

Orsolya Réthelyi

Mary of Hungary in Court Context (1521-1531)

PhD thesis in Medieval Studies

Central European University

Budapest

2010

Table of Contents

Word of thanks	6
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Questions of methodology	5
1.2 The sources	9
1.3 The structure of the thesis	9
2 Courts and court studies	13
2.1 Medieval and early-modern court studies and its sources	13
2.2 Royal court and royal household	15
2.3 Royal household and the queen's household	17
2.4 The power of the queen and the court	20
2.4.1 Financing the court - marriage contract, dower, dowry	20
2.4.2 Decisions about the staffing of the queen's household	25
2.5 The function of the queen's court	26
2.6 Dowager queens – possibilities and strategies	29
3 The Hungarian royal court	31
3.1 Queens and the reginal court in medieval Hungary	31
3.1.1 Queens of the Arpadian Age (972-1301)	31
3.1.2 Elisabeth of Poland (1305-1380)	32
3.1.3 Elisabeth Kotromanić (1339/40-1387)	33
3.1.4 Queen Mary (1371-1395)	33
3.1.5 Barbara of Celje / Cilli (1390/1392-1451)	34
3.1.6 Queen Elisabeth (1409-1442)	37
3.1.7 Beatrice of Aragon (1457-1508)	40
3.1.8 Anne of Foix (1484-1506)	47
3.2 The royal court and administration in the Jagiellon Age	50
3.3 Location, size and form	55
3.4 Personnel, power and function	57
4 Mary and her court	61
4.1 The problem of sources	61
4.2 The personal element of Mary's household – phases and households	69

4.2.1	Early households	70
	<i>The households of the royal children in Mechelen and in Buda (1505-1514)</i>	70
	<i>First independent household – The travel from the Low Countries (1514)</i>	72
	<i>First court in Vienna (1514-1516)</i>	74
	<i>The joint Princesses' court in Innsbruck (1516-1521)</i>	76
	<i>The splitting of the court – the royal bride's entourage (1521)</i>	80
	<i>The female household (1521)</i>	82
	<i>The male household (1521)</i>	84
4.2.2	The queen's court in Buda (1521-1526)	89
	<i>The female household</i>	90
	<i>The male household</i>	96
	<i>Chancery</i>	102
	<i>Estate management</i>	105
4.2.3	Court of a dowager - the queen's court after the Battle of Mohács (1526-1531)	110
	<i>The Battle of Mohács</i>	110
	<i>Court in Pressburg – interim centre of power</i>	112
	<i>The household of the widowed queen</i>	117
	<i>Travel to the Low Countries</i>	123
5	Life at Queen Mary's court	131
5.1	The relation of the queen's court to the Royal court	131
5.1.1	Topography	131
5.1.2	The queen's officers - appointment and shared functions	134
5.1.3	The household as a base of power	137
5.2	Religion	142
5.2.1	The institution of the king's chapel	143
	<i>The chapel under Louis II</i>	145
5.2.2	The queen's Chapel	146
	<i>The queen's singers and musicians</i>	147
	<i>Court priests</i>	148
5.2.3	Religious life at the royal court	164
	<i>Holy feasts and everyday religious practice</i>	165
	<i>Donations, pilgrimages and piety</i>	170
5.2.4	Early signs of religious reform in Hungary (1521-1526)	172
5.2.5	Religious reform and the queen's court	178
	<i>Intellectual context</i>	178
	<i>The queen's court priests and Reformation ideas</i>	179
	<i>Religious views of members of the queen's court</i>	180
	<i>Books</i>	182
	<i>Commissioning and authorship</i>	185

	<i>The Brandenburg influence</i>	190
	<i>Religion and identity</i>	191
5.3	Language and ethnicity	194
	<i>The royal court</i>	198
	<i>Languages in Mary's court</i>	200
6	Conclusion	209
6.1	Characteristics of the queen's household and court	209
6.2	Mary's courts in a European and Hungarian context	211
7	Bibliography	215
8	Appendix 1 - Court personnel of Mary of Hungary (1521-1531)	237
9	Appendix 2 - Gazetteer of the place names	245
10	Appendix 3 - Map: The estates of Mary of Hungary in the kingdom of Hungary	247

Word of thanks

Nearing the completion of a research project there are many people to thank for their guidance, support and advice. I am grateful to those professors in Hungary and the Netherlands – Katalin Halácsy, Erik Kooper and Thea Summerfield – who opened the doors of the field of Medieval Studies for me through their passion for their subject. I wish to express my gratitude to the professors at the Department of Medieval Studies of the Central European University, who have shaped my thinking in many ways, especially Professor János Bak, who first got me thinking about queens and queenship. A special thanks is due to Csilla Dobos and Annabella Pál, for making the department a place where one always feels welcome.

The studies of the late professor András Kubinyi have been decisive for my understanding of the Jagiellon period and the role of Mary of Hungary. I feel grateful for having known him and having been able to discuss certain questions about Mary with him. I am glad that my studies have made it possible to make acquaintance with fellow scholars with a research interest in Mary of Hungary. I wish to thank Jacqueline Kerkhoff, Laetitia Gorter-van Royen and Gernot Heiss for their encouragement.

Many of my friends and colleagues have been of great help and support in different phases of researching and writing this work. I would like to thank my ex-colleagues at the Budapest History Museum, especially András Végh, Enikő Spekner, Beatrix Romhányi, Eszter Kovács and Károly Magyar, with whom we fought through all the hardships of the Mary of Hungary exhibition. I would also like to thank my present colleagues at the Dutch Department of the Eötvös Loránd University for their patience. Of the many friends, and fellow medievalists from the CEU to whom I have much to thank, I am especially grateful for the advice and friendship of Antonín Kalous. I have received generous assistance, as well as kind words of advice and cups of tea from István Fazekas, archival delegate in Vienna, for which I am very grateful. I also wish to thank Géza Pálffy and István Kenyeres for their suggestions on different aspects of my research.

There are two people who have been of especially great influence on this work. The publications of Zoltán Csepregi have been a source of great inspiration, discussions with him have made me see my topic in a new light. Without Katalin Szende, my supervisor, this PhD would not have reached completion. I can hardly express my gratitude for her guidance, her

meticulous corrections, wise advice and endless patience with my shortcomings. Much of the values of this work are due to her, and – naturally – all its defects are my own.

Finally, I would like to thank my family, my parents, sister and brother, and their families, who have supported me throughout this long process. I have enjoyed the hospitality of my aunt and uncle in Vienna during periods of archival research. My cousin Lotti Viola has spent hours finding and copying articles for me in the Vienna Library. My sons, Bálint and Flórian have good-naturedly accepted the – at times overpowering – presence of Mary of Hungary in our every-days, on the kitchen table, and in my mind. And to whom this work, with all its burdens and joys is dedicated, Gerrit, I cannot begin, or end thanking you.

1 Introduction

“Even if I ever come to possess all the ability necessary for governing – and I am far from it – I still have sufficient experience (beside the fact that the books, Holy Scripture as well as others, are full of it) to know that it is impossible for a woman in peacetime, and even more in time of war, to do her duty as regent towards God, her sovereign, and her own sense of honor. For in peacetime it is unavoidable, in addition to all the meetings and cares of daily affairs which any government brings with it, that whoever guides the government of these provinces must mix with as many people as possible, in order to win the sympathy of both nobility and middle classes. . . . For a woman, especially if she is a widow, it is not feasible to mix thus freely with people. Of necessity I myself have had to do more in this respect than I really wanted. Moreover, a woman is never so much respected and feared as a man, whatever her position. If one is conducting the government of these countries in time of war, and one cannot in person enter the battle, one is faced with an insoluble problem. One receives all the blows and is blamed for all mistakes made by others, and is reproached if one does not carry out what everyone thinks he can demand. All the complainants can be heard throughout the entire country. But the accused stands alone and cannot answer for herself everywhere at once. And if things then do not go as expected, it is not difficult to make the people believe that the woman who heads the government is to blame for everything, and for this reason she is hated and held in contempt by the people.”¹

These lines were written in August of 1555 by Mary of Hungary, regent of the Low Countries in a memorandum to her older brother, the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V. In the letter she speaks openly about the frustrations and difficulties faced by a woman who takes part in the governing of a state. We know that Mary composed the memorandum specifically in order to argue why she wishes to retire after having served the Habsburg dynasty for 25 years as a regent, and to explain why she would not comply with her brother’s wishes and stay in the office. Therefore – being the clever politician that she was – she must have painted the picture deliberately darker, to emphasize her point.² Nevertheless the above lines give a keen analysis of some of the specific difficulties encountered by women with power involved in the administration in early Modern Europe. By the time she wrote these lines the fifty-year-old queen had had ample political experience. The quarter century of her life spent as regent of

¹ Detail from a letter from Mary of Hungary to her brother Charles V. S.d. [end of August 1555]. Edited in Christopher Weiss, ed., *Papiers d'Etat du Cardinal de Granvelle, Vol. 4.* (Paris, 1843), 469-480. The English translation is from Jane de Iongh, *Mary of Hungary, Second Regent of the Netherlands* (New York, 1958), 202. with capitalization and punctuation modernized.

² For a sensitive discussion of the memorandum see Gorter-van Royen. Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria van Hongarije regentes der Nederlanden* (Hilversum: Verloren, 1995), 307-315.

the Low Countries was preceded by a decade when she was first queen consort to Louis II, king of Hungary and Bohemia. After the early death of her husband in the battle of Mohács against the invading Ottoman army, Mary used her considerable political and economic influence as widowed queen to rally support, arrange the election, and act as regent and political advisor for her other brother Archduke Ferdinand, later king and Holy Roman Emperor. Unfortunately no such memorandum summing up her experiences about her possibilities, goals, political endeavours and frustrations in the years between 1521 and 1531 exists. We do know, however, that she became politically active early on in her life and that her intelligence and talent for governing emerged already in the years she spent in Hungary and the Central European region. However, no ruler acted on his or her own, but had to conform to structures and conventions set in the form of the court. Weak and unsuccessful rulers were subdued by these structures and their representatives; strong and talented ones could use them to their own advantage. Female rulers were even more exposed. The question of the possibilities and limitations of autonomous activity, or power exercised by a queen has led me to the investigation of the queen's court as basis of her power.

In his essay published in 1986 on queens of Hungary up to the late fourteenth century János Bak mentions that despite the renewed interest in queens and queenship in international scholarship, Hungarian research has paid little attention to this topic so far.³ Though the past few decades have seen an improvement of the situation, his statement is still unfortunately true for queens of the late middle ages.⁴ Mary of Hungary (1505-1558) consort to King Louis II (1506-1526, reigned 1516-1526) and queen of Hungary and Bohemia, later Regent of the Netherlands (though not strictly a medieval queen) is exceptional in this respect, having received more than cursory attention from scholars both inside and outside Hungary.⁵ This interest can be partially attributed to the fact that Mary spent the larger part of her active life as the Regent of the Low Countries for her brother, Emperor Charles V. Also, it must be taken into consideration that the lack of written sources, which plagues the investigation of the

³János Bak, "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpadian and Angevin. Hungary (1000–1386)" in *Medieval Queenship*, ed. Carmi John Parsons (New York, 1986), 13.

⁴ Attila Zsoldos has since published a book on the queens of the Arpadian Age and the reginal institution. Attila Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik (A királynéi intézmény az Árpádok korában) [The Arpadians and their women. The reginal institution in the Age of the Arpadian dynasty]* (Budapest: Történettudományi Intézet, 2005).

⁵ For a recent survey and bibliography of scholarly works on Mary of Hungary see Heiss and Réthelyi. Gernot Heiss and Orsolya Réthelyi, "Maria, Königin von Ungarn und Böhmen (1505-1558), als Thema der Forschung" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007).

Middle Ages in Hungary, is already less of a problem in dealing with the sixteenth century. Still, her personality, her historical role, her relationship with contemporary cultural events and trends are probably the strongest factors, in making her an intriguing topic for research. These aspects also make the subject worth re-examining, despite the considerable amount of previous scholarly attention.

In the year 2005 the 500th anniversary of the birth of Mary of Hungary had given occasion for several events commemorating the queen.⁶ The largest project was the international exhibition dedicated to Mary of Hungary in Budapest and Bratislava, organised by the Budapest History Museum of which the author of this dissertation was initiator and curator. The exhibition catalogue entitled *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and Her Court* includes eleven articles by an international group of experts on Mary of Hungary on a wide range of topics, as well as descriptions of the exhibits.⁷ The exhibition served as background to the international conference on Mary of Hungary, the proceedings of which were edited by Marina Fuchs from the University of Vienna and myself under the title *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, and published in 2007 in the series *Geschichte in der Epoche Karls V.*⁸ In this volume the most recent research results from several countries are collected and made available for the international audience. The immense work of writing the exhibition concept, directing the exhibition, organising the conference, and co-editing both the catalogue and the proceedings of the conference have made the years devoted to the subject of this PhD dissertation somewhat longer than average. However, they have shaped my thinking about the subject of my inquiry and my understanding of the questions radically. The project has also made available the most recent results of colleagues pursuing different aspects of research relating to Mary of Hungary in two volumes, which has been of a great inspiration in my work and to which I have gratefully turned for background information for my own research during the process of writing the dissertation.

⁶ E.g. a conference organised by the Musée royal de Mariemont on 11 and 12 November 2005. The abstracts of the conference were published a few years later. Bertrand Federinov and Gilles Docquier, eds., *Marie de Hongrie. Politique et culture sous la Renaissance aux Pays-Bas* (Morlanwelz: Musée royal de Mariemont, 2008).

⁷ Orsolya Réthelyi et al., eds., *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and her Court 1521-1531* (Budapest: BTM, 2005).

⁸ Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi, eds., *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007). About the results of the conference see Kubinyi. András Kubinyi, ed. Martine Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007).

The intention of the present study is to give a detailed analysis of the queen's court using the figure of the queen as a focal-point. The term "court" has several possible layers of meaning. It can have reference to the actual place of residence of the sovereign, to the formal assembly of councillors and officers, the family and retinue of the sovereign, but also to an official gathering held by him/her mainly with the purpose of administering justice. Here the court is primarily approached as a group of people surrounding the sovereign(s), whether official councillors, people of influence, friends, or members of the retinue. This approach is especially justified because within the time period of the study, determined by the ten years between Mary's arrival to Hungary and her departure to the Netherlands, the second half was spent away from the Royal Palace at Buda. Mary left Buda in haste, following the defeat of the Hungarian army and the death of the king at Mohács in 1526. In the years of confusion which followed, with two crowned kings of Hungary, neither of which was her husband, it would be difficult to give one definite location for the Hungarian Royal Court or to equate this with the residence of Queen Mary.

The great wealth of landed property and rights received by Mary as dower from her husband in accordance with the rights of the queen of Hungary and Bohemia made her one of the country's richest feudal lords.⁹ This wealth did not only give her the means to cover the costs of her household, it also made it possible for her to construct and make use of a network of patronage, influencing a large number of people, and hereby both home and foreign politics. Arguably, Mary was the queen of Hungary who made best use of the economic and political potential provided by her wealth. This fact also makes the function of the queen and the role played by the queen's court a question worth investigating. Therefore the sources are analysed as to how they reflect personal relationships, smaller groupings, and spheres of influence within the court, with special attention to evidence regarding the queen's court.

The defeat at Mohács, with all its consequences, forms a natural division of the ten years in the center of interest into twice five years with vastly different settings and circumstances, and thus also different questions. In the period between 1521 and 1526 one of the key issues will be the attempt to locate and define the institution of the queen's court within the multiethnic, multilingual and multicultural royal court and in relationship to the court of the king. Since no

⁹ Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber der Königin Maria von Ungarn in den Jahren 1521 - 1531" *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 82 (1974): 128.

traditional sources for court studies exist for the period in Buda the material is supplemented by evidence from Mary's households preceding 1521 from the richly documented years in Innsbruck and Vienna. In the second period, between 1526 and 1531, this focus is replaced by the general theme dealing with how the spheres of influence change with the death of King Louis and the gradual transfer of power from Mary to her brother, who became King Ferdinand I of Hungary.

1.1 Questions of methodology

Mary of Hungary in the context of her courts is placed in the focus of my research, in the time period between her moving from her aunt's court in Mechelen to the Austrian provinces of the Habsburgs in 1514, then her coronation as queen of Hungary in 1521 and her appointment as the regent of the Netherlands 1531. The court is a place for the practice and display of power, the stage for diplomacy and political life, as well as the focal point for the accumulation and distribution of art, science and new trends. However, it is also a group of people with various backgrounds, social standing and interests living together in a regulated manner.¹⁰ In this study the court will be examined primarily as a group of people structured by social relations and tensions. Questions about the political, religious and social context of the royal court are approached through investigating the relationship of household and power, both formal and informal. Special attention is given to questions of religion, ethnic and linguistic identity, gender, and age. All these fields accommodate what contemporaries saw as problematic issues pertaining to the queen.

The best known issue of tension is the queen's interest in the ideas of the early Reformation. There is no end to sources in which Mary is accused of harbouring protestant sympathies, by friends and enemies alike. Indeed, she was an admirer of Erasmus, was familiar with the teachings of Martin Luther and sympathised with the scripture-based reform movement within the Church. Several members of her immediate surroundings, among others, her court priests, were also associated with the reform movement. Even though most recent scholarship agrees that despite her interest and sympathy she cannot be considered "protestant", her attitude to

¹⁰ In this aspect my methodology is closely related to the prosopographic method developed by András Kubinyi for the study of offices of medieval administration about which no institutional archives survive. To counteract this shortcoming, he investigated these offices (e.g. royal chancery, treasury, etc.) by collecting data on the lives of the persons officiating in them. This method can be used – and was also used by him – for the study of the royal court itself.

the religious controversy in her surroundings focused much religious tension on her person.¹¹ One of my intentions is to study her religious interest and preferences within the context of the court. It has been said that Mary would not have come into contact with the ideas of Luther without the influence of the Margrave Georg of Brandenburg.¹² Was he also responsible for the dissemination of protestant ideology within the court? At least one lady-in-waiting is said to have converted to Lutheranism under the influence of the queen.¹³ Are there traces of any other such conversions? Did religious affinity play any part in the personal alliances and party politics? Can the signs of religious preference be found in the choice for employment in the household?

Since to many contemporaries, being “German” was an equivalent to being “Lutheran,”¹⁴ the question of national and linguistic identity stands in close connection with the religious tension. Hungarian queens were nearly always foreigners and often the object of mistrust and hate in medieval Hungary.¹⁵ In addition to her foreignness, Mary was a representative of the Habsburg influence in Hungary, which was feared and disliked by the majority of the Hungarian nobility. Recent research has demonstrated that the political controversies within Hungary in the years before Mohács cannot be simplified as the struggle between the “national party”, supported by the lesser nobility on the one hand, and the barons, representing the Habsburg interests, on the other. In a large number of studies of the political power centres of the Jagiello period, András Kubinyi has shown that the situation was far

¹¹ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests in the Entourage of Queen Mary of Hungary" in *Mary of Hungary: The Queen and Her Court 1521 - 1531*, ed. Orsolya Réthelyi et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2005).; Katherine Walsh and Alfred A. Strnad, "Eine Erasmianerin im Hause Habsburg: Königin Maria von Ungarn (1505--1558) und die Anfänge der Evangelischen Bewegung" *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft* 118 (1998): 82. and Bart Jan Spruyt, "Bart Jan Spruyt, "Verdacht van Lutherse sympathieën. Marie van Hongarije en de religieuze controversen van haar tijd (Suspected of Lutheran sympathies. Mary of Hungary and the religious controversies of her age) [Suspected of lutheran sympathies. Mary of Hungary and the re" in *Maria van Hongarije : koningin tussen koningin tussen keizers en kunstenaars (Mary of Hungary. Queen between emperors and artists), 1505-1558 (exhibition catalogue)*, ed. Bob van den Boogert and Jacqueline Kerkhoff (Zwolle: Waanders, 1995), 87-117.

¹² Katherine Walsh et al., "Eine Erasmianerin im Hause Habsburg": 82.

¹³ Zsuzsanna Kovács, "De gedroomde echtgenoot. Het Hongaarse hof van Maria van Hongarije, echtgenote van koning Lodewijk II (The dream-spouse. The Hungarian court of Mary of Hungary, wife of Louis II)" in *Maria van Hongarije : koningin tussen koningin tussen keizers en kunstenaars (Mary of Hungary. Queen between emperors and artists), 1505-1558 (exhibition catalogue)*, ed. Bob van den Boogert and Jacqueline Kerkhoff (Zwolle: Waanders, 1995), 57., József Bessenyei, "König Ferdinand und die ungarische Aristokratie" in *Kaiser Ferdinand I. Ein Mitteleuropäischer Herrscher*, ed. Martina Fuchs et al. (Münster: Aschendorff, 2005).

¹⁴ E.g. Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Egyháztörténelmi emlékek a magyarországi hitújítás korából. Monumenta ecclesiastica tempora innovatae in Hungaria religionis illustrantia. 1521-1552, Vol. I* (Budapest, 1902), 1,202, nr. 194.

¹⁵ János M. Bak, "Queens as scapegoats in medieval Hungary" in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Anne J. Duggan (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997), 232.

more complex, characterised by shifting alliances between different sections of both groups of the nobility, and the court. In this background the queen emerges as a figure of some importance, interests of whom did not always coincide with those of her family.¹⁶ Nevertheless, the traditional xenophobic sentiments of the Hungarian nobility, which reached a peak in the motions ruling to expel foreigners from the court brought by the Diets of 1524 and 1525, were aroused to a great extent by the queen's preference of German advisors and courtiers, and directed against them.¹⁷ In an age which does not yet consequently apply the theory of a nation as a geographical and linguistic unity, the use of the concept of "foreignness" in political discourse and ideology is especially intriguing.¹⁸ In this field of tension also, Queen Mary seems to have had an emblematic position, as the embodiment of foreignness. Within this topic I shall investigate the concept of "foreignness", how it was used, by whom, against whom, and for what purpose. The royal court was necessarily a group with a high concentration of non-Hungarians. The king himself, though born in Hungary, was from the Polish Jagiello dynasty and was king of Bohemia as well. Therefore, the number of Czechs and Poles at the court was significant.¹⁹ Did they also count as foreigners, or was this title restricted to the Germans? Which languages were spoken in the different layers and how did this influence communication? What is the ratio of Hungarians and foreigners at the different levels of the court? Can the personal views and preferences of the queen be traced?

Unlike the question of religious and ethnic tensions, which has received ample scholarly attention, the problems concerning gender issues in connection with the court of Mary of

¹⁶ András Kubinyi, "A magyar állam belpolitikai helyzete Mohács előtt [The internal politics of the Hungarian state preceding Mohács]" in *Mohács. Tanulmányok a mohácsi csata 450. évfordulója alkalmából.*, ed. Lajos Rúzsás and Ferenc Szakály (Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó, 1986). See also Csepregi Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", Zoltán Csepregi, "'Ich wil alle ding wol erfahren." Mária királyné és udvari papjai [Queen Mary and her court priests]" *Lelkipásztor* 75 (2000): 205.

¹⁷ Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber": 131, 133.

¹⁸ For the question of foreignness discussed in relation to royal brides see especially Spiess. Karl-Heinz Spiess, "Fremdheit und Integration der ausländischen Ehefrau und ihres Gefolges bei internationalen Fürstenheiraten" in *Fürstenhöfe und ihre Außenwelt. Aspekte gesellschaftlicher und kultureller Identität im deutschen Spätmittelalter*, ed. Thomas Zotz (Würzburg: Egon Verlag, 2004).; Katalin Péter, "A Reformáció és a művelődés a 16. Században (Reformation and education in the sixteenth century)" in *Magyarország története 1526-1686 (The history of Hungary)*, vol. 1, ed. Ágnes R. Várkonyi (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1985), 499.

¹⁹ András Kubinyi, "Nemzetiségi és vallási tolerancia a középkori Magyarországon [Ethnic and religious tolerance in medieval Hungary]" in *Főpapok, Egyházi intézmények és vallásosság a középkori Magyarországon (High-priests, religious institutions and religion in medieval Hungary)* (Budapest: METEM, 1999), 135.

Hungary have not been thoroughly researched.²⁰ Gender identity certainly was referred to in contemporary sources in descriptions of the queen, who was often characterised as a strong woman endowed with the “masculine” virtues of political and strategic intelligence as well as physical skill and endurance.²¹ However, it is necessary to take a step further and re-examine the sources for gender relationships and tensions within the court. What is the relationship between the queen and the predominantly male world of officers and menial servants?²² What do we know about the women’s household of the queen? What kind of information can be found on the structure and functioning of the economically separate queen’s court? András Kubinyi calls attention to the close connection between the presence of a queen at the royal court and the appearance of courtly culture and how the relatively short periods in which queens resided at the Buda court could be significant.²³ Does courtly culture (or the lack of such) in Hungary then have a gendered explanation? Given the male personnel at the royal court, is it possible that there was a complete lack of women before the arrival of the queen? Is there any reason to suppose that some of the tensions surrounding the queen were due to the reappearance of a female presence at the court? Here, as in the field of religion, a comparison between my period of research and earlier periods is called for. The queen’s court under Mary is contrasted to the courts of the previous queens of medieval Hungary.

In researching the period one forgets all too easily that the young age of the royal couple was a significant feature of the Buda court. In 1521, when she arrived to Hungary, Mary was only sixteen years old; King Louis II was half a year younger. Five years later the king died and Mary became a widow at the age of twenty-one. Much of the grievances about the life of the royal couple (too much dancing, hunting and amusement, improper behaviour, etc. that gave rise to a lack of respect among the courtiers)²⁴ was understandable, if not excusable in the light of their age. Similar complaints can be found referring to other young sovereigns, Henry

²⁰ Both issues are touched upon in the article of András Kubinyi about the royal court. András Kubinyi, "Alltag und Fest am ungarischen Königshof der Jagellonen 1490-1526" in *Alltag bei Hofe (Residenzenforschung 5)*, ed. Werner Paravicini (Sigmaringen, 1995).

²¹ Katherine Walsh et al., "Eine Erasmianerin im Hause Habsburg": 41, 63.

²² According to the surviving account books the court staff was exclusively male, down to the dishwashers and cleaning personnel. Vilmos Fraknói, *II. Lajos udvara. Történeti rajz* (Budapest: Franklin-Társulat, 1878), 36..

²³ Between 1440 and 1526 queens resided at the Buda court for only 26 years. András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar a késő középkori Magyarországon [The royal court in late medieval Hungary]" in *Idővel paloták.: Magyar udvari kultúra a 16 - 17. században [In time palaces.: Hungarian court culture in the 16th and 17th centuries]*, ed. Gabriella Etényi and Ildikó Horn (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2005), 309..

²⁴ Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Krzysztof Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója 1523-ból [The diary of Chancellor Krzysztof Szydłowiecki from 1523]*, ed. István Zombori (Budapest: METEM, 2004), .

VIII of England, for instance.²⁵ The question of the age of the people surrounding the queen is also addressed below. To what extent can this be determined? Does this provide any extra information about our understanding of the queen's court?

1.2 The sources

Sources traditionally used for the investigation of the royal and reginal court do not exist for the court of Mary of Hungary in the period between 1521 and 1531. Since we do not have either household ordinances, or court accounts of the queen's court, information had to be collected from a number of divergent source types, chiefly from letters, charters and narrative sources from the period. This has been supplemented by material (ordinances, accounts) from the years preceding the time period under investigation, from which a richer source material exists. When appropriate, images and other sorts of non-written evidence were also consulted. A detailed description and analysis of source types used for the reconstruction of Mary's court can be found in chapter 4.1. A more general discussion about source types used for court studies is discussed in 2.1.

1.3 The structure of the thesis

Following the introduction the dissertation starts out in Chapter two with a survey of the recent results of court studies of the late medieval and early modern period and an introduction of the key concepts and problems surrounding the topic. Starting out with the sources of court studies, the distinction between court and household, royal and reginal court are discussed primarily using the results and copious examples from West European scholarship. In the introduction to the institution of the queen's court and the relationship between power and household, two decisive aspects are identified: the financial background and the authority in appointing officials. The chapter is rounded off with a discussion of the characteristics and functions of queen's courts and the specific situation of widowed queens.

From the context of European courts Chapter three progresses to the presentation of the Hungarian royal court. The investigation starts with a survey of short characterisations of the queens and their courts from the beginnings of the Kingdom of Hungary with increasing detail as we approach the Jagiellon Age. Through these sketchy portraits some of the recurrent

²⁵ András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar", 330..

themes and central issues concerning Hungarian queenship become visible. From 3.2 the focus is on the royal court of Hungary in the late Middle Ages, the relationship between court and administration, the location, size and form of the royal court as well as the relationship between the court offices, their function and aspects of power.

Chapter four provides the core of the dissertation and addresses the question of the personal element of the court of Mary of Hungary. After a survey of the sources used, Mary's different households are investigated chronologically and the characteristics of the different household forms and functions are compared, starting with the earliest years up to Mary's departure to the Low Countries in 1531, with the bulk of sources used for the years spent in Austria and Hungary. The individuals of the queen's household are identified in each phase – as much as this is possible – to trace the factors of permanence and change within the group of people around the queen. Relationships between members of the queen's household and networks of family and communication receive special attention. In each case a characterisation of the household according to the male and female sides and the indications to age is investigated. Attention is given to the financial background of the household in the different stages, as well as the authority of appointing new members of the court. The relationship between court and household, private and official functions, and different administrative departments are explored. Each distinctive period of Mary's court ends with concluding remarks with regard to the questions posed above concerning religion, language, gender and age.

Chapter five approaches the same theme, the court of the queen, from a different perspective, by concentrating on a few selected themes, such as the relationship between the royal and the reginal court, questions of political and cultural patronage, factors of language and ethnicity and the question of religion in the context of the royal and reginal courts. The latter subject is being discussed especially thoroughly since the relationship of Mary to the ideas of early Reformation and the humanistic circle is a question that has received extensive scholarly attention in previous as well as contemporary historiography. The relationship is reinvestigated from the perspective of the household, which provides the possibility of a new interpretation of earlier results, as well as uncovering new facts and correlations. The question of languages used at the court and the ethnic composition of the household offers a new angle of analysing not only the dynamics within the household, but also to the interpretation of the tensions between the court and the nobility.

In Chapter six the information presented in the preceding chapters is summed up by concentrating on the functions of Queen Mary's court on the one hand and the comparison of her court to other courts in European and Hungarian context on the other. The major findings are reviewed and the possibility for further paths of investigation is charted.

