax; cf. Mucciarelli, \textit{I Piccolomini di Siena}, pp. 545-546. The most dramatic case is that of Dioprovegga di Marchionne, who was taxed for the pitiful sum of 175 lire and was jailed for debts: ASS, Lira 144, c. 3r-v.}
\footnote{Defined as \textit{a ius honorificum onerosum et utile}; cf. Greco, ‘I giuspatronati laicai in et\'a moderna’, pp. 538-539; an honour that in the Quattrocento was naturally connected to the building of churches; cf. Alberti, \textit{I libri della famiglia}, pp. 257.}
\footnote{The property that formed the benefice was in fact protected by ecclesiastical immunity; cf. Greco, ‘I giuspatronati laicai in et\'a moderna’, pp. 538-542.}
\end{flushright}
ries. It is tempting to draw a parallel with the institution of the *fedecompresso*, which is a secular variant of ecclesiastical patrimony in so far as it complies with the same need for patrimonial immobilization and social stability.46 Pius II is a precursor to all of this. The division of the patrimony into equal secular and ecclesiastical parts held in place by similar stipulations on the succession, and the preference of canonical clergy under secular patronage to accommodate family resources, are elements of a model that would become common practice in central northern Italy during the following two centuries.47

The creation of the ecclesiastical institutions of Pienza has therefore to be seen within the framework of Pius II’s wider project of organizing a larger ecclesiastical patrimony for family use48; this circumscribes a kind of *cursus honorum* which

46 It is no coincidence that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries both institutions developed in a parallel way and that they were both substantially limited in the age of Leopoldine enlightened reform.
48 In the course of the eighteenth century – possibly due to the controversy between the Consorteria and the princes of Valle, descendants of Antonio Piccolomini, duke of Amalfi – pamphlets were published which give inventories of the benefices with historical and documentary notes, divided by diocese. Some rough copies were preserved in the ASS, *Consorteria Piccolomini* 67, by Francesco Maria Piccolomini, archivist of the Consorteria and subsequently bishop of Pienza. Cf. ADP 2824, ‘Diocesi di Pienza’; ASS, *Consorteria Piccolomini* 32, ‘Diocesi di Siena’, and ASS, *Consorteria Piccolomini* 67, ‘Diocesi di Chiusi’ and ‘Basilica Vaticana e Collegiata di San Eustachio in Roma.’ Among
begins from chaplaincies and leads to canonries and ultimately to the bishopric of Pienza itself. That this was a project of the pope himself, shared by his nephews, is recorded by Giacomo in his testament, which instructs his sons Enea and Silvio, heirs of his patronage rights, to present to the vacant benefices *clericos et presbiteros de domo et progenie Piccolominea; quia, dixit, quod hec fuit voluntas felicis memorie Pii Secundi et Terrill*. The already considerable patrimony was increased both by the nephews of the pope— with new canonries in Siena and Rome—and by other members of the family who had made use of it for furthering their careers, for instance the bishops of Pienza, Girolamo, senior (1517) and Francesco Maria, senior (1584). All of this illustrates that the politics of patronage of Pius II in the ecclesiastical realm was the fruit neither of passion nor of whim, but that it was based upon a precise strategy of political and patrimonial preservation, the true significance of which has not been recognised clearly before.

the numerous benefices endowed by Pius II are to be noted: in Siena Cathedral the canonry under the title of Santa Maria Bellemense, and in Rome, in the Vatican basilica at the altar of San Andrea.

49 ASS, *Consorteria Piccolomini* 32, n. 20, c. 13v.

50 Cf. note 48.
REJECT AENEAS!
PIUS II ON THE ERRORS OF HIS YOUTH

Thomas M. Izbicki

Believe the old man more than the youth, nor count the private man of more value than the pontiff. Reject Aeneas; accept Pius!

These words of Pope Pius II (1458-1464) in the bull In minoribus agentes (26 April 1462) are among the most familiar from his pen.¹ They form a part of an apologia of the Piccolomini pope for his present policies and a recantation of the errors of his youth. These errors are not those sins of the flesh which loom so large in the modern consciousness. Aeneas had indeed fathered two illegitimate children, at least one of whom died young; but he admitted later to having abandoned Venus for Bacchus in his middle years:

Dearest brother, I am full; stuffed; Venus makes me nauseous! Also, it is true that my powers have declined. I am sprinkled with grey hairs; the muscles are withered; the bones, rotten; the body is shrivelled with wrinkles. Neither am I able to bring pleasure to a woman; nor is a woman able to give pleasure to me. I celebrate with Bacchus more than with Venus. Wine nourishes me; helps me; delights me; makes me happy. This liquid will be charming to me all the way to death. But it also would be a sin were I to drink more for pleasure than from necessity.²

Rather these errors were of a political nature, adherence first to the Council of Basel (1431-1449) in its struggle with Pope Eugenius IV (1431-1447), later to the policy of neutrality maintained by many of the German princes in the struggle between pope and council. Two things about this bull, with its play on the resemblance of Piccolomini’s personal and regnal names to that of Virgil’s hero, the pious Aeneas, need to be underlined. The first is his previous use of this play on names in letters concerned with ecclesiastical polities. The second is the place of In minoribus as the last of a small group of apologies by Aeneas for the political errors of his youth.

For both of these points we must have recourse not just to Aeneas’s literary works, but also to his letters. These texts are to be used with due caution, as Cecil Clough has reminded us. Nonetheless, they can provide insights into the life and times of the Piccolomini pope. Aeneas first alluded to his namesake in a letter dating from his years as a conciliar secretary. In a letter to Emperor Sigismund written in 1437, an effort is made to win the aging prince over to Basel’s side in its struggle with Pope Eugenius. A subsidiary target of Aeneas’s letter is Venice, the pontiff’s native city. Venetian ambitions are described in this peccadilloes of the young; see Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61) pp. 245-247.

3 Aeneas’s role in these conflicts can be traced in J. Stieber, Pope Eugenius IV, the Council of Basel and the Secular and Ecclesiastical Princes in the Empire (Leiden, 1978). For a brief description by Aeneas of neutrality as confined only to the Germans, see Historia Friderici III imperatoris, ed. A.F. Kollar, Analecta monumentorum omnis aevi Vindibonensia, 2 vols. (Vienna, 1762-63; reprint Farnborough, 1970), vol. II, p. 114.

letter in terms derived from the classics. One Trojan refugee, Antenor, the mythical founder of Padua, a Venetian possession, is described as trying to displace another, Aeneas, the ancestor of Rome’s founder, in the domination of Italy.\(^5\) A more purely personal allusion, however, appears later, when Aeneas was a member of the chancery of Frederick III, the Habsburg king of the Romans. Writing in 1443 to the Castilian canonist and Eugenian envoy Juan Carvajal in defense of the German policy of neutrality, Aeneas claims, in Virgilian terms, that he is being forced to enunciate a political position when neither faction pleases him:

You now force me to say something, you who advise me to emulate the armed Aeneas. I would rather keep silent than speak, because my words will be pleasing to none of the parties, just as no party pleases me.\(^6\)

After arguing for the king’s policy, Aeneas returns to Virgil for an eloquent conclusion in which the pope to be elected by a united Church becomes Anchises, the father of this modern Aeneas:

I wanted to say these things to you with your indulgence, because whether I speak not or speak truly, this is Aeneas armed. I will play him; he will be my Anchises whom the consensus of the universal Church will have selected, while Germany, which is the greater part of the Christian world, goes along.\(^7\)

Thus some fifteen years before his election to the see of Peter, Aeneas Silvius can be found alluding to his namesake in order to present his present opinion more eloquently. The opinion is different in 1462 than it was in 1443, but the method of expressing this is the same. This can be seen too in the types of works which were composed to support one position or another. They contain different messages but the media remain the


\(^7\) Wolkan, *Briefwechsel*, (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 211.
same: dialogues, letters and histories. Only two examples can be given here, but they are indicative.

The first of these is the composition of histories of the Council of Basel itself. As early as 1434 Aeneas wrote a description of the city of Basel as a first effort toward writing the history of the Council. This he addressed to Giuliano Cesarini, apostolic legate to the council. More complete, and more partisan, was the account which Aeneas wrote in 1440 of the deposition of Eugenius IV by the council and the election of Amadeus VIII of Savoy to reign in his stead. This history was written in the same period as a set of dialogues supporting the actions of the Basel assembly, which will be mentioned below. Aeneas’s highly favorable account of deposition and election circulated together with the author’s letter describing the coronation of Amadeus as Pope Felix V, which was treated in some manuscripts as the third book of the commentaries. Aeneas’s description of the pope-elect is worth quoting, especially for its largely positive tone:

At the beginning of that day, Felix, the pope elect, came to all those waiting persons, venerable with white hair, graceful in bearing and appearance, displaying singular prudence. His stature, like that of his sons, was average; his form, slight. As age compelled, his hair was white; and his skin was wrinkled. His speech was sparing and fretful.

Later in life, in 1450, the year of the Jubilee celebrated by Nicholas V (1447-1455) after he had reunited Christendom, Aeneas would paint another, less favorable portrait of Amadeus in a second history of the Council of Basel. This he incorporated into a letter to Juan Carvajal, whom he once had presented with the arguments of the armed Aeneas in favor of

---

8 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 28-38.
11 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 105-110.
12 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 105-110 at 107.
neutrality. This epistle is one of those documents in which Aeneas wrote a very influential negative description of the Council. For example, he dismissed the deposition of Eugenius as the act of a few bishops and many lesser men:

There did not remain enough prelates for the deposition of Eugenius.

Furthermore, in the next sentence, Aeneas puts part of the blame for the deposition on Amadeus VIII, whom he accuses of sending his bishops to Basel in order to increase his own chance of being elected pope. Aeneas’s physical and moral description of Felix V, too, is negative, reversing what had been said before. First, let us look at Aeneas account of how Amadeus reacted to news of his own election, with its emphasis on avarice:

He showed himself difficult from the beginning. He seemed grave of demeanor, but avarice made him petty by habit. He said [to the embassy]: ‘You issued a decree in which annates are taken away from the pope. On what is the pope to live? Shall I eat up my patrimony and disinherit my sons in your cause? It is fitting, therefore, to promise provision, by which, after it has been made, every fifth coin of the first year from benefices small and great is given [to the pope].”

13 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 67), pp. 164-228.
15 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 67), p. 199.
Aeneas’s description of Felix is no more complementary:

Amadeus, however, was small of stature, light of eye, pale of skin, rather wordy in counsel, tenacious of injury, unmindful of benefits, outstanding for avarice, eager for peace and leisure, indulgent to freemen, sparing nothing to his subjects.\(^\text{18}\)

This description so differs from that which precedes as to make the reader wonder whether the author was motivated merely by his self interest or more by a fear that his older, more positive letter might be quoted against him.

For the second pair of texts we turn to Aeneas’s more political letters, charting his changes of allegiance and his methods of argument. After looking at these writings of a ‘private’ person, we also need to mention the other, papal letters in which Pope Pius sought to close off debate on the thorny issues of papal relations with church and council. The most conciliarist of Aeneas’s letters is that addressed to Hartung von Kappel, a fellow member of the entourage of Frederick III. This letter has not received as much attention as have the dialogues and the commentaries,\(^\text{19}\) but it shows how its author could argue like the great conciliar apologists of his day, Juan de Segovia and Panormitanus.\(^\text{20}\) Furthermore, it serves as an ecclesiastical parallel to Aeneas’s great ‘political’ letter, *De ortu et auctoritate imperii Romani*.\(^\text{21}\)

The letter to Hartung von Kappel arises from a particular

\(^{18}\) Wolkan, *Briefwechsel* (Fontes, vol. 67), p. 228. It is worth noting the Aeneas closes his history with this negative passage. Likewise, for the sake of balance, one should note that Aeneas’s summary of the character of Eugenius IV was not entirely positive; see the report on his mission to Rome at the end of the Venetian pope’s reign in Wolkan, *Briefwechsel* (Fontes, vol. 67), pp. 237-263 at 253, ‘But there was no great vice in him, except that he was without moderation and was aggressive in what he wanted but could not do.’


milieu, the court of Frederick III. Aeneas’s letters from that court include both complaints about being far from Italy and pleas that friends should send him books. Nor was work in the chancery of a prince always pleasant, since it involved often abrasive contacts with colleagues and hard work on the practical details of administration. The literary culmination of this experience is Aeneas’s *De curialium miseriis epistola*, which is more interesting from a biographical standpoint for its tactful nods to his royal master and to Kaspar Schlick than for its argument that anyone who takes service with a prince is a fool.22 These difficulties of court life surely were heightened for the servants of Frederick III, even one as successful as Aeneas in advancing himself, by his policy of neutrality. This effort to balance between the conflicting claims of pope and council, although it had its apologists,23 must have left some courtiers leaning to one faction or the other without the ability to take sides in public. Thus it is plausible enough that Aeneas, by his own account, was driven to writing the letter when a third party, interrupting a conversation between the author and Hartung, both attacked neutrality and argued for the superiority of pope over council. This may also explain why the letter is a vindication not so much of the royal policy — although it is mentioned favorably — but of conciliar supremacy.24

Although the raw material for this letter would derive from the common heritage of texts and arguments employed in medieval debates about institutions, their structures and interrelationships, Aeneas managed to give these some literary varnish by comparing his reaction to the third party’s arguments with


23 For the most prominent of these, see A. Lhotsky, *Thomas Ebendorfer: ein österreichischer Geschichtsschreiber* (Stuttgart, 1957).