2 Courts and court studies

2.1 Medieval and early-modern court studies and its sources

There is general agreement in secondary literature that the definition of a medieval and early modern court is difficult to arrive at due not only to the complexity of the term and its changing form, but also to the inherent fluidity of the court itself, which was also experienced by the contemporaries.²⁶ A compact and highly serviceable model for theorising the concept indicated by the Medieval Latin terms *curia* and *curtis*, the Middle High German *hof* and the Romance words *cour*, *court*, *corte* was made by Aloys Winterling, who differentiates between five different fields of reference. 1. The material/spatial: the residence of a lord (“bei Hofe sein”); 2. The social: the retinue of a lord, or the people in his vicinity (“ein Mitglied des Hofes”); 3. The temporal aspect: the elevated lifestyle in the surroundings of the sovereign (“Hof halten”); 4. The communicative aspect: the specific norms of behaviour expected around the lord (indicated by words like *curialitas*, *höveschheit*, *Höflichkeit*, *courtoisie*, etc.); 5. The political aspect is a less unified one: in the medieval period it refers to the assembly of the “mighty people” of a realm for advice and justice in law (“Hoftag”). In another combination it meant, at least from the Early Modern period, the institutional aspect of the court, the organisation of the court offices (“Hofstaat”), whose responsibilities included not only the care of the persons of the court, but also the governance and administration of his dominion. Finally the term Hof/court can also have the reference to a state (“ein Abgesandter des französischen Hofes”).²⁷

Traditionally court studies uses source types, which are closely related to the structuring and functioning of the court. Household ordinances are issued by the head of the household and

²⁶ The question is discussed in great detail by Vale. Malcom Vale, *The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe, 1270-1380* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 15-33, especially 16. The subject has a large literature and I will not attempt to give a summary of even the most influential recent publications. For a clear and useful overview of the recent changes in theoretical approaches and methods in Early Modern court studies, see Duindam with a detailed bibliography Jeroen Duindam, "Early Modern court studies: an overview and a proposal" in *Historiographie an europäischen Höfen (16.-18. Jahrhundert): Studien zum Hof als Produktionsort von Geschichtsschreibung und historischer Repräsentation*, ed. Markus Völkel and Arno Stroymeyer (Berlin, 2009).

²⁷ Aloys Winterling, "„Hof“. Versuch einer idealtypischen Bestimmung anhand der mittelalterlichen. und frühneuzeitlichen Geschichte" in *Hof und Theorie. Verstehen durch Erklären eines historischen Phänomens*, ed. Reinhardt Butz et al. (Köln: Böhlau, 2004). The article has been printed in a number of publications. I use the most recent version. See also Ronald G. Asch, "Introduction: Court and Household from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries" in *Princes, patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c.1450-1650*, ed. Ronald, G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke (Oxford, 1991).

regulate the types of household offices and who shall hold these, the duties and rights of the holders of these offices and in which manner the tasks should be performed.²⁸ One text can include any number of these elements, though almost never all of them. Such ordinances are further characterised by a prescriptive, rather than descriptive function and should therefore be used with caution in the reconstruction of the actual households. The source type emerged in the thirteenth century in England and France and appears in other west European courts during the fourteenth, in the Empire especially from the middle of the fifteenth century. In the Habsburg court its first appearance is at the end of the fifteenth century under Maximilian I.²⁹ A second type of source commonly used for the investigation of courts is the household account. Examples of this source type survived in Western Europe from 1250 in larger quantities and are in many ways a more useful source type for the reconstruction of the everyday functioning of households than the ordinances. They also make comparisons of consumption and expenditure between different courts possible as well as providing information on cultural patronage and artistic production.³⁰ A further source type consists of treatises on household governance and economy, a prescriptive source type, examples of which survived in Western Europe from the middle of the thirteenth century.³¹ Information about the courts can be obtained from material sources, surviving artistic artefacts, archaeological finds, literary texts and music, though typically these survive in a very small percentage and often one has to work with the lists and descriptions of material finds and objects. Within this group of sources the remains of buildings that served as residences of the court should be given a special emphasis: castles, palaces, mansions, etc. and the chapels and other church buildings adjoining them.³² Finally, one should also mention the large body of

²⁸ This characterisation is derived from the definition of household ordinances by Werner Paravicini in the keynote article of the conference volume dedicated to this source type: "Hofordnungen sind vom jeweiligen Herrn erlassene Bestimmungen, die feststellen, (1) welche Ämter es in seiner Haushaltung gibt, (2) wer sie innehaben soll, (3) mit welchem Gefolge beziehungsweise mit welcher Entlohnung sie zu versehen sind, (4) was zu tun ist und (5) in welcher Form dies zu geschehen hat." Werner Paravicini, "Europäische Hofordnungen als Gattung und Quelle" in *Höfe und Hofordnungen 1200-1600 (Residenzenforschung 10)*, ed. Holger Kruse and Werner Paravicini (Sigmaringen, 1999), 14..

²⁹ Paul-Joachim Heinig, "Theorie und Praxis der "höfischen Ordnung" unter Friedrich III. und Maximilian I." in *Höfe und Hofordnungen 1200-1600 (Residenzenforschung 10)*, ed. Holger Kruse and Werner Paravicini (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1999), 230-231..

³⁰ Malcom Vale, *The Princely Court.*, 9.

³¹ Malcom Vale, *The Princely Court*, 42.

³² For instance material objects, books in testaments and the recent attention to detailed lists of trousseaux of royal brides. Karl-Heinz Spiess, "Unterwegs zu einem fremden Ehemann. Brautfahrt und Ehe in europäischen Fürstenhäusern des Spätmittelalters" in *Fremdheit und Reisen im Mittelalter*, ed. Irene Erfen and Karl-Heinz Spiess (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997)., Orsolya Réthelyi, "'Maria regina. nuda venerat ad Hungariam."

miscellaneous sources, meaning the gathering information piecemeal from charters, reports of diplomats and envoys, letters, etc. and making an attempt at a reconstruction from these records.³³

2.2 Royal court and royal household

The royal household is similar to other great aristocratic households in that its prime purpose was the “honour, status, profit and well-being of the lord. Everything was organised to those ends, providing a way of life as much as a home for the lord, his immediate family and a large group of servants and followers.”³⁴ Because of its vast size this involved a high level of organisation, where the members were formed in a network of strict hierarchy depending on status, rank and precedence. The households were typically divided into departments responsible for the different aspects of everyday life, with a chief official at the head of the department. Some of these departments served the domestic needs of the lord and his *familia*: at the most basic consisting of the pantry, responsible for bread and table linen; a buttery, responsible for wine and ale, a kitchen and a marshalsea, with special jurisdiction for the royal household. These basic four department structure might be enlarged by other, more specialised departments.³⁵ The chamber, headed by the Chamberlain was where the physical needs (sleeping, dressing, washing, etc.) were cared for. The wardrobe, under the direction of the Master of the Wardrobe, was originally where the lord’s clothes and valuables were kept, later this evolved into the treasury. The feeding of the household was managed in the pantry and the buttery, headed by the Pantler and the Butler, or Cup-bearer respectively. The hunting establishment and the chapel, with further sub divisions also belonged to the domestic area of the household. The chancery, headed by the Chancellor served the administrative functions, while the military function was headed by the Marshall, or Master of the Horse. The Steward (“Hofmeister”) stood at the head of the household organisation in the medieval period, which position was gradually taken over by the Marshall.³⁶ Different periods and countries show

The Queen's Treasures" in *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and her Court 1521-1531*, ed. Orsolya Réthelyi et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2005)..

³³ For the Early Modern period a number of additional source types are used, including Mirrors of Princes, testaments, tractates on governance, court literature, memoirs, court critique, etc. For a discussion of the source types see Müller’s chapter „Hof-Quellen.” Rainer A. Müller, *Der Fürstenhof in der Frühen Neuzeit (Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte, Bd. 33)* (München: Oldenbourg, 2004), 77-88..

³⁴ C. M. Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Medieval England*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 8.

³⁵ C. M. Woolgar, *The Great Household*, 17.

³⁶ Rainer A. Müller, *Der Fürstenhof*, 19.

variation in the sub-division of the responsibilities and departments, often making the translation of the functions of court officials problematic, nevertheless the general structure everywhere shows a basic structure of five areas the domestic, the administrative, the military, the financial and the juridical functions of the court.

There are a few other general characteristics of medieval noble or royal households that are worth noting. The importance of the military function of the medieval household meant that there was a great predominance of men, even in households headed by a queen.³⁷ Women could be present as the attendants of the female members of the lord's family and in certain menial functions, but almost all of the gentle and menial servants were male. This only began changing at the end of the Middle Ages when the new type of warfare decreased the significance of the military function of the castles and resulted in an increase in the number of women in the household.³⁸ Differentiation was made between the noble and non-noble element in the household, though this is a difficult concept and not always useful. Every member of the household served the lord or his immediate family, but there was a distinction between types of service for gentle servants and menials. Furthermore it must be noted that the grade of closeness to the prince was critical³⁹

The royal household differed from other great medieval households in that beside the domestic functions and the administration of the household, its officials were responsible for the governance of the realm and the two functions cannot be separated.⁴⁰ This meant that certain household offices obtained immense political influence. In some countries eventually the main household offices became hereditary honorary titles of rank and did not necessarily imply attendance at court, but since influence was strongly connected to physical closeness to

³⁷ In the household of Eleanor of Castile, the wife of Edward I of England the presence of women was less than 10%. C. M. Woolgar, *The Great Household*, 8.

³⁸ C. M. Woolgar, *The Great Household*.

³⁹ „Herrschnähe was Gradmesser höfischer Personalstruktur.“ Rainer A. Müller, *Der Fürstenhof*, 19.

⁴⁰ „Idealtypisch gesehen bestand der frühneuzeitliche Hof aus zwei Personengruppen, die unterschiedliche Funktionen wahrnehmen, wenn auch oftmals in Personalunion. Die Gruppe – der sog. „Hofstaat“ – war mit der persönlichen Betreuung des Fürsten und seiner Familie beauftragt, die zweite Gruppe agierte in den Staatsorganen, etw dem Hof oder Geheimen Rat. Hofkanzlei und Hofgericht hatten zumeist landesweite Kompetenzen. Beide Funktionsbereiche waren im patrimonialen Staat der Früher Neuzeit nicht prinzipiell voneinander geschieden. „Hofdienst“ bedeutete weitgehend auch „Staatsdienst“. Die Institution Hof war staatlicher Regierungssitz einerseits und fürstlicher Haushalt andererseits. Arbeit in der Zentralverwaltung blieb mit Fürstendienst gekoppelt, der Verwaltungsbeamte hatte den zusätzlichen Status eines persönlichen Dieners des Landesherrn.“ Rainer A. Müller, *Der Fürstenhof*, 18.

the lord, typically these offices lost importance.⁴¹ The relationships between the terms household and court is a distinction which was already made by contemporaries. However while the concept of the royal household can be described and understood with ease, the concept of the court has changing meaning in medieval as well as modern use. There seems to be an agreement however that the “material infrastructure” of princely courts is provided by the household.⁴²

The period between the thirteenth and seventeenth century is characterised by a stable growth in the size and complexity of the royal courts. An important aspect of medieval and early modern courts is a strong competitive aspect between them and the close communication with each other, which made the ideas and customs easily adapted from one court to the other.⁴³ The competition is the all time driving force behind the adoption of new trends, the expression of wealth and taste in the form of courtly display, ceremony and art. The expression of differences in social and political hierarchy had central importance in the ceremonial aspect.⁴⁴

2.3 Royal household and the queen’s household

It may not surprise us that parallel to the intensification of research of medieval and early modern courts, analyses of the form and function of the courts of queens has experienced an intensified attention in the past years. This field of study has a shorter history and the basic categories are much less developed than the investigation of the royal court. This is partly due to the fact that the queen’s household is often “hidden” The queen consort is always understood in relation to the king and her position and power defined as compared to his, or to

⁴¹ Aloys Winterling, "Hof". Versuch einer idealtypischen Bestimmung", 84..

⁴² „The material infrastructure, or underpinning, of all princely courts – in both medieval and modern periods – was provided by the household. Court and household were never entirely synonymous, yet courts could not have existed without household organisations behind and within them.” Malcom Vale, *The Princely Court*, 14..

⁴³ Malcom Vale, *The Princely Court.*, Jeroen Duindam, *Vienna and Versailles: The Courts of Europe's Dynastic Rivals, 1550–1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 21.

⁴⁴ „Die am meisten ins Auge fallende gesellschaftliche Funktion des Hofes ist die der Repräsentation politisch-sozialer Rangverhältnisse. Generell gilt für Adelsgesellschaften, daß der eingenommene oder beanspruchte Rang des einzelnen einer äußeren, sichtbaren manifestation bedarf. In diesem Zusammenhang hat ein Hof üblicherweise die Funktion, die besondere Stellung des Monarchen gegenüber dem Adel und anderen Monarchen durch Exklusivität und Glanz zum Ausdruck zu bringen. Üblich ist dafür der besondere Umfang und ehrende Charakter der Hof-ämter („Hofstaat“), die Entfaltung materieller Pracht, ein herausgehobener Lebensstil mit feierlichem Zeremoniell bei besonderen Anlässen („weiter hof“), Festen und besonderen Vergnügungen, aber auch die Förderung von Dichtung, Wissenschaft und bildender Kunst.” Aloys Winterling, "Hof". Versuch einer idealtypischen Bestimmung", 86.

put it with other words, “queenship was obviously to be understood in relationship to kingship, yet its prerogatives were occasionally distinctive.”⁴⁵ In many cases there are no queens beside the kings for long stretches of time, without this influencing the kingdom in any significant manner. Furthermore, the queen’s household, in many cases seems to melt together with the king’s household, only showing its own characteristics when the king and queen reside in different locations. Scholarship has only recently begun addressing the question whether a specific queen has a household; therefore the significance of a separate household is not always recognised.⁴⁶ A further question is whether a queen can be said to have a court. This depends largely on the differentiation between our concepts what we mean by household and court, which – as has been shown above – is not a clear-cut situation. Much of the results come from the richly documented English courts, but studies on the Iberian Peninsula and the Holy Roman Empire have also influenced our knowledge on the question.⁴⁷ Recently, also the Residenzen-Kommission has dedicated a conference and a volume to the question of courts and women.⁴⁸

It has been earlier stated that medieval courts were typically masculine places, with an overwhelming majority of men in both the gentle and menial element of the people present, even in the households of queens. The situation started changing at the end of the middle ages, when one can expect a more significant presence of women, almost always in the context of the households of female or infant members of the lord’s family. The relationship between the presence of women at the court and the queen is perhaps best summed up by Rita Costa Gomes in her recent excellent analysis of the medieval royal court of Portugal:

“The presence of women was always considered a distinctive feature of court society at the end of the middle ages, and was connected in a precise manner to the queen, who was a central personage of this feminine world, and whose *familia* had an autonomous organisation. The majority of servants of the medieval queens were, certainly, men. But, besides this numerically dominant element of her

⁴⁵ Margaret Howell, *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), 262.

⁴⁶ The first such study to my knowledge is that of Hilda Johnstone about the households of the queens of England Hilda Johnstone, "The Queen's Household" in *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England: The Wardrobe, the Chamber and the Small Seals, Vol. 4* (Manchester University Press, 1967)..

⁴⁷ E.g. J. L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens. English Queenship 1445-1503* (Oxford: OUP, 2004), 228., Fössel on the Holy Roman Empire Amalie Fössel, *Die Königin im mittelalterlichen Reich. Herrschaftsausübung, Herrschaftsrechte, Handlungsspielräume (Mittelalter-Forschungen 4)* (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2000)..

⁴⁸ Jan Hirschbiegel and Werner Paravicini, eds., *Das Frauenzimmer. Die Frau bei Hofe in Spätmittelalter und früher Neuzeit. (Residenzenforschung 11)* (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2000)..

entourage, it was considered that the queen should be accompanied by a reasonably high number of women of varied standing who were permanently to follow her. Thus we could say that the principal originality of this group within the interior of the court organism resided, in the main, within the uncommon figure of a *familia* whose leadership always fell to a woman, and whose central nucleus (at least from a symbolic point of view) comprised a household of women. Ultimately it lay in its being a relatively unstable group which demonstrated a structural organisational fragility – for, with the death of the queen, the relationship which united the elements of her entourage would be dissolved and reintegrated within the patrimony of the monarch.”⁴⁹

One of the central points of distinction in all studies of the courts of queen consorts is the relationship of the court, or household to that of the king. The evaluations of this aspect vary in the different analyses from the description as an “autonomous organisation” above, to an administration that was subordinated and at times even submerged in the Royal court.⁵⁰ Even in the well researched English material rich in sources there is no consensus on the degree of independence in organisation and personnel of the queen’s court described as her *curia et hospicium* in the late medieval accounts.⁵¹ In a recent study on late medieval queenship Laynesmith sums up her survey of previous scholarship and own research as follows:

“Such studies have tended to focus upon the size and finances of the household, rather than the personnel, thereby constructing it as a discrete entity, but it is clear from the varying roles that of those described to the queen’s servants that her organization was firmly interlinked with the king’s household and court. This interdependence reflected the position of the queen herself, who did not have an official public identity separate from that of the king. The queen’s household, however, was not subsumed in the king’s: it could exist physically apart for long periods of time, with a certain amount of movement of personnel between the two, and enabled a queen to continue to function in a queenly fashion when away from the king, attending to affairs which were specifically her concern, such as the management of her lands, spending time with her eldest son, or on pilgrimages.”⁵²

⁴⁹ Rita Costa Gomes, *The Making of a Court Society: Kings and Nobles in Late Medieval Portugal* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 57.

⁵⁰ With relation to England: “The Queen’s household was always subordinate to that of the King – and when the two households were together, the Queen’s usually ceased to function as a separate administrative entity. The Queen was dependant on the King for her position: the sacral qualities of kingship were not extended to queens before Mary I, the first queen regnant since the Norman Conquest. Nonetheless the Queen was not without power, unofficial, but influential in selected circumstances.” C. M. Woolgar, *The senses in late medieval England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 229.

⁵¹ J. L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, 224.

⁵² J. L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, 222.

However in all analyses the connection is made between the queen's household or court and her basis of power, expressed most explicitly by Martin Kintzinger: „In der Leitung eines eigenen ‘Hofes’ bestand das Fundament, auf dem selbständiges Handeln einer Fürstin gründen konnte.“⁵³

The households of queens were usually organised similarly to those of the king, with a parallel system of separate court officials and servant body.⁵⁴ The main difference in the personal element was the presence of a group of women, in English termed ladies-in-waiting, in German sources and literature referred to as the „Frauenzimmer“.⁵⁵ In the queen's *familia*⁵⁶, therefore, one expects a great diversity of people, noble and non-noble, men and women, officers and menial servants, locals with frequently different ethnic and cultural background and people brought with her from her own home country.

2.4 The power of the queen and the court

2.4.1 Financing the court - marriage contract, dower, dowry

If the basis of a queen's power was based on her own court, the maintenance of a court was made possible by her income, documented and affirmed in the marriage contract (*pacta*

⁵³ Martin Kintzinger, "Die zwei Frauen des Königs. Zum politischen Handlungsspielraum von Fürstinnen im europäischen Spätmittelalter" in *Das Frauenzimmer. Die Frau bei Hofe in Spätmittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, ed. Jan Hirschbiegel and Werner Paravicini (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2000), 385.

⁵⁴ For England for instance: "The administrative structure of the queen's household paralleled the king's and was headed by her own Lord Chamberlain. Although he and many of those working under him – Vice Chamberlain, Master of the Horse, Carvers, Cupbearers, Servers, Gentlemen, Yeoman Ushers, and Groom Porters- were male, the queen's side of the court was a somewhat insulated female space within the royal household. The queen spent much of her time in the Privy Chamber in the company of her ladies, gentlewomen, and maids; ordinarily she also dined with them apart from the king and his servants even when they were lodging at the same place," Barbara Jean Harris, *English aristocratic women, 1450-1550: marriage and family, property and careers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 216.

⁵⁵ Anja Kircher-Kannemann, "Organisation der Frauenzimmer im Vergleich zu männlichen Höfen" in *Das Frauenzimmer. Die Frau bei Hofe in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit (Residenzenforschung 11)*, ed. Jan Hirschbiegel and Werner Paravicini (Stuttgart, 2000)., I will use both terms.

⁵⁶ I use the term *familia*, in the term of people serving the queen in a diverse range of functions, similarly to the usage of Costa-Gomes above. In Hungarian historiography the system of familiaritas, comparable to, but in many ways very different from vassalage has received much attention. For a good summary in English see chapter 'Familiaritas' by Pál Engel Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen* (London: Tauris, 2001), 126-128. For the late Middle Ages in male households it means the following: „By the time that the evidence becomes more abundant in the fourteenth-century, it is clear that the armed following was no longer restricted to a great man's own kinsmen. For the most part it was composed of lesser noblemen who entered the service of a greater lord not because of kinship, but in search of advancement. Their service usually lasted until the death of one of the parties. Once engaged, the retainer became a member of his lord's household, ate at the latter's table, was given full supplies and other benefits, in return for which he owed unconditional fidelity to his lord and had constantly to be at his disposal." Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 126-127.

matrimonia). Marriage in the Middle Ages was considered a contract between two families, and in the landowning classes it usually involved a written contract of marriage about the territorial and financial details of the agreement.⁵⁷ In the case of royal marriages between different kingdoms, the political nature of the contract would frequently necessitate that the contract is included in a treaty of peace, or allegiance.⁵⁸ The contract was issued by the bride's father or elder brother and subsequently confirmed by the groom's father and by the groom himself. The dowry was considered a compensation for the inheritance of a daughter and involved her renunciation of claims to the estate, which was sometimes explicitly included in the contract. More frequently a separate charter was issued by the bride in which she renounced her claims to the inheritance in her native land (*renuntiatio, abrenutio iuris*). The groom confirmed this in a separate document.⁵⁹

Most importantly the legal document incorporated the details of property transfer: the amount and conditions of payment of the of the bride's portion, paid by the bride's family called the dowry (*dos*);⁶⁰ the portion fixed on the bride by the groom's family for the case that she is widowed, called the dower (*dotalitium, contrados, reformatio*), which depended on the size of the dowry;⁶¹ finally the percentage of annual income the widow would receive from the interest of the dower. The contract might also include the date and place of the marriage ceremony, details of the bride's trousseau (*paraphernalia*), the date of the payment of the dowry instalments, or the fines and consequences of the breaking of the contract.⁶² A further sum of money, the so called morning-gift (*Morgengabe*),⁶³ could be given to the bride on the morning after the wedding night. This practice was especially characteristic in the Holy

⁵⁷ For the social and economic transactions connected to marriage see especially Reynolds Philip L. Reynolds, "Marrying and Its Documentation in Pre-Modern Europe: Consent, Celebration, and Property" in *To have and to hold: marrying and its documentation in Western Christendom, 400-1600*, ed. Philip L. Reynolds and John Witte Jr. (Cambridge: CUP, 2007).

⁵⁸ Chris Given-Wilson and Alice Curteis, *The royal bastards of medieval England* (Routledge, 1984), 21-22..

⁵⁹ Urszula Borkowska, "Marital contracts of the house of Jagiellon" *Majestas* (2006): 82.

⁶⁰ This was considered as compensation for the inheritance and involved a renunciation of claims to the family estate. Karl-Heinz Spiess, "European Royal Marriages in the Late Middle Ages. Marriage Treaties, Questions of Income, Cultural Transfer" *Majestas* 13 (2005): 15.

⁶¹ Usually the dower was set at the same value as the dowry. In Germany however a different system was practiced and it was usual to set the dower at double the amount of the dowry and pay an interest on this sum. For a detailed description of the different systems of dotations see Reynolds, especially 'Dotation'. Philip L. Reynolds, "Marrying and Its Documentation", 29-40.

⁶² Karl-Heinz Spiess, "European Royal Marriages": 10.; Urszula Borkowska, "Marital contracts": 76.

⁶³ „*Dotalitium seu victalitio, donationis nuptialis que vulgariter Morgengabe nuncupatur*”. According to the words of a marriage contract of the Polish Jagiellon dynasty. Urszula Borkowska, "Marital contracts": 82.

Roman Empire, where the noble wife as a rule received a sum of 10 000 fl, which was not handed over, but bore 10% interest annually.⁶⁴

Though amounts and percentages were negotiable, the system of widows' dowers, meaning the income the widowed queen would be able use as sustenance after her husband's death, was uniform for European royal houses.⁶⁵ This was not the case in the question of the queen's income during the lifetime of her husband, for which two systems seem to have been in use in Europe.⁶⁶ In the first model the queen was granted an income of which she could dispose freely and which covered her personal costs and that of her household. The income could come from various sources, most frequently from estates, often the same dower estates assigned for her widow's income later, which she either managed through her own officials and collected the revenues or which alternatively could be managed by the officials of the king, who would pay her a lump sum annually. Examples for this system can be brought from medieval England.⁶⁷ Additionally certain taxes and revenues could be assigned to the queen, like the "Queen's Gold".⁶⁸ In the second model the queen did not receive a land grant of regular income in the lifetime of her husband. The household and other costs were paid directly by the king as required. This model was widespread especially in the Holy Roman Empire, where the amount of the interest of the morning-gift was the only income the royal spouse could freely decide about.

The two systems had decisive consequences for the possibilities and power of the queen. As Spieß puts it:

⁶⁴ Karl-Heinz Spiess, "European Royal Marriages".

⁶⁵ Karl-Heinz Spiess, "European Royal Marriages": 15.

⁶⁶ This question has received little attention in comparative relation and needs more research. The model introduced here was developed and presented by Karl-Heinz Spieß as key-note lecturer at the Conference Medieval and Early Modern Queens and Queenship: Questions of Income and Patronage [CEU, 2004, organised by O. Réthelyi and A. Bárány] where the question was heavily debated. He published his findings in the article: European Royal Marriages in the Late Middle Ages. Marriage Treaties, Questions of Income, Cultural Transfer, in: *Majestas* 13 (2005), pp. 7-21. I will summarize his findings in this section.

⁶⁷ In Castile the queen received ten percent of her husband's property and half of what he would acquire after the wedding. Theresa M. Vann, "The theory and practice of medieval Castilian queenship", in: *Queens, regents and potentates*, ed. Theresa M. Vann (Academia, 1995), 129 quoted by Karl-Heinz Spiess, "European Royal Marriages": 19.

⁶⁸ The "queen's gold" in England comprised ten percent of the voluntary fines made to the king. Margaret Howell, "The Resources of Eleanor of Provence as Queen Consort" *English Historical Review* 102 (1987). For a detailed discussion of the incomes of queens see Fössel Amalie Fössel, "The Queen's Wealth in the Middle Ages" *Majestas* 13 (2005).

“It is obvious that the two models entailed quite different roles for respective queens. In England and Castile the queens were relatively wealthy landowners with considerable revenues at their disposal and had their own administrative staffs and their own councils. In Germany, by contrast, the queen was financially completely dependent on her husband.”⁶⁹

The Habsburg rulers followed the German model, as can be demonstrated for instance in the case of the wives of Sigmund of Tyrol and Bianca Maria Sforza, wife of Maximilian I.⁷⁰ The situation of the latter queen is especially appalling. Bringing the astounding dowry of 500 000 Ducats with her to the marriage – principally to compensate for her non-royal descent – she was kept so short of money and provisions, that she had to beg for money to pay the household bills.⁷¹ At least twice she and her ladies-in-waiting were forcibly detained in different towns by burgers until Maximilian would pay her debts.⁷² It is unclear to which system Hungary can be said to belong, since no overall research has been conducted regarding the queen’s dower lands, but evidence points to an independent management of the estates by late medieval queens of Hungary. The question of the dowry systems of Hungarian queens is discussed in greater detail below.

The dowries of royal princesses put a great financial burden on their families and terms of payment in instalments were often included in the marriage contract.⁷³ In many cases the bride’s families did not meet the deadlines for paying, by which they risked diplomatic difficulties and the possible negative consequences in the situation of the queen. Certain

⁶⁹ Karl-Heinz Spiess, "European Royal Marriages": 19-20.

⁷⁰ Margarete Köfler and Silvia Caramelle, *Die beiden Frauen des Erzherzogs Sigmund von Österreich-Tirol* (Innsbruck: Wagner, 1982), 77.; „We have now seen that Bianca Maria was never given full control over her own finances and she was not allowed to plan her own budget. Consequently, she lived from hand to mouth with extremes of gluttony and luxury at one minute, and pawning of linen to pay for her purveyance at the next.” Gerhard Benecke, *Maximilian I (1459-1519) : an analytical biography* (London, Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982), 100. Data on the household of Empress Bianca Maria Sforza, wife of Maximilian I provides a useful comparison partly because detailed sources have survived, but also because – as this is described in greater detail in the following chapters – Mary of Hungary was raised in the same residence at Innsbruck, previously occupied by the Empress, and “inherited” much of household organisation and personnel of Bianca Maria.

⁷¹ Karl-Heinz Spiess, "European Royal Marriages": 11.

⁷² Gerhard Benecke, *Maximilian I*, 102.; Amalie Fössel, *Die Königin im mittelalterlichen Reich*, 79-80.

⁷³ Borkowska’s analysis of the marriage contracts of the Polish Jagiellon dynasty shows that delaying the paying of instalments was rather the rule than an exception. Paying the dowry instalments caused serious problems for both the Polish and the Habsburg royal houses. Sigismund I was paying overdue dowry instalments of his sisters to their children and even grandchildren. On the other hand Sigismund Augustus had to put considerable pressure on Ferdinand I to make him pay the complete dowry of his daughter Elisabeth. Urszula Borkowska, "Marital contracts": 85.

contracts even included clauses linking the payment of instalments with the widow's dower.⁷⁴ Further clauses contained conditions of the fate of the queen's dowry and trousseau if she should happen to die without leaving children behind. A specific construction was possible for the case when two dynasties had a son and a daughter each who would be married to each other in a double dynastic marriage. In this case the dowries of the two brides could be made equal and thus cancel each other out. Both famous examples for such a construction involved the Habsburg dynasty. The avoidance of the burden of paying a dowry was one of the main motives for the Spanish-Habsburg double marriage of 1496/1497 between Philip the Fair and Joana *infanta* of Spain the future parents of Mary of Hungary on the one hand, and Juan infant of Spain, and Margaret of Austria.⁷⁵ In the second double marriage treaty the Habsburg siblings Mary and Ferdinand would be betrothed to Louis and Anne of Jagiello in 1515.⁷⁶

The queen's income could be substantial and was spent chiefly on running expenses of the household and on display, clothing and jewellery. Household costs on a basic level constituted of the feeding, clothing and providing shelter for members of the household, and paying their wages, all of these according to the rank of the official.⁷⁷ The queen's income was also used

⁷⁴ Spieß brings the example of the marriage contracts between Margaret of York and Charles the Bold of Burgundy on the one hand and between Sophia of Poland and Margrave Frederick of Brandenburg on the other. Karl-Heinz Spiess, "European Royal Marriages": 12.

⁷⁵ Alfred Kohler, "Die Doppelhochzeit von 1496/ 97: Planung, Durchführung und dynastische Folgen" in *Hispania - Austria: Die katholischen Könige. Maximilian I. und die Anfänge der Casa de Austria in Spanien*, ed. Alfred Kohler and Friedrich Edelmayer (Wien, München, 1993).

⁷⁶ Werner Ogris, "Die habsburgisch-jagiellonische Doppelheirat von 1515" *Österreichisches Archiv für Recht und Religion* 50 (2003). Enikő Spekner, "Die Geschichte der habsburgisch-jagiellonischen Heiratsverträge im Spiegel der Quellen" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martine Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007). See below in detail. The serious drawbacks of this system would be evident in the case of Mary of Hungary who had to fight with her family for years, ultimately unsuccessfully, for the compensation of the non-existent money, which she had a right to as widowed queen without children according to the terms of the marriage contract. She finally passed on the claim to the amount in her testament to the son of Ferdinand, Gerhard Rill, *Fürst und Hof in Österreich. Von den habsburgischen Teilungsverträgen bis zur Schlacht von Mohács (1521/22 bis 1526). Band 2: Gabriel von Salamanca, Zentralverwaltung und Finanzen* (Wien: Böhlau, 2003), 288-291.

⁷⁷ Benecke writes the following about the household of Bianca Maria Sforza: "Because court service provided food, shelter and clothing, the money element in a job there was naturally rather small. Annual rates of pay ranged from the chief cook at twenty-six gulden down to the stable hands and porters at six gulden. The annual salary bill of Bianca Maria's court was less than 1500 fl. and this included the salaries of top court officials like the chamberlain who netted between 150 and 300 fl every year. On average, chamber servants received eight gulden a year and master craftsmen twenty gulden. Chaplains, lutanists, accountants, stable masters and master-cooks also received twenty guldens. Ladies-in-waiting were promised surprisingly little. At between ten and twelve gulden per annum, they no doubt relied on their noble families to make them an extra allowance." Gerhard Benecke, *Maximilian I*, 110.

in construction work on the chief residences, religious foundations and patronage of the art and all other forms of court display.⁷⁸

2.4.2 Decisions about the staffing of the queen's household

The size and accessibility of the queen's income is a rather obvious factor in the limits of her power, as well as her household. There is another aspect, less frequently recognised in modern studies on queenship, but similarly influential aspect in the formation of the court: the decisions about who would be employed in the queen's household. Before looking at the specific examples a theoretical overview of the making of the queen's court is necessary to understand the factors and forces underlying the processes in the development of the body of people. Generally speaking, in theory the all time male head of the family had the right to appoint members to the royal woman's court.⁷⁹ In the case of a royal bride this meant that first the father decided on who would accompany the bride, and conferred this role to the husband at the handing over of the bride. In the practice the queen often also had influence on the composition of her court, but this always depended on the individual relationships and specific situation.

Three factors should be separated in the creation of the queen's household: emotional, diplomatic and financial. The queen and her family strove for a larger number of courtiers from the home country for the emotional value of the presence of trusted people around the queen. Even more important for the family of the queen were the diplomatic reasons as members of the queen's household were potential representatives of the interests of the queen's family in the new country. Last but not least one must mention the financial reasons; it was advantageous for the queen's family to put as many of their faithful subjects possible on the pay list of the queen. Obviously – for exactly the same reasons – the interest of the king and the estates was to reduce to a minimum the members of the household which came with the queen and increase the newly appointed members from the kingdom. Typically the king was less concerned by the emotional support of the old intimates and tried to increase the number of people who he hoped would help the cultural and linguistic integration of the queen. He had to take into account the negative effects – financially, legally and in the

⁷⁸ C. M. Woolgar, *The senses*, 224-226.

⁷⁹ Spiess brings several examples from European marriages Karl-Heinz Spiess, "Fremdheit und Integration", 281.

reaction of his subjects – of foreigners coming with the queen and holding office in the country. Finally, he also had to take in account how large body the queen's estates could support financially. The outcome of the opposed interests was decided partly by the negotiations before the marriage and these were sometimes even recorded in the marriage charter or some kind of official document.⁸⁰ They also depended, however, on the actual execution of the agreement, which often boiled down to the power of the king as opposed to the power of the queen and her family after the arrival of the bride. The most problematic issue in the queen's household personnel was often the fact that a foreign queen would bring foreign officials with her, the presence of whom caused jealousy and irritation in the surroundings.⁸¹ Historical examples also demonstrate the right of the sovereign to have a decisive word in who would be allowed to stay in the queen's household after her arrival and who would have to return to the home country. Maximilian systematically reduced the Italian element in the court of his second wife, Bianca Maria Sforza until there was not a single Italian-speaking person in her household.⁸²

2.5 The function of the queen's court

A discussion of the function of the queen's court must begin with the investigation of the functions of the queen herself. The most important official duty of a queen was giving birth to heirs and to strengthen political alliances.⁸³ Both duties were often problematic given that several marriages did not produce the necessary heir, and that political alliances were subject to changes, which could cause conflicting loyalties for queens between the land of birth and the land of marriage.⁸⁴ The queen also had an important ceremonial function and often played

⁸⁰ E.g. from the marriage contract of Eleonora of Portugal and king Frederick III of Germany quoted by Spiess Karl-Heinz Spiess, "Fremdheit und Integration", 281. A Hungarian example from can be found in the wedding contract between Zsigmond Rákóczi and his German wife Henrietta of Pfalz in which the exact members of the bride's household are fixed. András Koltai, "Udvar és rendtartás a 17. századi Magyarországon" in *Magyar udvari rendtartás. Utasítások és rendeletek 1617-1708*, ed. András Koltai (Budapest, 2001), 40.

⁸¹ János Bak, "Roles and Functions", 16.

⁸² See the examples given by Fössel. Amalie Fössel, *Die Königin im mittelalterlichen Reich*, 83. Several further examples are brought by Spiess. Karl-Heinz Spiess, "Unterwegs zu einem fremden Ehemann", notes 33 and 82.

⁸³ "Queens were expected to provide kings with children, specially a male heir, and to cement the diplomatic alliances of which their marriage was a part. Any other influences or activities depended on their individual characters and abilities, and on the inclinations of their husbands" Ralph Griffiths, "The political institutions of the realm" in *An Illustrated History of Late Medieval England*, ed. Chris Given-Wilson (Manchester University Press, 1996), 187.

⁸⁴ See for a discussion of both aspects in late medieval Hungary Orsolya Réthelyi, "Ambiguous Loyalties? Mary as Queen of Hungary (1521-1526)" in *Marie de Hongrie. Politique art et culture sous la Renaissance aux Pays-Bas*, ed. Bertrand Federinov and Gilles Docquier (Morlanwelz: Musée Royal de Mariemont, 2008).

an exemplary role in exercising piety as well as exercising religious patronage.⁸⁵ Certain medieval queens could have a role in the administration, but Europe showed a wide variation in the extent of power given to queen making it necessary to investigate the question within the context of a given country in a given period.⁸⁶ Queens – who usually came from abroad – were also an important vessel of cultural transfer between the two countries, though this was more a result of their changing homes, and less a function that was expected of them.⁸⁷

Queens' households had on one level the same function as that of the king, which was reflected in a parallel structure of departments and officials.⁸⁸ Primarily the household served as the body of people who cared for the physical and spiritual necessities of the queen.⁸⁹ It certainly had a ceremonial function as is often emphasized in marriage charters when the king grants domains for the upkeep of the queen's court "as befits her status". A queen without a household in some way lacked the outward symbol of her status, which seems a wholly unacceptable situation for the contemporaries. There are suggestions that size and content of her entourage was an important factor which elevated the queen above other aristocratic women. An interesting case of the Hungarian Queen Barbara of Cilli who was deprived of her household as a punishment will be analysed below. This idea is also reflected in the attitude of Margaret of Austria to her niece Isabella of Habsburg. Isabella and her husband Christian II of Denmark, Norway and Sweden had been driven from their kingdoms and dispossessed of their thrones (1523). After some months of great financial problems and humiliation they were allowed to stay in the Low Countries and were given financial support by Margaret following the instructions of Charles V. Margaret appointed the town of Lier as their residence because she feared political and religious unrest around the couple known for their sympathies with Lutheran teaching. When Isabella and the family travelled to the province of

⁸⁵ "Queens had a prominent and honoured place at the king's Court; they helped to set its tone and brought up the royal children, they had patronage to dispense, and who knows what wifely pressure might have been exerted in the bedchamber." Ralph Griffiths, "The political institutions", 187.

⁸⁶ Armin Wolf, "Reigning Queens in Medieval Europe: When, Where, and Why" in *Medieval Queenship*, ed. John Carmi Parsons (Stroud, 1994).

⁸⁷ Karl-Heinz Spiess, "European Royal Marriages", on queens and cultural transfer see especially Langer Andrea Langer, "Frauen - Kunst - Kulturtransfer. Forschungsstand und Perspektiven zur Rolle der weiblichen Mitglieder der jagiellonischen Dynastie im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert" in *Die Jagiellonen. Kunst und Kultur einer europäischen Dynastie an der Wende zur Neuzeit.*, ed. Dietmar Popp and Robert Suckale (Nürnberg, 2002).

⁸⁸ Barbara Jean Harris, *English aristocratic women*, 215.

⁸⁹ "The unifying purpose of the household was to sustain the queen. She and her entourage had to be fed and clothed, her accounts kept in order, her letters written and dispatched, her religious and recreational needs met and her entertaining arranged all in royal style." Margaret Howell, *Eleanor of Provence*, 267.

Zeeland in the autumn of 1525 Margaret sent her secretary to reprimand her in sharp tones that it did not befit the honour either of the Emperor, or herself to travel through the country with such a small and shabby retinue.⁹⁰

The household was a flexible structure which changed according to need and was flexible enough to adapt to the needs in the given phase of life of the queen. As Margaret Howell characterises it in her study on the queen's court of Eleanor of Provence "The household was a personal institution and its dynamism was that of the queen's own development".⁹¹ It was basically the group of trusted intimates, the *familia* of the queen on the support of whom she could count in the management of different aspects of life. Even in the cases that the queen did not have an overt role in administration, this did not mean that she was necessarily excluded from the practicing of power.⁹² The households gave the queen a potential power basis which could be used for exerting influence.⁹³

The queen could exercise political influence through intercession and patronage. In her theoretical work on the function of queens Christine de Pizan emphasises the importance for the wise queen to use intercession as a means of influencing her husband, which became a *topos* in medieval culture.⁹⁴ Patronage could take many forms, from the outright distribution of political, economic and religious posts, to cultural patronage, or gift giving. The arranging of marriages also was a feature that seems to be a basic form of patronage, which took place

⁹⁰ Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria van Hongarije*, 206-207.

⁹¹ Margaret Howell, *Eleanor of Provence*, 268. This aspect is especially emphasized by Howell about the court of Eleanor of Provence, but I believe it to be one of the key aspects of queen's households to which I will return in the analysis of the court of Mary of Hungary below.

⁹² For England: "The court was where the queens consort had influence. They had no particular public role in politics or government, they were rarely nominated as keeper or guardian of the realm when their husbands were abroad." Ralph Griffiths, "The political institutions".; "The queen's active political role in the middle ages was usually limited and only rarely was she in the forefront of events. Yet her use of religious and cultural patronage gave her a different type of power." Jennifer C. Ward, *Women in England in the Middle Ages* (New York: Continuum, 2006), 135.

⁹³ Margaret Howell, *Eleanor of Provence*, 266.

⁹⁴ Jennifer C. Ward, *Women in England*, 129. The queen's role as intercessor and the Marian overtones of intercession have been discussed in detail in two recent articles: Lois L. Huneycutt, "Intercession and the High-Medieval Queen: the Esther Topos," and John Carmi Parsons, "The Queen's Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England," both in *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, ed. by Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth MacLean (1995), 126-46, 147-77.

in the queen's household. Aristocratic families especially made efforts to place their daughters in the queen's court for the possibilities this offered for contracting a good marriage.⁹⁵

The household of queens at the end of the fifteenth and in the early sixteenth centuries also showed the increasing level of complexity and general growth in size similarly to the royal courts. In France the household of Anne de Bretagne amounted to 325 persons in 1496, 53 of whom were women.⁹⁶ At the end of the reign of Francis I Queen Eleanor of Austria's *maison* was near 400 persons, which included about 100 women.⁹⁷ In the empire the size of the court of the empress Bianca Maria Sforza varied between 100-200 people.⁹⁸

2.6 Dowager queens – possibilities and strategies

The fate of a dowager queen depended largely on factors like whether she had children, the size of her dower, and her relationship to the next in reign. Queen mothers sometimes had the possibility to act as regents, though such a function was not universally accepted.⁹⁹ Widowed queens could retire to a religious house, or more commonly to their dower lands. The dowagers' claim to their dower lands was not always a simple case, since the acceptance of the terms secured in the wedding contract depended in practice on the successor to the throne. Not to mention the complications arising if the system of more or less fixed reginal estates existed in a kingdom.¹⁰⁰ Since the successor's wife, the new queen also had rights to the reginal estates, the use of these by the dowager could cause serious tensions and put heavy economic burden on the crown possessions and ultimately tempt the new king to try to regain

⁹⁵ Ward quotes the letters of Margaret of Anjou from the middle of the fifteenth century which deal in great numbers with attempts to secure jobs and marriages for members of her household. Jennifer C. Ward, *Women in England*, 129.

⁹⁶ Jeroen Duindam, *Vienna and Versailles*, 31.

⁹⁷ Jeroen Duindam, *Vienna and Versailles*, 41.

⁹⁸ Hermann Wiesflecker, *Kaiser Maximilian I., das Reich, Österreich und Europa an der Wende zur Neuzeit*, vol. 5, *Der Kaiser und seine Umwelt* (München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag, 1986), 383.

⁹⁹ „Few queens acted as guardians to sons who were under-age. The number of minorities after the Conquest was relatively small, but in England, unlike France, the practice of using the queen mother as regent never developed. Instead male members of the royal family and magnates governed by means of a minority council.” Jennifer C. Ward, *Women in England*, 133.

¹⁰⁰ Spieß very appropriately calls this the „structural disadvantage of the system” meaning that „the father of the husband or the husband himself benefited from the original dowry, however their successors had to bear the financial liabilities arising from the dowry which had long been spent and the interest rates agreed on long ago.” Karl-Heinz Spiess, "European Royal Marriages": 15-16.

the dower lands at the cost of the dowager queen.¹⁰¹ Remarriage offered a further possibility, though this was also laden with political consequences and had to be treated with caution.¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ An example from England is that of Joan of Navarre, widow of Henry IV, who was arrested and deprived of her dower and kept prisoner for three years on the accusations of witchcraft. It is thought that Henry V, burdened by the costs of the French war had his eye on her dower. After she was freed she gradually recovered her possessions and was allowed to live in peace. Jennifer C. Ward, *Women in England*, 141. An interesting comparison arises with the Hungarian queen Barbara of Cilli, who was also deprived of her enormous dower lands in Hungary. See below in chapter 3.1. See also the marriage negotiation between Mary of Hungary and János Szapolyai.

¹⁰² An example from England: the clandestine second marriage of Katherine of Valois with Owen Tudor had decisive political implications. Jennifer C. Ward, *Women in England*, 141. The feigned marriage of the Bohemian pretender to the throne Wladislas to the dowager queen of Hungary Beatrice of Aragon was decisive in his eventual crowning because of the material resources with which the wealthy queen supported his military campaign to win the kingdom. See in detail below in chapter 3.1.

3 The Hungarian royal court

3.1 Queens and the reginal court in medieval Hungary

The queen's court in medieval Hungary as a historical phenomenon has not received any general scholarly treatment. Several medieval queens have had biographies dedicated to them, but these give only fleeting discussion of the court and household of the queens. In the following paragraphs an overview will be given about the main characteristics of the queen's court in order to see the traditions that existed in Hungary before the arrival of Mary of Hungary.¹⁰³

3.1.1 Queens of the Arpadian Age (972-1301)

The most in-depth analysis has been devoted so far to the questions of the reginal institution and the queens of the Arpadian Age (972-1301) in a recent book by Attila Zsoldos. Zsoldos summarises the power of the queens of Hungary between 972 and 1301 in the following terms: The position of the queens would have made the existence of a reginal institution (*reginatus*), parallel to the royal institution possible. The queen – just like the king – had land possession, had serving people living on these lands, had a separate court, with officials, had a chancery from which reginal charters were issued, which resembled royal charters both in form and content. The elements of the royal and reginal institution were thus complementary, the difference being in the size and significance, both of which were considerably less in the case of the reginal institution. The most important conclusion of Zsoldos' investigation of the sources is, however, that despite the complementary structures, the *reginatus* must be positioned within the royal institution and not alongside it. This meant that the effects of the “cultural dowry” brought with the bride to Hungary were extensively limited by the limits of the royal power, furthermore that the reginal institution was fundamentally shaped by the forces determining the development of Hungarian history, rather than being formed by the external influences transmitted by the foreign queens.¹⁰⁴

In the Arpadian Age the court of the queens of Hungary was organised similarly to that of the king's court. One can find the same chief offices – steward, Master Carver, Master of the

¹⁰³ For a brief survey of eleventh to fourteenth century queens see Bak János Bak, "Roles and Functions".

¹⁰⁴ Attila Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik*, 179.

Horse, Master Cup-bearer and Master of the Treasury – as in the royal court, but these offices, the holders of which belonged to the “genuine barons” (*veri barones regni*) had a closer association with the king than with the queen, and were appointed by him. Members of the queen’s narrower household, who in most cases had accompanied her from her country of origin, including the female household and the court nobility, can be considered as her affective court personnel, with whom she had daily contact.¹⁰⁵ Because the queen consorts in medieval Hungary usually came from abroad there exists a decree from the Arpadian period (1298), which stated that the courts offices should be held by Hungarian nobles and the queen should accept the barons appointed by the king to these posts.¹⁰⁶

3.1.2 Elisabeth of Poland (1305-1380)

The Anjou period was not marked by any radical change concerning the position or the court of the queens consort. A recent PhD dissertation on Elisabeth of Poland (or Elisabeth Łokietek) (1305-1380), queen consort of Hungary and her court concludes that any changes in the nature of queenship in the period of 1320-1380 can be attributed to the personality of Elisabeth rather than to the development of the reginal institution.¹⁰⁷ The queen had her own household in accordance with the custom and resided in Visegrád. The king allotted important parts of the royal demesne to the queen for the support of herself and her household. The officials of her court, her *magister tavernicorum* and her *iudex curiae* belonged to the highest office-holders of Hungary, but were mostly chosen by the king and not by the queen.¹⁰⁸ Elisabeth had little possibility to demonstrate her talent for government in the lifetime of her husband King Charles I of Anjou, king of Hungary (1308-1342), when she was chiefly occupied with raising the royal children. The situation changed after the death of her husband when she remained an active player in the politics of the kingdom as an important support base for her son King Louis I, king of Hungary (1342-1382) and Poland (1370 -1382).¹⁰⁹ The

¹⁰⁵ For the queens court in the Arpadian Era see Zsoldos Attila Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik*, 267-302.

¹⁰⁶ „Statuimus etiam, quod domina regina Hungariae dignitatis culmine gaudere possit, curia sua dignitatibus et honore in personis Hungarorum nobilium, non vero aliegenarum solempnius, sicut debet, ordinetur, et ut curia eiusdem dominae reginae decentius gubernetur, quosdam electos a domino rege barones ipsa domina regina habere teneatur.” (III. Endre, decrees of 1298, § 24) Quoted by Zsoldos Attila Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik*, 93.

¹⁰⁷ László Szende, *Piast Erzsébet és udvara 1320-1380. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)* (Budapest, 2007)..

¹⁰⁸ Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 148.

¹⁰⁹ László Szende, *Piast Erzsébet és udvara*. Szende also published some of his findings in an article in German László Szende, "Mitherrscherin oder einfache Königinmutter. Elisabeth von Łokietek in Ungarn (1320-1380)" *Majestas* 13 (2005)..

queen had her son give her the town and castle of Óbuda and developed it as a special reginal residence in her decades of widowhood.¹¹⁰ Óbuda remained an important alternative residence and power-base in the vicinity of Buda for several subsequent queens, e.g. Barbara of Cilli and for Erzsébet Szilágyi as queen mother. The management of the Óbuda estate and the reginal castle provided good opportunity to place courtiers in service of the queen in well-paid positions close to the Buda court. Subsequent queens (E.g. Beatrice of Aragon and Mary of Hungary) also made use of this possibility.

3.1.3 Elisabeth Kotromanić (1339/40-1387)

Elisabeth Kotromanić of Bosnia was queen consort as wife of King Louis I. She did not have much chance to demonstrate independent activities beside her powerful mother-in-law who was very influential in Hungarian and Polish politics up to her death in 1380. Elisabeth was widowed soon afterwards and became regent as the mother of two daughters, Mary and Hedwig/Jadwiga, who were to succeed to the thrones of Hungary and Poland. However, the opposition to the female succession in both countries was considerable and different fractions supported different constellations for succession to the throne, leading to a state of anarchy in Hungary. The ‘favouritism’ of the regent queen, who relied heavily on her own supporters, the magnate clan of the lords of Gara (Garai), and the ‘incapacity’ of the young Mary were blamed for the situation.

3.1.4 Queen Mary (1371-1395)

King Louis did not have a son and made significant efforts that his daughter, Mary should inherit the throne, an idea which was completely alien to the Hungarian inheritance customs.¹¹¹ The eleven-year-old Mary – who had been affianced to the son of Emperor Charles IV, the later Emperor Sigismund of Luxemburg when she was hardly a year old¹¹² –

¹¹⁰ For details see the unpublished MA Thesis of Brian Mc Entee. *Elizabeth, Queen of Hungary (1320-1380), and the Óbuda Clares: A Study in Reginal Burial Site Selection* and his article on the same subject Brian McEntee, "The Burial Site Selection of a Hungarian Queen: Elizabeth, Queen of Hungary (1320–1380), and the Óbuda Clares' Church." *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU* 12 (2006).

¹¹¹ On Mary see Bak János Bak, "Roles and Functions", 21-22.

¹¹² The boy Sigismund was brought to Hungary and raised at the Hungarian royal court to learn the languages and cultures of the kingdoms. Sigismund of Luxemburg (1368-1437), king of Hungary (1387-1437), Holy Roman Emperor (1433-1437). For most recent scholarship on Sigismund see *Sigismundus Rex et Imperator. Kunst und Kultur zur Zeit Sigismunds von Luxemburg, 1387- 1437: Ausstellungskatalog*. Ed. Imre Takács et.al. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2006; and *Sigismund von Luxemburg: ein Kaiser in Europa : Tagungsband des*

was crowned queen of Hungary (reigned 1382-1395) under the regency of the dowager Queen Elisabeth Kotromanić the day after her father's death. Mary was the only queen in her own right of medieval Hungary, but – as we have seen – her crowning introduced a period of crisis in the royal power since – using the words of Pál Engel – “being ruled by a woman must have appeared wholly absurd in a land of patriarchal customs, and where the nobility, regardless of their political sympathies, expected to be led to war by the king in person.”¹¹³ In the political plans of her father interpreted by the Venetian diplomat Lorenzo Monaci, Mary bore the title *rex feminus* “her sex remaining hidden under the title of rex” filling the gap between her father and her husband until she becomes of age and able to “help raise him to the throne”.¹¹⁴ During this succession crisis Mary's mother, Elisabeth tried to play the noble fractions against each other, without much success. The supporters of a pretender to the throne, Charles Durazzo, an Angevin from the Neapolitan-Sicilian branch forced the queens to abdicate and was crowned king of Hungary on 31 December 1385. Elisabeth's supporters assassinated him less than two months after his coronation, leading to a wide-spread rebellion in the country. The retinue of the queens was ambushed and the military escort, lead by the palatine Gara was killed while on the way to Zagreb a few months later. The queens were captured and incarcerated in a fortress of Gornec. They were taken to Novigrad where Elisabeth was strangled in front of her daughter. Shortly thereafter Sigismund of Luxemburg liberated his wife and became next king of Hungary.¹¹⁵ Mary died in 1395 in a riding accident, without bearing any heirs to the throne.

3.1.5 Barbara of Celje / Cilli (1390/1392-1451)

A more crucial development regarding the later development of the queen's power and court can be connected to the period of Sigismund's second wife, Barbara of Celje / Cilli

internationalen historischen und kunsthistorischen Kongresses in Luxemburg, 8.-10. Juni 2005 / hrsg. von Michel Pauly und François Reinert. Mainz am Rhein: Zabern, 2006.

¹¹³ Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 195.

¹¹⁴ See the interesting discussion of the question by Marianne Sághy. Marianne Sághy, "Aspects of Female Rulership in Late Medieval Literature: The Queen's Reign in Angevin Hungary" *East Central Europe - L'Europe du Centre Est Special Issue* vol. 20-23, part I (1993-1996): 78. See also Szilárd Süttő. Anjou-Magyarország alkonya. Magyarország politikai története Nagy Lajostól Zsigmondig, az 1384-1387. évi belviszályok okmánytárával. Szeged, 2003 and Szilárd Süttő. Der Dynastiewechsel Anjou-Luxemburg in Ungarn. In: Sigismund von Luxemburg. Ein Kaiser in Europa. Tagungsband des internationalen historischen und kunsthistorischen Kongresses in Luxemburg, 8-10. Juni 2005. Hrsg. von Michel Pauly und François Reinert, Mainz am Rhein 2006, 79-87.

¹¹⁵ Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 195-199., János M. Bak, "Queens as scapegoats", 230-231.

(1390/1392-1451) queen consort of Hungary.¹¹⁶ Sigismund reinforced his authority in the Kingdom by marrying the daughter of his supporter Hermann of Cilli, thus forming a close league with the mighty Cilli and Gara families.¹¹⁷ Barbara became the only medieval queen of Hungary who did not descend from a royal family. She is also the first queen of Hungary for whom the land donation relating to the marriage has survived.¹¹⁸ The largest part of the estates she received was in the southern part of the kingdom beyond the river Drava, with an occasional domain in the north, probably because her family's domains were also in the south. Surrounded by loyal councillors, the young queen acted in certain cases as the regent for her frequently absent husband. For reasons not known to us she lost the favour of the king when he returned to Hungary in 1419.¹¹⁹ He dispossessed Barbara, dissolved her court and according to the chronicles forced her and their child into exile for nine months to Várad (today Oradea in Romania).¹²⁰ In May 1421 she was already allowed to collect some of her revenues, e.g. requiring the burghers of Sopron to present all their receipts for their compulsory New Year gift from her coronation onwards¹²¹ and in 1423 Barbara was allowed to have a court again. Next year Sigismund gives her a significant new land grant including some of her earlier domains (Óbuda, Csepel Island, Kecskemét, etc.) and extends this with several royal towns of northern Hungary, including the counties of Trenčín and the revenues of the chamber of Kremnitz (Körmöcbánya, today Kremnica in Slovakia) and the eight northern mining towns belonging to it, and more. In 1427 she was allowed to have her own *magister tavernicorum* again and was granted one more castle, that of the strategically very well placed Altsohl (Zólyom, today Zvolen in Slovakia) in the vicinity of the mining towns.

¹¹⁶ Most recently analysed with a thorough reinterpretation of the sources by Amalie Fössel also including a summary of previous scholarship. Amalie Fössel, "Barbara von Cilli. Ihre frühen Jahre als Gemahlin Sigismunds und ungarische Königin" in *Sigismund von Luxemburg. Ein Kaiser in Europa. Tagungsband des internationalen historischen und kunsthistorischen Kongresses in Luxemburg, 8.–10 Juni 2005*, ed. Michel Pauly and François Reinert (Mainz am Rhein, 2006).

¹¹⁷ Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 207.

¹¹⁸ Edited by Gusztáv Wenzel. Gusztáv Wenzel, "Okmányi adalék Borbála és Erzsébet magyar királynék birtokáról (1424–1439) [Charter evidence on the domains of the Hungarian queens Barbara and Elisabeth]" *Magyar Történelmi Tár* 12 (1863): 268-287.

¹¹⁹ For an analysis of the political power of Barbara as regent for Sigismund, see Fössel Amalie Fössel, *Die Königin im mittelalterlichen Reich*, 369-372.

¹²⁰ Fössel does not believe that the accusations, whether of mismanagement or of having had a love affair with a German knight are justified. Amalie Fössel, "Barbara von Cilli", 112. In a later charter Sigismund stated that the queen herself had asked to be relieved of these domains, which were threatened by the Ottoman attacks and had requested domains in the more protected northern territories in exchange. 1429 Engel Pál Engel, *Királyi hatalom és arisztokrácia viszonya a Zsigmond-korban (1387-1437) [The relation of royal power and aristocracy in the Age of Emperor Sigismund]* (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1977), 74.

¹²¹ Jenő Házi, ed., *Sopron Szabad Királyi Város története. Part 1, Vol. 2. Oklevelek és levelek 1407-1427* (Sopron, 1921), 197-198. With thanks to Katalin Szende for the reference.

From this point on her power increased continuously and she received new land grants and mortgages repeatedly. She turned out to be an excellent manager of the domains and later regularly lent the king money in exchange for further properties pledged/mortgaged to her. At the death of Sigismund she was the wealthiest landowner of the kingdom.¹²² She also officially was given the right to appoint her own castellans from 1427, making it possible for her to have a high level of autonomy in the management of the domains.¹²³ Pál Engel notes that beside the main body of estates also the political setup of the officials of the queen's court underwent a significant change after 1423. In contrast to the previous queens, Barbara, in her new estate management practically did not have magnates, i.e. nobles of the highest ranks, thereby supporting the political program of Sigismund, who made an effort to rule without appointing magnates to administrative functions.¹²⁴ The harmony between the spouses was disturbed by Barbara's dislike of her son-in-law Albert V of Habsburg, later king of Hungary. In 1420 the king designated prince Albert IV of Habsburg as his successor if he should die without a male heir and had his daughter engaged to him. The king had to apply considerable pressure to have the succession accepted.¹²⁵ Directly before the death of Sigismund, Barbara tried to obstruct Albert's succession, supporting an alternative Polish succession plan instead, as a consequence of which she was taken captive and moved to Pressburg (Pozsony, today Bratislava in Slovakia) on the order of Sigismund four days before his death. When she turned against Albert again in 1438 she was dispossessed of all her Hungarian domains and was forced to escape to Poland and Bohemia, where she finished her long life in 1451, outliving her daughter and the next queen of Hungary, Elisabeth (1409-1442).¹²⁶

¹²² It is not known what led Sigismund to grant such enormous wealth to his wife, far more than what she needed „pro sui status et honoris conservatione”, as indicated in one of the donation charters. Given her talent at estate management and her function as a source of cash loans for the king Engel speculates that it may have been part of a conscious political design to make direct profit from the estates for the crown usually given as *honor* (possessions tied to certain offices) to loyal followers. Pál Engel, *Királyi hatalom és arisztokrácia*, 76.

¹²³ MOL DI 39 286. Quoted by Engel. Pál Engel, *Királyi hatalom és arisztokrácia*, 74-75.

¹²⁴ Pál Engel, *Királyi hatalom és arisztokrácia*, 76.

¹²⁵ Elemér Mályusz, "Az első Habsburg a magyar trónon [The first habsburg on the Hungarian throne]" *Aetas* 1 (1994): 200-202.

¹²⁶ Jörg K. Hoensch, *Kaiser Sigismund. Herrscher an der Schwelle zur Neuzeit 1368–1437* (München, 1996), 496-499. For basic literature on Elisabeth see Mollay's introduction to the edition. Helene Kottannerin, *Die Denkwürdigkeiten der Helene Kottannerin. Die ältesten Frauenmemorien des deutschen Mittelalters, 1439-1440* [=Wiener Neudrucke II.Bécs, 1971, ed. Karl (Károly) Mollay (Vienna, 1971), 1-9.; see also Engel and Tóth C. Pál Engel and Norbert Tóth C., *Királyok es királynék itineráriumi 1382-1437. Itineraria regum et reginarum 1382-1438* (Budapest: MTA, 2005).

The case of Queen Barbara offers several important conclusions, which also have significance for the analysis of the discussion of the power basis of Mary of Hungary. Firstly, it is important to draw attention to the body of domains given to Barbara. It is unclear whether in the Arpadian Age a group of estates can be designated as reginal estates, but at the first grant given as dower to Barbara, several estates were already considered “reginal estates” (Óbuda, Csepel, Kecskemét, etc.).¹²⁷ The towns and mining towns in the north of the kingdom granted in the second phase of donation instead of the Slavonian estates are significant because this body of estates will be the reference point for reginal domains in the marriage contracts of all late medieval queens. This did not mean that all queens received all the estates, but there is usually a reference to the estates previously owned by Queen Barbara. The second noteworthy element is that though Barbara received the estates – as this is usually formulated in marriage grants – for a lifetime, or until she remarries, the new king, her son in law took the estates from her as punishment for political scheming and gave them in part to the new queen, Elisabeth, daughter of Barbara. This action should be analysed within the larger context of the internal contradiction of reginal estates meant for the all time queen and the claim of queen dowagers to the estates for a lifetime referred to by Spiess above.¹²⁸ The enormous domains of the queen may have been a stabilising factor in Sigismund’s lifetime, but after his death they became an economic and political problem for his successor, which was solved by deposing her and giving the estates to the new queen. A third aspect I would like to draw attention to is the punishment inflicted upon the queen including the economic penalty of depriving her of her lands, sending her to exile and dissolving her household for three years. This points not only to the close connection between the queen’s income and her household, but also to the importance of the household as a power base of the queen.