Ulysses’ stopping his ears with wax to avoid hearing the Sirens’ song – a loose adaptation of Homer’s text.\textsuperscript{25} Aeneas also presented himself, like Gerson once had, as following the Gospels instead of the decretal letters of the Roman pontiffs.\textsuperscript{26} Aeneas’s message in this letter is that the pope should show himself obedient to the council if he expects to be obeyed when issuing legitimate commands:

I say, therefore, not that a man should prefer to have another placed over him, but that he should subject himself to the judgments of the universal synods, so that he may display the obedience which he exacts. Simon is called Peter, which name, Hrabanus, not without reason, interpreted as ‘Obedient.’\textsuperscript{27}

Furthermore, as is typical of contemporary writers like Nicholas of Cusa,\textsuperscript{28} Aeneas argues that the power of the pope exists to build up the Church, not to destroy it. Here Aeneas appeals to the decree \textit{Haec sancta} of the Council of Constance, in its clause stating that the pope was subject to the council in matters of reform, to buttress his argument. He concludes: ‘Therefore, in every matter in which the power of the pope has a place, the council is superior.’\textsuperscript{29}

There is nothing unusual about Aeneas’s arguments in favor of the council. It is interesting, however, that he resorts to another one as stronger than any of these, an argument recently transformed from a papalist to a conciliarist weapon. This is the contention that Peter represented the Church when he received the power of the keys. In the generation of Gerson this argument, based on the authority of Augustine, had become a minor part of the conciliar arsenal. Only in the Basel generation, when Jean Mauroux advanced it in opposition to Eugen-

\textsuperscript{25} See \textit{Odyssey}, xii. 41-54, 153-300.
\textsuperscript{26} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 133. For Gerson’s critique of canon law, see L. B. Pascoe, \textit{Jean Gerson: Principles of Church Reform} (Leiden, 1973).
\textsuperscript{27} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 1, 135.
\textsuperscript{28} It is noteworthy that Cusanus retained this emphasis in his papalist writings; see T. M. Izbicki, ‘The Church in the Light of Learned Ignorance’, \textit{Medieval Philosophy and Theology} 3 (1993), pp. 196-214
\textsuperscript{29} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 136.
ius IV, had this interpretation of Peter’s reception of the keys become important to the foes of unfettered papal supremacy. This, in turn, led papal apologists like Juan de Torquemada to reply, attempting to reclaim key patristic texts for the Eugenian cause.\cite{30}

Despite the novelty of this argument, Aeneas used it boldly:

If even this argument [Aeneas means the one based on the decrees of Constance] does not move you, I add another one, indeed, in my opinion, one stronger than the others. Peter the Apostle, when he accepted the keys of the kingdom of heaven, received them as a personification of the Church, as Augustine says in \textit{De agone Christiano}, where he declares, ‘The keys of the kingdom of heaven were given to the Church itself when they were given to Peter.’ In that way, it follows that he was made the vicar of the Church; however, as is well known, the vicar always gives way to the lord. Nor do vicars have jurisdiction over lords. What, therefore, can be said about Peter in relationship to the Church, the same can be said of his successors in relationship to the general councils. The pope, then, represents Peter; the council, however, represents the Church. If this is so, what we said, that in every matter on which the council and the pope disagree the judgment of the synod is superior, is proven already.\cite{31}

In his reply to Eugenian arguments, Aeneas restates his support for \textit{Haec sancta}, reminding Hartung and any other reader that the Council of Constance claimed superiority in only three areas – and in no others:

You are accustomed to say, and many like you do too: the Council of Constance expressed exactly three things, in which it wished the pope to be subject to the council; therefore, it did not wish this in all things, since the inclusion of the one is the exclusion of the other and whoever asks three things does not ask more.\cite{32}

\cite{30} T. M. Izbicki, ‘A Papalist Reading of Gratian: Juan de Torquemada on c. Quodcunque [C. 24 q. 1 c. 6]’, forthcoming in the proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Medieval Canon Law, Syracuse University, 1996.
\cite{31} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 136-137.
\cite{32} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 137.
Aeneas also denies the papalist argument based on the model of princely rule, which required that only one man head the polity. He argues both that the gospel opposed lording it over subjects [cf. Math. 20:25-26] and that Christ, not the pope, is true head of the Church and her bridegroom too.\textsuperscript{33} This argument sets aside the traditional papalist argument that divided power – especially power divided by pope and council – would leave the Church a two-headed monster.\textsuperscript{34} In Aeneas’s text, however, the pope is only a ministerial head, ‘the vicar of the true God’, just as are other bishops.\textsuperscript{35} The letter concludes by conceding plenitude of power to the pope, but only when there is no sitting council.\textsuperscript{36}

Aeneas’s departure from these confident assertions can be described as a crisis of identity (as Cusanus’s change of allegiance has been\textsuperscript{37}) or as a conversion.\textsuperscript{38} If the former, there is no lack of confident assertions by Aeneas of whatever position he was defending at a particular moment. His political identity changed – even as his vocation changed in the same period; but he never showed any indication, at least as expressed in writing, of dramatic upheaval, despite his efforts to defend a tortuous political progress.\textsuperscript{39} If the latter, Aeneas’s conversion must have been slow, as slow as his move from worldly-wise lover of Venus and author of racy stories to the man who asked for, and received, a copy of the Bible.\textsuperscript{40} Nor should a conversion of morals and vocation, leading to priestly ordination and episco-

\textsuperscript{33} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 141.
\textsuperscript{35} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 142
\textsuperscript{36} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 143.
\textsuperscript{40} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 443-444, 581-582.
pal consecration,⁴¹ be confused with abandonment of the conciliar vision of the ecclesiastical polity and of neutrality for a rapprochement with Rome.

Aeneas’s changes of allegiance can be tracked in his diplomatic missions, which culminated in the acceptance of Eugenius IV as true pope by Frederick III and the other German princes.⁴² It also can be traced, and more pungently, in Aeneas’s letters. These illustrate not just Aeneas’s political role but his supreme practicality in dealing with political issues. Neutrality had allowed the princes to promote their own interests at a seemingly endless series of diets while avoiding the potentially divisive effects of a choice between the contenders for the papal throne. This, however, left Christendom divided and with little hope of rapid reunion. Such a situation is more likely to evoke satire than panegyric, and Aeneas responded with some of his sharper gibes. In one letter the Sienese humanist, writing from Frederick’s court, makes a play on the Latin noun *dieta*, which is feminine, saying that each diet is born pregnant with the next. He expresses a wish that a council (*concilium* being neuter) would be held to interrupt this endless succession of useless meetings.⁴³ In another letter, *dieta* becomes sterile, instead of all too fruitful. Using a classical allusion, Aeneas refers to the diet as a Phoenix, bearing no young but being reborn from her own ashes.⁴⁴ In a more acerbic passage, he dismisses neutrality as a snare and a means for some

---


⁴³ Wolkan, *Briefwechsel* (Fontes, vol. 67), pp. 30-33. For an expression that Aeneas cared little what the assembly were called, even a synagogue, as long as it ended the schism, see Wolkan, *Briefwechsel* (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 248-250.

to obtain advancement.\textsuperscript{45} This cynical opinion goes hand in hand with Aeneas's observation about one prince's conduct, which he describes as typical of the rest in matters of religion:

The king of Aragon [Alphonso V], who, after the fashion of princes, does not want the kingdom to serve the faith but the faith to serve the kingdom, ordered his prelates to leave Basel.\textsuperscript{46}

Looking at the larger effort of Eugenian and conciliar envoys to win the Germans over through long speeches and longer treatises, Aeneas comments – again with a combination of practicality and bile – in his history of the Council of Basel on the uselessness of learned argument in moving princes to embrace a desired course of action. The specific example which he adduced is that of Panormitanus, who went on at great length at the 1442 diet of Frankfurt reading from a prepared text, despite the fact that the lay lords had left the hall, leaving their prelates and learned advisers to brief them later:

While the king was being crowned, the archbishop of Palermo disputed at Frankfurt; and he decided to write down his words. He was a fool to think kings are moved by books and manuscripts. Once the king had returned, the prelates and doctors who had remained told the king and the electors what they had heard and gave their advice.\textsuperscript{47}

Despite this practical cynicism about human efforts, Aeneas retains a moral outlook on the larger affairs of the Church. In one letter of 1443, the year after the diet of Frankfurt at which Panormitanus spoke, Aeneas describes the conciliar controversy as a kind of tennis game whose players eventually would be punished by God for their neglect of ultimate priorities:

But God watches it from on high; and, although he rarely afflicts men with fitting punishments on Earth, in His supreme judg-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{45} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 318-319; see also pp. 323-324.
\item \textsuperscript{46} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 175-177.
\item \textsuperscript{47} Wolkan, \textit{Briefwechsel} (Fontes, vol. 67), pp. 203-204. On this diet, see Stieber, \textit{Pope Eugenius IV}, pp. 237-240.
\end{itemize}
ment He leaves no wrong unpunished. He gives us free will, letting us live as we please; He exercises loose control over mortals. Nevertheless, there will be a reckoning concerning all matters when He shall judge the world.\textsuperscript{48}

This passage reflects the declared values of an age which admired strong proponents of morality, especially Bernardino of Siena, even while falling away readily from adherence to his message.\textsuperscript{49} (Aeneas’s own temporary conversion after hearing Bernardino preach itself is an example of both the preacher’s power and the often transitory nature of his impact upon suggestible souls.\textsuperscript{50})

By 1447 Aeneas was Frederick III’s chief negotiator in the effort to move all of the Empire into the Eugenian camp. This effort succeeded; and Aeneas was rewarded by the new pope, Nicholas V, a friend from his days in the household of Cardinal Albergati, with promotion to the see of Trieste.\textsuperscript{51} This reward also left Aeneas suspect in the minds of many Germans. Like Nicholas of Cusa,\textsuperscript{52} he would experience continuing hostility, which would dog him through his years as bishop, cardinal and – ultimately – Roman pontiff. Unlike Cusanus, Aeneas would show himself frequently both sensitive to this criticism and eager to explain himself time and again, always fruitlessly.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{48} Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 175-177.

\textsuperscript{49} The place of Bernardino in art and written history reveals his contemporar- standing, although many of the conversions he wrought were followed by relapses into worldly ways; see I. Origo, The World of San Bernardino (New York, 1962).


\textsuperscript{51} Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 67), pp. 50-51. Aeneas depicts himself as an agent of Frederick, not as a policy maker, in Historia Friderici III imperatoris; see Kollar, Analecta monumentorum, vol. II, pp. 122-139.


\textsuperscript{53} See Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, Deutschland: Der Brieftraktat an Martin Mayer, ed. A. Schmidt (Graz, 1962).
The most stinging criticism, not in its style or content but in its ability to provoke Aeneas to apologetic labors, was that of the University of Cologne. This ability to arouse Aeneas derived from his conciliar days, from the inquiry by that university concerning the locus of ultimate authority in the ecclesiastical institution which inspired the young Aeneas to write his *Libellus dialogorum*.*54 This is the other, less noted fact which was mentioned at the beginning of this paper. Aeneas would explain himself to the university not once, in his letter to Jordan Mallant, the rector of that institution, but twice, the second time in the bull *In minoribus*.

The letter to Jordan Mallant is the pro-papal letter which balances in content while paralleling in method of composition the letter to Hartung von Kappel.*55 Here Aeneas presents himself as one who has forsaken not truth but opinion, adding that:

> The one who dies for justice, having forsaken iniquity, is more praiseworthy than he who stays the course.*56

Speaking of the academics in Cologne as having discussed ecclesiastical affairs ‘amid wine and entrées’, Aeneas argues that he is being slandered, accused of changing his allegiance out of ambition. He presents himself, instead, as having abandoned the harlot city of Basel when God opened his eyes to the truth. The young scholar was driven by pride and was ‘full of wind’, and:

> The name Aeneas was no small thing among the opponents of the Roman curia.*57

---


What follows is a reinterpretation not so much of Basel, as in
the later history of the council, but of Aeneas himself, as a
young man led astray not just by his vices but by other, more
eminent men. Nor does he hesitate to compare himself to
Augustine, who had written retractions after reviewing his own
work. After denouncing the Council of Basel for its proceed-
ings against Eugenius IV, reversing previous arguments,
Aeneas represents Peter not as the Church’s representative, but
as the dread doorkeeper of heaven whose power was revealed
to him:

The door of the celestial hall, which, without doubt, no one en-
ters who denies the authority of blessed Peter, the key bearer of
the eternal kingdom, his successors and their power, is apparent
to me by a divine gift.

Aeneas goes on to argue that not even the Council of Con-
stance decreed anything detrimental to a true pope like Eugen-
ius, who was not a heretic. Moreover, he denies that the as-
sembly at Basel was a council any longer when it acted apart
from its legitimate head, the pope. Aeneas concludes: ‘[...] what
does not represent the Church is not a council.’ Bringing
the letter back to his own situation, Aeneas argues that he was
not alone in going over to Eugenius and that he did it long
before he was nominated to a bishopric, for good reasons and
not for bad.

Even a generous amount of space does not permit a detailed
reading of In minoribus, which follows the lines laid down by

conversion to Giuliano Cesarini and Juan Carvajal at Wolkan, *Briefwechsel*
(Fontes, vol. 67), p. 57.
60 Wolkan, *Briefwechsel* (Fontes, vol. 67), p. 58
Aeneas in the letter to Jordan Mallant. Suffice it to say that Aeneas once more portrayed himself, and more famously since he was pope, as being drawn into error through youthful arrogance and the example of his elders. The bull Execrabilis, sometimes thought to have ended the Conciliar Era, was actually a vain effort, as was In minoribus, to tidy up the Church, permitting Pope Pius II to concentrate on other matters, including the crusade against the Turks. Aeneas’s older ideas of Peter representing the Church have vanished, replaced by the idea that what was addressed to Peter by Jesus, the promise of the keys, was addressed too to the reigning pope. Any appeal from the pope to a council would turn this hierarchic ordering of the Church upside down, licensing sin and indiscipline. In no case, however, was Pius ever able to put Aeneas behind him, leaving him to protest, even from the throne of Peter: ‘Reject Aeneas; accept Pius!’

Finally, I would like to point to a related line of inquiry, one directed to Pius’s Commentaries. These may be described as combining history and diary; their charming indiscretions – many of which were eliminated in early printed versions – can be found alongside echoes of classical writings. Nonetheless, they are best approached as a form of autobiography, one anticipated by earlier works, in which he strives to set the record straight and put Aeneas Sylvius in the proper light. This effort cannot be understood properly without a glance at the written

66 Defensorium obedientiae, ed. Oberman, pp. 3-7, 224-227.
67 For the most recent edition, see Pii II Commentarii rerum memorabilium que temporibus suis contigerunt, ed. A. van Heck, 2 vols., Studi e testi 312-313 (Vatican City, 1984).
record, the dialogues, histories and letters which left a trail from Basel to the doorstep of the reigning pope. Whenever reminded pointedly of these records of the past, Aeneas could not resist trying to defend himself – without satisfying his critics or, apparently, himself. And it is one of the ironies of history that it is this complicated life – with its protagonist’s vain effort to set it in order – which so attracts our attention. Aeneas combined in one life political indiscretions and high policy, sexual escapades and sober second thoughts, satirical turns of phrase and conscientious efforts to describe the powers of Peter and his successors, humanism and crusade, assertiveness and self defense. This Protean figure, whenever we encounter him, leaves us eager to make our own effort to wrestle him into one true form; and he continues to elude our grasp.

70 Aeneas’s apologetic efforts were complicated, when he was pope, by an inability to obtain custody of his most vehement critic to punish him, Gregor Heimberg; see L. Pastor, The History of the Popes, 40 vols. (London, 1900-1953), vol. III, pp. 185-192.
‘MORE MATTER AND LESS ART.’ AENEAS SILVIUS PICCOLOMINI AND THE DELICATE BALANCE BETWEEN ELOQUENT WORDS AND DEEDS

Zweder von Martels

On May 30, 1416, the trial of the Hussite heretic Jerome of Prague at the Council of Constance ended with his execution. Immediately afterwards, Poggio Bracciolini, a Council secretary, sent an eloquent eyewitness account to his friend Leonardo Bruni in Florence. Bruni’s and above all Piccolomini’s critical reactions to Poggio’s letter make it a suitable beginning for this essay on Piccolomini’s view on the relation between eloquence and moral behaviour. Here I shall first pursue the reactions of Poggio, Bruni and Piccolomini to the case of Jerome of Prague as an introduction to the latter’s ideas on eloquence in connection with the studia humanitatis and the search for truth. What this connection meant in practice will be shown in the second part, which is devoted to Piccolomini’s efforts in uniting the Christian princes of Europe in a crusade against the Turks.

Poggio’s letter demonstrates a more than common understanding of Jerome’s views, and it shows admiration for his eloquent answers and dignified bearing:

To confess the truth, I never knew the art of speaking carried so near the model of ancient eloquence. It was, indeed, amazing to hear with what force of expression, with what fluency of language, and with what excellent reasoning, he answered his adversaries: nor was I less struck with the gracefulness of his manner, the dignity of his action, and the firmness and constancy of his

I wish to thank Adrie van der Laan and Arjo Vanderjagt for their astute observations and comments on an earlier draft.

whole behavior. It grieved me to think so great a man was laboring under so atrocious an accusation.

Jerome’s learning, reasonableness and honesty raised Poggio’s sympathy, who argued that Jerome was ‘already pronounced a heretic and condemned before he was examined.’ He added that the Council was moved and inclined to pity Jerome ‘if not to favor him under the influence of his words.’ Jerome’s courageous criticism of the abuses of the Church was not neglected:

Braving death, he even provoked the vengeance which was hanging over him. ‘If that holy martyr,’ said he, speaking of Hus, ‘used the clergy with disrespect, his censures were not leveled at them as priests, but as wicked men. He saw with indignation those revenues, which had been designed for charitable ends, expended upon pageantry and riot.’

Poggio, though, was clever enough to see that too much praise of this heretic might harm his own position, and so, pretending objectivity, he prudently distanced himself a little from the case of Jerome at the start of his letter:

It grieved me to think so great a man was laboring under so atrocious an accusation. Whether this accusation be a just one, God knows: for myself, I inquire not into the merits of it; resting satisfied with the decision of my superiors. But I will just give you a summary of his trial.

Such words clearly did not convince Leonardo Bruni, who observed that Poggio would have sympathized with the other party, if he had thought twice: ‘I think you ought to write more carefully about such matters.’ Perhaps Bruni anticipated the

---

religious turmoil which would be the scourge of Bohemia for decades. Its tragic history is found in Piccolomini’s *History of Bohemia*, which also contains a chapter on the events at Constance. Like Bruni, Piccolomini praised the ‘elegance’ of Poggio’s letter but blamed the author ‘for seeming to be biased against the clergy.’ Like Poggio, he admired Jerome’s endurance of his ordeal but disapproved of both the intransigent attitude of John Hus in 1415 and later of Jerome and their refusal to follow the prescribed procedures. He remarked that both had come to the Council, less eager to learn from others than to teach and to be pleasing to the ears of the people. The elected body of doctors of divine and human law had urged them again and again to abandon those doctrines which were against divine law, not to be wiser than the Church, and to use their eloquence to strengthen not to demolish the institutions of the Church. They needed to place their proposals for reform before a general council for discussion. Yet, though vanquished by the Council’s arguments, they stubbornly continued to argue:

that they were veracious, that they were the emulators of the Holy Gospel, that they were the disciples of Christ. The Church of Rome and other Churches scattered over the world had far de-

\[\text{quam ego vellem, et si iudicium tuum saepe purgas, tamen nescio quid maioris}
\]

affectionis animi prae te fers. Ego cautius de hisce rebus scribendum puto.’

3 Aeneas Silvius, *Historia Bohemica / Historie Česká*, eds. and transl. D. Martinková, A. Hadravová and J. Matl, Fontes rerum Regni Bohemiae 1 (Prague, 1998), pp. 98-100 (I1. 1488-1529). The *Europa* (in: Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, *Opera omnia* (Basle, 1551), pp. 387-471, esp. p. 427) does not mention the history of the trial extensively, but refers to the *Historia Bohemica*. He concludes among other things that John Hus and Jerome of Prague had deceived the people and that four kings had extirpated this virus of heresy. On the first page of his *Bulla Retractationum* of 1463 (at the beginning of his *Opera omnia* (Basle,1551)), Pius mentions John Hus and Jerome of Prague among those heretics who become pertinacious (pertinaces) in order not to appear inconstant (inconstantes), and who act most arrogantly (superbissimi), wanting to appear like gods not humans (qui videri dii, non homines volunt).


5 Aeneas Silvius, *Historia Bohemica*, p. 100 (ll. 1520-1526).
parted from the traditions of the apostles, as they pursued riches and pleasures, sovereignty over peoples and first reclining at banquets, as they fed dogs and horses, and wasted the goods of the Churches, destined for the Christian poor, in wantonness and luxury. They either did not know at all the commands of God, or knowingly held them in contempt.  

Finally – as Piccolomini observes in agreement – the leaders of the Council judged that these inflamed parts, as they could not be cured, should be cut off so that they would not infect the rest of the Church.

Pope John Paul II’s public apology for the role of the Catholic Church in condemning heretics like John Hus and Jerome of Prague’ might appear to support Poggio’s view of a Church which had lost much of its authority through corruption and lack of respect for its own values. No surprise then that the case of Jerome became a shining example in the age leading to the Reformation and its aftermath, as the popularity of Poggio’s letter in its Latin version, in the various translations, and the references to it show. One case deserves mention because it

6 Aeneas Silvius, *Historia Bohemica*, p. 100 (ll. 1510-1515).

7 See the address of the Holy Father to an International Symposium on John Hus, December 17, 1999: ‘Today, on the eve of the Great Jubilee, I feel the need to express deep regret for the cruel death inflicted on John Hus, and for the consequent wound of conflict and division which was thus imposed on the minds and hearts of the Bohemian people. It was during my first visit to Prague that I declared my hope that precisely in your land decisive steps could be taken on the path of reconciliation and true unity in Christ. The wounds of past centuries must be healed through a new attitude and completely renewed relationships’; cf. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/.

illustrates the dilemma and fear which Poggio’s letter caused in the hearts of many people. When, around 1525, Goswinus of Halen (Halensis) in his life of Rudolph Agricola listed a few men from Groningen who had acquired a scholarly reputation in Cologne, he gave special attention to Bernard of Reida, who was called the ‘oracle of Cologne’. Goswinus tells that Reida had been present at Constance in 1416.

He had been the one who with his own hand had put Jerome of Prague to the stake – a deed still exalted by his relatives. The Florentine Poggio, who writes that he was present there, is a reliable witness of the religious zeal with which this happened.

Significantly Goswinus did not dare to say much more about this case, for he adds:

In our time it is much safer to remain silent about this case than Poggio – who had been the secretary of four or five popes – was in those days at Constance when he suggests rather than writes about the innocence of Jerome. 9

Very Interesting Account of the Waldenses and Albigenses (London, 1812 1, 1826 2), Chapter V, section 8.

9 H. B. Kan, ‘Wesseli Groningensis, Rhodolphi Agricolae, Erasmi Roterdami vitae ex Codice Vindobonensi typis descriptae’, in: Erasmiani Gymnasii programma litterarium (Rotterdam, 1894), p. 6: ‘Parochus Henricus Fredericus Huusman licentiatus fuit, ut appellant, sacrae theologiae, evectus in id nominis Coloniae Agrippinae ubi ea tempestate frisio quidam erat, noster dictus magister, cui Bernardo a Reida nomen erat. Hic veluti oraculum totius Coloniae Agrippinae cum quodam alio ex nostra Groninga M. Bartoldo Bluniga pastore divi Martini in Groninga. et item alio Groningensi M. nostro Laurentio qui statuit collegium illud Agrippinae quod Laurentianum hodie nominatur. Hic Bernardus a Reida in concilio Constantiensii fuit, et is qui Hieronimum a Praga ut sui gentiles adhuc gloriantur in rogum sua manu pertruisit. quod quo zelo pietaetie fiebat locuples est testis Poggius florentinus qui scribit sese astitisse. De re plura tacere tueius hoc tempore est, quam Constantius Poggius tum qui fuit a secretis 4 aut 5 pontificibus maximis de innocentia Hieronymi insinuat quam scribit.’ For this rare text, I am indebted to Dr Fokke Akkerman, who also pointed out to me still another late example of Jerome’s influence; his case is mentioned (without Poggio’s name) in a letter of Martinus Dorpius to Erasmus (epist. 347 of 1515); see Erasmus, Opus epistolarum, ed. P. S. Allen (Oxford, 1910, vol. 2, p. 131 (line 164).
As will be shown below, Piccolomini’s censure of Poggio did not mean that he was insensitive to the moral decline of the Church. Yet, in the end he felt that coercion was the necessary ultimate means to attain unity of faith. Interestingly, he blamed Jerome and Poggio for using eloquence – an art which saw its revival in the Renaissance, and of which Poggio had become an outspoken propagator. Piccolomini’s fame as *poeta* and *orator* led Jacob Burckhardt to conclude that: ‘Great as he was both as scholar and diplomatist, he would probably never have become pope without the fame and the charm of his eloquence.’

Though Piccolomini’s writings offer no systematic theory about the proper use of eloquence, his scattered remarks enable us to form a good idea of what he regarded as right. That he shared the humanist enthusiasm for eloquence can be illustrated by his praise of the Duke of Gloucester for encouraging poetry and oratory as part of humanist studies. As a result, England will become more eloquent: citizens (*cives*) are used to follow their leaders:

> Eloquence is a great thing, and if we want to make known the truth, there is nothing that governs the world so much as eloquence. Whatever we do in political life, we do persuaded by words, and the opinion of him stays with the people, who knows to persuade best.

Piccolomini remarks that until his time humanist studies, focusing on oratory and poetry, had been almost unknown outside

---


Italy. The texts studied were not only meant to lead their readers to formal eloquence, but were as much a source of moral lessons. This connection is stressed when Piccolomini in his first letter on education to Duke Sigismund of Austria claimed that: ‘all standard of good living is contained in the study of literature.’ Inspired by ancient authors like Cicero and Seneca, Piccolomini calls ‘(practical) wisdom’ (sapientia) the first goal of humanist training. Good eloquence depends on this, but also prudence, based upon a combination of reason, practical experience, and wisdom. Piccolomini’s ethical perception and educational ideals appear in his remark that especially the study of history teaches prudence to the young against their nature (contra naturam): this was his ‘excuse’ for spending his rare free hours on this favoured pastime of his. With regard to material things, values, and cultures, he shares the perennial view of their relative nature and inconstancy.