3.1.6 Queen Elisabeth (1409-1442)

The position of Queen Elisabeth – analyzed in detail by Elemér Mályusz¹²⁹ – is significant because as daughter of the king she claimed to have power of a queen in her own right.¹³⁰ An

¹²⁷ István Kenyeres, *Uradalnok és végvárok. A kamarai birtokok és a törökellenes határvédelem a 16. században* (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2008), 62.

¹²⁸ See note 100 above.

¹²⁹ Elemér Mályusz, "Az első Habsburg". The article is unfortunately only available in Hungarian but contains an English and German summary.

¹³⁰ Mályusz brings many examples for this. Elemér Mályusz, "Az első Habsburg": 2004-205. Analysing the crowning ceremony of Elisabeth János Bak comes to the conclusion that she cannot be considered queen in her

intelligent and ambitious politician, Elisabeth used the support of the middle nobility (gentry) against the power of the barons and for increasing the authority of the king and herself as co-ruler.¹³¹ In the decree brought in 29 May 1439 at the Diet at Buda the gentry called Elisabeth the heir of the kingdom and pledged allegiance to the king and the queen („*quam principaliter hoc regnum iure geniture concernere dinoscitur*”), addressed them as co-rulers and expected both to maintain financial responsibility for the protection of the kingdom from the increasing Ottoman attacks. The queen had her own chancery and court officials. She obtained all the possessions that had once belonged to her mother and was given further estates, as well as 20 000 fl per year to cover the costs of her household. She also went into battle together with her husband, but only engaged in defensive warfare against the Ottoman attacks. Her husband died of an epidemic the same year resulting in a succession crisis since a large fraction of Hungarian nobles supported the election of an adult who could protect the country from the Ottoman invasion, while a smaller fraction supported the queen who was pregnant. Elisabeth tried to ensure the succession of the child by feigning to accept the suggestion of the Diet to marry king Wladislas III of Poland, but at the same time making plans to steal the Holy Crown of Hungary and escape to the relatives of her deceased husband.¹³² A fascinating account written down by Helene Kottanerin, member of the queen’s Frauenzimmer tells about how the crown was stolen from the treasury of the stronghold in Visegrád by the courageous Kottanerin according to the plans formulated by the queen and her cousin Count Ulrich of Cilli. It is described in detail how Helene Kottanerin and the ladies-in-waiting of the queen fled across the frozen River Danube on carriages and sleighs to Komárom. Here Queen Elisabeth awaited them, who went into labour the next day and gave birth to a baby boy, the future King Ladislas V.¹³³ The unique source written by a member of the queen’s Frauenzimmer also gives a valuable insight into the working and dynamics of the female

own right. János M. Bak, *Königtum und Stände in Ungarn im 14.-16. Jahrhundert* (Weisbaden: Franz Steiner, 1973), 169.

¹³¹ Elemér Mályusz, "Az első Habsburg": 216.

¹³² James Ross Sweeney, "The Tricky Queen and Her Clever Lady-in-Waiting: Stealing the Crown to Secure Succession, Visegrad 1440" *East Central Europe - L'Europe du Centre Est Special Issue* vol. 20-23 (1993-1996): 90-95.

¹³³ The fascinating memoirs of the lady-in-waiting of Queen Elisabeth who helped the pregnant queen escape and take the Holy Crown with her were first edited by Károly Mollay Helene Kottanerin, *Die Denkwürdigkeiten*. and later translated into English and accompanied by an introduction by Maya Bijvoet Williamson Helene Kottaner, *The memoirs of Helene Kottanner (1439-1440)*, ed. Maya Bijvoet Williamson (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1998). See also James Ross Sweeney, "The Tricky Queen and Her Clever Lady-in-Waiting: Stealing the Crown to Secure Succession, Visegrad 1440" *East Central Europe - L'Europe du Centre Est Special Issue* vol. 20-23 (1993-1996): 95-100.

household around the queen and gives evidence to its potential usage in the hands of an authoritative queen for attaining political ends.¹³⁴

In the later Middle Ages the offices of the queen's household lost some of their importance, they were no longer listed in royal charters, which included the names of the "genuine barons" of the realm. Toward the end of the period the holders of the reginal offices were increasingly not considered members of the baronial rank. The devaluation of the offices may have to do with the few periods in which medieval Hungary had a queen at all.¹³⁵ Due to historical circumstances, the years in which the Buda royal court lacked a residing queen outnumbered by far the periods in which queens were present. To be more precise, only in 26 of the 86 years between 1440 and 1526 a queen reside in the court.¹³⁶ Most importantly, this meant that customs relating to the presence of a queen at the court had very little continuity, thus traditions had not much time to develop and sink in. It also meant a quite dramatic change in court life every time a queen did appear. We have evidence that household personnel were male, down to the servants in charge of washing the dishes or the clothes.¹³⁷ Certainly the advisory and administrative members of the court were also men, meaning that in the absence of a queen the court was exclusively male. However, when a queen appeared in addition to bringing her own retinue and advisors, she was also accompanied by her ladies in waiting and servant body, as well as attracting ladies from the local nobility. This female element in itself must have changed the everyday of court life. One expects that the changes brought about by the arrival of the members a new queen's household resulted in tensions in the court life, especially so, if – as in the case of the Buda royal court – the presence of the queens was punctuated by long periods when no queens resided at the court.¹³⁸ As has been mentioned above the size of the reginal estates in late medieval Hungary was exceptionally large, even in international comparison.¹³⁹ Her possession of these extremely lucrative estates made the queen one of the largest land owners of the kingdom. Through her domains the

¹³⁴ For the relationship of Elisabeth to the royal domains as queen mother see BariskaIstván Bariska, "III. Frigyes gyámsági kormányzása és Nyugat Magyarország" *Századok* (2007). see also Mollay's comments to his edition Helene Kottanerin, *Die Denkwürdigkeiten*.

¹³⁵ András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary of Hungary and Politics between 1521 and 1526" in *Mary of Hungary: The Queen and Her Court 1521 - 1531*, ed. Orsolya Réthelyi et al. (Budapest: Budapesti Történeti Múzeum, 2005), 14-15.

¹³⁶ András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 13.

¹³⁷ András Kubinyi, "Alltag und Fest", 209-211.

¹³⁸ For a detailed discussion of the topic see Orsolya Réthelyi, "Ambiguous Loyalties?"

¹³⁹ Amalie Fössel, *Die Königin im mittelalterlichen Reich*, 78-79.

queen had a possibility to gain significant economic and political weight; whether she made use of this possibility depended chiefly on her personality, intelligence and ambitions. The queen also had the patron's right concerning religious institutions on her lands and could make use of this for the construction of a power base.

3.1.7 Beatrice of Aragon (1457-1508)

In the last fifty years of the medieval Hungarian kingdom four queens resided at the royal court. Twelve years after the death of his first wife Catherine (Kunhuta) of Podjebrad (1449-1464),¹⁴⁰ Matthias Corvinus (ruled 1458-1490) married Beatrice of Aragon, daughter of King Ferrante I of Naples and Isabel di Chiaramonte through a representative (*per procuram*) in Naples on 15 September 1476.¹⁴¹ After a long travel with a magnificent retinue the queen arrived at Székesfehérvár, where the nineteen-year-old Beatrice first met her husband and was crowned queen of Hungary in December 1476. The marriage was considered to be happy, especially in the first years. Matthias was fascinated by his clever, well educated and beautiful bride. Tension starts rising in the eighties, when after several years of marriage Beatrice is still childless, but does not support her husband's plans about making his illegitimate son (born in the period between the two marriages of Matthias) successor to his throne. Matthias died in 1490. From the several candidates to the throne the Hungarian estates support Wladislas Jagiello king of Bohemia. Wladislas agrees to marry Beatrice, whose financial and political power makes her a dangerous enemy, but a valuable ally. Behind her back Wladislas and the Hungarian magnates agree to perform a secret wedding ceremony with formal

¹⁴⁰ Catherine died young in childbed not long after she took residence in Buda. Because of complications around the crowning of Matthias, she was not yet crowned queen before her death. For the marriages and marriage plans concerning Matthias Corvinus see Réthelyi Orsolya Réthelyi, "King Matthias on the Marriage Market" in *Matthias Corvinus, the King: Tradition and Renewal in the Hungarian Royal Court, 1458-1490*, ed. Péter Farbaky et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2008), 248. For his illegitimate son Johannes Corvinus and the succession problems see Spekner Enikő Spekner, "'To be judged worthy of your illustrious father and to rule over the Hungarians.' Matthias' struggle for John Corvinus' Succession" in *Matthias Corvinus the King. Tradition and Renewal in the Hungarian Royal Court 1459-1490*, ed. Péter Farbaky et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2008).

¹⁴¹ For the diplomatic relations between Hungary and Naples see E. Kovács Péter E. Kovács, "Magyarország és Nápoly politikai kapcsolatai a Mátyás-korban [Political contacts between Hungary and Naples in the age of Matthias Corvinus]" in *Tanulmányok Szakály Ferenc Emlékére [Studies in memory of Ferenc Szakály]*, ed. Pál Fodor et al. (Budapest, 2002). The only monograph on Beatrice, which is a thorough, but by now in many aspects dated study of Albert Berzeviczy. His work is based on rich charter evidence collected and also published by the author. Albert Berzeviczy, *Beatrix királyné. Történelmi élet- és korrajz* (Budapest, 1908). The Italian version of the monograph was published under the title of *Beatrice d'Aragona*, Milano, 1931. Abridged French and Spanish translations also exist. Latest literature on the queen, especially on her role in artistic patronage and the relation to the early renaissance in Hungary see the article of Árpád Mikó Árpád Mikó, "Queen Beatrice of Aragon" in *Matthias Corvinus, the King: Tradition and Renewal in the Hungarian Royal Court, 1458-1490*, ed. Péter Farbaky et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2008).

mistakes, because neither party wants the aging and infertile Beatrice as a new queen. After giving Wladislas large sums of money to support his fight to secure the throne Beatrice is forced to realise that she has been deceived. Despite the bitter fight of Beatrice and her family the marriage is finally annulled by Pope Alexander VI ten years later, in 1500. Beatrice left Hungary in 1501 and lived in the kingdom of Naples and on the island of Ischia until her death in 1508. Beatrice was not popular in Hungary. Beside Bonfini's such indications, a letter by King Matthias from 1489 to the brother of Beatrice, Alfonso, heir to the throne of Naples gives the most outright evidence to the dislike of Beatrice by her Hungarian subjects. The King, seriously ill and struggling with the unsolved problem of succession and his wife's unreasonable ambitions writes about how his subjects do not like their queen, who, in turn, does nothing to make herself be liked by them. Later in the letter he expresses his worries that the queen may even be killed in the potential chaos following his death.¹⁴²

Unfortunately no comprehensive modern study has been made of the household of the queen, so I can only draw attention to some general characteristics. Berzeviczy mentions names many of her household officials, which give and these lists support the general idea and one of the main sources for complaint against Queen Beatrice, her favouring of Italians in her court offices causing a general sentiment against foreigners, especially from Italy. The changes caused by the queen in the royal court were also a source of tension. In the case of Beatrice we have the evidence of the humanist Italian historian Antonio Bonfini, who lived at the court as a reader to Beatrice and was commissioned by king Matthias to write the Chronicle of the Hungarians.¹⁴³ In an elaborate comparison of the king's court before the arrival of the queen to the court with a queen, he attributes most civilising measures to the influence of Beatrice. He describes the court of Matthias alone as simple, lacking in ceremony, where lords and soldiers had free access to their king. In contrast the arrival of the queen resulted in an intensified ceremonial aspect in court life, and at the table, limitations in the accessibility of the king, a rich cultural and artistic life and an increased expenditure. From other sources we know details such as Beatrice introducing the use of eating with a fork at the royal table. Galeotto Marzio, another court humanist also comments on how the Hungarians still ate from a common dish taking the meat with their hands and using a piece of bread, while South of the

¹⁴² Albert Berzeviczy, *Beatrix királyné*, 446-448.

¹⁴³ A. Bonfini, *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*, I. Főgel, B. Iványi and L. Juhász (eds.), Leipzig, 1936.

river Po individual plates are used.¹⁴⁴ The renaissance splendour and the patronage of arts, literature, sciences, architecture typifying the court of Matthias, which certainly were present in the court already before the arrival of the queen, intensified significantly from the second half of the 1470's.¹⁴⁵

Bonfini describes not only the changes brought about by Beatrice in life at the court but also the reaction of the Hungarians to these changes. It is very interesting to note the gendered language of his comparison. In his description, the Hungarians had a rough simplicity of domestic lifestyle, expressed a love of pomp only in their garments, horses and especially their weapons. If they listened to poems, these were of epic nature about heroes and wars, not love songs or romances. According to Bonfini, this masculine society reacted with strong disapproval and perhaps some anxiousness to the changes Beatrice's arrival brought about. They reproached the king for the great extravagance, they accused his majesty day after day of squandering money, of spending the taxes collected for more important reasons on worthless causes, forgetting the frugality and simplicity of kings of old, he has cast off native customs, discarded old tradition and takes pleasure in Latin, even Spanish practices, and customs which effeminise him. They also complained that King Matthias listens to his wife excessively.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁴ Galeotto Marzio. *De egregie, sapienter et iocose dictis ac factis Mathiae regis*. Ch. 17. It is interesting to note that the critique was not really justified since the use of individual plates and forks was by far not the rule in this period, rather an exception. Half a century later the use of a piece of bread as a plate and the use of bare hands instead of forks was common in the Brussel court of the regent Mary of Hungary. See Kerkhoff on the subject: „Plates were first only used for service: slices of bread or wooden boards called teljoor were used as plates. Forks were not yet used at the table, only spoons and knives. The use of tablecloths, napkins, plates and cutlery was not generally established yet. The use of spoons and knives was already quite common when the fork was introduced. But it can be established on the basis of reports that it was introduced early at Mary's court – no doubt because of the connections that she entertained with Italy, where its use by then had become general. But how it was used is still unclear.” Jacqueline Kerkhoff, "The Court of Mary of Hungary 1531-1558" in *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and her Court 1521-1531*, ed. Orsolya Réthelyi et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2005), 142.

¹⁴⁵ András Kubinyi, *Matthias Rex* (Budapest: Balassi, 2008), 132.

¹⁴⁶ I believe the detailed account of the “civilising measures” implemented by the queen and the description of the negative reactions of the locals justify quoting these two paragraphs from Bonfini's chronicle in full: “Postquam autem regina venerat, mensas et vivendi modum excoluit, fastidia domorum humilitate magnificas cenationes, exculpta triclinia, aurata cubicula introduxit, regem a popularitate revocavit, ianitores foribus apposuit assiduos, interceptit faciles aditus, regiam maiestatem ad servandum longe ambitiosius decorum redigit. Statis regem temporibus in auditorium prodire ac ius dicere monuit. Scythicis Italicos mores inseruit et latinis quoque epulis oblectavit. varias, quibus olim carebat, artes eximiosque artifices ex Italia magno sumptu evocavit. Quare pictores, statuarii, plastici, celatores et lignarii argentarii que fabri, item lapidice operarii et architect ex Italia conducti insanaque his impensa salaria; divinus hinc cultus adauctus, edicula regia accitis e tota Gallia Germaniae que cantoribus exculpta, quin et olitores, cultores hortorum agriculture que magistri ex Italia educti; qui caseos etiam Latino, Siculo Gallicoque more conficerent, evocati. Adiecti quoque histriones et mimi, quibus regina nimium indulisit; item monaule, utricularii, choraule ac citharedi. Invitati etiam muneribus poete,

An invaluable source for the practical working and the social dynamics of the queen's court is the tractate *De institutione vivendi* by Diomede Carafa. In the following paragraphs this source will be considered in greater detail, which, though written about the court of Beatrice, nevertheless offers significantly broader possibilities in application to the question of the queen's court. It is of a different category than the descriptive evidence of the letters, charters and envoys' reports, furthermore, it has been given relatively little attention in the discussion of queen's court.¹⁴⁷ Diomede Carafa – not only a learned diplomat of the Neapolitan court, but also the childhood tutor of Beatrice – wrote a work containing a list of practical advice for the young queen. According to its prologue, the *De institutione vivendi*, written in the form of a “Queen's mirror”, was composed at the request of Beatrice and given to her at her departure from Naples.¹⁴⁸ There are several elements that would deserve a deeper analysis, but I will here concentrate only on three aspects: the question of appointments to court offices and the composition of the queen's court; details on the practical questions and topographical arrangement of the Frauenzimmer; and finally the financial aspects of the household.¹⁴⁹

rhetores et grammatici, qui falsi opinione sua miseres longae musas, quam adduxerint, in Italiam reduxerunt. has omnes Mathias mirifice coluitque; Pannoniam alteram Italiam reddere conabatur. Viros quaque arte prestantissimos undique disquisivit conduxitque. Astronomos, medicos, mathematicos iurisque consultos dilexit; ne magnos quidem et nigromantes abominatus est; nullam artem contempsit unquam.

Contra Ungari politice culture ac deliciarum expertes hec omnia egre ferre, insanos damnare sumptus, regiam maiestatem quotidie incusare, quod pecunias ludibrio haberet, vectigalia ad meliores usus instituta in res fuitiles vanasque erogaret, a priscorum regum parsimonia et frugalitate descisceret, patrios et severos mores exueret, aboleret, antiquos ritus et ad Latinas, immo Gotalanicas delicias effeminatosque mores plane transfugeret. Mussitare quoque nimis uxorum et externos non modo aurum, sed principis indulgentia universum quotidie regnum populari; multa quoque obloqui et in malam partem accipere. At divus ille princeps amnium bonarum artium parens et fautor ingeniorum Ungaricos vulgo mores damnare, rusticitatem Scythicam et incultam vitam publice taxare, inhumanos passim ritus abominari, urbanitatem sensim introducere, proceres cum nobilitate ad politicum cultum hortari, iubere domos pro facultate magnificas erigere, vivere longe civilius ac sese mitius cum peregrinitate gerere, quam ante preter omnium opinionem abominabantur. Ad hec igitur omnia exemplo suo imprimis omnes invitavit.” Antonius de Bonfinis, *Rerum Ungaricum Decades*, Vol 4., ed. I. Fögel et al. (Leipzig, 1941), 135-136. See also Albert Berzeviczy, *Beatrix királyné*, 445.

¹⁴⁷ To my knowledge it has only been used in my own publications and in one study of Spiess Karl-Heinz Spiess, "Fremdheit und Integration".

¹⁴⁸ D. Carafa, *Memoriale a Beatrice d'Aragona Regina d'Ungheria*, B. Croce (ed.), Napels, 1894. New publication of both the Italian and the Latin version of the text, appended with a Hungarian translation was published in 2006. Diomede Carafa. *De institutione vivendi*. Budapest, OSZK, 2006. The text is highly personal and takes regard of the actual situation and the personality of Beatrice. The author has obviously made inquiries into the situation at the Hungarian royal court and bases his advice on these (e.g. he talks in detail about the importance of Beatrice's good relation with her mother in law, Erzsébet Szilágyi, or frequent references to the customs among the Hungarians). The theme and structure of the two versions is similar with some differences in style. The Latin elaborates the points in slightly greater detail. My quotations are from the Latin version.

¹⁴⁹ I will refer back to the question of language in the discussion of ethnic and linguistic questions in the household below. I write elsewhere about the tension arising from the conflicting expectations of the lands of birth and marriage as reflected in this book. Orsolya Réthelyi, "Ambiguous Loyalties?"

Regarding the authority in the deciding of the personal contingent of the household it can be stated that according to the source the decision was officially in the hands of the king, who was expected to give his approval to a certain extent of native element in the queen's retinue, especially in the female household. The *De Institutione Vivendi* is very informative and explicit on the question; Queen Beatrice is told to thank her husband, the king for allowing her to take with her and keep her female household from Naples,¹⁵⁰ but instructs her to ask the king and her mother-in-law repeatedly to place local women and men in her retinue, with whom she must make a show of being even kinder than with the people she brought with herself.¹⁵¹ She must make sure that the Italian courtiers do not provoke arguments or fights with the Hungarians and leave the solving of possible conflicts to her.¹⁵² Perhaps the most revealing passage is about the difference between those servants whom she brought with her and those she will be given in Hungary:

“I wish that you keep the following in mind and strictly follow my advice; you must treat those differently, whom your husband has assigned for service in your court than those with whom you have lived in your father's court. The latter have always striven to make your person more dear and lovable for your father, while the Hungarians will try to make you an object of hate. Therefore, just as the love of a father for his daughter differs from the affections of a husband for a wife, so are also these servants different from each other.”¹⁵³

Practical advice given by Carafa to Beatrice regarding her female household also involves aspects of the travelling household. He cautions her to make sure that a number of guards ride beside her ladies-in-waiting and serving women on the long trip to Hungary, to protect them

¹⁵⁰ “Quod viro gratias agat de ancillis Italicis sibi concessis: Agenda eidem abs te gratiae sunt, quod humanissime indulserit te posse uti ministerio Italicarum ancillarum, praesertim earum, quae apud te bonam partem aetatis consumpserunt idque ads te magnipendi, cum et de iis possis bene mereri, tum ut de te in posterum bonam prebeas opinionem.” Diomede Carafa, *Il memoriale a la serenissima regina de Ungaria De institutione vivendi*, ed. Péter Ekler (Budapest: OSZK, 2006), 38.

¹⁵¹ „Quid erga delegatos a marito viros et mulieres: Et quamvis Maiestas tua et litteris et nuntiis maritum admonuerit, ut ex gente panonica tam viros, quam mulieres destinet, qui in tua familiaritate futuri sint, tamen iterum (cum te non deceat) per socrum aut per alium quempiam admoneto, quod abs te vele o faciendum est, quod id etiam te non postulante instituerent. Qui ubi erunt delegati, ostendito iis nequaquam italicas tibi esse cariores.” Diomede Carafa, *De institutione vivendi*, 36.

¹⁵² “Eas tu diligenter admoneto, ut cum panonicis familiaribus quietissime vivant caveantque earum quampiam aut dicto aut facto laedere, immo omnia potius patientissime tollerent, adhortans te omnibus consulturam.” Diomede Carafa, *De institutione vivendi*, 38.

¹⁵³ “Illud te meminisse volo et tenacissime complecti: aliter tibi scilicet vivendum esse cum iis, quos maritus familiaritati tuae ascripsit, ac cum paternis vixeris; paterni enim in id solum incumbuerunt, ut semper patri carissima esses et gratissima, at rursus Pannonici, ut semper odio habearis. Itaque ut alius est paternus amor in filiam ab eo, quo maritus uxorem prosequitur, aequae utriusque familiaris differre scito” Diomede Carafa, *De institutione vivendi*, 38-39.

from the men who would like to approach them and talk to them. She must also warn the ladies not to answer questions, except if they receive explicit permission to do so. This is especially important since the Hungarians are said to be of jealous nature.¹⁵⁴ When she arrives to the buildings, where her rooms are assigned to her she should show special care of the rooms of the ladies-in-waiting. She should make sure that they are securely closed from the outside world. If she encounters unnecessary windows or doors, which provide possibilities for temptation; she must have these walled up immediately, without waiting for others to warn her about them, she should also caution her ladies to be distrustful of excessive friendliness.¹⁵⁵

The author takes it for granted that the queen will be in charge of the distribution of the money in her household. He warns Beatrice to economise wisely with the amount provided her by her husband for the upkeep of her household and servants, for the sake of avoiding unpleasant situations, but even more importantly not to lose the respect of her husband. This might cause him not to give any more, or in an even worse situation to assign somebody as an overseer or controller of the queen's possessions.¹⁵⁶ He also warns her of paying the people in her service, everybody according to their rank, and also providing for her ladies in waiting all that they need. She must not overreach her budget, because no one praises women who want to seem lavish: by nature women are meant to safeguard, while men are meant to earn and spend.¹⁵⁷ Carafa's tractate is valuable for our investigation not only because of his addressee,

¹⁵⁴ „De custode pedissequarum instituendo. Non est apud me dubium, quoniam id tute diligenter facere soles, te scilicet aliquem instituturam, qui semper pedissequas et ancillas tuas adequitet, ne a viris intercludi possint et cum iis colloqui. Velim te scire huic oneri non sufficere unum, sed pluribus opus esse. Nam unus saepe aut viarum angustiis remanere cogitur aut aliis necessariis rebus. Ad hec admonendae ipsae pedissequae, ut si etiam ad sermonem provocarentur, non respondeant, nisi ab iis data venia, quibus earum cura iniuncta est; quod profecto institutum apud omnes gentes et pulchrum et decorum est, sed imprimis apud Pannonicos, qui suapte natura zelotipi memorantur.” Diomede Carafa, *De institutione vivendi*, 24.

¹⁵⁵ „De cubiculis pedissequarum: In his aedibus, quae pro mansione tibi institutae erunt, imprimis habenda cura est cubiculi pedissequarum, idest ut bene occludatur; et si quae erunt fenestrae sive fores, quae videantur non necessariare, quam primum ut claudantur, efficito, neque ut id monearis, expectes; multa enim tentandi causa fieri consueverunt. Instituito, ut ancillae, quas hinc in tuam comitivam duxeris, diligenter caveant nimias familiaritates. Postremo illud admonuerim tales mores tibi sectandos, quales sese ibi observandos offerrent.” Diomede Carafa, *De institutione vivendi*, 35-36.

¹⁵⁶ „De pecuniis a marito constitutis bene locandis: Quae ad domus et familiae cultum pecuniae a marito constituentur, ut bene locentur, curandum est, ut satis sint; quod non modo in eo iactura foret carendi pecuniis, sed multo maior opinionem apud maritum perdendi. Esset enim causa, ut non solum posthac non tibi alia crederet, sed, quod multo turpius esset, aliquem ordinaret velut impendiorum tuorum custodem. Itaque sacra Maiestas, curandum est, ut voluntas et facultati et decoro consentiat. [...]” Diomede Carafa, *De institutione vivendi*, 39-40.

¹⁵⁷ „De salario familiaribus prospiciendo: postquam quae ad te pertinent bene instituta intelliges, ea cura negligenda non est, ut tuorum familiarium cuique salarium prospicias, habita cuiusque conditionis ratione. Mox mulieribus consulendum, ut nihil, quod necessarium sit, desit. [...] Nec Maiestas tua putet mulieribus dari laudi,

but also because the points he makes can be recognised in the discussions of European queen's households. The question of appointments to household posts figures as an important feature in this study, the question of the protection of the Frauenzimmer and the measures taken for this is discussed for instance in the case of the Innsbruck court of Mary of Hungary and Anne Jagiello by Heinig¹⁵⁸ and the financial aspect of the court is a returning theme in almost all the examples. It is impossible to say whether Queen Beatrice was influenced by Carafa on asking the advice of her mother-in-law regarding the affairs of the household, or whether she did her best to safeguard the Frauenzimmer. She is regarded to have been extravagant in her expenditure by her contemporaries and by her biographer, certainly not the thrifty wife, which the Italian diplomat advised her to be.

Regarding the incomes and estates of Queen Beatrice we also only have estimations. Unfortunately the marriage contract had been unknown until very recently.¹⁵⁹ We know from other sources that she brought with her a dowry of 200 000 ducats, of which 170 000 was in gold, the rest in jewellery. Since we do not have the contract, an estimation of Beatrice's income is very difficult and one must rely on reconstructing the land possessions secured for her by Matthias from later charters. Conspicuously, charters only give evidence of her possession of a part of the reginal estates from the second half of the 1480's. Since after the premature death of Catherine of Podiebrady the mother of Matthias, the extremely wealthy and powerful Erzsébet Szilágyi controlled most of the reginal estates, most of these went into Beatrice's possession only very gradually after the death of her mother-in-law in 1483.¹⁶⁰ It is suggested that at least in the first 8-10 years of her reign Beatrice had access to her husband's incomes to cover her expenses until she managed to obtain the reginal domains.¹⁶¹ In the chaotic years after the death of Matthias and after the election of Wladislas and his proclamation of the marriage with Beatrice as non-binding, the dowager stayed in Hungary,

quae liberaliores videri volunt. Quippe mulieres natura duce ad conservandum natae sunt, út viri et ad comparandum et ad expendendum. [...] Diomede Carafa, *De institutione vivendi*, 40-41.

¹⁵⁸ Paul-Joachim Heinig, "Umb merer zucht und ordnung willen. Ein Ordnungsentwurf für das Frauenzimmer des Innsbrucker Hofes aus den ersten Tagen Kaiser Karls V. (1519)" in *Das Frauenzimmer. Die Frau bei Hofe in Spätmittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, ed. Jan Hirschchbiegel and Werner Paravicini (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2000).

¹⁵⁹ At the last revision stage of this text a copy of the marriage contract – previously unknown to Hungarian scholarship – has actually been identified. Unfortunately I have not yet had the occasion to investigate it.

¹⁶⁰ István Kenyeres, *Uradalmak és végvárak*, 63. For the charter evidence of the land possessions of Erzsébet Szilágyi see Ányos Lajos Ányos, "Szilágyi Erzsébet oklevelei I [The charters of Erzsébet Szilágyi I]" *Levéltári Közlemények* (1927). furthermore Zsuzsa Teke. „Szilágyi Erzsébet”.In: *Nők a magyar történelemben*.Budapest: Zrínyi Kiadó, 1997. 26-45.

¹⁶¹ Albert Berzeviczy, *Beatrix királyné*, 266-267.

mostly in Esztergom, where her nephew, Hippolyte d'Este was the archbishop. She kept possession of the reginal estates, which must have been specified as a standard feature in her marriage contract. She stayed in the country in the period when the representatives of Wladislas and the representatives of her family fought over the request of the annulment of the marriage in Rome.¹⁶² She left the kingdom at the end of 1500 after the papal decision against her case, which even burdened the costs of the legal procedure on the widowed queen. The outcome of the trial was largely due to the large sums of money given to the papal court by Wladislas to influence the case.¹⁶³ The last part of the reginal estates, the castle of Zólyom (Zvolen) and the wealthy mining towns were pawned to the Thurzó family the same year. In the next eight years she fought for the retrieval of her dowry with renewed strength, but neither the repeated papal letters to Wladislas, nor the efforts of kings and legates had any result and she died in September 1508 without receiving it, living in Naples from means provided by her family. Wladislas' treatment of the widowed queen was regarded by general disapproval in the contemporary opinion.¹⁶⁴

3.1.8 Anne of Foix (1484-1506)

Even before having obtained the divorce, the aging Wladislas was on the lookout for a bride. The French-Polish-Hungarian political alliance of August 1500, and the long awaited divorce granted by the pope from both Beatrice and Barbara of Brandenburg¹⁶⁵ resulted in a *per procuram* marriage between the king and Anne of Foix. The marriage contract is dated to 23 March 1502 in Blois. Anne of Foix, daughter of Gaston II de Foix, count of Candale and Catherine de Foix was a cousin of the French queen, Anne of Bretagne, and a member of the French royal court.¹⁶⁶ In contrast to Beatrice, medieval sources about Anne of Foix are scarce, probably due to the mere four years she spent in Hungary, between her arrival to Buda in

¹⁶² Fort the power shifts in European alliances, which influenced the divorce case see E. Kovács Péter E. Kovács, "Magyarország és Nápoly", 245.