16 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 67), p. 164 (no. 44): Piccolomini to Juan Carvajal of 1450. Piccolomini quotes Cicero’s adage Historia testis temporum, lux veritatis, magistra vite, nuntia vetustatis (‘History, the witness of the times, light of truth, teacher of life, messenger of antiquity’) at least six times.

sketch of the literary history of Italian and Latin authors from Dante to Brunì and his observation that humanist studies had flowered within one or two generations in England during his own lifetime demonstrate that for him constant change did not always mean decline and degeneration. The only exception to the rule of change is the immutable truth of the Christian faith: ‘For the truth of faith is always true, and cannot be changed at any place or time.’ Thus humanists continued to respect the Bible and the Church Fathers as the highest authorities for leading a Christian life, despite their keen interest in the writings of the great pagan authors of Antiquity. Coluccio Salutati had first defended the connection between the two traditions that form the basis of humanist studies. This explains the


19 See note 12 below.

20 Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 68), p. 41(no. 12): Letter of Bishop Aeneas to Cardinal Juan Carvajal, August 21, 1451: ‘[...] nam verum fidei semper est verum, nec ullo potest vel loco vel tempore variari.’

21 Cf. Collucio Salutati, Epistolario, ed. F. Novati, 4 vols., Fonti per la Storia d’Italia, 15-18 (Rome, 1891-1911), vol. 3, p. 330: letter to Giovanni Manzini (1398): ‘The other thing with which I congratulate you is that you apply yourself to the study of literature. For nothing remains more steadfast with us than the acquired perfect condition towards knowledge and the studies of humanity. And then I want a condition not in order to become more learned, but better men, as a great part of it is held together by the precepts and teaching of moral philosophy. But the highest and most accomplished condition is achieved by the most holy lessons of the Christian religion. Those moral guidelines should be learned, but those lessons should not only be conceived but also be
popularity of the commonplace of the ‘spoils of Egypt’, based on the story of Moses who ordered the Israelites on leaving Egypt to take the vessels, ornaments, silver, gold and clothes of the Egyptians with them, in order to make better use of them. Piccolomini referred to Jerome’s letters to Damasus and an unknown Roman orator for the story of the captive woman of Deuteronomy 21.10-13 to draw attention to the studies of humanity as an indispensable source of erudition, eloquence, and ethics. In a political sense, the existence of a hierarchy of truths stimulated humanists such as Piccolomini in their efforts to establish concord upon consensus rather than coercion. The energy he devoted to this goal was as much inspired by the strength of his moral convictions as by his ideals of leadership and his personal ambition.

Piccolomini’s ordination as deacon in Vienna in March 1446 – not very long after his love affairs, which led to an illegitimate child in 1443, his composition of licentious poems and, in 1444, of the famous Tale of Two Lovers – might appear to be a sharply defined turning point in his life, but rather it illustrates the conflict raging within him between the opposite

embraced, so that we know whatsoever moral philosophy transmits, but not only know those lessons of the Christian faith, but also put them to practice.’ For this and other examples, see also my ‘The Kaleidoscope of the Past: Reflections on the Reception and Cultural implications of the Term Studia humanitatis’, in: eds. G. J. Dorleijn and H. L. J. van Stiphout, Cultural Repertoires. Structure, Function and Dynamics (Louvain, 2003), pp. 87-104.

22 Exodus 3.21-22; 11.2; 12.35-36.
24 See, for instance, his letter to Leonardo dei Benvoglienti of September 25, 1453 in: Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 68), p. 279 (no. 153). For another example of the use of the word consensus, see his letter to Cardinal Juan Carvajal about the Hussites of August 21, 1451 in Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, 68), p. 53 (no. 12).
values of the ancient (pagan) classical and Christian traditions.  

His decision of 1446 meant a clear choice as to what was important to him morally and professionally. The search for carnal pleasures and the *carpe diem* ethos of the ancient love poets were left behind. More weight was given to loyalty to political and educational ideals. Burdensome responsibilities as priest, bishop and cardinal on the one hand and as secretary and counsellor of the German emperor on the other soon had him giving up the proud title of ‘poet’ with which he had adorned his letters since his coronation as poet in 1443. It seems, then, that practical and moral considerations had become more important for Piccolomini. His inclination to a practical approach is not only reflected by his view that for speech one should look to custom not to authority and antiquity, but also by his answer to the Polish Cardinal Zbigniew Olesnicki, who had complimented him on the form of his letters:

> Yet I acknowledge that I am nude and speak openly, and avail myself of no trappings. I reject all covering, and I do not labour when I am writing, since I do not mention things too high for me or of which I have no understanding. I pass on what I have learned; the man who remains himself, shows himself easily understood by others; the man who is obscure to himself cannot provide light to another. I avoid knotty and long periodic sentences. If elegant words are at hand, I do not neglect to weave them in; if not, I do not search further off, but use what there is. My sole aim is to be understood; yet, I observe how rude and artless my language is and how unworthy that it should disturb the ears of learned men.

---

26 For this subject see my ‘The Fruit of Love’ in this volume.  
28 See also Aeneas Silvius’s letter to king Ladislaus entitled *De liberorum educatione*, February 1450, in: Wolkan, *Briefwechsel* (Fontes, vol. 67), p. 136 (no. 40). Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 1.6.1 is the source of this idea.  
29 Wolkan, *Briefwechsel* (Fontes, vol. 68), pp. 319-320 (no. 177): Aeneas Silvius to Cardinal Zbigniew Olesnicki, Oktober 27, 1453. G. Voigt did not believe in the sincerity of Piccolomini’s emphasis on contents rather than form. ‘Unashamed’ is his most negative qualification of Piccolomini’s style in his letters: ‘Von Filelfo lernte er wenig mehr als die kalte Form; Poggio’s Beispiel
For a long time prejudice reigned against humanist eloquence, which was connected with the study of form rather than contents. 30 It is worthwhile to mention here a nineteenth century example of this for it will lead us to Piccolomini’s sermon on St Ambrose, offering an early example of the two ideals which dominated Piccolomini’s thoughts throughout his life. Jacob Burckhardt mentioned the oration, held in Basle in 1436, in a chapter on fifteenth-century Latin or Italian oratory. The Swiss historian compared renaissance oratory to music which filled many of the social hours in his own time ‘with results which every reader can imagine.’ Shortly after, Burckhardt added that ‘the social position of the speaker was a matter of perfect indifference; what was desired was simply the most cultivated humanist talent.’ This meant, for instance, that ‘married laymen ascended the pulpits of the churches at any scene of festivity or mourning and even on the feastdays of the saints.’ Borrowing from Piccolomini’s Commentaries, Burckhardt adds:

It struck the non-Italian members of the Council of Basle as something strange that the Archbishop of Milan should summon Aeneas Sylvius, who was then unordained, to deliver a public discourse at the feast of Saint Ambrose; but they suffered it in spite of the murmurs of the theologians, and listened to the speaker with the greatest curiosity. 31

Burckhardt apparently sympathised with the horror provoked in his age by the idea of laymen holding sermons on religious subjects. Yet, today this has again become a rather common

30 An early example of this prejudice is Samuel Johnson’s comments with regard to the sixteenth-century Scottish historian Hector Boece in the chapter on Aberdeen in his Journal to the Hebrides (1773): ‘The first race of scholars in the fifteenth century, and some time after, were, for the most part, learning to speak rather than to think, and were therefore more studious of eloquence than of truth. The contemporaries of Boethius thought it sufficient to know what the ancients had delivered. The examination of tenets and facts was reserved for another generation.’

practice. This and the fact that Piccolomini proudly mentions the success of his oration some 25 years later in the first book of his Commentaries might raise our curiosity as to what he had said. He first explained that his aim was not the glorification of St Ambrose but the description of his life as a model for imitation. This, after all, is why the life of a holy man is commemorated in the first place. Piccolomini used Ambrose to castigate the greed and wealth reigning in his age. Ambrose’s humility demonstrated to him and his audience how the Church might regain its authority. Piccolomini, who is usually seen as a young, flamboyant orator and a lascivious poet at this time, yet appears to be familiar with Ambrose, whose vast erudition and acquaintance with the authors of pagan Antiquity is praised by him. To illustrate his moral conduct, he briefly digresses on

32 Some time after 1460, Pope Pius II, in the first book of his Commentaries, described the event on December 7, 1437 as follows: ‘At Basle the feast of St Ambrose was being celebrated and at the invitation of the archbishop Aeneas delivered the eulogy of the saint before the synod, though the theologians objected, because they wanted to perform this function themselves. But Aeneas was preferred before them all and was listened to with incredible attention by the entire audience.’ Commentarii, eds. Bellus and Boronkai, vol. I, p. 40 (= Commentarii, I, 8); Gragg and Gabel, The commentaries of Pius II, p. 25.


34 Aeneas Silvius’s most important source was Paulinus of Nola, Vita Sancti Ambrosii Mediolanensis Episcopi a Paulino ejus notario ad Beatum Augustinum conscripta in: Sancti Ambrosii Mediolanensis Episcopi Opera omnia, Patrologiae Latinae Tomus 14 (Turnhout, 1879), pp. 27-46; besides a number of pagan authors, Piccolomini also quotes the Historia tripartita (that is Cassiodore’s Chronicon tripartitum), Jerome, and Augustine.
Ambrose’s excommunication of Emperor Theodosius, after the latter had ordered a massacre in Thessalonica (390 A.D.): by being prepared to suffer martyrdom, Ambrose had shown himself the true shepherd of his Church. In short, this sermon is proof of Piccolomini’s life-long conviction that good moral behaviour but also erudition and eloquence are crucial in persuading others.

The Turkish threat

In the first chapters of the second book of his Commentaries (ca. 1462) Pius claimed that ‘among the purposes he had at heart none was dearer than that of rousing Christians against the Turks and declaring war upon them.’ In fact, a great many letters, orations, and other writings offer testimony to Piccolomini’s anxiety over the Turkish threat after the conquest of Constantinople. They show the reasons for his untiring efforts in uniting his allies, and his growing despair as to what his eloquence might achieve in Christian Europe where concord was lacking. His unconventional decision to constitute himself as leader of the Crusade was his last hope of persuading the other princes. The history of Piccolomini’s attempts is well-known through his own accounts and through the many scholarly studies since Georg Voigt. The same is true for the advantageous political and social circumstances which enabled him to take his decisive step: the vow taken by the Duke of Burgundy, the discovery of the alum mines, and the pledge of the Venetians to support a crusade. Here, I shall pay attention to those aspects which show his loyalty to thoughts fostered by him long before but only fully developed in the course of time.

The failure of the council of Florence (1439) was the harbinger of the conquest of Constantinople by Sultan Mehmed II on


May 29, 1453. It is not unimportant that Piccolomini himself actively proposed Basle and Siena before Florence was designated for the council of 1439. The victory of the Turks at Varna in 1444 and other skirmishes and battles between the Turkish and Christian armies must have worried him. On June 5, 1452, he publicly took the matter in hand, when on the behalf of Emperor Frederick III he addressed Pope Nicholas V to acquire his consent for a crusade against the infidel. Not long after the news of the conquest of Constantinople had arrived, he — then bishop of Trieste — wrote his political friends to communicate his bewilderment and seek support for a crusade. His letter to Nicholas of Cusa, for instance, stressed the inseparable connection both of the ancient classical and the Christian traditions and the Christians of East and West. The Turks are seen as common enemies, hostile to Christianity. The ancient church of the Hagia Sophia reminds him of the definitive loss of Greek civilisation now that Constantinople had fallen. He defines Greek literature as a source from which the smaller streams of Latin studies originated: how can a river contain water if its source is dry? Once Christianity stretched out over large parts of Asia, but now it had been driven out of that part of the world and pushed back to this side of the Danube and the Hellespont. This emphasis on the connection of the pagan classical and Christian traditions was an important feature of Piccolomini’s early letters and orations, but also of his Asia,


Europa, and Commentaries, written shortly before and after his election as pope. Yet, in the letters and orations of his papacy, he tended to restrict himself to the desperate position of the Christian faith. This theme returns in his remarkable letter to Sultan Mehmed II of ca. 1462. Piccolomini’s analysis of the differences between Christianity and Islam led him to the conclusion that the Christian belief in the Holy Trinity is the main obstacle for a peaceful agreement with the Muslim Turks. Without much scruple, he proposed to give his adversary the imperial crown and vacant throne of Constantinople on the condition that he would have himself baptized. Whereas his mind was bent on persuasion, the tone of this letter remains polite and conciliatory. Yet, in the Commentaries, written around the time he took the decision to lead the Crusade himself, he not only bluntly and implacably called the Turks ‘foes of the Trinity’, but also spoke with great contempt of ‘Mahomet’, their ‘false prophet’, and his perversion of the Old and the New Testaments, and also of his many outrageous misdeeds.

In his letter to Cusanus, there are two other points that constantly remain in his mind: the pursuit of glory, and the search for a suitable leader of a crusade against the infidel. The idea of glory that had occupied Piccolomini’s mind since his earliest acquaintance with the writings of the ancients conflicted with his Christian conviction that one’s main preoccupation should be with the care for one’s soul after death. This is perhaps best expressed in the preface of his Commentaries where he remarks that he did not reject the pagan idea of glory which he regarded as an incentive for illustrious men to do well and for men in a high position like himself to endure criticism. In earlier writ-

44 Pius’s view is in line with Augustine’s, who regarded glory as a reward and a compensation for the burdens connected with public responsibility; see A.
ings, too, he is fascinated by both pagan and Christian ideas, though in different ways. In the letter to Cusanus, for instance, the pagan concept was connected with the transitory nature of things. There he reasoned that our ancestors wrongly believed that they would continue to exist after death provided that they had been immortalised in literature. Hostile to Greek and Roman literature, the Turks would burn the writings of the ancients that still exist; what is rescued is only safe as long as the Roman empire and the Apostolic See remain.

‘Glory’ also is mentioned as an argument in the first part of Piccolomini’s famous oration at the Frankfurter Fürstentag of 1454. This is somewhat unexpected because he there deals with the question whether the war against the Turks is just (iustum). Here again, Piccolomini saw the conquest of Constantinople as the demise of Greek literature. Wondering what interest soldiers might take in literature, he exclaims: ‘Everything, for what drives them more than fame and glory?’ Cicero and Virgil, among others, are called in as witnesses for the belief that through literature one will continue to live after death. The connection of these ideas with the issue of the lawfulness of war only becomes clear at the end of this part in the form of a rhetorical question:

Could we doubt the justice of war against this monstrous people, which does not care for the studia humanitatis, which does not observe treaties, and which drinks our blood?


45 Oratio Aeneae de Constantinopolitana clade, & bello contra Turcos congregando [1554], in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, pp. 678-89; for an analysis of the structure of this oration see J. Blusch, ‘Enea Silvio Piccolomini und Giannantonio Campano. Die unterschiedlichen Darstellungsprinzipien in ihren Türkenreden’, Humanistica Lovaniensia 28 (1979), pp. 78-138. The same three points, but in different order, and less harmoniously discussed, were used by Pius in Mantua; Oratio Pii Papae II habita in conuenitu Mantuano sexto Calendas Octobris Anno Domini MCCCLIX, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, pp. 905-914.
But even at this stage of his life, Piccolomini did not lose sight of the transience of earthly things. In the second and third parts of the oration on the questions whether a war is useful (utile) and easy (facile), such advantages as booty and earthly fame are made subordinate to the Christian belief that fighting the infidel will give the human soul a secure place in heaven. It is characteristic of Piccolomini’s view of tradition that in addition to Christian sources he quotes pagan ones in support. He leaves it to Cicero (Somnium Scipionis 13.13) to confirm the idea common among Christians that everyone who does something for his country will receive a sure place in heaven, and he adds that this is even more certain and true for the defenders of the Christian faith against the impious Turks.\footnote{Quoting pagan authors in a Christian context is not necessarily to be explained as a humanist flirtation with classical sources. It is interesting to see that Augustine, too, sometimes sought support in pagan sources, especially in cases where he made an appeal to matters of faith, rather than reason.}

In a letter of July 5, 1454, to his friend Leonardo dei Benvoglienti, Piccolomini complained that Europe was divided politically and that this division would not be healed easily; unanimous action could not be expected.\footnote{For this letter, see Piccolomini, Opera omnia, pp. 654-658. See also his earlier letter of Sept. 25, 1453 to the same recipient: Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 68), pp. 278-285 (no. 152).} In those years, he had set his hopes on Emperor Frederick III, whom he tried to inspire to his ideal of leadership, already present in rudimentary form in his sermon on St Ambrose. This ideal is more sharply defined in his oration to Pope Nicholas V of June 5, 1552. There he asks permission for the emperor to organize and lead a crusade. Piccolomini defines his ideal of leadership with the help of three qualities found in Cicero’s De officiis.\footnote{Cicero’s De officiis was used before by Piccolomini for his De ortu et auctoritate imperii Romani; cf. Cary J. Nderman. ‘Humanism and Empire: Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, Cicero and the Imperial Ideal’, The Historical Journal 36 (1993), pp. 499-515.} In one long sentence, he claims that princes are chosen so that their peoples may enjoy the benefits of justice, that it is their task to ward off injuries, and that they must try to convert the management of
the state not to their own interest but to that of those who entrusted it to them.⁴⁹

Encouraged by these noble thoughts of leadership, driven by personal ambition and fame, and convinced that Christianity greatly lacked defence against this enemy of the European tradition, Piccolomini kept hammering on the need for a crusade. His orations on this subject held in Regensburg and Frankfurt in 1454, and, after his election as pope, at the council of Mantua in 1459 led to nothing. The council of Mantua, though, was remarkable in more than one respect. It was organised by the pope against the wish of many of his cardinals who ‘were entirely satisfied with the present state of things and liked their easy life in the capital.’⁵⁰ Neither did many princes show any interest. Pius had to admit that his eloquence lacked cogency. This is clear from the tenor of the oration held at Mantua, which to a large extent repeats old arguments. The pope shows himself vulnerable when he remarks that his exhortations to take the cross were received by many with the reproach that priests are used to send others, not themselves, into a war to be slaughtered by the enemy. Pius’s reply sounds unconvincing when he claims that he had already done so much: dangerously ill, he had made the long journey to Mantua; he would have used the money of the Church, if its financial position would have allowed this; and were he only in the strength of his youth, he would certainly not hold back from going to battle himself, carrying the sign of Christ.⁵¹ However, this was precisely the step Pius would take a few years later when he decided that he


⁵¹ Oratio Pii Papae II habita in conuentu Mantuano sexto Calendas Octobris Anno Domini MCCCCLIX, in: Piccolomini, Opera omnia, pp. 905-914, esp. p. 914.
himself would head the Crusade. It is perhaps illustrative for his change of mind that in these years he described with sympathy the life of other priests who had renounced the world. He praised Antoninus, archbishop of Florence, for his exemplary life and his total contempt for material goods, and also ‘the Bishop of Silves, a Spaniard of Lusitania’, whom he met on a visit to the monastery of Subiaco. He writes of this man that he:

had grown weary of ecclesiastical pomp and hated the cares of this world. He had therefore resigned his church, keeping only an annual income sufficient to live on decently and had come here. He lived among the brethren wearing his former dress, attended and, on occasion, celebrated mass. [...] The pope sent for the Bishop and when he learned the reason for his resigning his church and for his love of solitude, he approved the purpose of a man who had learned how to exchange the things of this world for those of Heaven. The bishop died soon after this. He was blessed indeed if, as we may believe, his contempt of the world was sincere and if he did not reject a high dignity in this world in hope of gaining a higher."

Around March 1462, Pius first announced his decision at a secret meeting with six of his most loyal cardinals. His speech bears much resemblance to a longer one held on September 21, 1463, explaining his intention to all his cardinals. On the first

---

52 Commentarii, eds. Bellus and Boronkai, vol. I, p. 120 (= Commentarii, II, 29); Gragg and Gabel, The commentaries of Pius II, pp. 163-164.
54 Commentarii, eds. Bellus and Boronkai, vol. I, pp. 362-364 (= Commentarii, VII, 16); Gragg and Gabel, The commentaries of Pius II, pp. 515-518. Campana, Pius’s biographer, mentions that the pope had written an epitaph four years before his death, in which he predicted that he would die preparing a war against the Turks. It is hard to say whether this is the same one as the epitaph preserved as part of the manuscript of the Commentaries; its content corresponds, but it must date from around 1462: ‘EPYTAPHIV PROPRIVM (vs. 17) ultum ire in Turchos et uindicare Pelasgum / ulnera dum properat, mors tulit atra Pium’; cf. Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, Carmina, ed. A. van Heck, Studi e Testi 364 (Città del Vaticano, 1994), pp. 171-172.
occasion, he said that he was 'ashamed to sit inactive while the Turks were besetting more and more closely now Pannonia, now Dalmatia in unremitting war.' Resolved to undertake war against the Turks in the defence of the Catholic Faith, he would summon Philip, Duke of Burgundy to follow.\textsuperscript{56} In 1454, the latter had made a vow that he would fight against the Turks, if the Crusade were headed by a great prince. According to Pius: 'It will not beseen a duke bound by a vow to stay at home.' The pope, though convinced that others would follow, wanted first to acquire the support of the Venetians for without their assistance very little could be done. Pius himself writes that his six cardinals had listened 'with wonder and stupefaction,' and that they had said after a number of days for consideration 'that his purpose was worthy of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, who like a shepherd did not hesitate to lay down his life for his sheep.' In the second speech, Pius repeated that it was his duty to stand up for his people. Entering into the reasons why so few were inclined to listen to the authority of the Church, he concluded that the Church had no credit. He complains that no one had answered his entreaties and that distrust was great when he had ordered indulgences to be proclaimed: 'They said this was a trap to extort money and a scheme of the greedy Curia.' His criticism of the behaviour of the Church was very similar to that of Jerome of Prague, mentioned above:

The priesthood is an object of scorn. People say that we live in luxury, amass wealth, are slaves to ambition, ride on the fattest mules and the most spirited horses, wear trailing fringes on our robes and walk the streets with puffed out cheeks under red hats and full hoods, breed hunting dogs, lavish much on actors and parasites and nothing on the defence of the faith. And they are not entirely wrong. There are many among the cardinals and the other

members of the Curia, who do these things and, if we are willing to tell the truth, the luxury and pride of our Curia is excessive. This makes us so hateful to the people that we are not listened to even when we speak the truth.\footnote{Commentarii, eds. Bellus and Boronkai, vol. I, pp. 603 (= Commentarii, XII, 31); Gragg and Gabel, The commentaries of Pius II, p. 823.}

Thus realizing the situation in which the Church found itself, Piccolomini moved on to the question how it might regain its influence. Using the Sallustian idea that ‘a principate is easily kept by the same means that won it in the beginning’ (Cat. 2.4), he reverted to the examples set by the martyrs of the Church: ‘Abstinence, purity, innocence, zeal for the Faith, religious fervour, scorn of death, eagerness for martyrdom, have set the Church of Rome over the whole world.’\footnote{Commentarii, eds. Bellus and Boronkai, vol. I, pp. 603 (= Commentarii, XII, 31); Gragg and Gabel, The commentaries of Pius II, p. 823.} As in his sermon on Ambrose, he compared these martyrs to the ‘true and approved shepherds.’ Pius then calls for action in imitation of Christ instead of by words:

By martyrs and confessors alike our Church was made great. It cannot be preserved unless we imitate our predecessors [...] and it is not enough to be confessors and preach to the peoples. [...] If this method does not rouse Christians to war, we know no other. This path we are resolved to tread.

He adds, however, that leading this venture would be a crushing burden to his old age, and a little later he explains that he would not act as a warrior, because he was ‘physically weak’ and a priest ‘whom it does not befit to wield the sword.’ Instead, he would (like Aeneas as depicted by Virgil (Aen., 10.261))

stand on a high stern or on some mountain brow and holding before our eyes the Holy Eucharist, that is, our Lord Jesus Christ, we shall pray heaven for the safety and victory of our fighting soldiers.\footnote{Commentarii, eds. Bellus and Boronkai, vol. I, p. 605 (= Commentarii, XII, 31); Gragg and Gabel, The commentaries of Pius II, p. 826.}
Reaching the end of his oration, the pope and other cardinals were moved and broke out in tears. He was praised by the Bishop of Rouen, ‘averse to the project, a devotee of luxury and ease who when he was bidden to express his opinion did not oppose the plan.’ Pius explains: ‘The man’s nature was conquered by the nobility of the plan.’ During the next months, last preparations were made. The Duke of Burgundy, the Venetians and Hungarians, among others, had promised their support. There was an unexpected turn of events when the Duke of Burgundy was prohibited by the King of France to follow his ardent wish to take the cross. Before this news reached Pius at the end of March 1464, he had consulted eight of his cardinals as to what course should be taken in case Philip failed to keep his agreement. In the thirteenth book of his Commentaries, he recorded their opinion with which he himself agreed full-heartedly: this meant that in such a situation words could not be an excuse for not following the course that had been set. The cardinals on the one hand believed ‘the decree of departure to be binding on the pope only if Burgundy came.’ Nevertheless, they mentioned various reasons why the pope should indeed sail. They argued:

Confidence in the Apostolic See would be utterly destroyed if its promises were not kept and Burgundy’s delay would not seem to the populace a sufficient excuse. Both the pope and the duke would be condemned by the voice of the people but the pope more severely, since it behooved him to hold more steadfastly to his word.

Afraid that no one ‘thereafter would heed his decrees’ and eager to ‘avoid the stigma of inconstancy’, he ‘must go with the Venetians and with the aid of the Hungarians.’