¹⁶³ Berzeviczy brings several contemporary sources in Italy and Hungary, who clearly state that the decision was bought by Wladislas for much money. Albert Berzeviczy, *Beatrix királyné*.

¹⁶⁴ Interestingly Mátyás Bél, a Hungarian historian in the eighteenth century explained all the misfortunes encountered by Wladislas and his son Louis as punishment for the wrongs done to Beatrice. Matyás Bél, *Notitia Regni Hungariae Novae, Pars I. tom. 3. 236*. Quoted by Berzeviczy Albert Berzeviczy, *Beatrix királyné*.

¹⁶⁵ Wladislaw had made a marriage alliance with 1476 with Barbara of Brandenburg, which was, however, not consummated. Gusztáv Wenczel, "II Ulászló magyar és cseh király házas élete 1501-1506 [The Married Life of Wladislaw II, King of Hungary and Bohemia]" *Századok* 11 (1877).

¹⁶⁶ Anna de Foix was also a cousin of Germaine de Foix, who later became the second wife of Ferdinand of Aragon (1505). It was hoped that Germaine would provide the old king with an heir to the throne to avoid the Habsburg succession to the throne of Aragon. Indeed she gave birth to a son, who died immediately after his birth. Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria van Hongarije*, 30.

1502 and her death in 1506. Consequently, modern Hungarian and Czech historiography barely mentions her.¹⁶⁷ A precious exception in the scarce source material is the detailed report which gives account of Anne's journey, the festivities in the Italian city-states, and the queen's coronation and arrival to Buda. It is written by the herald in the service of the French Queen Anne of Bretagne, Pierre Choque, who was commissioned by his lady to observe and give a written report on the events of Anne's trip to the distant Hungarian kingdom.¹⁶⁸ Anne and her entourage arrived in Székesfehérvár on 27 September where she was met by Wladislas. Two days later she was crowned here and the marriage ceremony took place. She entered the town of Buda in October. The marriage between the 18 year old Anne and the 45 year old Wladislas was considered to be happy. The couple's daughter, Anne Jagiello was born on 23 July 1503. Their son Louis, later King Louis II was born three years later, on 1 July 1506. Anne of Foix died three weeks after the delivery of her son in child-bed fever. Anne seems to have enjoyed greater popularity than her predecessor on the queen's throne. According to the report of Sebastian Justiniani, envoy of the Venetian Republic in March 1503: "*The authority of the king is small, but the queen is so well liked by the Hungarians that in less than two years she will be king and queen in one person.*"¹⁶⁹ Upon Anne's death Benedetti, another envoy of Venice reports that the queen, beloved for her wisdom was mourned by all. The Czech chronicler Johannes Dubravius describes a similarly positive relationship between queen and subjects.¹⁷⁰ Her popularity is no doubt largely due to the fact that she was able to provide the king with a male heir in a period which was dominated by the

¹⁶⁷ Some exceptions are: Lajos Kropf, "Anna királyné, II. Ulászló neje [Queen Anne, wife of Wladislaw II]" *Századok* 29 (1895).; Gusztáv Wenczel, "II Ulászló házasa élete"; 1501-1506 [The Married Life of Wladislaw II, King of Hungary and Bohemia]" *Századok* 11 (1877).; Macek, Josef: *Tři ženy krále Vladislava (The Three Wives of King Ladislas)*. Prague. Mladá fronta. 1991.

¹⁶⁸ Antoine Le Roux de Lincy. Discours des cérémonies du mariage d'Anne de Foix, de la maison de France, avec Ladislas VI, roi de Bohême, précédé du discours du voyage de cette reine dans la seigneurie de Venise, le tout mis en écrit du commandant d'Anne, reine de France, duchesse de Bretagne, par Pierre Choque, dit Bretagne, l'un de ses rois d'armes. Mai 1502., *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, 1861, n° 1, pp. 156-185, 422-439.

¹⁶⁹ Gusztáv Wenzel, "Marino Sanuto világkrónikájának Magyarországot illető tudósításai III. 1515-1526 [Fragments from the world-chronicle of Marino Sanuto relating to Hungary]" *Magyar Történelmi Tár* 25 (1878): 70.

¹⁷⁰ Gusztáv Wenczel, "II Ulászló házasa élete": 838-840. There is, however, at least one different opinion expressed by the early sixteenth century Hungarian chronicler, György Szerémi, who gives a very different picture of Anne de Foix. In his largely unreliable collection of scandals he reports how Queen Anne, jealous of the popularity of the son and daughter of Johannes Corvinus, the illegitimate son of King Matthias, had the innocent children poisoned to ensure the succession of her own son. This is an obvious piece of nonsense, purely on basis of the dates, but express some of the anxiousness surrounding the idea of the interests of a foreign queen. György Szerémi, *Epistola de perdicione Regni Hungarorum. (Szerémi György emlékirata Magyarországról 1456-1543)*. (*Monumenta Hungariae historica II. Scriptores 1.*), ed. Gusztáv Wenczel (Pest, 1857).

political turmoil and nationalistic propaganda around the question of succession to the Hungarian throne.¹⁷¹

Queen Anne's marriage contract gives evidence that she brought with her 40 000 franks dowry and that Wladislas secured an annual 30 000 Florins for his wife from the reginal estates.¹⁷² Reports of the Venetian envoys give account of how the king compensated his wife with frequent presents for this relatively low amount, or perhaps for the fact that Anne did not always receive the full amount from the reginal estates, many of which were loaded with debts and mortgaged. According to certain opinions in earlier literature Wladislas was not able to secure the reginal estates on his wife as marriage portion,¹⁷³ but this statement is contradicted by the wording of the marriage contract. The field definitely requires further research before one is able to draw conclusions on the continuity of the reginal estates. Here again, we know very little of the queen's actual income and next to nothing about the queen's household, its expenses, or its relation to the royal court.¹⁷⁴ The names of some of her officials are known, her secretary was János Gosztonyi and her estates were managed by Johannes Melakh de Gozono.¹⁷⁵ Certain charters give evidence of estate management activities by the queen and tempting details about further administrative bodies. The best example is the charter issued by queen Anne in 1503 on the question of a disputed lake on the Island of Csepel, which both the people of the town of Kevi (today Ráckeve), and the officials of the queen's residence and estates claimed as their own. The people of the town turned to Queen Anne who decided that the case was to be determined by the lawyers (*ítélőmester / protonotarius*) of the queen's court and those of the kingdom. The final outcome was in

¹⁷¹ For the volatile political situation of Hungary in the first years of the fifteenth century and the Degree of Rákos see András Kubinyi, "The Road to Defeat: Hungarian Politics and Defense in the Jagiellonian Period" in *From Hunyadi to Rákóczi. War and Society in Late Medieval and Early Modern Hungary*, ed. János M. Bak and Béla K. Király (Brooklyn, 1982)., Rady Martyn Rady, "Rethinking Jagiełło Hungary 1490–1526" *Central Europe* 3 (2005). Anne was the first Hungarian queen since 1326 who was able to provide a male heir in the lifetime of her husband. Queen Elisabeth gave birth to her son, Ladislaus V (Posthumus) on 22 February 1440, after the death of her husband Albert which did not solve the question of succession, but introduced a period of political chaos in Hungary.

¹⁷² Orsolya Réthelyi, "Marriage Contracts and Possessions of Late Medieval Hungarian Queens." Unpublished paper given at the *Workshop on Medieval and Early Modern Queens and Queenship: Income and Patronage*, Central European University, Budapest, 2004. The marriage contract is not known in Hungarian historiography. I have found a nineteenth century copy in the archives and am working on a future edition of the text.

¹⁷³ See István Kenyeres, *Uradalma és végvárák*, 64., who quotes earlier literature to support his point.

¹⁷⁴ There are extant charters of the queen's estate management, but no overall study has been made of these.

¹⁷⁵ See for instance Queen Anne's charter to the mining towns in which she talks of Melakh as „Magnificum Joannem Melakh de Gozono Gubernatore Curie nostre”. Buda 23 08 1505, Hofkammerarchiv, Vermischte Ungarische Gegenstände, Rote Nummer 1, Folio 19. He is also referred to as “le sieur de Meslac, chevalier d'honneur d'icelle dame”. Lajos Kropf, "Anna királyné": 709.

favour of the town and the queen commanded her officials to withdraw all claims on the lake.¹⁷⁶

3.2 The royal court and administration in the Jagiellon Age

After the above chronological overview of the households of Hungarian queens the discussion of the court will be continued by a summary of the institution of the royal court in the Jagiellon period (1492-1526). The period receives its name from Wladislas II and Louis II of Jagiellon, both kings of Hungary and Bohemia, who subsequently occupied the throne of the Hungarian Kingdom.¹⁷⁷ The role and function of the court nobility in the fourteenth century was ascertained and described in detail by Pál Engel.¹⁷⁸ Here he differentiates between the terms *curia* and *aula* with reference to the royal court in the following manner:

That in the late Middle Ages the king's 'court' (*curia*) and his 'palace' (*aula*) were still carefully distinguished has so far escaped attention. There is good reason to believe that this distinction is crucial, but little is known about its real nature. It may be supposed that by *aula* was meant the 'private court' of the king (more or less the equivalent of what was called the royal household elsewhere), while the *curia* denoted the king's 'public court', and was more or less identical with his council where he was assisted by the prelates and the barons.¹⁷⁹

For the court of the Jagiellon kings, Kubinyi also separates the narrower circle of household (Hung. "udvartartás"), responsible for the personal service of the king and his immediate family and the court (Hung. "udvar") which included the people involved in the administration: the royal council, the chancery, the court of justice and the royal treasury.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁶ Charter of Queen Anne from 18 08 1503. MOL DL 32556.

¹⁷⁷ In the following description of the Jagiellon royal court I summarize the finding of András Kubinyi and base my argumentation on these. Kubinyi has published on the royal court in several of his articles, most comprehensively in András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar". An earlier article on the Jagiellon court is also available in German András Kubinyi, "Alltag und Fest".

¹⁷⁸ Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 145-148.

¹⁷⁹ Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 145.

¹⁸⁰ Kubinyi comes to this conclusion in one of his latest articles on the Jagiellon court. András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar", 15. The Hungarian terminology is modern, both as terms and as defined groups. In the medieval sources Latin names were used and such differentiation was not made. I give the Hungarian terms here, because no consensus exists in Hungarian secondary literature yet due to the relatively small number of publications dealing with medieval court structures.

The chief governing body of the kingdom was the royal council consisting officially of all the barons and prelates of the realm.¹⁸¹ This group of 60-70 people was obviously too large to manage the day-to-day tasks, which was done by a smaller group of 8-10 people forming a kind of inner council making decisions about those issues of domestic and foreign policy, which did not need parliamentary sanction.¹⁸² When the sovereign was in Buda the royal council held its sessions in the palace. Constant members were the holders of chief governmental offices: the palatine, the judge royal (*iudex curiae*), the so called “Master of the treasury” *magister tavernicorum*¹⁸³, the Steward of the royal court (*magister curiae*), the chancellor and some of the other prelates. The role of the Lord Chancellor (*aulae regiae cancellarius*) was the most influential in the royal council, because he held the royal seals.¹⁸⁴ He was also the leader of the chancery, which meant that all documents passed through his hands, giving him a possibility to control and influence the administration. He was appointed by the king, but also had to take into account the opinions of the prelates and barons. He was helped in his work by the notaries of the chancery. The secretaries of the king should not be counted to the chancery, though they did help out with the work there. They were appointed by the king and were often also councillors as well (*secretarius et consiliarius*); typically they were sophisticated individuals, often with a university education, frequently from middle class burgher, or tenant peasant background. Kubinyi compares them to the educated councillors appearing in increasing number in the royal councils of Western Europe.¹⁸⁵

In this period the court of justice included three central offices, two of them – the palatine, and the judge royal – were magnates, the third was a professional who represented the king (*personalis praesentiae regiae in iudiciis locumtenens*). He was also the keeper of the judicial

¹⁸¹ Kubinyi investigates different aspects of the royal council in the Jagiellon age in a number of articles. See especially András Kubinyi, "A királyi tanács köznemesi ülnökei a Jagelló-korban (The Royal council members from the middle nobility under the Jagellos)" in *Mályusz Elemér emlékkönyv*, ed. Éva Balázs H. et al. (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1984). and András Kubinyi, "Bárók a királyi tanácsban Mátyás és II. Ulászló idején [Barons in the Royal Council in the time of Matthias Corvinus and Wladislas II]" *Századok* (1988).

¹⁸² Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 352-353.

¹⁸³ The title “master of the treasury” is misleading, since the *magister tavernicorum* is the title of a royal officer, originally responsible for the king’s finances and provisioning, derived from the Hungarian name for the guards of the royal magazines (*tavernici*); in this age it was no longer associated with the treasury, but was rather the presiding judge of the appeal court of certain royal cities (*sedes tavernicalis*). István Werbőczy, *The Customary Law of the Renowned Kingdom of Hungary: A Work in Three Parts Rendered by Stephen Werbőczy (The “Tripartitum”)* (1517), ed. János M. Bak et al. (Budapest: CEU Press, 2005), 451-452.

¹⁸⁴ “Whatever the ruler continued to have a say in – such as royal grants, the principles of foreign policy and appointments to ecclesiastical benefices – was in fact decided by the chancellor” Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 353.

¹⁸⁵ András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar", 20.

seal. Four legal professionals (*prothonotarius*) assisted the judges, one each for the palatine and the judge royal, and two for the king. According to ancient custom the high judges did their work in the company of assessors drawn from among the barons, prelates and nobles.¹⁸⁶ The king could act as co-judge for a given case, and took over the control of the court case in more important matters. In the cases when the king presided the court session, this took place within the palace, but it is unknown exactly where the location would have been. It is possible that in other cases the court held sessions in the town of Buda.¹⁸⁷ The *curia militaris* was the central link between the court as organ of judgement and as household. Originally it counted as a separate court for the royal household, later cases of honour belonged to this court. The parties were obliged to appear in person, not represented by lawyers and ordeal by single combat was often the decisive means of judgement. Judgement was brought by the king, who was in practice substituted by the judge royal (*iudex curiae*), or by the royal Steward (*magister curiae*). From the time of the economic reforms of Matthias Corvinus in 1464-68 the financial matters of the kingdom were managed by the royal treasurer (*thesaurarius*) and his *familiares*. It is unclear whether this took place in the palace or in the town of Buda. The royal treasury – where the *Libri Regii*, e.g. copies the royal granting charters, and other treasures, including the armour of the king were kept – was in charge of the *tavernici*, and was in the royal palace beside the Stephan-tower.¹⁸⁸

The narrower category of the royal household was then responsible for the personal service of the king. With some resemblance to the differentiation between gentle and menial servants, Kubinyi subdivides this group into three sub-categories: (1) The court nobility, who – in a system similar two western courts – received salary after a certain number of horses, that is armed horsemen, who would ride to battle with the noblemen. (The group could include non-noble burghers, who had the same rights as the nobles once they were on the king's pay-list.) (2) The body of menial servants, who were usually non-noble (with notable exceptions like the court cooks, who were lower nobles from the village of Oroszi and Szakácsi, and Ferenc

¹⁸⁶ Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 191.

¹⁸⁷ András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar", 16-17.

¹⁸⁸ The *tavernici* did not belong under the *magister tavernicorum*, who had been in charge of the royal incomes up to the Anjou Era, but in our period was in charge of juridical court appeals of the towns. On the Buda Palace and its functional division see the recent dissertation of Károly Magyar and his articles on the subject Károly Magyar, "'Et. introivit ad Hungariam sola germanica ancilla nomine Maria.' Mary of Hungary and Buda" in *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and her Court 1521-1531*, ed. Orsolya Réthelyi et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2005). and Károly Magyar, "Residenzen des Königs und der Königin" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007).

Mosó, the washer of the king's clothes, also of lower noble origin), including ushers, grooms, wagoners, tailors, gunsmiths, shoemakers, painters, etc. (3) A miscellaneous third group includes the royal secretaries, the personnel of the chapel, the physicians, astronomers, musicians, hunting personnel, etc and is typified by not belonging to either of the first two groups.¹⁸⁹ The situation is further complicated by the relationship between the royal court and the personnel of the Buda castle. The Buda castle was under the jurisdiction of the castellan (*castellanus castris Budensis*) and the royal estate manager (*provisor curiae castris Budensis Hung. udvarbíró*). Kubinyi argues that though the royal court resided predominantly in Buda, the castle personnel should formally not be regarded as part of the royal household, even though the *provisor curiae* was responsible for the management of all the royal estates, and as such was the superior of the royal dispenser (*dispensator regius*), who in turn was the boss of the personnel of the royal kitchen and cellar.¹⁹⁰ All members of the household were on the royal pay-roll and received a salary from the king.

The court nobility served in one of the departments of the household, but as the above case demonstrates it is often difficult to delineate the separate departments of the household. Some of these departments are more visible, some hardly discernable from the records. The most visible and numerous department was that of the chamber. The account book of 1525 mentions the names of 73 gentlemen of the chamber (*cubicularii*), who assumedly served the king in groups of eight. In the same source there is record of 18 gentlemen of the table (*dapiferi*), but the other departments cannot be pinpointed. The court nobility can be also categorised according to rank.¹⁹¹ According to the order of hierarchy in the Jagiellon Era members of the court nobility (*aulici*) were either pages (*parvulus, aprodianus*), squires (*adolescens*), or belonged to the group of court *familiares* (*aulae familiaris*).¹⁹² As this is also visible in the salary given according to the number of horses, court nobility had a military function. A distinction is made between the court light cavalry (*aulicus huzaro*), a term which

¹⁸⁹ András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar", 20.

¹⁹⁰ András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar", 20-21.

¹⁹¹ Some sort of court nobility must have existed in the Arpadian Age. In the twelfth century there are records of nobles who stood in the service of the king. At least in the fourteenth century the ranks of the court nobility had developed, which remained relatively stable till the end of the Middle Ages, with some minor changes in the terminology. In the fourteenth century one finds the mention of pages (*aulae parvulus*), squires (*aulae juvenes*), and knights (*aulae miles*). Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 146. See also the study of Agnes Kurcz on courtly culture. Ágnes Kurcz, *Lovagi kultúra Magyarországon a 13-14. században* (Budapest, 1988).

¹⁹² This category was not necessarily a marker of age. Perhaps it indicated marital status. András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar", 24.

emerged in the Jagiellon period and the other group, presumably consisting of knights in heavy armour. Both groups were partially stationed at the royal court in Buda, and partially in the castles in the border region. The two groups together constituted the *banderium* of the King.¹⁹³

A further characteristic specific to the Jagiellon royal court was that both Wladislas and Louis were kings of both Hungary and Bohemia. Though a separate royal court existed in Prague, both kings were served by court nobles from both kingdoms. In addition to the Bohemians a number of Polish people could also be found in the court because of the Polish roots of the Jagiellon family and the close family ties with the king of Poland.¹⁹⁴ According to the calculations of Kubinyi non-Hungarian subjects (mainly Bohemians and Poles) made up slightly more than half of the court nobility under Louis II. The two groups of subjects stood under the leadership of its own Steward (*magister curiae*).¹⁹⁵ This virtually even distribution of the court offices between people from the Hungarian and Bohemian crowns is no coincidence. It is rather a reflection of a Letter of Majesty (Majestätsbrief) issued by King Wladislas in 1510 in which he promised his Bohemian subjects that members of both crowns will be evenly represented in the courts of both his children.¹⁹⁶ The group of the subjects of the Hungarian crown was therefore by no means ethnically and linguistically homogeneous. There are several records of tensions between different ethnic/linguistic groups.¹⁹⁷

The main four court officials of the Jagiellon royal household were the Master Doorkeeper/Usher (*magister ianitorium regalium*), who also served as the Steward (*magister curiae regiae*), the Master Carver (*magister dapiferorum / structorum regalium*), the Master

¹⁹³ András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar", 24-25. The number of the court nobles together with their familiares amounted to a thousand men. The king was required to have a body of 1000 knights under his banner, according to the 21 paragraph of the laws of 1498. Dezső Márkus, ed., *Corpus juris hungarici. Magyar törvénytár. 1000-1526* (Budapest: Franklin, 1899), 576-578.

¹⁹⁴ Prince Sigismund, the later Sigismund I, king of Poland was brother of Wladislas and had resided at Buda for a longer period before his coronation.

¹⁹⁵ András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar", 24.

¹⁹⁶ Franz Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen: Größtentheils nach Urkunden und Handschriften. Fünfter Band: Das Zeitalter der Jagelloniden. Zweite Abtheilung: König Wladislaw II und König Ludwig I. Von 1500 bis 1526.* (Prague: In Commission bei Friedrich Tempsky, 1867), 194-195. This charter is analysed in detail below in the chapter on the court and languages.

¹⁹⁷ E.g. in 1524 the imperial ambassador reported that Hungarian pages repeatedly made fun of foreigners, which could have caused trouble, had the king not stopped it in time. Letter of Schneidpöck to Salamanca. 04 04 1524. Quoted by Kubinyi András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar kormányzati szerepe mohács előtt [The role of the royal court in the government before Mohács]" *Székhogyalók a Magyar Tudományos Akadémián* (2005): 25.

Cup-bearer (*magister pincernarum / pocillatorum regalium*) and the Master of the Horse or Marshall (*magister agazonum regalium*).¹⁹⁸ The holders of these offices ranked as “genuine barons” (*veri barones regni*) of the realm.¹⁹⁹ In contrast to many countries these offices never became hereditary in Hungary; the king had the power of appointing and terminating the appointment. It is not clear to what extent the chief offices required regular attendance at court. In the Jagiellon period the office of the Marshall, the Master Carver and the Master Cup-bearer seem to have become ceremonial functions which were practiced on the occasion of important events while the everyday tasks were delegated to a deputy officer.²⁰⁰ The Steward and the relatively new office of the royal Master of the chamber (*magister cubiculariorum*, created by Wladislas in 1490) both had tasks in the household, which necessitated their presence. The Steward also had an important political function in the royal council; after debating an issue he was responsible for asking every member individually for their opinion before the making of a decision, as well as officially announcing the decision. He can therefore be considered the head of the royal council. However, neither officer can be considered as the absolute leader of the household, since the Master of the chamber who, according to the 1523 reform suggestions was responsible for the valuables and the personal safety of the king, was not a lower rank than the Steward.²⁰¹ A further factor complicating the household structure is that certain household offices, the Steward and the Master of the chamber for instance, could be simultaneously held by two people of the same rank.²⁰²

3.3 Location, size and form

Medieval courts were typically itinerant, travelling from one residence to another, a tendency which decreased gradually towards the end of the Middle Ages. This form of life had obvious

¹⁹⁸ András Kubinyi, "Alltag und Fest", 202.

¹⁹⁹ “Under Matthias, membership of the royal council had been fluid and had consisted of the principal office-holders, leading churchmen, and the largest landowners. Inclusion in the ranks of the council generally merited the title of baron. In the 1490s, however, permanent membership of the council and thus qualification for the title of baron, was narrowed down to the main office-holders and churchmen — the so-called *barones veri*. To their number was added a fixed group of powerful landowners and their heirs who were considered sufficiently rich to be able to field their own *banderia* — the so-called *barones naturales*. These two groups, the *barones veri* and the *barones naturales*, were alone entitled to style themselves as *magnifici*, could use red-wax seals, received personal invitations from the king to attend any forthcoming Diet, and were entitled to attend meetings of the royal council. Although it was still possible for individuals to break through into the baronage, this became an increasingly rare phenomenon.” Martyn Rady, "Rethinking Jagiello Hungary": 12-13.

²⁰⁰ Bonfini writes that at the wedding of Matthias Corvinus the most powerful magnates served the royal couple at the table. András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar".

²⁰¹ András Kubinyi, "Alltag und Fest", 204.

²⁰² András Kubinyi, "Alltag und Fest", 204. I have not found any parallels to this situation in other courts and believe that the reasons for such a development would deserve further attention.

consequences for the logistics of court life which are well documented in many court records in Western Europe. In medieval Hungary the town of Buda emerged as the most important royal residence during the second half of the fourteenth century, but the itinerant aspect of royal life did not cease completely until the end of the middle Ages.²⁰³ The Jagiellon Kings were kings of both Hungary and Bohemia, but both Wladislas and Louis reigned over the two kingdoms using Buda as principle residence. The king had a separate body for the government of Bohemia, and had a separate Czech chancery. When he held court in Bohemia his regent in Hungary was the palatine.

In the period between 1521 and 1526 the royal couple and their households spent two longer periods away from the royal residence of Buda. On 24 February 1522 they left Buda and travelled to Prague to attend to matters of state and have Mary crowned queen of Bohemia. After a longer period spent in Prague and a shorter stay in the Moravian Olomouc they returned to Buda more than a year later, in April 1523. In October of the same year the couple travelled through Sopron to Wiener Neustadt to attend the diplomatic summit between the king and queen of Hungary, the Archduke and Archduchess of Austria, and the Polish chancellor as representative of his king. Accompanied by the Polish delegate, Louis and Mary continued to Pressburg in November, from where they returned to Buda in February 1524. From then on to the Battle of Mohács their residence in Buda is only interrupted by shorter visits to other royal residences and hunting lodges. The size of the retinue accompanying the royal couple to their travels is not known. Unfortunately there is no record of the royal couple spending a longer period of time in two separate locations which would perhaps make the distinction of the separate households of the king and queen easier.

It is notoriously difficult to calculate court sizes and because different researchers have different criteria as to who belongs within and without the court the comparisons are not always meaningful.²⁰⁴ Kubinyi calculates the size of the royal household to about 450-500 people, excluding the royal council, the judges of the royal court of justice, the chapel and the

²⁰³ Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 147.

²⁰⁴ Paul-Joachim Heinig, "How large was the Court of Emperor Frederick III?" in *Princes Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, cc. 1450-1650*, ed. Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

court of the queen, and the “horses”, i.e. men in arms serving the court nobility.²⁰⁵ This amount of people was not present at the court simultaneously, since a significant number of them performed military service in the border region. If one includes the royal council, the chancery, and the law court, this number could approach a thousand people, not all of whom were at the court at any given time.²⁰⁶ This is rather a large number in comparison with the contemporary Habsburg royal courts, that of Maximilian in 1519, amounting to above 450 people, and that of Ferdinand in 1527/28 amounting to about 360 people.²⁰⁷ However these latter calculations only count those people directly on the prince’s pay role, which makes the comparison difficult. The court of the English kings, by comparison had 400 to 700 servants in the fourteenth century, about 800 during the reign of Henry VI, and continued growing during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,²⁰⁸ while Charles V’s itinerant court amounted to between 1000 and 2000 members.²⁰⁹ Nevertheless, the above data, taken with the necessary precaution suggest that the household of King Louis was more numerous than that of Ferdinand.²¹⁰

3.4 Personnel, power and function

Service at court on a basic level meant provisions of food, drink, accommodation and clothing. Since the household servants were organized in hierarchical fashion in which status, rank and precedence were of supreme importance, the provision of these necessities, the amount, quality, and form of these supplies was also systematically regulated, with details about food, drink, clothes, wages, perhaps allowance to servants and horses, or the position at the table in the lord’s hall documented in writing.²¹¹ Unfortunately, no household ordinances have survived from the Jagiellon period, and – as will be argued in the next chapter –

²⁰⁵ Kubinyi actually calculates with the men at arms, who were serving the court nobility and comes to the amount of 650. Following Pálffy I believe that this amount is better comparable with the court of Ferdinand. Géza Pálffy, "A Magyar Királyság a 16. századi Habsburg Monarchiában [The Kingdom of Hungary within the Habsburg Monarchy of the sixteenth century]" *Századok* 141/5 (2007): 1088.

²⁰⁶ András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar", 25.; András Kubinyi, "Alltag und Fest", 206.

²⁰⁷ Alfred Kohler, *Ferdinand I. 1503–1564. Fürst, König und Kaiser* (München: C. H. Beck, 2003), 137-141. Heinig gives the size of Maximilian’s court that approaches 600 people Paul-Joachim Heinig, "How large was the Court", 150-151. Pálffy gives a higher number for the court of Ferdinand (500-550), but that probably regards his court in the later years of his reign. Géza Pálffy, "A Magyar Királyság": 1088.

²⁰⁸ C. M. Woolgar, *The Great Household*, 11.

²⁰⁹ Jeroen Duindam, *Vienna and Versailles*, 36.

²¹⁰ This would support the idea of the contrast between the more regulated Austrian and less regulated, and thus probably more expensive Hungarian court, as this is voiced in the court reform proposal of 1523. See the subject discussed in more detail in chapter 4.1.

²¹¹ C. M. Woolgar, *The Great Household*, 9.

probably no such existed. Since the ordinances served, among other things, as a contract between lord/lady and courtier, by which the court official had to pledge allegiance to the lord/lady, the question arises whether any other form of document regulated the relationship between the king and the members of his court? Was there any kind of written contract regulating the rights and duties of a court official? No attempt has yet been made to collect these systematically from the Hungarian archives; nevertheless such “indentures of retinue” do exist.²¹² A good example is provided by a contract between Louis II and Boldizsár Batthyány from 1520 in which the king accepts Batthyány as officer of his chamber (*cubicularis*) who pledges to serve the king with 50 “horses”, receives an annual salary of 1300 Fl. and a monthly compensation for his service out of the court.²¹³ That the practice of pledging allegiance is known from better documented courts and is probably also referred to in the advice of the Polish Chancellor Szydłowiecki where he suggests that to safeguard the king and queen against threats (probably of poisoning) the court kitchen should always be guarded by “a man who has pledged allegiance, so that he only lets those in, who have also pledged, so that all should be pledged people”.²¹⁴

The household was a legal entity and court service also meant the belonging under court jurisdiction. Members of the court nobility were allowed to use the title *egregius*, regardless of their social background. Members of the household were the king’s trusted servants on whom he could rely to manage his affairs, whether military, political, diplomatic or financial. The court gave the possibilities of social advancement and positions were hotly competed. Offices were often given to people the king and his advisors wanted to entice, or tie to the king. Individuals often entered the court through the support of relatives – Kubinyi gives examples of families from which three, four members were among the court nobility at the

²¹² For indentures of retinue as sources of information on households see Woolgar: „From around the 1300, a more patent definition was applied. Indentures of retinue – that is, those binding an individual to the service of a lord, typically in time of war and peace in return for money payment – provide details of household membership, specifying the rights granted. These included either a right for food and drink within the household, sometimes known as *bouche of court*, or a regular payment of wages in lieu.” C. M. Woolgar, *The Great Household*, 8-9.

²¹³ Charter of Louis II. 26 11 1520 MOL DL 101824. Kubinyi quotes another example of a contract between the king (Wladislas) and István Hencelfi. MOL DL 47 129.