The issue has been raised whether Pius actually intended to lead the Crusade, as his journey to Ancona and his last days aboard his ship suggests. Marcello Simonetta remarks that Gio-

---

vanni Simonetta, Sforza’s chief secretary, wrote in his *Sforziade* that Pius II never intended to go on the crusade alone\(^62\) and that Ottone del Carretto revealed that the pope would have sailed from Ancona but planned to interrupt his voyage in Southern Italy to castigate the Italian princes for their inadequate support of the holy war.\(^63\) Others, of course, defended the pope after his death.\(^64\) However, the answer to the question whether Pius intended to fulfil his pledge can be found in the last sentences of the opinion of Pius’s cardinals mentioned above. It is clear to them that he never intended to seek blind martyrdom but that he would act in accordance with his responsibility for the institution of the Church and the people entrusted to him. In other words, as much as possible, prudence would dictate his steps, or, as it was formulated in the thirteenth book of the *Commentaries*:

The less help they had from men in God’s cause the more they must put their hope in the aid of Heaven. He must embark and sail against the enemy as far as he could without manifest danger. If by God’s grace it should happen that there was an opportunity of vanquishing the enemy, the occasion must be seized. If not, they must conclude that it was not the will of the Divine Mercy that the Turks should be destroyed at this time. He would be justified in turning his ships about even without victory and men’s praises, but not without hope of God’s grace which measures desires more than it does deeds. Neither glory among men nor the pity of Heaven would be the lot of those who had refused to stand beside their spiritual father, the Vicar of Christ, as he went off to war for religion and exposed his aged person to mortal danger.\(^65\)

---


\(^{63}\) Simonetta ‘Pius II and Sforza’, pp. 169-170 (referring to *Disparci e lettere di Giacomo Gherardi*, ed. E. Carusi (Vatican City, 1909), *ad indicem*).

\(^{64}\) See the examples mentioned by Simonetta ‘Pius II and Sforza’, pp. 169-170.

THE FRUIT OF LOVE. AENEAS SILVIUS PICCOLOMINI
ABOUT HIS ILLEGITIMATE CHILD

Zweder von Martels

On May 27, 1521, Erasmus asked his friend Beatus Rhenanus to prevent the publication of his letters by Froben in a form that might harm his reputation:

Do not be moved by the small financial loss that will have to be faced in the alteration of some leaves; I wish the whole expense, whatever it may be, to be charged to me.¹

Fearing that his letters would make him most unpopular, Erasmus mentioned especially ‘this sorry business of Luther blazed up into such a controversy that it is safe neither to speak nor to keep silence.’ Due to the political climate and religious intolerance, the contents of none of his letters would be safe, as no notice is taken of the time when a man was writing, but what was entirely correct when it was written is transferred to a date which it does not fit at all.

The situation reminded Erasmus of letters written by Cicero, Pliny and Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, for he wrote a letter that displays like a picture the writer’s character and fortunes and sentiments, and the state of affairs both public and private – such, for example, as the letters of Cicero and Pliny and in more recent times those of Aeneas Pius – have somewhat more risk about

¹ I wish to thank Adrie van der Laan and Arjo Vanderjagt for their astute observations and comments on an earlier draft.

¹ For this and the following quotations of this letter, see The Correspondence of Erasmus. Vol. 8: Letters 1122 to 1251. 1520 to 1521, transl. R. A. B. Mynors (Toronto, Buffalo and London, 1988), pp. 217-221, esp. pp. 218-220.
them than writing the history of recent events, which, as Horace says, is a task with dangerous hazard filled.

The reception of Cicero’s letters since Petrarch’s shock about the author’s unstable character may convince us that Erasmus was correct, but this also goes for the letters of Piccolomini, especially for the one written to his father about his illegitimate son. Georg Voigt branded that letter, including his other writings on matters of love ‘als Zeugniss seines liederlichen Lebens und seines frivolen Denkens.’ Voigt’s judgement was perhaps encouraged by Piccolomini’s wish to disassociate himself from these early writings at a later age. With Augustine’s Retractationes, Piccolomini’s have in common the silent admission that absolute truth can only be attained over a period of time and is, in fact, a learning process. Moreover, they show that errors of youth are in need of both the corrective view and the generosity of elder men. The letter to his father contains contrasting ways of thinking which explain on the one hand his somewhat presumptuous behaviour at the time and also his later scruples. This leaves the possibility of a more subtle interpretation of the letter than scholars have hitherto given.


3 See p. 370 of his letter to Carolus Cypraeus in Piccolomini, Opera omnia (1551), p. 869-872 (Epistola cccxcv: Poenitet olim composuisse tractatum de duobus amantibus: ‘De amore igitur, quae scripsimus olim iuvenis, contemnite o mortales atque respuit; sequimini quae nunc dicimus et seni magis quam iuveni credite! Nec privatum hominem pluris facite quam Pontificem. Aeneam reicite, Pium suscipite. Illud gentile nomen parentes indidere nascenti: hoc christianum in apostolatu suscepiimus.’ The famous, last paragraph is also found at the end of the second page of his Bulla Retractionum of 1463 (at the beginning of Piccolomini’s Opera omnia (Basle,1551)).

4 For the Latin text, see the appendix on pp. 245-248, copied from vol. 61, pp. 181-191 (no. 78) of Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini, ed. R. Wolkan, Fontes rerum Austriacarum: Österreichische Geschichtsquellen. 2. Abt., Diplomatia et Acta, 61 / 62 / 67 / 68 (Vienna, 1909 / 1909 / 1912 / 1918). The text is also found in Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, Opera omnia (Basle,
The letter to his father was written in those years when Piccolomini enjoyed baring his heart to the arrows of Amor. His writings before his ordination (1446), after which he overcame this carnal desire, are full of characteristic phrases and thoughts, such as: ‘He who does not love in his youth, loves afterwards at an old age, when it is derided and becomes the talk of the people’,\(^5\) and ‘who has never felt the fire of love is either a stone or an animal.’\(^6\) His letter to Johann Vrunt of March 8, 1446, reveals something of the psychology of his mind at a somewhat later age when he first declares that ‘he is sick of Venus’, and soon after admits that ‘Venus is fleeing him rather than that he abhors her.’\(^7\) However, his particular attention to the subject of love found its culmination in his poetry and the often-reprinted Tale of Two Lovers Eurialus and Lucretia, written in the summer of 1444, about half a year after the letter to his father, which is the main subject of this study.\(^8\)

The letter has various functions, which go further than the exchange of factual information about a love adventure and its serious consequences. The open-hearted and almost frivolous tone suggests a strong intimacy between father and son. This


6 See the final words in his letter to Kaspar Schlick of ca. July 3, 1444: Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), pp 395 (no. 153); a similar remark in his letter to Giovanni Campisio of June 1, 1445, in Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 504 (no. 173). For other such examples, see Voigt, Enea Silvio de’ Piccolomini, vol. II, pp. 285-289, 297-302.

7 Other interesting examples are found in his letter to Johann Vrunt of March 8, 1446 (Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 67), pp 31-32 (no.) 6: ‘[…] nauseam mihi Venus facit […] nanque, ut verum fatear, magis me Venus fugitat quam ego illam horreo.’

becomes clear at once in the opening sentences:

You write that you do not know yet whether to be glad, or sorry, Father, that the Lord has given me a child. But I see cause for gladness and none for sorrow. For what is sweeter to mankind than to beget in one’s own likeness and, as it were, continue one’s stock and leave someone after one’s death? What on earth is more blessed than to see your children’s children? For my part I am delighted that my seed has borne fruit and that some part of me will survive when I die; and I thank God who has made this woman’s child a boy, so that another little Aeneas will play about my father and mother, and give to his grandparents the comfort which his father should have supplied. For if my birth was a pleasure to you, who begat me, why should not my son be a joy to me? And will not my baby’s face rejoice your heart, when you see me in him? Will it not make you happy when the little one hangs about your neck and charms you with his baby ways?  

These words show abundantly that the author, at the same time, addresses a larger audience of readers able to understand his literary allusions. He seeks applause for his humanist talent. Indeed, the letter easily found its way into many manuscripts and printed editions.

The letter has three parts. The first demonstrates that Piccolomini is conscious of guilt and feels a sincere responsibility for his son. He appeals to the natural feelings between parents and their children and to the force of the laws of nature in matters of love and procreation. At the same time he gradually acquaints the reader with his situation: unable to educate his son himself, he places this burden on his parents’ shoulders. They

---

9 For the translation, see Mitchell, The Laurels and the Tiara, pp. 92-93.
10 For the manuscripts of letters based on the codex Chigi J VIII, 287 expurgated by Piccolomini in the years after his ordination, see Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), p. 188 (no. 78); the first printed editions were based on this manuscript tradition (cf. Wolkan, pp. xxiii-xxiv). This means that Piccolomini maintained the letter, but changed his own name at the head of it into ‘Antonius Fortunius’; cf. Wolkan pp. xxi-xxii and p. 188 (no. 78).
11 I conclude this from the fact that he urged Goro Loli in Siena on January 15, 1444, to ask his father to adopt his son, born at Florence, adding that he had written his father about the reasons he assumed that the boy was really his own; cf. Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 284-285 (no. 118).
felt too old and unfit for this task, and his father reproaches him as to his behaviour and requires an answer to the question whether this was really his child. This question provides the basis for the second part of the letter in which Piccolomini, in Boccaccio’s footsteps, recounts how he had seduced an attractive ‘English’ or ‘Breton’ woman (who even spoke his own mother tongue, Tuscan) during his stay in Strasbourg, this woman, called Elizabeth, and her little daughter of five years old were left in the care of an innkeeper by the girl’s father (pater), probably mistakenly called ‘Melincus’. In this part of

12 For this translation of ex Britannia, see Mitchell, The Laurels and the Tiara, p. 92.
13 This must have happened early in 1442, when he was an ambassador of the anti-Pope Felix; cf. Mitchell, The Laurels and the Tiara, p. 90.
14 Dr Fokke Akkerman wrote me the following comment on my request: ‘In one of the theses added to my dissertation of 1980, I paid attention to the name “Melincus” in this letter of Piccolomini. My suspicion had been roused by several questions which troubled me: why is the father of the little daughter mentioned here by name, whereas the mother remains anonymous until she has given birth to the parc vus Aeneas? The postponement of her name is obviously a nice little narratological trick. The father of the little girl does not play any other part in the story than that he commits his daughter to the charge of the innkeeper. Besides, where did he stay at the time? What was his business in or around Strasbourg? From which language is his name derived? Wolkan gives as a varia lectio “Milinchus”; the edition of Basle 1551, p. 511 reads “Milinthus”. So one has to reckon with some sort of corruption due to copyists. In mss. of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the letters “c” and “t” are often hardly or not at all distinguishable. Another source for corruption is the straight mark over the vowel indicating an abbreviation for “n” or “m”. If the transverse line of the -t- had been extended too far to the left, one can expect the shifting of the -n- from a position after the vowel following the -t- to a position before the -t-. Since the confounding of e/i and of u/a occurs quite often, an original reading of “militans” could easily have been corrupted into “milincus”, “melincus” or “milinthus”. In the latter case the -h- could be explained by the Greek appearance of the combination -nth- or simply as a redundant addition. If “militans” is the reading meant by the author, several problems have been solved: the father of the little girl is with some (English?) army in the field somewhere in France and he lodged his mistress (she is not called his wife) and her daughter in a Strasbourg inn. She was English by birth but also fluently spoke Italian, which can be explained by a travelling existence, or, perhaps, her “officer” was an Italian. Above all, by reading “militans” we can dispense with the totally unknown name “Melincus”, which in the story is entirely misplaced.
the letter many references are made to Classical literature and history: Cleopatra, Anthony and Julius Caesar describe his growing passion. Aristotle, Moses and Christian examples come to his mind in helping him overcome his hesitancy in completing his conquest. The child was conceived on the thirteenth of March, and born exactly nine months later in the following November.

In its final part, the letter bears the character of a familiar letter. It is meant as another attempt to appease both his father and his mother. Piccolomini does this by showing loyalty to his family. Sometimes he uses the lightly moralistic tone found in the first part: again his parents are encouraged to see the bright side of having his child under their protection. He also makes inquiries after and shows himself concerned with other members of the family. He even promises to adopt one of the sons of his sister Laudomia as soon as his position would allow. The letter draws to an end after words of comfort to his elderly

Prof. Claudia Märtl of the Ludwig Maximilians-Universität of Munich kindly examined the place in the ms. clm 12725, which was apparently the source for Wolkan’s edition. She affirmed the reading of Wolkan, or, possibly, it might read “Melnicus”. The latter word is impossible in view of the above mentioned alternative readings. So I propose to read “militans”.

15 Piccolomini easily combines examples of the pagan, Jewish and Christian traditions. As to Aristotle, Blok (Seventy-seven Neo-Latin Letters, p. 169) explains that the author is probably thinking of the story of Aristotle and Phyllis, popular in the Middle Ages since Jacob of Vitry (d. 1240) used it in one of his sermons as an exemplum: after Aristotle had instructed his pupil Alexander of Macedon to devote more attention to study and less to his wife, she took revenge by conquering the heart of the old philosopher. After she had succeeded in this, she made one condition before she would secretly meet him: early in the morning, he should carry her on his back through the garden, walking on his hands and feet. Alexander was warned by his wife, saw this ridiculous situation, and concluded that, if this could happen to an experienced philosopher, how much more should he beware of the tricks of a woman. Moses is known as the man who married Zipporah, the daughter of the priest of Jethro, a priest of the non-Jewish people of the Midianites (Exodus 2). Piccolomini may have seen a parallel between himself and Moses in the sense that they both allied themselves with strangers; this seems a better explanation than the polygamy implied by Blok’s reference to Numbers 12.1 (p. 169).