²¹⁴ „Alterum consilium de custodia sanitatis, út ad portam coquine adhibeatur nobilis iuratus fide dignus, qui nullum in coquinammitteret, nisi iuratos homines et quod omnes imprimis sint iurati.” Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 192. The source is discussed in detail in the next chapter.

same time (E.g. Jan, Felix and Martin Lezecki; Ferenc, György, Lajos and Márton Rákóczi).²¹⁵

Through the analysis of a wide range of sources from the Jagiellon period and with numerous parallels from western court studies, Kubinyi concludes that the court of Louis II – in any case from 1523 onwards – was in every way comparable to the courts of other European sovereigns.²¹⁶ The bad press it had received was largely due to the retrospective judgement focused on the defeat at Mohács and the resulting end of the independent kingdom of Hungary. In the hand of a capable king the household could be a sufficient bastion of authority. In late medieval Hungary the king and his court was one of the three centres of power struggling against each other, the other two being the magnates, internally also torn by divisions of conflicting interests, and the middle and lower nobility. The question was whether the king was able to mobilize the members of his court to the extent that they support him in exchange for the advantages of court service sufficiently to be able to subdue the two other forces. Recent scholarship sees the person of the politically talented queen, Mary of Hungary as the person who was able to use the potentials in the royal and reginal court to rally support for increasing royal authority, which brought fruits at the Diet of April 1526, too late to be of any use to the country doomed to defeat by the Ottoman attack the same summer.²¹⁷

²¹⁵ András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar kormányzati szerepe": 24. and András Kubinyi, "Alltag und Fest", 207. "Was a position at Maximilian's court hotly competed or not? The evidence so far suggests that even menial posts had to be purchased with bribes worth up to five years in expected salaries" Gerhard Benecke, *Maximilian I*, 111.

²¹⁶ For the arguments of this paragraph see Kubinyi András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar kormányzati szerepe": 26-27.

²¹⁷ Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 369.

4 Mary and her court

4.1 The problem of sources

The discussion of the source types traditionally used for court studies above has indicated that the two main groups of sources used for the reconstruction of the working and structure of courts are **household ordinances** and **court accounts**. No household ordinances have survived from either the reign of Wladislas (1492-1516) or of Louis II (1516-1526). In the Hungarian kingdom the source type first appears in the court of the magnate Imre Thurzó in 1617, which he issued in Hungarian language four days after the burial of his father and which became the model for other aristocratic household ordinances in Hungary and Transylvania.²¹⁸ The intriguing question, whether court ordinances existed for the Hungarian royal court before 1526 and were lost during the Ottoman wars, similarly to the majority of medieval sources cannot be answered with certainty. There are several reasons for doubting this. Seeing the pattern of gradual extension of the source type eastwards one would expect to encounter the ordinances contemporaneously with that of the court of Maximilian, or more likely somewhat later. The initiative for drawing up and enforcing ordinances in written form is dependent on the ruler's, or more often his clerks' wish to regulate and give fixity of form to the household, often with the goal of increasing efficiency and reducing household costs.²¹⁹ It is possible, that Wladislas drew up such a document, for instance around the time of the arrival of his wife, Anne de Foix from France in 1502, or at the birth of his children in 1503 and 1506, but there is no record of such. It is highly unlikely that Louis would have drawn up such a document given his young age at the beginning of his reign.

The apparent lack of similar written regulations sheds new light on the only source from the period, which slightly resembles the category of household ordinances. This was the so called "court reform proposal" discussed at the diplomatic summit between the royal couple of Hungary-Bohemia, the archducal couple of Austria, and the representatives of the Polish king and the emperor at Wiener Neustadt from 15 to 24 October 1523 and continuing in smaller circle (without Ferdinand, Anne and their retinue) in Pressburg from 25 October to 16

²¹⁸ András Koltai, "Udvar és rendtartás", 42.

²¹⁹ "The first concern of rulers and their counsellors was therefore to attempt to limit and regulate access to its benefits and services: food, drink, accommodation, and, increasingly, privileged status." Malcom Vale, *The Princely Court*, 35. See also the efforts of Maximilian at the restructuring and reduction of the court of the princesses' below. Paul-Joachim Heinig, "Theorie und Praxis", 227.

December.²²⁰ Concern about the situation at the royal court was the main unofficial reason for the summit, which was officially called together for deliberation on the cooperation in an anti Ottoman attack and issues of foreign policy concerning the Prussian Polish relations.²²¹ According to Szydłowiecki the reform suggestions were drawn up in Wiener Neustadt by Andrea de Burgo, permanent envoy of Ferdinand and Charles at the Buda court together with László Szalkai, Hungarian chancellor and bishop of Eger, aided by the imperial ambassador Salamanca and Szydłowiecki and had been read by both Louis II and Archduke Ferdinand.²²² The proposal was officially handed over in the presence of Gabriel Salamanca to Szydłowiecki on 19 October, and recorded by him in his diary.²²³ The draft comprises a miscellaneous collection of proposals – often in very general terms – regarding court management and administration. The general purpose is to provide a document “by which the royal and reginal majesties of Hungary can reform their situation and customs, as well as the administration of their kingdoms. Because if they stay with their old customs in which not even the incomes of these countries are sufficient for their squandering on vanities, and they become despised and loathed by their subjects, then it can be feared that their disordered state should cause the inhabitants of the kingdom should loose all hope”.²²⁴ The points were several times revised by different groups of people including the royal couple, clearly showing the different interests and goals and mistrust of the different parties, but a resolution

²²⁰ The most important source of the diplomatic summit is the diary of the polish chancellor Krzysztof Szydłowiecki. The Latin text was recently edited and extended with a Hungarian translation. Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*. Zombori analyses the summit in a further article. István Zombori, "A magyar királyi udvar 1523-ban. Krzysztof Szydłowiecki lengyel követ beszámolója [The Hungarian Royal Court in 1523. The report of the Polish envoy Krzysztof Szydłowiecki]" in *Idővel paloták... Magyar udvari kultúra a 16–17. században*, ed. Nóra G. Etényi and Ildikó Horn (Budapest, 2005)..

²²¹ The court reform draft is discussed by Kubinyi in several articles, most recently in András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 20-21.

²²² Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 41. Interestingly the proposals follow the argumentation and are sometimes word for word repetitions of a letter written to Louis II by Uncle Sigismund I, King of Poland in 1521. The letter is quoted and discussed by Vilmos Fraknói, "Brandenburgi György, II. Lajos nevelője" *Budapesti Szemle* (1883). Ed. Acta Tomicianiana, VI. 270., with the letter dated falsely to 1523.

²²³ Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 126-127.

²²⁴ “Qui omnes pecierunt magnificum dominum oratorem, ut ipse cum eis et illi cum eo simul et quanto diligentius conscriberent articulos, quomodo videlicet serenissimi rex et regina Hungarie debeant reformare status et mores suos ac regnorum suorum administracionem, nam si procederent – prout soliti sunt et hactenus faciunt – et tot regnorum proventus eis non sufficient ad vanitates et reddent se suis subditis abhominabiles et despecti, immo timendum est, ne ex eorum deordinacione veniant regnicole in desperacionem.” Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 199.

was finally postponed to a later date by the Hungarian magnates “because they saw that some of the above mentioned articles were too weighty” on 14 December.²²⁵

Traditionally the failed court reform proposition was interpreted as further evidence for the low moral conditions at the Buda royal court. Kubinyi – rightly – emphasises the diplomatic efforts of the Habsburg court to increase its influence in the Hungarian court.²²⁶ I would like to draw attention to a further characteristic of the negotiations. Against the background of the Habsburg house with its fresh inheritance of household ordered in writing, the “unordered”, that is, not functioning according to written ordinances, and therefore “disordered” court of Louis and Mary the contrast must have been seen as enormous, not only in practice, but also in the underlying theory.²²⁷ Among the initiators of the court reform we find two representatives of the Habsburg house, the representative of the Polish king and the Hungarian chancellor Szalkai, who had much to gain by the implementation of the proposals. When they present the draft to Szydłowiecki they also present him with “written documents with clauses describing how any catholic ruler, king or emperor behaves, such as the king of Poland, the Archduke of Austria, the king of France and other monarchs”. They explain that they have given their own proposals to the king, but have also shown him the clauses about the other princes: “since now that he is bearded and wed we have to deal with him in a humble and courteous manner, so he does not think we want to harm his honour, because he then might turn fearsome, harsh and obstinate, so we have to reason with him through the example of other kings.”²²⁸ It is possible that the written documents about the different rulers were some kind of household ordinances, which the initiators used as models for their own proposal, and presented to the king as examples of a norm which was not yet exercised in

²²⁵ „Domini Hungarie visis predictis nonnullis articulis quasi gravioribus omnia in aliud tempus reiecerunt.” Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 204. For the revised version of the reform draft see pages 201-204.

²²⁶ “The cause of these talks is probably quite prosaic. The lifestyle of the royal couple, engaged in the pleasure of their youthful years, gave a pretext for Ferdinand to try and increase his influence through reforms. There was talk of some administrative innovation as well, which would have increased the power of Hungarian Chancellor Szalkai. We have no information on the implementation of the reforms.” András Kubinyi, “The Court of Queen Mary”, 21.; See also András Kubinyi, “A királyi udvar”, 23.

²²⁷ See a discussion of ordered versus non-ordered courts in the case of Frederic III and Maximilian I. Paul-Joachim Heinig, “Theorie und Praxis”, 228.

²²⁸ “Ibidem ipsi domini obtulerunt domino oratori articulos scriptos, quomodo se quilibet princeps et rex catholicus gerit videlicet cesar rex Polonie, archidux Austrie, rex Francie etc. et alii principes et dixerunt, licet ipse rex audiat consilia, que ei dicimus, tamen quia iam est barbatus et uxoratus, oportet cum eo procedere modeste et debite, ne quid dicamus contra eius dignitatem in specie quia ipse aliquando fit terribilis, durus et obstinatus, immo oportet cum eo saltem per exempla aliorum regum procedere.” Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 125.

Hungary. It is important to keep in mind that household ordinances often took the form of an unwelcome pressure on the sovereign from outside. Either the clerks of his own establishment tried to limit the number of people enjoying the advantages of the court with written rules, or the estates assemblies, who the rulers had to turn to in increasing numbers to supplement the dominical revenues, which did not cover the costs of the household with extra subsidies.²²⁹ In the above mentioned case the unique aspect of the proposal seems to be the involvement of foreign powers beside the officials of the king's own court, though these foreign rulers were also relatives.²³⁰

Turning to household accounts it should be kept in mind that of the three royal household account books that survive of the Jagiellon court only two fragments are extant from the period of our investigation.²³¹ The first of these is the list of the expenditure of the royal court during a period of five months from 1525.²³² The second is a fragment containing the expenditure of one month in 1526.²³³ This may not seem a rich source material, but it is far more than anything in the preceding decades and has been the chief source used for sketching the life of the courts of Wladislas II and Louis II.²³⁴

²²⁹ Duindam writes in general about the initiative: „Was the prince the main initiator of such attempts? The sources suggest that he was often loath to be bound by his clerks' written procedures and rules, and ignored them as he saw fit. Princely liberality was too important to be subordinated to the dictates of a balanced budget. When rulers depended on the subsidies of estates in addition to the revenues of their domains, as would often be the case, ordinances could be forced upon a ruler not by his servants in household and government, but by such estates assemblies seeking to bridle his costly appetites through reforms and reductions.” Jeroen Duindam, *Vienna and Versailles*, 27.

²³⁰ It should not be forgotten that the Christian II, king of Denmark, Sweden and Norway, who was a brother in law of Charles, Ferdinand and Louis (through his wife Isabella of Habsburg) had been deposed from his throne in January of the same year. This threatening example also features as a discussion topic of the summit.

²³¹ András Kubinyi, "Alltag und Fest". The account book of the royal treasury from 1494-95 is edited by Johann Christian von Engel. Johann Christian von Engel, ed., "Fragmentum libri rationarii super erogationibus aulae regis Hungariae Ludovici II." in *Monumenta Ungarica* (Wien, 1809). The account book of the brother of Prince Sigismund, later Sigismund, king of Poland, who lived at the royal court of his brother Wladislas for a few years was edited by Adorján Divéky Adorján Divéky, "Zsigmond lengyel herceg budai származása (1500–1502, 1505)." *Magyar Történelmi Tár* 26 (1914).

²³² Edited by Vilmos Fraknói Vilmos Fraknói, ed., "Liber rationum Ludovici II." (Budapest, 1877).

²³³ MOL DL 24 405. Edited with many mistakes by J. Ch. Engel. Johann Christian von Engel, ed., "Fragmentum libri rationarii".

²³⁴ Several studies attest to the interest in courts in the scholarship of the late 19th and early 20th centuries: József Fógel, *II. Lajos udvartartása [The household of King Louis II]* (Budapest, 1917)., József Fógel, *II. Ulászló udvartartása* Vilmos Fraknói, *II. Lajos udvara*. Kubinyi also used these sources for his characterisation of the royal court in the Jagiellon period. No in depth analysis of the account books as source material for the court has been made.

No examples of treatises on household governance and economy are known for medieval Hungary. However, certain passages from works categorised under the genre Mirror of Kings and, less frequently, Mirror of Queens dealing with advice to the rulers on the practical side of management could also be classified under this group. From the Jagiellon period two tractates of the Mirror of Kings genre are known and both were connected with the court of Hungary. The first consisted of the instructions of Elisabeth of Habsburg, queen of Poland, the *De institutione regii pueri* [...] (1502). The tractate is dedicated to Wladislas II, king of Hungary and Bohemia and at least one copy has a, so-called, “Hungarian renaissance bookbinding” with the combined coat of arms of King Wladislas and his wife Anne de Foix.²³⁵ The second tractate, the *De regis officio opusculum* (1519) was written for Louis II at the instigation, and according to the information provided by János Gosztonyi (later chancellor of Queen Mary) by his friend at the University of Paris Jodocus Clichtoveus.²³⁶ There is also the much more famous work by Erasmus, the *Institutio principis Christiani* (1516), which was dedicated to Mary’s brother, Charles V and a copy of which has survived in leather binding made in Buda.²³⁷ Nevertheless, neither of these gives information on the practical questions of the queen’s court. Concerning Queens Mirrors there is evidence that Mary of Hungary must have had a copy of Christine de Pizan’s *Treasure of the City of Ladies*. Assuming that this was basic literature for princesses one can safely believe that Mary was familiar with the roles and possibilities of queens as laid out in the fascinating tractate.²³⁸ Nevertheless it tells us little about the specific situation of queens in the Hungarian court and is not a useful source on this investigation. The tractate introduced in the preceding chapter, the *De institutione vivendi*, written in the form of a “Queen’s mirror” by Diomedes Carafa. The tractate has been used above in the analysis of the court of Beatrice of Aragon, but has more general implications for the queen’s household. Though the writing of the text precedes the Jagiellon period, it gives such specific details about the working and dynamics of the queen’s court, which make it a

²³⁵ Edited by Zeissberg H[einrich] von Zeissberg, ed., "Kleinere Geschichtsquellen Polens im Mittelalter" in *Archiv für Kunde österr. Geschichtsquellen. Vol 4, 1. Hälfte* (1877), 108. The manuscript is kept in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (Cod. lat. 10573). On the copy and the binding see Csapodi Csaba Csapodi, "Újabb ismeretessé vált hiteles és ál-korvinák [Newly discovered authentic and fake-Corvinas]" *Magyar Könyvszemle* 102 (1986): 298, Nr.4.

²³⁶ Asztrik Gabriel, *The University of Paris and its Hungarian Students and Masters during the Reign of Louis XII. and Francois. I.* (Frankfurt a. M., 1986), 72.

²³⁷ Orsolya Réthelyi et al., eds., *Mary of Hungary*, 211.

²³⁸ Claude Lemaire, "De librije van Maria van Hongarije [The book collection of Mary of Hungary]" in *Maria van Hongarije, koningin tussen keizers en kunstenaars (1505-1558)*, ed. Bob van den Boogert and Jacqueline Kerkhoff (Zwolle: Waanders, 1993).

valuable source which can be used in the general reconstruction of the institution, with specific regard to the situation in late medieval Hungary.

Narrative sources have traditionally been used by historians to reconstruct the period. Much of what we know about the period under investigation comes from the reports of the papal nuntius, the Venetian diplomats, the memoirs of the royal chaplain György Szerémi and others. These non-fictional literary products of contemporaries were produced with the purpose of documenting the events of their time, whether in the form of diaries, letters or memoirs. (E.g. the works of Krzysztof Szydłowiecki²³⁹, György Szerémi²⁴⁰, István Brodarics²⁴¹, Johannes Cuspinianus²⁴², Georg Kirchmair²⁴³, Hans Dernschwam²⁴⁴). Some of these have been known to scholarship for a long time, the use of others has been facilitated by recent text editions. An important group of contemporary sources for the period (at least up to 1526) are the reports of diplomats from the Royal Court. The Hungarian Kingdom had close diplomatic ties with Austria, Rome and the Polish kingdom. Up to 1525 Venice also had a permanent ambassador or a secretary at the court. (E.g. Austria: Andrea da Burgo²⁴⁵, Sigmund von Herberstein, ambassador of Austria²⁴⁶, Johannes Schneidpöck, imperial ambassador; Venice: Marino Sanuto²⁴⁷, Aluise Bon²⁴⁸, Lorenzo Orio, Francesco Massaro, Vincezo

²³⁹ Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*.

²⁴⁰ György Szerémi, *II. Lajos és János királyok házi káplánja emlékirata Magyarország romlásáról 1484-1543 között (Epistola de partitione regni Hungarorum)*, edited by Gusztáv Wenzel, MHHS 1, (Pest, 1857). György Szerémi, *Magyarország romlásáról (About the ruin of Hungary)*, translated by László Erdélyi and László Juhász, edited by György Székely, (Budapest, 1979).

²⁴¹ Stephanus Brodericus, *De conflictu Hungarorum cum Solymano Turcorum imperatore ad Mohach historia verissima – Oratio ad Adrianum pontificem maximum*, edited by Petrus Kulcsár and Csaba Csapodi, (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1985).

²⁴² Hans Ankwich-Kleehoven, (ed), *Johann Cuspinians Briefwechsel*, (München: C. H. Beck, 1933).

²⁴³ Georg Kirchmair, "Denkwürdigkeiten seiner Zeit. 1519-1553," in *FRA I. Scriptores I*, edited by Th. G. von Karajan, (Wien, 1855), 419-534.

²⁴⁴ Peter Ratkoš, *Dokumenty k baníckemu povstaniu na Slovensku [Documents concerning the miners' revolt in Slovakia] (1525-1526)*. (Bratislava, 1957).

²⁴⁵ Karl Stoeckmann, "Über die Briefe des Andrea da Burgo, Gesandten König Ferdinands, an den Kardinal und Bischof von Triest, Bernhard Cles" *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften Wien, phil.-historischen Klasse* 24 (1857).

²⁴⁶ Sigismund, Freiherr von Herberstein, *Rerum Moscovitarum Comentarij* (Antverpiae, 1557). Elfriede Rensing, "Sigmund von Herberstein am Hofe König Ludwigs II. von Ungarn" *A Bécsi magyar történelmi intézet évkönyve. Jahrbuch des Wiener Ungarischen Historischen Instituts* 1 (1931).

²⁴⁷ Marino Sanuto, *I diarii*, edited by Federico Stefani, Guglielmo, Berchet and Nicoló Barozzi, (Venice, 1879-1903) the parts referring to Hungary were edited by Gusztáv Wenzel, "Marino Sanuto tudósításai".

²⁴⁸ For the reports of the following four Venetian ambassadors see István Balogh, István Balogh, ed., *Velencei diplomaták Magyarországról 1500-1526 [Venetian ambassadors' reports about Hungary 1500-1526]* (Szeged, 1929).

Guidoto; Rome: Cardinal Campeggio, papal legate²⁴⁹, Giovanni Antonio Pulleone Baron Burgio, papal ambassador / nuntius; Polish Kingdom²⁵⁰). These sources can be re-examined regarding the information they can provide on Jagiello household and the queen's court.

As mentioned above, information about the courts can also be supplemented to a certain extent from material sources, surviving artistic artefacts, archaeological finds. However, given the destruction of buildings and material objects, most significantly the complete loss of almost all of the medieval Royal Palace in Buda this source type can unfortunately only supplement information from narrative sources to a modest extent. Works of art, literary texts and music can also be used. Few of these have actually survived from the period, but much of these surviving objects have been catalogued in the recent exhibition on the court of Louis II and Mary of Hungary in Budapest and Bratislava.²⁵¹

A significant part of the sources used for the research of the court of the queen are letters in which Queen Mary is author / addressee, which mention her or events and transactions that have to do with her. Some of these have been edited already, for instance her correspondence with her brother Archduke Ferdinand, later king of Hungary.²⁵² Others have been published in various articles and studies. There is also a separate body of unpublished personal correspondence between Mary and the brothers George, Albrecht and Casimir, Margraves of Brandenburg-Ansbach. Mary (as well as her husband Louis II, of whom they were first cousins) maintained a close friendship with all three brothers.²⁵³ Efforts have been made to try

²⁴⁹ The letters of both legate and ambassador are edited by Fraknói. Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Monumenta Vaticana 1884 Relationes oratorum pontificiorum 1524-1526 (Mon. Vat. Hung. Ser. II. vol. 1)* (Budapest, 2001 (1884)).

²⁵⁰ Stanislaus Gorski, ed., *Acta Tomicianae. Epistolae, legationes, responsa, actiones, res geste, Serenissimi principis Sigismundi, ejus nominis primi, regis Poloniae etc.* (Posnaniae, 1852-1960).

²⁵¹ Orsolya Réthelyi et al., eds., *Mary of Hungary*.

²⁵² Wilhelm Bauer, ed., *Die Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol. 1.: Familienkorrespondenz bis 1526. (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs 11)* (Wien, 1912).; Wilhelm Bauer and Robert Lacroix, eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. II: Familienkorrespondenz 1527-1530, 2 vols. (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs, 30-31)*. (Wien, 1937-1938).; Herwig Wolfram and Christiane Thomas, eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. III. 1531-1532 (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs)* (Wien, 1985).; Christopher F. Laferl and Christina Lutter, eds., *Die Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Bd. 4: Familienkorrespondenz 1533 und 1534. (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs 90)* (Wien, 2000).

²⁵³ Zoltán Csepregi, "„ich will kein fleis nit sparen“ – Königin Maria von Ungarn und das Haus Brandenburg" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin. (Geschichte in der Epoche Karls V. Bd. 8.)*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007). Their correspondence, which reflects this familiarity, can be found in the collections of the Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preussischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin and the Bayerisches Staatsarchiv Nürnberg, Brandenburger Literalien and has been transcribed by Zoltán Csepregi. The subject is treated in detail in chapter 5.2.5 below.

to find other unpublished letters, mainly using the pre-Mohács collection of the Hungarian National Archives and different archives in Vienna.²⁵⁴

As this short survey of sources has shown, in the case of the Hungarian royal court the majority of these fall into the category of miscellaneous sources, with information gathered piecemeal from charters, reports of diplomats and envoys, letters, etc. with an attempt made at reconstruction from these records.²⁵⁵ This is precisely the reason why the information we have on Mary's household from the years in Austria (1514-1521) – which, strictly speaking, predates the period of our investigation – receives relatively more attention than just being fleetingly introduced. It is this movement of Mary and her household to Buda from the abundantly documented court of the royal princesses in Innsbruck, with a vast amount of all kinds of source types for court studies, that make it possible to supplement research of the years spent in Hungary, which are barren of such documentation. Several scholars have used the sources of Mary's household in Austria, most notably two researchers, Gernot Heiss and Jacqueline Kerkhoff.²⁵⁶ Gernot Heiss wrote his dissertation on Mary of Hungary based on Austrian archival records in 1974, the most important results of which he published in three articles, providing the foundations of the political and economic scholarship on Queen Mary.²⁵⁷ The section of his dissertation dealing with the household of Mary was not published, so I refer to his findings with reference to the unpublished dissertation. Jacqueline Kerkhoff has published her dissertation on the court of Mary of Hungary in 2008.²⁵⁸ She has collected and analysed different household ordinances from Queen Mary's life, giving an interesting overall picture of the queen's household.²⁵⁹ In her study she has edited three

²⁵⁴ The collection of the Hungarian National Archives contains over 125 charters issued by Mary of Hungary, mostly unedited.

²⁵⁵ A similar process is described by Heinig regarding the "unordered" court of Frederick III. Paul-Joachim Heinig, "Theorie und Praxis", 224.

²⁵⁶ Both of them made use of the unpublished dissertation of Anneliese Gatt, who also worked with and analysed the court documentation of the court in Innsbruck first under Bianca Maria Sforza, later under princess Anne and Mary. Anneliese Gatt, *Der Innsbrucker Hof zur Zeit Kaiser Maximilians I. 1493-1519*, Diss. Univ. Innsbruck (Innsbruck, 1943).

²⁵⁷ Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber".; Gernot Heiss, "Die ungarischen, böhmischen und österreichischen Besitzungen der Königin Maria (1505 - 1558) und ihre Verwaltung I." *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 27 (1974).; Gernot Heiss, "Die ungarischen, böhmischen und österreichischen Besitzungen der Königin Maria (1505 - 1558) und ihre Verwaltung. II" *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 29 (1976).

²⁵⁸ Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof (1505 - 1558) : tot plichtsbetrachting uitverkoren [Mary of Hungary and her court: chosen for devotion to duty]* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2008)..

²⁵⁹ Jacqueline Kerkhoff, "Die Hofhaltung Marias von Ungarn" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558)*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007).

household ordinances from the period between 1514 and 1521²⁶⁰ which I have used for my own analysis of these years, to supplement my archival findings.²⁶¹ Her results have been especially useful for the tracing of certain individuals in the later households of Mary in the Netherlands and Spain. In the following chapters the foundations of the reconstruction of the independent queen's household and court during Mary's years in Buda are constructed on the personnel lists from Innsbruck and her travel household to Buda.²⁶²

4.2 The personal element of Mary's household – phases and households

By the late middle ages it was common for the king, the queen, the royal children and other members of the royal families to have separate households.²⁶³ These differed from each other in form, size and function and all had different forms of dependency on the central organ of the royal household. They were considered separately functioning financial units. They also had a separate organisational structure with officials for the main court functions and menial servant body. There existed a further differentiation between resident and travelling households, which was less common in the later Middle Ages, but was still a common feature of royal households. These different factors resulted in characteristic identities, which had much to do with the status, the gender and the stage of life of the head of the household. In this chapter the different forms of household organisation in the life of Mary of Hungary will be introduced to give the context to the institution of the queen's court. In all the below forms of court two recurring questions are the financing of the court and the person who has authority to make decisions about its composition.

²⁶⁰ One of these has previously been published as facsimile and analysed by Heinig. Paul-Joachim Heinig, "Ein Ordnungsentwurf".

²⁶¹ Kerkhoff's goal was to map and describe all households of Mary of Hungary and thus she deals also with the Buda household. However, since there are no traditional household sources available for the period, and she is neither familiar with other types of archival sources, nor is much of the Hungarian secondary literature of the period available to her, her work and the present dissertation complement each other.

²⁶² The importance of the lists of the travel household for the reconstruction have led me to publish on this source in German Orsolya Réthelyi, "Die Anfänge der Ofener Hofhaltung der Königin Maria von Ungarn" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558) : eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007). and more elaborately in Hungarian Orsolya Réthelyi, "Főhercegnői udvarból királynéi udvar: Habsburg Mária királynéi udvartartásának kezdetei [From the archducal court to the queen's court. The beginnings of the reginal court of Mary of Hungary]" *Századok* 5 (2007).

²⁶³ "Separate households for the royal children are already apparent by the middle of the thirteenth century. A knight or royal clerk would act as head of the household and 'keeper' or 'master' of the royal children. Apart from ladies attending the youngest children, there would be chaplains, menial household servants, minstrels and sometimes other noble children being reared alongside those of the king. The heir to the throne, as he grew up, would acquire his own household, and this grew large in size by the end of the Middle Ages." Nicholas Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy, 1066-1530* (London, New York: Methuen, 1984), 14.

4.2.1 Early households²⁶⁴

The households of the royal children in Mechelen and in Buda (1505-1514)

Mary of Hungary was born as Mary Archduchess of Austria on September 15, 1505 in Brussels as the fifth of the six children of Philip of Habsburg (“the Fair”) and Joanna of Castilia (also known as “la loca”). A few months after the birth of Mary the couple left for Spain on business of the state leaving the regency of the Burgundian provinces as well as the care of the children to the governor William II de Croÿ, Lord of Chièvres (1458-1521). Philip died unexpectedly in Spain on 26 September 1506 and Joanna, who had shown signs of mental instability, which were increased by her grief, was declared unfit for a political role and confined to a convent. It was decided that the government and the care of the four children who remained in the Low Countries was to be entrusted to Philip’s sister, Margaret of Austria.²⁶⁵ The four siblings Eleanor (1498-1558), Charles (1500-1558), Isabella (1501-1526) and Mary (1505-1558) had been born in different towns of the Low Countries²⁶⁶ and now were raised in a joint children’s household in the court of their aunt in Mechelen (Malines), which was considered one of the most important intellectual and artistic centres of the age.²⁶⁷

The household of the children stood under the leadership Charles de Croÿ-Chimay, who was First Chamberlain (Steward) and Anna de Beaumont, who was Grand Mistress (Stewardess) of the household.²⁶⁸ The household of Charles was separated from that of his sisters in 1509

²⁶⁴ Appendix 1 contains a list of all the known members of the Household of Mary of Hungary between 1521 and 1531.

²⁶⁵ Philip had not made arrangements for either the regency of the Low Countries or the guardianship of his children in his testament, so the Estates-General of the Low Countries entrusted both matters to Maximilian I until Philip’s heir in the Burgundian territories, Archduke Charles, would come of age. Maximilian was overburdened with matters of the Empire and named his daughter, Margaret of Austria as his representative in both matters. Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria van Hongarije*, 50.

²⁶⁶ The remaining two children were born in Spain. Ferdinand (1503-1564) was raised at the court of his maternal grandfather Ferdinand of Aragon. Catharina (1506-1578) was born after the death of her father and stayed in Spain beside her mother.

²⁶⁷ Dagmar Eichberger, “A cultural centre in the southern Netherlands: The court of Archduchess Margaret of Austria (1480-1530) in Mechelen” in *Princes and princeley culture, 1450-1650*, ed. Martin Gosman et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

²⁶⁸ “Anna de Beaumont, dame d’honneur de Mesdames mes niepces” A.J.G. Le Glay, *Correspondance de l’empereur Maximilien Ier et de Marguerite d’Autriche, sa fille, gouvernante des Pays-Bas, Vol.2* (Paris, 1845), 251. Anna van Beaumont was a French relative from the house of Navarra, who had come to the Low Countries into the retinue of Joanna. Jane de Iongh, *De hertogin. Margaretha van Oostenrijk, Hertogin van Savoie, 1480-1530* (Amsterdam: Querido, 1981 (first published 1943)), 309. Mary wrote a letter to her following her coronation in Prague praising her husband.

with the influential William de Croÿ as his tutor and Steward. It should be noted that the decision about the officers in Charles' court was a decision of Maximilian and Margaret at this point and played a central role in their correspondence. It was also a matter of utmost importance, because as the court of Charles became a growing competitor in political matters to that of Margaret, and individuals in his vicinity had an influence on matters of the state.²⁶⁹ The court of Margaret and also of the royal children followed the Burgundian model in its administration and in aspects of court ceremony. The language of the court was French – which also remained the language of written correspondence between Margaret and the children – partly because of the Burgundian tradition, partly because she herself had been raised at the court of the French king and moved with greatest ease in this language and culture.²⁷⁰ The children received a thorough education in arts and languages, but also matters of state.²⁷¹ Mary did not have a separate household in this period and the immediate reason for creating such was Maximilian's instructions to Margaret to prepare the Archduchess for her travel to Vienna to be married to the heir to the thrones of Hungary and Bohemia, King Louis Jagiellon.

Our knowledge of the joint household of the royal children in Mechelen can be compared with what we know of the household of the royal children of King Wladislas, Anne and Louis in Buda. The family situation is similar in that their mother, Anne de Foix (1484-1506) was also absent, having died in childbed two weeks after giving birth to her son. Though no ordinances survive, the royal children must have had a household of their own, because records exist of some of the officials of this household. János Pető of Gerse was the chief steward of the royal children's household (*magister curie*) and both children are depicted in the illumination above the coat of arms on the Grant of Arms issued by King Wladislas in 1507.²⁷² Records also bear evidence to other officials, the Master Doorkeeper of the royal

²⁶⁹ Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria van Hongarije*, 50-51.

²⁷⁰ Margaret seems not to have spoken Dutch, at least not very well. van, Florimond Duyse, *Het oude Nederlandsche lied. Eerste deel*. (Den Haag, Antwerpen: Martinus Nijhoff, 1903), 540. I deal with the question of court and language in chapter 5.4.

²⁷¹ Jacqueline Kerkhoff, "'Getrouwd met de dynastie', 'Madame Marije'" in *Maria van Hongarije. Koningin tussen keizers and kunstenaars, 1505-1558*, ed. Bob van den Boogert and Jacqueline Kerkhoff (1993).

²⁷² Grant of Arms to János Pető of Gerse, steward to the royal children, his son Ferenc, gentleman of the royal chamber, and his brother György. 22 09 1507, Buda. MOL DI 86051. Orsolya Réthelyi et al., eds., *Mary of Hungary*, 164. Other charters naming him steward to the royal children: E.g. MOL DI 93736 and 93741, both from 1508. He had previously been steward of Queen Anne. He later becomes chief steward to King Louis in which position he still can be found in 1520. See MOL DI 93825, 22 10 1520, Bős.

children, István Istvánffi of Kisasszonyfalva²⁷³ and the manager of the estates of the royal children, László Szalkai, who was later to become the powerful archbishop of Esztergom.²⁷⁴

Some incidental information on the female element of the household can also be traced. We know that the wife of the castellan of Buda János Bornemissza was involved in the raising of the royal children. Her husband was officially appointed tutor of the young King Louis.²⁷⁵ Ursula Pemfflinger, wife of Johann Pemfflinger judge of the town Buda, had also been involved in the raising of Anne. There is a third name that of a certain Sophia, who, as a nurse of the princess went with Anne to Vienna in 1515.²⁷⁶ Anne must have had a Frauenzimmer in Buda. King Wladislas issued a letter of majesty (*Majestätsbrief*) in which he promises to the estates of Bohemia that Bohemian subjects (men and women) will be employed in the court of his daughter Anne in the same number as Hungarian subjects.²⁷⁷ Among the names of some of the young ladies who accompanied her to Austria one finds the name of Barbara von Lanau (Lónyay), who was said to have grown up together with the princess.²⁷⁸ The courts of Anne and Louis were separated at a certain point, definitely before the travel to Bratislava/Pressburg and further to Vienna in the spring of 1515 for the wedding ceremonies of both children.²⁷⁹

First independent household – The travel from the Low Countries (1514)

Mary departed from the court of Margaret of Austria in Mechelen on 2 May, 1514 and arrived in Vienna 12 June 1504 with a retinue of officers, a household of women and servants. We know some names of the people, who arrived with the princess from the correspondence between Maximilian and Margaret of Austria, who had raised and cared for Mary since her

²⁷³ For István Istvánffi of Kisasszonyfalva see MOL DI 104524, 30 10 1509, Buda.

²⁷⁴ Between 1508 and 1512 Szalkai was the manager of the lands appointed to cover the costs of the royal children's household. These properties originally belonged to the Queen Anne as Queen's estates, but served to finance the household of royal children after her death. András Kubinyi, "Szalkai László esztergomi érsek politikai szereplése [The political role of László Szalkai archbishop of Esztergom]" in *Főpapok, egyházi intézmények és vallásosság a középkori Magyarországon* (Budapest, 1999), 149..

²⁷⁵ King Louis was crowned at the age of two in his father's lifetime. He became king of Hungary on 4 June 1508 in Székesfehérvár and king of Bohemia on 11 May 1509 in Prague.

²⁷⁶ The Emperor Maximilian ordered a gift to be given to her in 1517, but in 1520 she was ill and wished to return home. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn (Unpublished dissertation)* (Wien, 1974), 427.

²⁷⁷ Charter by Wladislas 11 01 1510 Prague. Franz Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, 194-195. I quote and discuss the letter in detail in chapter 5.4 on language below.

²⁷⁸ Hofstaatsverzeichnis, s.d. (March 1520), LA Innsbruck, Codex 2470, quoted by Heiss. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 427.

²⁷⁹ János Pető of Gerse's name already occurs as King Louis's steward in a charter dated to 23 14 1514, Buda. MOL DI 93772.

birth. The choice of personnel of Mary's first separate household was in their hands and their deliberations would form the size and content of the group of people around Mary. In the correspondence of Margaret with her father she names the people who would accompany Mary to Vienna, and explicitly states which members of the court should stay beside Mary in her new home.²⁸⁰ Margaret emphasizes the emotional reasons, trying to ensure some form of personal stability in the surroundings of the eight-year-old Mary. Not surprisingly, however, she also had economic considerations: providing a livelihood for certain courtiers at her father's expense. This motive, an endless effort of finding a place for members of one's own court into the court of another princely member of the family and thus under his/her financial care is a recurrent theme in the Habsburg family correspondence.

No ordinance survives of this household, but some names can be found in the correspondence of Margareta with her father. Claude de Pontarlier, Lord of Flagy and Vaulgrenant was appointed Steward of the travelling household and Guillaume Lefort vice-cup bearer. Hugo de Bulliaux was appointed Master of the Horse and was ordered to travel on to Buda and inspect the conditions at the royal court with special attention to Mary's future husband, Louis and return to Mechelen.²⁸¹ Marguerite de Poitiers, Mary's "bercheresse" had not left her side since her birth and would travel with her to the East with her husband and children. Margaret considered her presence essential for Mary and requested Maximilian to make sure she and her husband are treated well and receive a sufficient income, so that she is able to do her work well and be an example to others.²⁸² The other person who the Emperor should make allow to stay with Mary and be treated well was a certain "demoiselle Cerf", whose sister stood in the service of Margaret and was the daughter of an old Flemish noble, who had many children to care for.²⁸³ The travelling company group stood under the protection of Floris of Egmont, because Margaret of Austria feared the attack of Charles of Guelre. It would be interesting to know the composition of the delegation sent by Maximilian to escort Mary to Vienna, and

²⁸⁰ A.J.G. Le Glay, *Correspondance de l'empereur Maximilien Ier, Vol.2., 252..*

²⁸¹ A.J.G. Le Glay, *Correspondance de l'empereur Maximilien Ier, Vol.2., 278.* Unfortunately no written report survives of his impressions.

²⁸² "Monseigneur, damoiselle Marguerite de Poitiers, bercheresse de madame Marie, ma niece, qui l'a continuellement servy puis sa naissance, s'en va avec elle, ensamble son mary, ses filz et fille qui sont tous a madite dame et nyepce; et est ladite bercheresse si nécessaire empres elle que la raison vault bien qu'elle et sesdits mary et enffans soient bien tractez et entretenuz, affin qu'elle puisse continer son service comme elle desire. Si vous supplie, Monseigneur, l'avoir pour recommandé, et il sera exemple aux autres." A.J.G. Le Glay, *Correspondance de l'empereur Maximilien Ier, Vol.2., 126.*

²⁸³ "Monseigneur, vous m'avez aussi escript pour une josne demoiselle, nommée Cerf, cousine du seigneur de Castre" A.J.G. Le Glay, *Correspondance de l'empereur Maximilien Ier, Vol.2., 126.*

whether anyone was sent by the Hungarian king, but no names are known. The one significant exception is that of Johannes Croner, an educated cleric from Kronstadt (Braşov), who was in the company travelling and would be the court priest of Mary. His case will be introduced in detail in the discussion of Mary's chapel below.²⁸⁴

First court in Vienna (1514-1516)

Mary arrived to Vienna 12 June 1514 and was greeted here as the bride of Louis by Hungarian delegates.²⁸⁵ She was given lodgings in the Cillierhof. Her first Steward (Hofmeister) in Vienna was Georg von Rottal, Freiherr zu Thalberg. Georg von Rottal was the Landhofmeister of Lower Austria and a trusted officer of Maximilian, who had spent a longer time in the emperor's retinue in the Low Countries, where he filled important financial and diplomatic positions, and had later played an important part in the peace treaty and diplomatic contacts with Wladislas. As a special token of honour his daughter, Barbara von Rottal²⁸⁶ was married to Siegmund von Dietrichstein, the most influential Austrian councillor of Maximilian during the celebrations of the double marriage of the Habsburg and Jagiello dynasties.²⁸⁷ Rottal's wife Margaretha von Rappach was appointed Hofmeisterin. It can hardly be a coincidence that the first male and female head of Mary's household were people who had lived for a while in the Low Countries and were familiar with the people, customs and languages there. Beside the copious written sources describing the spectacular series of events surrounding the celebrating of the double marriage, there also exists a painting which depicts the feast after the wedding of Barbara von Rottal and Siegmund of Dietrichstein with all the high ranking guests sitting around a table feasting.²⁸⁸

²⁸⁴ See chapter 5.2.2 below.

²⁸⁵ Hans Ankwicz-Kleehoven, *Der Wiener Humanist Johannes Cuspinian Gelehrter und Diplomat zur Zeit Kaiser Maximilians I.* (Graz, Köln: Böhlau, 1959), 74. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 4.

²⁸⁶ Though it is often suggested that Barbara von Rottal was one of the many illegitimate children of Maximilian, neither Wiesflecker nor Konrad von Moltke the monographer of Siegmund von Dietrichstein find any reason to suppose that this was the case. Konrad von Moltke, *Siegmund von Dietrichstein : die Anfänge staändischer Institutionen und das Eindringen des Protestantismus in die Steiermark zur Zeit Maximilians I. und Ferdinands I* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 76., Hermann Wiesflecker, *Kaiser Maximilian I., das Reich, Österreich und Europa an der Wende zur Neuzeit, vol. 5, /Der Kaiser und seine Umwelt* (München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag, 1986). Rill, on the other hand, does support the idea that Margarethe van Rappach was the mistress of Maximilian. Gerhard Rill, *Fürst und Hof in Österreich: von den habsburgischen Teilungsverträgen bis zur Schlacht von Mohács (1521/1522 bis 1526). Vol. 1* (Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1993), 140.

²⁸⁷ Hermann Wiesflecker, *Kaiser Maximilian I.*, 272-275.

²⁸⁸ The painting – probably a seventeenth century copy of the original – is more valuable for its historical context than its esthetic qualities and actually exists in several copies. Sitting at the central table are King Wladislas, Barbara von Rottal, Emperor Maximilian, Anne of Jagiello, King Sigismund of Poland (brother of Wladislas), Mary of Hungary, King Louis, Margarete von Rappach, indicated at the Hofmeisterin of the princesses and

Anne and her household stayed in Austria after the wedding ceremony until December 1516, but it is unclear when the two princess' households were joined. It is not clear what the form of organisation was in the year and a half between the wedding and the travel from Vienna. The first ordinance known to us was drawn up for only Mary's court in 31 January 1516. Mary is said to have had Georg von Rottal as Hofmeister, but also the name of Hans Lamberg is given also as Hofmeister.²⁸⁹ Rottal was probably the higher in hierarchy, while Lamberg was charged with the practical tasks.²⁹⁰ Lady Rottal is specified as Hofmeisterin and it is indicated which other ladies are allowed to share the room with Mary. In the same document it is specified that Mary should again move into the Empress' room and live there.²⁹¹

Other sources indicate that the household was under the leadership of Siegmund von Dietrichstein and his mother in law, Lady Rottal. From his correspondence on the subject with Maximilian it seems that Dietrichstein and his wife were supposed to take the joint household of the princesses to Innsbruck, where the former Hofmeisterin of Maximilian's deceased wife, Paula von Firmian would take over the office of Hofmeisterin.²⁹² Dietrichstein seems to have been worried about the complaints from the princesses regarding Maximilian's choice of his own and his wife's person for the office, but the emperor reassured him that he would regard it as a sign of their youth and that they should not have their own will and any special

Sigismund von Dietrichstein. Orsolya Réthelyi et al., eds., *Mary of Hungary*, 159-160. Dietrichstein retained the office of Hofmeister to Anna after she married Ferdinand, though he practically only was present on special festive occasions. His wife, Barbara von Rottal became the governess of the children of Anne and Ferdinand in their early years. Konrad von Moltke, *Siegmund von Dietrichstein*, 79.

²⁸⁹ Ordinance for Mary's court from 31 01 1516 "Den erst soll her Jorg von Rattall der Khunigin Hoffmayster sein auch Herr Hanns Lamberg der Khunigin diennen wie pis her rund bott mit den personen hallten zumassen wie sy forgetan haben." HHStA, Maximiliana, inv. nr. 38, ff.88r-90v., partially edited by Kerkhoff. Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 262.

²⁹⁰ "Was taglich zuefallender Hanndlung sein soll Hoffmayster lamberg und Vitztumb darinen im pesten Vleiss nach wie sy zu thuen wissen hanndlen und furnemen und was in der alle Ordnung stet und den Hoffmayster guet pedunckht mag er auch heraus ziechen und darnach hanndlen was guet ist." HHStA, Maximiliana, inv. nr. 38, ff.88r-90v. Partially edited by Kerkhoff Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 264.

²⁹¹ "Die Khunigin soll sich wider in der Kaysserin Zymer ziechen unnd darynnen wonnen." Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 264. This sentence is ambiguous since it could have meant that the two households at least inhabited the same place (Anne was often called "the Empress" because of her former engagement to Maximilian), or more probably, that this ordinance was made for a location where there was a room called the Emperess' room.

²⁹² Moltke quotes from a letter of Maximilian to Dietrichstein from 04 01 1517: "so wil unns doch fur nutz und guet ansehen, daz du ir [Paula von Firmian] dieweil du nu der bemelten unser zwo tochternn kundtschafft und erfahrung hast [ihr mittelst] welher massen die baid kunigin gesipt und genoturt sein." Konrad von Moltke, *Siegmund von Dietrichstein*, 78, note 28.

grace.²⁹³ It is possible that in this period the courts were not yet joined and Dietrichstein and his wife headed Anne's court, while Mary's court was led by the Rottal couple.

The joint Princesses' court in Innsbruck (1516-1521)

The households of Anne and Mary moved gradually from Vienna to Innsbruck where they arrived around March 1517 after a frequently interrupted travel of a few months. The first joint ordinance is from December 1516 and gives instructions on the rules of the household in Steyr (“*Ordnung beder Kaiserin unnd Kunigin wie sy zu Steyr undterhalten warden sollen*”).²⁹⁴ It can be assumed that a joint court was organisationally and financially advantageous, as well as being an important instrument of integration between the households of the sovereigns of Austria and Hungary-Bohemia. Maximilian instructed the Government of Innsbruck to send Bartholomeus von Firmian, his wife, and Paula von Firmian²⁹⁵ to Salzburg where Bartholomeus would take over the office of Hofmeister from Georg von Rottal and Hans von Lamberg, Paula von Firmian the office of Hofmeisterin from lady Rottal, and the wife of Bartholomeus would become Hofmeisterin of the Frauenzimmer.²⁹⁶

The court also had a function of a sheltered place of education for raising young people of royal families. Beside Anne and Mary also Catharina, an illegitimate daughter of the Polish king Sigismund was raised there, as well as Eugen von Lusignan, son of Jacob II of Cyprus, as well as Christoph son of Herzog Ulrich von Württemberg.²⁹⁷ The court life was well regulated and divided into five departments, each under the leadership of the masters of the house, yard, stable, kitchen and wardrobe. The meals were also regulated according to the hierarchy of the court offices, with all personnel being assigned specific places at the dinner tables in the great hall. The princesses sat at the high table with the Hofmeisterin Paula von Firmian. At the next table the lord High Steward sat with the heads of the household

²⁹³ From the same letter: “unnd ob uns schon etwas zuekumen were oder noch zuekumen wurde, so ... kunden [wir] wol gedunken daz die jugendt etwas frech und frey sein und die so inen solhen irn willen nit verhenggen wellen, daz dieselben khain willen noch gnaden bey inen haben mogen.” Konrad von Moltke, *Siegmund von Dietrichstein*, 78, note 28.

²⁹⁴ Edited by Kerkhoff Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 264-268.

²⁹⁵ Paula von Firmian, née Caballis was the second wife and widow of Niklas Lord of Firmian an der Etsch. Her husband had been the Hofmeister of the Emperor Maximilian and she had been the Hofmeisterin of Bianca Maria Sforza in Innsbruck. Gerhard Benecke, *Maximilian I*, 96, 105. One of Mary's favourite ladies in waiting, Lucretia Caballis must have been her relative. For Lucretia see more below.

²⁹⁶ Maximilian to the Government of Innsbruck, Antdorf, 10 03 17, LA Innsbruck, Copialbücher, Geschafft von Hof 1517, fol.125-128. Quoted by Heiss Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 421.

²⁹⁷ Wilhelm Bauer, *Die Anfänge Ferdinands I.* (Wien, Leipzig, 1907), 99.

departments and the personal servants and domestics of Anne and Mary. At the next few tables the noble pages, ladies, common servants, guards and porters, as well as favoured servants, musicians and guards of the inner court were seated. Nicholas von Firmian, his wife and his daughter sat at the table of the ladies in waiting, including two further tables for the personal servants of the ladies. These tables comprised the inner court. The outer court included the cook's table, kitchen accountants and table hands, the cellarer's table with the stable servants, the servant's children and the outdoor servants (people involved in hewing, carrying, hygiene, cleaning, wagoners, woodcutters). Next was the chaplains table with the choirboys. All together, the household sat at fourteen tables.²⁹⁸

The costs of the Princess' household in Innsbruck was a considerable sum amounting to 30 000 fl annually in 1520, excluding the provisions and drink which came directly from the ruler's officials.²⁹⁹ The household consisted of approximately 200 people.³⁰⁰ While the princess' household was travelling westwards from Vienna. Maximilian started negotiations in March 1517 with the Government in Innsbruck. They offered to pay the travel costs from Rosenheim and one-third of the costs of the household in Innsbruck. The Emperor ordered the other two thirds of the costs to be paid by Lorenz Saurer, councillor of the Emperor – who had been responsible for the financing of the household to this point – on the tax (“Landessteuer”) and the Urbar (“Urbarsteuer”) of the Austrian provinces under the Enns.³⁰¹ The financing of the household therefore remained a difficult issue because of the high costs and the refusal of the *Vizedomamt* in Vienna to continue paying a share after 1517, which caused a wave of protest by the Government in Innsbruck and the town. In March 1518 Maximilian came to Innsbruck and was forced to promise reform his own court as well as the Princess' household to decrease the financial burden and asked the Government in suggesting measures for reducing the size of the princess' household.³⁰² The sudden death of the emperor on 12 January 1519 made it necessary for his heir Charles to address the problem. After extensive

²⁹⁸ Gerhard Benecke, *Maximilian I*, 105-106.

²⁹⁹ Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 9-13. As a comparison the Innsbruck Government argued that the household of Bianca Maria Sforza, second wife of Maximilian in Innsbruck had been 13 000 fl. Anneliese Gatt however comes to a much higher calculation of the costs of this household, which makes it probable that the Government manipulated the costs for the sake of the argument.

³⁰⁰ Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 42.

³⁰¹ Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 7.

³⁰² Maximilian had incurred such debts that the Raitkammer and consequently the Innsbruck court suffered severe shortage of money and could not pay the extra costs of the arrival of the Emperor's court and refused to accept his arrival until the earlier debts (24 000 fl) had been paid. Maximilian was forced to travel on to Rattenberg, severely ill and finally died in Wels. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 9.

negotiations with Charles, including requests by the Innsbruck Government for the sending away of certain gentlemen of the chamber, suggestions were put forward for splitting the princess' court and moving one half of it to regions above the Enns, thereby involving finances from that region. The reform suggestions did not seem to have made any dramatic change in the princess' household. By the end of 1520 preparations were being made for the splitting of the court and for the travelling of Anne and Mary to their respective bridegrooms.

The main features shaping the princess' household therefore were the financing of the costs, and the appointment of the members of the household. The latter was ultimately in the hand of the head of the family. The sources also reveal, however, the existence of an informal, but rather effective influence of the princesses, especially Mary. The Government in Innsbruck reports to Wilhelm von Wolkenstein in the beginning of August 1520 that when confronted with the list of people who would have to leave their household in the process of the court reform, both Mary and Anne protested against the decision and demanded to see the original instruction, not believing this to be the wish of Charles. Mary – 15 years old at this point – spoke in the name of both princesses and did not give in, even when Anne showed signs of accepting the decision. She wrote a French letter to Charles and had Anne sign it as well. Charles finally gave in to the princesses. In Mary's case one courtier in question whom she insisted on keeping at her side can be found in her court lists even up to 1532.³⁰³

Another revealing example concerns the priest Simon Keck, who visited Mary and Anne in Innsbruck in the spring of 1520 in the company of his abbot and writes to his brother-in-law about the results of his visit.³⁰⁴ In his letter he explains that “through the mediation of certain mighty lords he has succeeded in being accepted by Queen Mary as her chaplain for when she comes to our land [when she travels to Hungary].”³⁰⁵ The letter is enlightening in the practice of winning court positions, involving the sequence of recommendations by people of power,

³⁰³ Report of the Innsbruck Government to Wilhelm von Wolkenstein, Innsbruck, 12 08 1520, LA Innsbruck, Copialbücher, Missiven 1519-21, fol.87-89, quoted in Heiss. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 13. The two gentlemen of the chamber (Kämmerer) in question belonged to the household of Mary and Anne each and were accused of „unschicklichkeiten in Frauenzimmer“. Mary's gentleman of the chamber was Philipp de Feure (Feuers, Fence) from the Low Countries, who went with her to Hungary on to the Netherlands in the same function („valet de chambre“). Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 426.

³⁰⁴ I deal with Keck and the case in detail in Chapter 5.2.2.

³⁰⁵ Letter from Simon Keckh to his father in law Veytt Oder, judge of the town Schemnitz about his visit to Innsbruck: "...durch ettlichen grosmechtigen herren anpringn hab ich erlangt von unser allergenedigsten frawen und konigin Maria ein genedigs zw trettn und mich auff genomen hatt zw einen capplan als pald sy yn das land kumpt..." MOL DL 47 343 Pressburg/Pozsony, 26 03 1520.

personal visit, and the promise for the future. It also shows that Mary felt free to make such promises independently, without being inhibited by waiting for permission from male members of the family. Both examples show that even in this phase Mary's influence on the shaping of the personal element in her household should not be neglected, despite the fact that she was not involved in the official decision making process.

Life in the Princess' court was strictly regulated, the details of which were fixed in the household ordinances.³⁰⁶ The goal of these documents is threefold: they acted as contract in fixing the details of the agreement between the parties, e.g. what kind of service is to be expected for what kind of compensation (money, lodgings, food, clothes, shoes, horses, etc.). They secured the organisational, logistic details of the daily life at the court (exact instructions regarding the meals, seating hierarchy, manner of serving the dishes, type of food given to the different tables). Finally, they included strong restrictions regarding the order and moral condition of the court life, regulating when the Frauenzimmer was locked and when it was opened, who kept the keys, who was allowed to enter at which times, what types of dances were and were not allowed for members of the Frauenzimmer, etc. Special emphasis is given to the normative moral and controlling function of the ordinance, which regulated the man-woman relations (i.e. the relations between members of the Frauenzimmer and the outside world) and well as the woman-woman relations (i.e. within the Frauenzimmer), all of this in the system of a strict social hierarchy.³⁰⁷ Though the princesses Anne and Mary bore both the titles of queen³⁰⁸ in accordance with the engagement ceremony in 1515, the princess' court resembled a court for royal children in many aspects, with the strong emphasis on protection, exclusion and education. However it would be a mistake to think that the strict protective regulations regarding the court had to do with the age of the princesses, since both locked doors and strict restrictions on visiting times are a basic characteristic of female households.³⁰⁹

³⁰⁶ Since I have already dealt with the aspect of everyday life in the princess' court elsewhere I will only treat it in brief. Orsolya Réthelyi, "Föhercegnői udvarból királynéi udvar": 1210-1211. and Orsolya Réthelyi, "Die Anfänge der Ofener Hofhaltung".

³⁰⁷ Paul-Joachim Heinig, "Ein Ordnungsentwurf", 314.

³⁰⁸ In fact, Anne was called "Kaiserin" in the year after the engagement because she had been engaged to Maximilian, who temporarily replaced one of his grandsons. In the sources this title appears even in the later years.

³⁰⁹ Anja Kircher-Kannemann, "Organisation der Frauenzimmer", 242.

The splitting of the court – the royal bride’s entourage (1521)

After much negotiation and a frequent change of plans, Anne and Mary left Innsbruck on 14 May to travel through Schwaz, Rosenheim, Mühldorf and Passau, where they spent the Pentecost Sunday, and arrived to Linz on the 20th. They were not able to leave Innsbruck before Charles had sent 4 000 fl.rh. to settle the debts of the Innsbruck court and a further 1 000 fl.rh. for the costs of the travel.³¹⁰

The entourage and household of the royal brides can be reconstructed mainly from a document, which is also the most valuable source in reconstructing the beginnings Mary’s household in Buda. This is a manuscript entitled „Stat baider kunigin rays und überantwortung zu iren gemahl(e)n” dated in Worms on 3 May, 1521.³¹¹ It is not signed, but its content makes it clear that it has to do with the marriages of Anne and Mary. It contains a recommendation of the Government in Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Regiment) for Charles V concerning the trousseau to be taken by Mary and Anne and the household and bridal entourage that would accompany the brides to their new homes. The concept includes many sections which were crossed out, or changed, usually indicating an effort by Charles or his advisors to reduce the costs. The final version would be an inventory of the household goods, the clothing, textiles, carriages, horses and other valuables taken with the queens as well as a record of the exact costs of the new liveries for the household of the bridal entourage in the form of an account to their respective husbands, Archduke Ferdinand and King Louis II. This list is the last source specifically about the court of Mary up to her departure to the Low Countries in 1531, and gives information on the beginnings of her household in Buda therefore it will be dealt with in greater detail.

For the reconstruction of the household, the list of people who will accompany Queen Mary to Hungary in Folio 36-40 is of special interest.³¹² The queen’s household for the travel

³¹⁰ Letter of Charles to the Government and Raitkamer of Innsbruck, Worms, 03 05 1521, LA Innsbruck, Copialbücher, Missiven und Beveln von Hof 1519-22, fol.115; Charles to the same, Worms 05 05 ebd. fol.117.

³¹¹ „Stat baider kunigin rays und überantwortung zu iren gemahl(e)n”, 3 May 1521, Worms. Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (henceforth ÖStA) Hofkammerarchiv (henceforth HKA), Nieder-Österreichische Herrschaftsakten, W-61/A-36, Fol.17-44 (Fol.31-35 missing). I would like to thank Jacqueline Kerckhoff for bringing this important source to my attention and for providing me with a copy of the manuscript. The quotations are from my own transcription.

³¹² „Stat der personen so mit Künigin Maria ziehen sollen”. Unfortunately Fol. 31-35, presumably with the list of people accompanying Anne is missing, making a comparison of the two impossible. Since I haven have edited and made a prosopographic analysis of this list in my article on the beginning of Queen Mary’s household and

consisted of about 80-90 people including officials, the *Frauenzimmer* and the menials. The names are listed in different categories, largely according to the court hierarchy (though not always following this) in the following sections:

The *Hofmeister* and *Hofmeisterin* (Steward and Stewardess; the male and female head of the household) [1+1]³¹³,

Members of the female household, the *Frauenzimmer*, subdivided into the *Perseresserin* and the entourage of six noble ladies [1+6], the *Kammerjungfrauen* (maids of honour) [4], and the female menials of the queen (*Königin jungfrau dienern*) [4]

The main court officials and departments: *Unterhofmeister* (Vice-steward) [1], *Fürschneider* (Carver) [1], *Truchsess* (Carvers) [1+5]³¹⁴, *Schenckh* (Cup-bearer) [1], *Stablmaister* (Master of Ceremonies) [1], *Silberkammer* (Silverchamber) [4], *Edlknaben* (pages) [4], *Pfennigschreiber* (Accountant) [1], *Laybartz* (Physician) [1], *Garderober* (Master of the Wardrobe) [1], *Caplan* (Chaplain) [1], *Thürhuter* (Doorward) [2], *Portier* (Porter) [1], *Furrier* (Quartermaster), *Kellner* (Cellarer), *Kuchl* (Kitchen), subdivided into *Küchenschreiber* (1) and *Zuschroter* (butcher) [1+1], *Koch* (he queen's kitchen) [5], *frauenzimmer und hofgesind kuchl* (kichen staff for the *Frauenzimmer* and the household) [4], *Stall* (personnel of the stables, including a smith) [8], *Wagenknecht* (Wagonlads) [8], *Lacayen* (Lackeys) [4], *Senfftenmeister* (person responsible for the coaches) [1], *Fuetermaister* (person responsible for the fodder of the animals) [1], *Schneyder* (tailor) [1], *Trümmelschlag* (Drummer) [1], *Pfeyffer* (Piper) [1], *Hofweschin* (court washerwoman) [1], *Tappesier* (Master of the tapestries) [1]

Both the *Hofmeister*, Hans von Lamberg herr zu Saunstein and the *Hofmeisterin* Elizabeth Gräfin zu Salm (née Freiin von Roggendorf) were intimates of Queen Mary, who returned to Austria after escorting the queen to Hungary, but with whom Mary maintained close relations. Hans von Lamberg had been a Hofmeister of Mary's court already in 1516. He was also the person – by that time councillor (*Hofrat*) to Ferdinand – to whom she would first write about the defeat at Mohács and warn Ferdinand's court against the Ottoman attack during her flight from Buda in August.³¹⁵ Elizabeth Salm, wife of Niklas zu Salm, the famous supreme commander-in-chief of Ferdinand I, would become Hofmeisterin of Anne Jagiello but at the

will only summarise the results here and refer, where necessary to the article. Orsolya Réthelyi, "Die Anfänge der Ofener Hofhaltung".

³¹³ Square brackets indicate the number of people within a group.

³¹⁴ The Master Carver also functioned as Master of the Horse (*Stallmeister*).

³¹⁵ From the letter of Mary to Hans Lamberg: „Lieber her Hans ich kan euch nichts anders schreyben denn das leyder der Turk meinen hern vnd gemahl vollens In der schlacht geschlagen hatt, vnd vyl redlich leynt vmbkomen, was seiner lieb person antrifft, wie mir angesagt das er daruon Ist got gib das es war sey dem Ich hab khain gewisse kuntschafft von Inne.“ Tivadar Ortway, *Mária, II. Lajos magyar király neje 1505-1558 [Mary, wife of Louis II king of Hungary]* (Budapest: Athenaeum, 1914), 203-204.

request of Mary would be the Hofmeisterin of her household 15 years later, when Mary returned to the Netherlands in 1531.³¹⁶

The female household (1521)

After having named the two main persons, the list follows with the queen's ladies household, or the members of her Frauenzimmer with Madame von Bailleul,³¹⁷ or as she is most often called the *Frau Perseresserin* on the top of the list. The importance of her person is marked not only by her prominent place, but also by the indication that she has her own servants – two young women and a boy servant – with her.³¹⁸ She had come in the entourage of Mary from the Low Countries to Vienna with her husband, two sons and daughter in 1514, in 1521 they were accompanying her to Buda. Madame Margareta von Bailleul, was Mary's governess in the Innsbruck court.³¹⁹ She had an important position, visible for instance in her handing over the presents to the envoys of Louis II in Steyr. At a certain point of the preparations it was suggested that she would be Mary's Hofmeisterin for the travel from Innsbruck to Buda.³²⁰

The ladies' court further consisted of six noble ladies-in-waiting, "who will accompany the queen on horseback", these are Katharina van Poitiers, Barbara von Maidburg, Maria Cerf, Landenbergerin, Schwekawitzin and the daughter of the *Perseresserin*. Three of the ladies in waiting had come with Mary from the Low Countries. The daughter of the *Perseresserin*, Margaretha Bailleul (the younger) who – according to other sources – had married Hans Persinger a Doorward of the joint household in Innsbruck in 1519.³²¹ Katarina van Poitiers

³¹⁶ The insistence of Mary to have Elisabeth Salm at the head of her court was a returning topic in the correspondence of Mary and Ferdinand in the early 1531's and caused some irritation since Countess Salm had promised to stay beside Anne who was expecting to give birth soon and did not want to leave her, Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria von Hongarije*, 125..