16 For Piccolomini’s fondness of the children of the members of his family and his support for them, see Mitchell, The Laurels and the Tiara, p. 93.
parents, the expression of his hope of a safe reunion before their death, and his assurance that he will not disagree with his father after his return.

No one can fail to recognise the rich and varied use of images derived from the Classical, Biblical and Christian traditions, and also from contemporary sources. Thus Piccolomini underscores the natural joy humans feel when they produce someone of their own blood, who will stay behind after their death, with reference to Psalm 128: ‘What on earth is more delightful (beatius) than seeing sons of sons.’ He expresses his gratitude to God, who made the woman’s child into a boy, and then connects his happiness about this son to the Virgilian image that the lad would bring comfort to his father and mother, something he himself could not offer because of his long absences from them. His rhetorical question whether he himself might claim the same right to joy after the birth of a son as his father can be read as another appeal to the rule of nature. The image of the comforting idea of a little grandson, who is the likeness of his own son, hanging from his neck (cum parvulus pendebit ex collo nepos), derives from Jerome’s letters rather than from Virgil’s Aeneid. More surprising are Piccolomini’s remarks inspired by Boccaccio’s Decameron. Voigt has pointed out this source in the form of a general remark, but neither function nor consequences for the interpretation of the letter have yet been discussed. Apart from

17 ‘Yea, thou shalt see thy children’s children’ (‘Et natos natorum, et qui nascuntur ab illis’).

18 Virgil, Aeneid 4.327-329: ‘si quis mihi parvulus aula / ludevet Aeneas, qui te tamen ore referret, / non equidem omnino capta ac deserta uiderer.’ Perhaps Erasmus had Piccolomini’s letter in mind when he wrote: ‘What joy it will bring to you when your beautiful wife makes you the parent of beautiful offspring, when some tiny Aeneas will play in your hall and will call you by the name of father’ (Erasmus: Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami, I-2: De conscribendis epistolis, ed. J.-C. Margolin (Amsterdam, 1971), pp. 421-422; for the translation of Ch. Fantazzi see Collected Works of Erasmus (Toronto, 1985), vol. 25, p. 140.

19 Jerome, Epistole. Pars I: epistolae I-LXX, ed. I. Hilberg, Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum LIV (Vienna, 1996), Ep. xiv,3 (pp. 46-47); ‘licet parvulus ex collo pendeat nepos.’

20 Virgil, Aen., 1. 719: ‘[...] ubi complexu Aeneae colloque pependit.’
the open allusion to the tale of Zima the Florentine *(Decameron*, Day 3, Tale 5) in connection with Piccolomini’s love affair,21 there is a more important, hidden, reference to the tale of Guiscardo and Ghismonda *(Decameron*, Day 4, Tale 1) in the first part. It is no coincidence that the Latin translation of this tale was preserved among Piccolomini’s letters in the *Opera omnia* (Basle, 1551); at any rate, the same tale was used by Piccolomini for his *Tale of Two Lovers.*22 The remarks inspired by Boccaccio’s tale to a large extent determine the colour of the first part of the letter; I shall therefore first summarize its contents.23

Tancred, Prince of Salerno, has one daughter, Ghismonda, whom he loved so much that he did not know ‘how to part with her and kept her unmarried for many a year after she had come of marriageable age.’ As she deemed it unseemly on her part to ask for a husband, she sought for herself a secret lover from among the men frequenting her father’s palace.

Closely scanning their mien and manners, she preferred before all others the Prince’s page, Guiscardo by name, a man of very humble origin, but pre-eminent for native worth and noble bearing.

The love between the two young people became impassioned. When ‘they burned in secret for one another’, she showed him

---

21 This tale well fits Piccolomini’s account that his mistress at first showed little willingness in responding to his flirtation but that she left her door open for him. Blok *(Seventy-seven Neo-Latin Letters*, p. 170) summarizes the core of Boccaccio’s story as follows: ‘Zima has suggested to a woman whose beauty he admires, that she should put two handkerchiefs in her window if her husband is not at home. In the night he will find the garden gate open and come to her. The woman said and promised nothing, but the day soon comes when Zima, passing her house, finds the two handkerchiefs in her window.’


23 I closely follow the English translation of Boccaccio’s *The Decameron* by J. M. Rigg (London, 1921).
a grotto connected with her room through a secret corridor. By this way they frequently met each other ‘to their marvellous mutual satisfaction’, spending many hours of great happiness, until ‘fortune [...] gave to events a dolorous turn, whereby the joy of the two lovers was converted into bitter lamentation.’ When Tancred visited his daughter’s room where he had hoped to find her, he unwittingly fell asleep hidden behind a curtain. So he witnessed, after he woke, how the young lovers came together.

Whereupon Tancred, old though he was, got out at one of the windows, clambered down into the garden, and seen by none, returned sorely troubled to his room.

Not long after, Guiscardo, on Tancred’s order, was caught when he left Ghismonda’s room. The following day Tancred addressed his daughter, complaining among other things that she had chosen a man of the lowest condition. He explained his dilemma in the following terms:

I am distraught between the love, which I have ever borne thee, love such as no father ever bare to a daughter, and the most just indignation evoked in me by thy signal folly; my love prompts me to pardon thee, my indignation bids me harden my heart against thee, though I do violence to my nature.

Ghismonda’s answer was a long dignified speech which is both the central piece of Boccaccio’s tale and the source of Piccolomini’s response to his father’s reproaches. The princess declares that she neither wanted to deny her father’s accusation, nor beg for mercy. Her only care was to confess the truth, to defend her honour by words of sound reason. She confesses the true nature of her love, saying that she would continue to love Guiscardo during the brief time she had yet to live – ominous words followed by her suicide at the end of the tale when a bowl with her lover’s heart is sent to her by her father. She continues that her love should not be imputed to womanly frailty. Its cause is rather in her father’s slowness in arranging her marriage, and in Guiscardo’s excellence. Moreover, she adds:
It should not have escaped thee, Tancred, creature of flesh and blood as thou art, that thy daughter was also a creature of flesh and blood, and not of stone or iron; it was, and is, thy duty to bear in mind (old though thou art) the nature and the might of the laws to which youth is subject.

Since Boccaccio was one of the most popular vernacular authors of his time, it is not unlikely that Piccolomini expected his father to recognise the references to the tale of Guiscardo and Ghismonda, when he with similar frankness and with no less greater boldness reminded his father of the ‘errors’ of his youth:

But perhaps you will say it is my offence you mourn, because I have begotten a child in sin. I do not know what idea you have of me. Certainly you, who are flesh, did not beget a son of stone or iron. You know what a cock you were, and I am no eunuch not to be put in the category of the cold-blooded. Nor yet am I hypocrite who wants to seem better than he is.²⁴

Like Ghismonda, Piccolomini clearly tried to gain psychological ascendancy over the objections of the other party. Like Ghismonda, he subsequently elaborates on the effect nature has on human beings so as to excuse his sinful love as well as he may. Ghismonda’s arguments were meant to counter her father’s accusation that she had chosen a man of low birth. She connects the equality which is found in nature with the suggestion that nobility by merit is superior to that by birth. Her father, in her view, wrongly blamed her for bringing shame over him:

[...] consider a little the principles of things: thou seest that in regard of our flesh we are all moulded of the same substance, and that all souls are endowed by one and the same Creator with equal faculties, equal powers, equal virtues. ‘Twas merit that made the

²⁴ For this translation, see Mitchell, The Laurels and the Tiara, p. 93. Piccolomini’s characteristic expression: ‘Nor yet am I hypocrite who wants to seem better than he is’ (nece sum hypocrita, ut videri bonus quam esse velim) is inspired by Sallust, Cat. 54 (esse quam videri bonus malebat); cf. Blok, Seventy-seven Neo-Latin Letters, p. 168.
first distinction between us, born as we were, nay, as we are, all equal, and those whose merits were and approved in act the greatest were called noble [...]. Which law, albeit overlaid by the contrary usage of after times, is not yet abrogated, nor so impaired but that it is still traceable in nature and good manners; for which cause who so with merit acts, does plainly shew himself a gentleman; and if any denote him otherwise, the default is his own and not his whom he so denotes.

Piccolomini, on the other hand, follows a different strategy. He appeals to the laws of nature by referring to the authority of ancient biblical – apparently avoiding ancient Classical (pagan) – examples: yet he confesses his error, adducing that he is no holier than David the King nor wiser than Solomon, and a little later that no one is so just that he does not trespass seven times in a day (quis tam iustus ut septies in die non cadat). This sin is an ‘ancient and old fault’ (antiquum et vetus est hoc delictum) found everywhere: how can it be wrong to avail oneself of the organs of generation provided by nature (naturalibus). The very word naturalibus is taken by the

25 For David’s adultery with Bathsheba, see II Samuel 11; for Solomon, see I Kings 11.3: ‘And he had seven hundred wives, princesses and three hundred concubines: and his wives turned away his heart.’

26 Luke 17.4.

27 For the Latin, compare: Augustine, De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum ad Marcellinum libri tres, eds. C. F. Urba and J. Zycha, Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. 60 (Vienna, 1913), 3.3.5: ‘si baptismus mundat antiquum illud delictum’; Jerome, Commentarium in Esaiam libri XII-XVIII, Corpus Christianorum, 73A. Series Latina, ed. G. Morin (Turnhout, 1963), In Esaiam paruula adbreuiatio l. 153: ‘uulnus, peccata recentia: liuor, antiqua scelera: plaga tumens, incoctum est et utus delictum, quasi quodam pure parturiens.’

28 Alasdair MacDonald kindly informed me that a similar use of this argument of nature is found in Chaucer, The Wife of Bath, Prologue vss. 113-123 ‘I will bestow the flower of mine age / In th' acts and in the fruits of marriage. / Tell me also, to what conclusion / Were members made of generation, / And of so perfect wise a wight y-wrought? / Trust me right well, they were not made for nought. / Glose whoso will, and say both up and down, / That they were made for the purgatioun / Of urine, and of other thinges smale. / And eke to know a female from a male: / And for none other cause? say ye no?’ Chaucer’s passage is inspired by Jerome, Adversus Jovinianum, 1.36 (P. L. 23);
author as an acknowledgement that nature, by which nothing is produced in a wrong way, has implanted this desire in order that humankind be continued. Piccolomini’s logic and the terms used are reminiscent of the rules of Canonical law, and especially of their scholastic interpretation by Johannes Teutonicus (1180-1245), an influential commentator of Gratian’s *Decretum*. In order to understand the force of Piccolomini’s arguments, it is helpful first to turn to Justinian’s *Institutions*, which explain that natural law is valid for all creatures in the air, on land and in the water: ‘out of this the coition of man and woman, which we call matrimony, proceeds; out of this the procreation of children and education.’ Gratian repeats these thoughts in an extended form. In addition, his *Decretum* says that anything similar is never unjust, but is regarded as natural and fair. The importance of natural law for Canonical law in which the question of justice and fairness dominate, is expressed by Gratian in this remark:

Natural law, through its dignity, prevails over custom and law. Everything namely which is admitted by custom, or written down in laws is to be regarded as groundless and invalid if it is contrary to natural law.31

Johannes Teutonicus, finally, determines the limits of Gratian’s definition of natural law (*ius naturale)*:

Note that nature has different meanings: the force planted in things that procreates similar things from similar things is called nature. Secondly, a certain stimulus or rather natural instinct is called nature when it proceeds from a capacity for sensation either to obtain things, or to procreate, or educate. Thirdly, a natural

---


31 *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. Friedberg, Distinctio, post canon 1.
instinct proceeding from reason is called nature. Law which proceeds from such nature is called natural equity. And according to this law of nature, everything is called common, that is they must be made common if time makes this necessary [...]. Fourthly, natural precepts are called natural law, such as you shall not steal, or commit adultery.\textsuperscript{32}

A number of thoughts and Latin expressions in his letter indicate that Piccolomini must have had such lessons in mind.\textsuperscript{33} First there is the phrase: \textit{quid enim dulcius in humanis est quam gignere sibi similem} (‘what is more delightful for humans than to produce someone similar to themselves’); he finds no fault in the use of ‘his natural organs of procreation’ (\textit{si pestis est naturalibus uti}), or in coitus ‘as nature, which never operates wrongly, has implanted this appetite in all living creatures for the procreation of the human kind’ (\textit{cum natura, quae nihil perperam operatur, omnibus ingenuerit animantibus hunc appetitum, ut genus continuetur humanum}).\textsuperscript{34} Piccolomini also addresses the fourth point mentioned by Teutonicus, that adultery is a sin according to natural law. He admits this crime but before telling his story he overwhelms the reader with

\textsuperscript{32} Joannes Teutonicus (Commenting on Gratian’s chapter on \textit{Ius naturale C. VII} in: \textit{Decretum Gratiani emendatum et notationibus illustratum unaque cum glossis Gregorii Pont. Max. iussu editum ad exemplar diligenter recognitum editio ultima} (Turin, 1620), ‘Decreti prima pars, Distinctio II (p. 6)’: ‘Ad intelligendum istorum nota quod natura multis modis dicitur: quandoque dicitur natura, vis insita rebus similia de similibus procreans. Secundo modo dicitur natura, quidam stimulus, seu instinctus naturae ex sensualitate proueniens ad appetendum, vel ad procreandum, vel ad educandum. [...] Tertio modo dicitur, instinctus naturae ex ratione proueniens. Et ius ex tali natura proueniens dicitur naturalis aequitas. Et secundum hoc ius naturae dicuntur omnia communia, id est, communicanda tempore necessitatis [...]. Quarto modo dicitur ius naturale, praecepta naturalia, hoc est, Non furtem facies; Non moechaberis.’ I am grateful to Jan Lokin for pointing out this source to me.

\textsuperscript{33} As far as the Latin of these passages is concerned, they are a mixture of Classical phrases and expressions which are harder to trace and seem to derive from medieval sources. This aspect of Piccolomini’s needs further study, as Keith Sidwell has already observed on p. 93 of this volume.

\textsuperscript{34} For the use of \textit{continuaretur}, compare Macrobius, \textit{Saturn.} 7.16.11: ‘natura primum singula animalia perfecta formavit, deinde perpetuam legem dedit ut \textit{continuaretur} procreatione successio.’
arguments that committing such a sin is a human and natural thing that deserves to be judged with equity.

This use of arguments drawn from Canonical law is perhaps not what one expects after Georg Voigt’s emphasis on Aeneas Silvius’s aversion to legal studies. Voigt blamed Piccolomini’s aesthetic approach of Latin literature:

Dem Schüler Cicero’s und der römischen Dichter, welcher der formellen Schönheit der lateinischen Sprache sein eifrigstes Studium zuwandte, widerstand natürlich alles Formlose oder Unformliche, wo es ihm auf dem Gebiete der Wissenschaften entgegentrat. Ueberhaupt war es unter den Humanisten Modeton, auf die scholastischen Disciplinen und ihre Bekenner loszuziehen, wobei weniger die Berechtigung jener Wissenschaften an sich, als vielmehr die pedantische und geschmacklose Weise ihres Betriebes in Frage kam. Auch hierin war Enea der echte Schüler Poggio’s. Besonders auf die Juristen schüttet er, wo er nur auf sie zu sprechen kommt, die volle Schale seines Zornes aus. Wir erinnern uns dass er einst wider Willen dem Rechtstudium sich widmen musste dass er dann die lockenden Aussichten, die es bot, fahren liess und der Musse folgte. Die einzige Frucht jenes Studiums war bei ihm der Widerwille, den es zurückliess.  

Guido Kisch has demonstrated Piccolomini’s knowledge of Roman and Canonical law. Benedikt Konrad Vollmann stressed the importance of reason and the study of philosophy for Piccolomini in the area of justice.

An episode of his papacy, which bears much resemblance to the letter to his father, may illustrate how Piccolomini’s thoughts about illicit love developed and how he tried to be an example, very much in accordance with what he had once remarked about himself: ‘that he used to pass on what he has learned’; ‘that he was convinced that the man who remains himself, shows himself easily understood by others’, and ‘that his sole aim was to be understood’. 38

Several pages of book four of Pius’s Commentaries are devoted to the case of Jean, Count of Armagnac, a French nobleman, who on his parents’ death conceived an incestuous passion for his sister and seduced her. 39 ‘Dreading, however, the infamy of such a crime, he called the incest “marriage”, and (to use his own expression) sheltered his guilt under this term.’ He first asked Nicholas V for dispensation, but in turn was rebuked by him. Then he made another attempt through the agency of the Bishop of Alet, who, according to Pius, was ‘a sly and crafty man ready for any trick, a supreme artist in simony, a practised orator, a handsome fellow, agreeable in address, a lavish spender, and bent on making money [...]’. The bishop could not obtain what he had promised in return for ‘not less than 24,000 ducats’, neither from the ‘greedy’ old pope Calixtus, nor from any other man at the Curia until Giovanni Volterrano, ‘one of the apostolic scriptors’, procured a dispensation for a marriage within the first degree through forgery. New trouble arose when ‘the commission issued in Calixtus’s name expired on the death of the pope who had authorized it.’ Armagnac, at last, ‘indignantly’ turned to Pius who had gone to the baths of Macereto after the Council of Mantua, referring to letters by Calixtus and Pius granting him dispensation. The


forgery came out after the arrests of the Bishop of Alet and Giovanni Volterrano. The scene now moved to the Curia where the pope summoned Armagnac to confess his error and ask forgiveness. Jean Jouffroy, Bishop of Arras, defended the count’s case. Pius extensively mentions this man when, a year later, despite much opposition, he appointed him as cardinal. At that occasion he called him a shameless and dangerous opponent, who would not hesitate to use his learning, eloquence and boldness ‘to support the opposite side’ and who ‘will find plenty of passages from the Scriptures to cite in favor of it.

Jouffroy’s oration in defense of the Count of Armagnac is an example of this. Perhaps Jouffroy knew the letter that Pius had written to his father nearly two decades ago, for there is some similarity in his approach to the sin committed by Armagnac. He first admits that the count had sinned grievously, but in excuse urged three reasons: his impassioned love for his sister, the counsel of jurists and the greatest theologians who had told him that a union between brother and sister ‘could not be except through the indulgence of the Pope, who did sometimes grant dispensation’, and the poverty of his house. The orator then drew parallels with a number of pagan examples:

He is not the first who has yielded to love, for almost all the gods worshiped in antiquity submitted to love’s yoke. If we read the Old Testament, what instances of love will you find there! and the pagan epics are but tales of heroes conquered by love. Further if we look for instances of marriage (or, if you call it so, incest) between brother and sister, Jove himself lay with his sister and she, when she complained that she had been deserted, said, ‘Sister of the Thunderer; this is now the only title left me.’ Furthermore our first parents sanctioned marriage between their children. Amnon took his sister Tamar to wife. All too winning and persuasive is love, whom the ancients counted among the gods.

And what wonder that a god has conquered a mortal? It is a god to whom the Count has yielded. [...] He confesses his sin and confession in itself deserves pardon [...].

Jouffroy had miscalculated, for after listening ‘grimly’ to all this, the pope severely castigated Jouffroy. Pius’s reaction shows how much he had distanced himself from what he would have loved in his youth. His responsibility for the Church and its laws now carried more weight for him, but it is also important that his words were in agreement with his condemnation of his own writings in the Retractationes mentioned above:

Your Excellency of Arras, you have sought to make a great crime appear small and have made use of heathen instances to show that incest is a light offence. Such is your confidence in your own eloquence! But you who have attained the episcopate should have employed ecclesiastical rather than pagan examples. Are you not ashamed to call gods those whom our ancestors called mere men (and wicked men too) or demons?

The count was forbidden ‘intercourse or speech with his sister forever’ and was ordered, among other things, ‘to enlist against the Turks with not less than fifty lances’. Before he reached this verdict, Pius showed how well he distinguished between Imperial and Canonical law:

But we look to sacred law and the ordinances of the holy fathers. The mandates of emperors and the edicts of princes brand incestuous unions between brother and sister as infamous and loathsome and deserving the extreme punishment. The Church is milder and desires not the death but the reformation of the sinner.

Appendix: Piccolomini’s letter to his father

Eneas Silvius poeta genitori suo Silvio salutem plurimam dicit. Leteris an doleas, quod mihi sobolem dominus dederit, incertum te scribis pater. at ego letitie causam video, doloris non

41 The Latin is copied from Wolkan, Briefwechsel (Fontes, vol. 61), pp. 181-191 (no. 78).
Natura, etiam, ite, rem, tibi, nomim, mea, videbis in illo effigiem? nunquid tibi jocundum erit, cum parvulus pendebit ex collo nepos puerilesque blanditas agitabit? sed ais fortasse dolere meum crimen, quod ex peccato genuerim filium? nescio, quam de me finxeris tibi opinionem. certe nec lapideum nec ferream genuisti filium, cum esses tu carneus. scis, quasis gallus tu fueris at nec ego castratus sum neque ex frigidorum numero nec sum ypocrita, ut videri bonus quam esse velim. fatebor ingene meum erratum, quia nec sanctior sum Davide rege nec Salomone sapientior. antiquum et vetus est hoc delictum nec scio, quis hoc careat. late patet hec pestis, si pestis est naturalibus uti, quanquam non video, cur tantopere dampnari coitus debeat, cum natura, que nichil perperam operatur, omnibus inguenerti animantibus hunc appetitum, ut genus continuaretur humanum. sed dicis, ut arbitror, certos esse limites, intra quos hoc liceat nec extra legtimas matrimonii faces progresi debet hic appetitus. ita est sanc e sepe inter ipsa nuptiarum claustra scelus admittitur. et bibendi quoque, comedendi et loquenti certi sunt termini. sed quis servat illos, quis tam justus, ut septies in die non cadat? loquatur ypocrita seque nullius culpa scium dicat. ego nullum meritum in me scio, solaque mihi divina pietas spem facit misericordie, que nos labiles scit et ad lasciviam proclives, nec nobis, qui patet omnibus, fontem venie claudet. sed de hoc satis. nunc, quia conjecturas petis, ne alienum pro meo nutrias, quomodo res se habuerit, paucis exponam. nondum anni duo effuxi sunt ex eo tempore, quo Argentine gerebam oratoris munus. quinquagesima tunc currebat, que ante proximam preteritam fluxit. ibi cum otiosus diebus essepluribus, mulier ex Britannia veniens diversorium meum petens in unus edibus mecum fuit
nec invenusta nec etate confecta. hec quia sermonem Italicum egregie norat, me verbis salutavit Etruscis, quod illa in regione tanto magis placuit, quanto rarius erat. oblectatus sum facetiis feminine, cujus in ore maximus lepor erat moxque in mentem venit Cleopatre facundia, que non solum Antonium sed Julium quoque Cesarem eloquentia inescavit, mecumque quis reprehendet inquam, si ego homuncio id faciam, quod maximi viri non sunt aspernati. interdum Moysen, interdum Aristotilem, nonnunquam Christianos in exemplum sumebam. quid plura? vicit cupido, incalui, mulierem arsi multisque blandimentis adorsus sum. sed ut asperis cantibus undes repellitur freti, sic verba hoc mea contempsit triduoque suspendit. erat illi filiola annorum quinque, quam Melincus pater hospiti nostro comendaverat verebaturque mulier, ne quid hospes presentiret filiamque post hac quasi moris materni abdicaret. instabat nox sequentique die recessura mulier erat. timeo, ne abeat preda. rogo, in noctem ne ostio camere pesulum obdet. dico me in-tempesta nocte venturum. negat nec spem ullam facit. insto. semper idem responsum est. itur dormitum. mecum ego: quid scio, an illa ut jussi fecerit. recordor Zime Florentini. forsitan illius amicam hoc imitabitur, temptandum est, inquam. post-quam silentium undique sentio, thalamum mulieris accedo. clausum ostium est, sed non firmatum. aperio, ingredior, muliere potior. hinc natus est filius, mulier Elisabeth vocatur. ex idibus februarii ad alias idus novembris menses currunt, qui partui dantur. hoc mihi dixerat mulier, dum Basilee postea fuisset. ego, quamvis ipsam non pecunia ulla sed maximis emissem precibus, ut est ars feminarum, credebam hec auri corrodendi causa dici nec verbis prebui fidem. nunc quia video, eam hoc asserre, quando nichil sperare ex me potest, quando nomen convenit tempusque, puerum meum puto teque, mi pater, rogo, ut nepotem suscipias alasque, donec grandiusculus factus ad me valeat proficisci, meisque imbui disciplinis, nec puta feminam divitem mentiri velle in filio. nunc alia prose- quar. quod scribis te senio cum matre confectum, hoc, mi pater, tibi sibique jocundum esse debet, quod eos annos attigisti, quos optabas juvenis, jamque libere et expedite potes deo servire, omnibus spoliatus passionibus, que mentes juvenum a deo alienant. nec mihi dixeris, omnia fert etas animumque, ut ex
hoc perire animum putes, qui divinus est atque immortalis. sed
voluit poeta significare, etatis cursu vigorem illum animi
tepescere, qui est in juvenibus ardens. sed ille magis ad vitia,
quam ad virtutes inclinatur. in senibus purgatus est animus,
nichil preter honestum cupiens, qualem tibi et matri mee spero
esse, quamvis illa nunquam mundanis desideriis inheserit, sed
heroica quadam virtute soli deo servire beatum duxerit. hoc fit,
ut senio vestro minus trister. si enim juvenes essetis, timerem
de vobis magis. quod de filiis sororis Laudomie scribis, certum
est apud me gratumque. tuum est curare, ut litteras discant, que
sole homines tollunt super alios. ego cum statum meum firmi-
orem videro, alterum mihi asciscam. Jacobus Tholomeus frater,
si ad me scripserit, responso non carebit. provocari litteris non
expectet, totiens enim necessario scribo, ut nichil ad libitum
vacet. lectura ejus ordinaria salarioque letatus sum, famamque
suam in dies crescere cum letitia percipio. Bartholomeo cum
presentibus litteras do, nec ejus obliviscor unquam pro suis erga
te matremque meritis et quia Katherinam sororem conjugem
suam unice amat. matrem tibi commendo tueque fidei, deum-
que rogo, ut patriam petens superstites omnes inveniam.
conventum nanque cum letitia celebrabimus et quomodo id
quod restat, vivamus spatium ex tuo transigemus arbitrio, nec
mihi in te ulla erit controversy. Johannem et Laudomiam uxo-
rem jube ex me salvos esse, filiolum suscipe, et quicquid ege-
ris, mihi rescribe. vale. ex Gretz, 20. septembri 1443.
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