³¹⁷ The family probably takes its name after the Manor in Bailleul in the Burgundian territories. I have not been able to trace their origin.

³¹⁸ „zwo junkfrawen ain knecht” fol. 36r.

³¹⁹ The name she was popularly known by „Perseresserin” is probably also a derivative of the French word for this function. I follow Heiss in identifying Madame de Bailleul with the *Perseresserin*, though this is never explicitly recorded. Stracke identifies her with Margaret of Poitiers, based on the letter of Margaret of Austria mentioning “damoiselle Marguerite de Poitiers, bercheresse de madame Marie”, who should always be kept beside Mary. For full quotation see note 280.

³²⁰ Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 423.

³²¹ Other sources reveal her name as Margaretha. She was a lady-in-waiting in the joint court in Innsbruck, where she married a member of the household, the Doorward Hans Persinger. Mary had promised her a dowry in Buda, which was still not received by Persinger in 1530; Margaret had died in the meantime. After the death of Persinger the debt went to his brother, Balthasar Persinger, serving in Ferdinand's court. Gernot Heiss, *Maria*

was the daughter of Margareta Poitiers, Lady of Belle, who was also involved in the raising of Mary in Mechelen. Katharina was married by Sigismund von Pfirt in 1521.³²² Maria Cerf was about five years older than the queen, and she also had come with Mary from the Low Countries. The other three ladies came from the Austrian territories: Barbara von Maidburg had served with her sister at the joint court in Innsbruck. At the separation of the court Barbara went with Mary, while Katharina von Maidburg went with Anne, where – according to a source from 1525 – she was in charge of her mistress’ jewellery.³²³ Katharina von Landenberg came from a Swiss noble family; sources testify her presence in Mary’s court up to 1537.³²⁴ The lady-in-waiting who appears in the inventory under the name “Schwekawitzin” can be identified with Katharina Svetkovics (Swetkovics / Schwetkowitz / Schwetkowitz). A lady with the family name Schwekawitz is documented in Mary’s court already about six years earlier. In 1515 Maximilian orders all ladies from non-noble, burger families to leave the princess court. In an answer the Innsbruck government requests that “Schwekawitzin”, who is the daughter of a rich burgher from Salzburg should be allowed to stay, despite her non-noble background.³²⁵ It is perhaps surprising to find Katharina among the “edl junkfrawn” in Mary’s entourage in 1521. Either her family had received nobility in the meantime, or she was silently accepted among the nobility. The neat balance of three ladies from the Low Countries and three from the Austrian territories may have been disturbed by the execution of the instructions in the sentence following the list of members of the Frauenzimmer. This stipulated that the Hofmeister and the Innsbruck Government should select and exchange one or two ladies from Anne’s Frauenzimmer, who spoke Hungarian, with one or two of Mary’s Frauenzimmer, who spoke French.³²⁶

As the next category on the list the group includes three “Camerjungfrauen”, indicated as “Kolpeckin, Fuxlin, Mayca von Prussl, Katherina von Neyss”. All four ladies of the chamber

von Ungarn, 424. It is interesting that the name of Persinger does not appear in any source concerning Mary’s household in Buda, but of course this is true of other people as well, who we know for certain were in the service of the queen in this period. Contrary to the data of Heiss Kerkhoff puts the wedding of Margaretha von Bailleul to 11 September 1519. Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 44.

³²² They both probably went to Buda with the queen since Sigismund von Pfirt died in 1523 in Buda. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 425.

³²³ See Inventory of the jewels of Archduchess Anne, HHStA, Familienurkunde Nr. 1183. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 431.

³²⁴ Hofstaatsverzeichnis, s.d. (March 1520), LA Innsbruck, Codex 2470. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 431.; Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 280.

³²⁵ Hofstaatsverzeichnis, s.d. (March 1520), LA Innsbruck, Codex 2470. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 431.

³²⁶ See a discussion of this below in chapter 5.4.

were of burgher background. Their tasks included providing linen for the queen's bed and overseeing the making of the bed, as well as ordering her chamber when she was not present. According to the findings of Kerkhoff, in household lists from Mary's period as regent there exist separate ladies of the chamber (usually three) for the queen's person and a separate group for the service of the noble ladies of the household.³²⁷ They had a privileged position because of their close contact with the queen. Three of these ladies were from Austria and can be identified as Miss Kalbeck, Katherina von Eis from Schwatz (Tirol) and Miss Fuchs, all three of whom the Innsbruck government wanted to send away from the court in 1520 because of their burgher background. Miss Fuchs was eight years old at the time. She stayed at the court and was later – somewhat surprisingly – married to Mary's Hofmeister Hans Pock.³²⁸ Mayca of Brussel probably came with Mary from the Low Countries and was kept in the household “out of compassion”.³²⁹ This group is separated from the group of the female menial servants of the queen's household, who include Miss Anthoinetta³³⁰ from the Low Countries, the unnamed personal washerwoman of the queen and an unnamed female (“ain Dienerin”) and male servant (“ain Knecht”). One extra female menial, the washerwoman of the complete household, who was the wife of the cook master Jobst, is not listed in this category, but at the end of the list.

The male household (1521)

Directly below the Women's household the men's household begins with the Vice-steward (“Undterhofmeister”), Ruperto de Balio. His son filled the office of Fürschneider. There is no explicit indication of a leading function of among the Carvers, though one should probably interpret Sebastian Pemfflinger as such, since his name stands at first place and is indicated as

³²⁷ Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 111.

³²⁸ In a private letter to his wife László Kanizsay in October 1524 reports that the magister curiae of the queen is getting married. Since we do not know of any other magister curiae at that time it can be assumed to refer to the marriage of Hans Pock with Miss Fuchs. She would have been 12 at the time which makes it possible according to the law, though it would have made her a very young bride. 09 10 1524, Buda. MOL DL 25708 Ed. Bessenyei József Bessenyei, *Enyingi Török Bálint* (Budapest, 1994), 8, Nr.8. The marriage invites further questions, because one would not normally expect a Hofmeister to marry a non noble member of the court. However, we know very little of the background of Hans Pock and Miss Fuchs. The fact that Catherine Svetkovic was allowed among the noble group of the household and later was married by the Hungarian noble Ferenc Batthány also a marriage that reminds us to be careful with a too strong differentiation between the noble and non-noble element of the household.

³²⁹ Hofstaatsverzeichnis, s.d. (March 1520), LA Innsbruck, Codex 2470. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 425.

³³⁰ According to the Household list of 1520 Miss Anthoinetta pretended to be of noble background, but in fact she was the daughter of a washerwoman. Hofstaatsverzeichnis, s.d. (March 1520), LA Innsbruck, Codex 2470. Quoted by Heiss Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 425.

“Trucksass” (and also Master of the Horse/Stallmaister, as well, according to the counsel of the Government of Innsbruck). His name is followed by that of five other nobles, the Carvers (Trucksassen). Sebastian Pemfflinger belonged to the influential noble family involved in trade from the vicinity of Regensburg who moved first to Vienna then to Buda. His father Johann was a wealthy burgher, who first appeared in Buda in 1477, had a spectacular career and became town judge, while his mother Ursula had been involved in raising Anne of Jagiello. Many of their children were in the households of Mary, Louis, Anne and Ferdinand. Several children as well as the mother, Ursula and her second husband, Leonhard Gallinzer were involved in Mary’s estate management.³³¹ Sebastian was the Master of the Horse (Stallmaister) of Mary up to 1531 and then served as the castellan of Diósgyőr and Bruck an der Leitha. The other five Carvers included Thomas Carondolet³³², and Heinrich Hanoque from the Low Countries³³³, who appears in the sources as “Hanika”, gentleman of the chamber of queen Mary and stays in her service after 1526.³³⁴ The three others were probably from the Austrian lands: Semenitsch, Schnitzenpainer and Hofer. Neither of them is traceable in the Innsbruck household and we have no records of further service for the queen. Schnitzenpainer may be the same as the Niklas Schnitzenpainer, who as a captain of the armed cavalry was the temporary vice-officer in command of Ferdinand I for several months in 1536.³³⁵ There is only one Cup-bearer in the list, Herr Ludwig von Lamberg Herr zu

³³¹ András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 15-16. On the family see: András Kubinyi, "Die Pemfflinger in Wien und Buda. Ein Beitrag zu wirtschaftlichen und familiären Verbindungen der Bürgerschaft in den beiden Hauptstädten am Ausgang des Mittelalters." *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Wien* (1978).

³³² According to Kerkhoff he is Thomas Perrenot, brother of cardinal Anton van Perrenot, Lord of Granvelle. Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 283. He does not figure as a member of the Innsbruck household and was appointed by Charles in January 1521 to accompany Mary. Letter of Charles to the Government of Innsbruck, Worms 25 01 1521. LA Innsbruck, Copialbücher, Karl V. Registratur 1519-22, fol.47f. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 425. A Jean de Carondolet is in service of Mary as gentleman of the chamber.

³³³ In the Hungarian literature also referred to as „Hannika, Henneke” and he was probably also the person referred to by the name Hänigken Oels. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 16. „Hans Hanogkh” served in the shared household between 1517-1521. He is one of the people who are in the list of household for the travel among the Carvers. There is also mention of a Heinrich Hanoque („Hannockhen”) who was from the Netherlands. The Innsbruck Government wanted to send him back because of his non noble state. Hofstaatsverzeichnis, s.d. (March 1520), LA Innsbruck, Codex 2470. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 425. It is most likely that „Heinrich” is a scribal error for „Hans”, or two people might have been in Mary’s service from the same family.

³³⁴ József Fögel, *II. Lajos udvartartása*, 26., Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 72. According to Kubinyi Hanika is the same as the gentleman of the chamber Hänigken Oels. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 15. Kerkhoff’s research shows that a Hannekin Oyelz can be found on her household lists of 1534, 1539 and 1543. Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 287.

³³⁵ Géza Pálffy, "A török elleni védelmi rendszer néhány alapkérdése a XVI. század első felében" in *hagyomány és korszerűség a XVI-XVII. században*, ed. Tivadar Petercsák (Eger, 1997), 70. I thank the information to Géza Pálffy.

Saunstain, a relative of the Hofmeister, while Wolfgang Prunner was appointed Master of the Ceremonies (Stäblmaister, i.e. Stabträger, meister des Stabes), a title difficult to find an equivalent for in Hungarian court. He had served in the court already in 1516 and though there had been many complaints about him from the Innsbruck Government he stayed. He became an important figure in the early estate management of Mary (see below), but after 1523 he disappears from the sources. The silver was in the care of the Master of the Silver (Silberkämmerer), the Austrian Hans Selnauer, and his helper, Jean Caudron from the Low Countries. Both had been in the Innsbruck household and the Innsbruck Government wanted to send both away in 1520.³³⁶ Selnauer can be traced up to 1527, when he was her treasurer. They were assisted by Hans Prenner Fuchs tinwasher and Hans Halsreiter silver washer.³³⁷

The list continues with four noble pages (“Königsperger, Wolfstain, Heystain, Thunner”), according to their names probably of Austrian origin. Hans Trummer from Vienna was treasurer (Pfenningsschreiber), who can be traced in Anne’s court in 1525 in the same function.³³⁸ The queen’s physician, Doctor Jacob Cicolin is listed next.³³⁹ Mary’s gentleman of the chamber responsible for the clothes (*Garderober*) was Philipp de Feure(s) from the Low Countries. He had come with Mary from the Netherlands and served her as gentleman of the chamber. The Innsbruck government suggested in 1520 that he and a gentleman of the chamber of Anne Christoph Ressman should be placed over to the quartermaster department because they had demonstrated “inappropriate behaviour in the Frauzimmer”. Both Mary and Anne interceded with Charles to have them remain. Feuers stayed in the service of the queen as gentleman of the chamber, acted as messenger between Mary and her aunt Margaret in 1528 and finally returned with her to the Low Countries in 1531 and can be traced up to 1534.³⁴⁰ The same Christoph Ressman is the next name on the list (after the chaplain,

³³⁶ Caudron was sent away because of his alleged madness. Charles did not give permission because he and his forefathers have served Mary and the Emperor Maximilian loyally in the past. March 1520. LA Innsbruck, Codex 2470.

³³⁷ It is not certain that the latter two accompanied Mary, since the source notes that they, or two others in their place should be included in the household.

³³⁸ Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 433.

³³⁹ He was formerly court physician to Maximilian in 1519. Thomas Fellner and Heinrich Kretschmayr, *Die österreichische Zentralverwaltung. I. Abteilung. Von Maximilian I. bis zur Vereinigung der Österreichischen und Böhmisches Hofkanzlei (1749). 2. Band. Aktenstücke 1491–1681.* (Wien, 1907). According to Kerkhoff he is the same as Jacob Eechau, who is the same as Jacob von Aichhoven figuring as physician on the household lists from Mary’s court in the Netherlands. Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 122.

³⁴⁰ Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 326., for service in the Low Countries: Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 291.

Johannes Croner, who is dealt with in detail below) in the function of doorkeeper (“Thürhueter”). He was originally from Transylvania, probably an ethnic German and had been in Anne’s service. He was probably only included in Mary’s retinue to be sent home to Hungary, since we cannot find any further indication of his service for Mary.³⁴¹ Next on the list is the other doorkeeper Christoph von der Lad, as well as the guard of the lower door (“Portier an die undter Tür”), Symandl and the quartermaster, Niklas Wuldersdorfer.

The numerous personnel of the kitchen follows, beginning with the bottler (“Kellner”), Erhard Ensser, the kitchen administrator (“küchenschreiber”), Christoff Kreutzer and the butcher (“zueschroter”), Andre Nobis, the latter from the Low Countries. Kreutzer’s function was not only the overseeing the complicated business food rationing of the household also was a controller of the treasurer. Kreutzer had filled the same function in the court of Bianca Maria Sforza. He stayed with Mary in Buda and received money in her name according to the account book of 1526.³⁴² There was a separate kitchen staff of five people who cooked for the queen, and perhaps some other people of high rank from the household. These people are Wolfgang Rauch (“Mundkoch”), Valentin Hunger (probably of Hungarian ethnicity), Paul Verner, assistant (“Kuchlknecht”), Jobst pastry baker (“Pastetenkoch”) and a boy helper. A much smaller group was responsible for the meals of the Frauenzimmer and the household (“Frauenzimmer und Gesind Kuchl”): Hans Burgstaler, Georg, a servant, and a boy helper.

The stables employed eleven people, including the smith (Ludwig Holzinger, his groom, a smith – to be hired, the grooms Carrolius Uterman, Hanns, Martin Koch, Sigismund Spät, Lienhard Sims, and two further grooms). Eight people worked with the wagons (Hanns Engl, Georig, Jacob Steyrer, Hans von Wien, Simon Krews, three strong wagon lads) and four lackeys had still to be found – according to the source. The man in charge of the coaches (“Senfftenmeister”) was Valentin Steyr, while Nassenthaler was responsible for the fodder for the horses (“Fuettermeister”). The list end with Sixt Pauer, the tailor, a drummer (Georg

³⁴¹ A very interesting letter survives from his hand written to George of Brandenburg asking for his patronage and support. Here he indicates himself as the ex-gentleman of the chamber of the queen of Hungary and Bohemia and the high vajda of the gipsies: “der kunigin zue Ungerem und Peham etc. altert kamerling wnd obrister zygan wayda in Wngeren.” I cannot place this title in any known category and further research must clarify it. I thank the reference to Zoltán Csepregi. Letter of Christoph Ressmann to George of Brandenburg. Vienna 10 March 1529. MOL Df 11202.

³⁴² Johann Christian von Engel, ed., "Fragmentum libri rationarii", 187-236.

Pirhinger) and a flutist, the washerwoman mentioned above, and in the last place Hackin Premberger from the Low Countries, master of the tapestries.

Though the lack of any court lists, ordinances or accounts from the Buda years makes this one source unique and very valuable for the reconstruction of the beginning of Mary's household, but nevertheless it cannot be taken as an exact list of those who went with Mary. In some cases there are no names given, only instructions to hire a smith, for instance. Charles V gave Ferdinand the government of the five lower Austrian provinces after the ending of the Diet of Worms in April. Anne and Mary left Innsbruck to go to Linz for the wedding on 15 May and arrived there on 20 May. This means that barely two weeks passed between the revision of the list in Worms and the departure of the princesses, leaving very little time for those in charge to follow the exact instructions and changes in the list. Furthermore the list of the names of the noble ladies is followed by a remarkable instruction to exchange a few ladies from the households of Anne and Mary with regard to their language knowledge, which makes further minor changes in the composition probable. We also miss some names, the presence of whom is documented in Mary's household in the period between 1521 and 1526 and who came from Austria or the Low Countries, but who are not listed here. It is possible that they joined her household in later years; we know that Mary extended her court with several people in these years. However, it is also possible that such a travel household list does not include all members of the household and some people travelled independently of their lady.

Beside the members of Mary's household the source also mentions two illustrious diplomats who accompanied Mary as councillors and members of her retinue. Bernhard von Cles, bishop of Trent was an important diplomat of the Habsburg family, councillor of Maximilian and instrumental in the division of power between Charles and Ferdinand. He returned to Ferdinand's court and became his trusted advisor.³⁴³ Andrea da Burgo went with Mary as the ambassador of the emperor and stayed with Mary up to 1523, gaining immense influence among the Hungarians.³⁴⁴

³⁴³ Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher, eds., *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), 313-315.

³⁴⁴ The role of Andrea de Burgo as councillor of Mary is discussed in detail below.

The list also indicates the costs of the trousseau of the queen, including the four gilded coaches and six utility carriages, as well as the costs of the liveries made for the household in uniform colour, red riding costume (“reitrockh”), stocking and cloak for the officers and servants, but of different quality cloth reflecting the social standing of the members of the household.³⁴⁵ The source also indicates clearly that the costs of the trousseau and the festive ceremonial pomp of the bridal entourages were paid by the Habsburg family. There are indications of reductions suggested in the original calculations on every page of the document. This is the only phase of Mary’s household in the investigated period in which we can make relatively precise comparisons about the constitution of the household. Less than a quarter of the 84 people on the list (18 people) were women including the Hofmeisterin, the ladies of honour, the ladies in waiting and the serving women from the different levels of the social hierarchy. The average age of the ladies of the Frauentzimmer was young, reflecting the age of Mary. Most of the ladies were a few years younger, or older than she was.³⁴⁶ The household was of diverse ethnic and linguistic composition. At least 18 people were from the Low Countries, at least 28 (but probably much more) were from the Austrian provinces, at least four people were from the Kingdom of Hungary, two of these being from (ethnically German towns of) Transylvania. The physician was Italian. The used languages were probably primarily German and French.

4.2.2 The queen’s court in Buda (1521-1526)

As it has been emphasised several times before, no traditional sources for the Queen Mary’s court exist in the years between 1521 and 1531, neither ordinances, salary lists nor even any form of collected court accounts have survived. Therefore, the reconstruction of the queen’s household is a question of gathering fragments of information on the individuals from charters and other written sources. The fact that not even descriptive sources have survived about the new queen’s bridal travel, her *Joyeuse Entrée* in the capital and her crowning and wedding

³⁴⁵ Orsolya Réthelyi, “„Maria regina. nuda venerat ad Hungariam.“ The Queen's Treasures" in *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and her Court 1521-1531*, ed. Orsolya Réthelyi et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2005), 123.

³⁴⁶ We know the ages of many of the ladies from the Frauentzimmer in Innsbruck thanks to the memorandum, used for repeatedly above, which was composed by the Government of Innsbruck in March 1520 as a suggestion for Charles to decrease the Princess’ court and economise on the costs. (Hofstaatsverzeichnis”, s.d. (March 1520), LA Innsbruck, Codex 2470.) Here we find the list of the complete household, often with indication of the ages of the people and with an advice to keep or send the person away. The source has previously been used in several other studies including the dissertation of Anneliese Gatt, of Gernot Heiss, Jacqueline Kerkhoff and others.

ceremony³⁴⁷ can be better understood if one keeps in mind the historical circumstances. Mary's arrival to the Hungarian Kingdom coincided with the first large scale Ottoman attack of the reign of the new Sultan Suleyman I, which led to the loss of Belgrade, the key stronghold of the southern defensive line and laying open Hungary to a new Ottoman attack.³⁴⁸ The bridal entourage was not met by the king in Pressburg in July, as this was planned, because he was involved in recruiting troops and finding money for the military campaign. Mary was advised by the Hungarian lords not even to continue her travel from Pressburg to Buda because of the dangers and uncertainties, an advice she did not follow.³⁴⁹ She arrived to Buda in August 1521 and had to wait for her barely 15 year old groom to return from the unsuccessful military campaign and recover from the epidemic that took its toll in the military camp. We do not know how these circumstances influenced the first months of Mary in her new country, neither is there any information on their effect on her household. One can only assume that these were considerable.

The female household

While both the Hofmeister and the Hofmeisterin, appointed for the travel returned to Austria after accompanying Mary to Buda, much of her household seems to have remained with her. It is not known when the Hofmeisterin, Elisabeth Salm went back to Austria, this may have taken place upon entering the borders of Hungary (in Hainburg or at the first longer stop, in Pressburg), which would be a traditional place to "hand over the bride" to the household officials appointed by her future husband, or it may have been after the wedding ceremony on 13 January 1522. The former version is more probable, since we know from another source, a letter written by a member of Mary's court shortly after the arrival of the retinue to Hungary that the wife of János Bornemissza, castellan of Buda castle had wanted to become Hofmeister to the queen.³⁵⁰ Neither is it known who acted as her Hofmeisterin in the period between the departure of Elisabeth von Salm and the appointment of the next known Hofmeisterin Margarethe Lochner von Liebfels, Freiin von Sonneck, the widow of Hans von

³⁴⁷ Several sources describing the ceremonies of the arrival of the new queen exist for Beatrice of Aragon and even for Anne de Foix. See for instance a recent analysis of the ceremonial of wedding feasts of Beatrice and Anne in a recent article of Géza Pálffy. Géza Pálffy, "Krönungsmähler in Ungarn im Spätmittelalter und in der Frühen Neuzeit. Weiterleben des Tafelzeremoniells des selbständigen ungarischen Königshofes und Machtrepräsentation der ungarischen politischen Elite, Teil 1." *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 115, Heft 1-2 (2007).

³⁴⁸ Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 367.

³⁴⁹ Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber": 121.

³⁵⁰ For a discussion of this interesting source see chapter 5.1.

Ungnad, who filled this post from the year 1524.³⁵¹ It is my assumption that Madame von Bailleul (*perseresserin*) was probably the queen's her Hofmeisterin up to the year 1524, since she is mentioned as Hofmeisterin to the queen in certain sources and since in an earlier version of the negotiations about the travel household of Mary her name had come up as Hofmeisterin.³⁵² Most of the Frauenzimmer remained with Mary in Buda, written sources attest to the presence of the Perseresserin, Barbara von Maidburg, Katharina von Poitiers, Katharina von Landenberg, Katharina Svetkovics, and Margarete Bailleul in these years. Marriage being one of the main goals of the unwed ladies-in-waiting, new maidens must have been accepted to the Frauenzimmer when the ones employed earlier married and subsequently often – but not necessarily – left the household.

There are a number of ladies-in-waiting, who are not mentioned in the list of those, who came with Mary, but joined the court sometime between 1521 and 1526, perhaps to fill the vacancies left by those who married and left service. Such are Lucretia Caballis, who was regarded as one of the queen's favourite and most influential companions already in March 1523.³⁵³ She was a relation of Paula von Firmian (née Caballis), Hofmeisterin of the queen in

³⁵¹ She is called „obriste Hoffmaystarin” in the German language marriage contract between her daughter Elizabeth Ungnad and Franz Eruszt of Csáktornya. 15 04 1526. MOL DI 24 279. Heiss and Kubinyi both refer to the reports of the presence of the son of Margaretha, Johann von Ungnad at the queen's court for a few weeks in early 1524 to obtain a court position for his mother. Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 177., András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 16. Margaretha is definately Mary's Hofmeister from 1527 to 1531. See below.

³⁵² I base my hypothesis on two documents: 1. A letter of Ferdinand I. to the Hungarian Chamber in which he orders a loan of 1000 fl to be paid back to "Margarethe Ballul magistra curie" of Queen Mary, who had leant the money for the personal necessities of the king and queen. Her husband "Carolus de Ballwl" went with Louis in the Battle of Mohács and probably died there. ÖstA HKA, Gedenkbücher, Konv. 1528, fol. 27. Pressburg 1528. november 25. 2. On the detail of a bill sent to the Margrave Georg of Brandenburg by Hans Krell court painter of he royal couple in which he writes about apair of portrait he painted at the order of the King and queen for the Lady Margaret, from the Low Countries, who was the Hofmeisterin of the queen ("Mer im 1522. jar irer baidir khunigl. maj. abgunderfehen, wie die obgemeltn, das sein maj. frawen Margrethn, Niederlenderin, meiner genedigisten frawen ir. maj. hofmaisterin gewest, geschenkht; darfur 30 shokh."). The bill was edited by Kurt Löcher: Kurt Löcher, "Der Maler Hans Krell aus Crailsheim in den Diensten des Markgrafen Georg von Brandenburg-Ansbach und König Ludwigs II. Von Ungarn" *Jahrbuch des historischen Vereins für Mittelfranken* 97 (1994-1995): 170. Here Löcher incorrectly interprets Margarethe as being Margaret of Austria, regent of the Low Countries. In a later study he corrects the statement and says that the painting was made for a lady in the court of the queen. See Kurt Löcher: Kurt Löcher, "Hans Krell - Court painter to King Louis II of Hungary and his Consort, Mary of Hungary" in *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and Her Court 1521-1531*, ed. Orsolya Réthelyi et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2005), 71. The source stating her name as Hofmeisterin for the travel: letter of Michael von Wolkenstein and Cyprian von Serstein to the Government of Innsbruck. 17 01 1521, Augsburg. LA Innsbruck, Copialbücher, Geschäft von Hof 1517, fol.9. Quoted by Heiss Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 428, note 7.

³⁵³ Therefore – da Burgo writes – the letter in favour of the father of Lucretia written by Mary will have its results. Letter of Andrea da Burgo to Gabriel de Salamanca. 10 03 1523, Prague. Quoted by Heiss Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 441. This early date makes it probable that she actually came with Mary, but was not

Innsbruck. She can be traced at the court since she received money from the royal treasury for Mary in 1525³⁵⁴, and was rewarded by Mary after the Battle of Mohács, and by Ferdinand for her loyal service at the court in the life of Louis II.³⁵⁵ She had more supporters than just the queen, since when she fell out of favour with Mary in 1529, Bernhard Beheim, Miklós Oláh, and Tamás Szalaházy pleaded for her. Finally she was received back due to their combined efforts.³⁵⁶ She followed Mary to the Low Countries and figures frequently in the correspondence of Oláh.³⁵⁷ She may in fact have been his mistress in these years.³⁵⁸ She is finally married to Leonhard, Count of Nogueroles (Naquerolle), who also had a post in Mary's household in those years, and consequently became the Hofmeisterin of Mary in 1548, an office that she kept up to her death in 1556.³⁵⁹

Another interesting case is that of Johanna Likercke. Already Fögel writes about the lady-in-waiting of Mary, "Lucretia Johanna Likerka" who was married to Gáspár Horváth of Vingart, but there is no information on when the marriage took place.³⁶⁰ Horváth, a member of the higher aristocracy from Transylvania became a member of the group of barons, after his appointment as royal Master Carver perhaps through this marriage.³⁶¹ The Likerka name does not appear in the household lists of Innsbruck. However we do have indications to a maiden called Likerke taking an active part in court intrigues between the courts of Mary and

included in the travel household list. In Burgo's letter she is referred to as "ministra secreta in cubiculo". András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 16.

³⁵⁴ „Lucrecie puelle pedisseque Reginalis Maiestatis infirme, jussu Regie Maiestatis dati sunt fl 50" 25 may 1525 Vilmos Fraknói, ed., "Liber rationum Ludovici II."

³⁵⁵ Ferdinand's donation charter 29 07 1527, Wien, HHStA Reichsregister Ferdinands I., Bd. 1., fol.111. Quoted by Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 441.

³⁵⁶ Letter of Tamás Szalaházy to Miklós Oláh, 29 06 1529, Buda. Miklós Oláh, *Codex epistolaris. Oláh Miklós levelezése. (Monumenta Hungariae Historica I/25)*, ed. Arnold Ipolyi (Budapest, 1876), 11.

³⁵⁷ The letter of Burgio papal nuntio from London 8 November 1531 reveals that lady Lucretia and Lord "Balius" were with the queen: "Domiane Lucretiae commendari cuio. Dominum Balius caetrosque conseruos nostros meo nomine salutato"; Tamás Szalaházy, bishop of Eger also refers to Lucretia in a letter from Pressburg on 5 April 1532 "d. Lucretiae commendetis me plurimum"; in a letter from Cornelius Sceper from 27 December he writes to Oláh: "Illustri dominae comitissae a Salm, dominae Baillieul dominaeque Lucretiae me plurimum commenda". Miklós Oláh, *Codex epistolaris*, 167, 211, 436.

³⁵⁸ István Fazekas, "Miklós Oláh, Secretary to Queen Mary of Hungary (1526-1539)" in *Mary of Hungary*, ed. Orsolya Réthelyi et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2005), 45.

³⁵⁹ Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 108-109. On her marriage to Nogueroles see Heiss Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 441.

³⁶⁰ Letter of Mary to Ferdinand in which she requests him to give back to Johanna von "Lytgerken", widow of Gaspar Horváth de Vingarth the possessions in Transylvania which have been regained, with respect to the loyal service of Horváth and the service of Johanna in Mary's Frauenzimmer. 16 11 1551, Brussel. Mihály Hatvani, ed., *Monumenta Hungariae Historica, Magyar Történelmi Okmánytár a Brüsseli országos levéltárból és a burgundi könyvtárból, Vol. 2* (Pest, 1858), 306.

³⁶¹ András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 17.

Ferdinand. In 1524 the imperial ambassador Johannes Schneidpöck reports to Gabriel Salamanca, the influential Lord Treasurer of Ferdinand, that a certain maiden called Lickerke is a close intimate of Bouton and intrigues with him against Gabriel Salamanca. Furthermore Bouton has written to the queen against the Salamanca.³⁶² The case turned out to be the involvement of a lady of Mary's Frauenzimmer in the rivalry for influence and power between two highly placed councillors of Ferdinand, the Spanish Gabriel Salamanca and Claude Bouton, lord of Corbaron from the Low Countries, Lord Steward (Obersthofmeister) of Ferdinand. It seems that Miss Lickerke was placed in the court by Bouton and he received information from her in the period he was away from Ferdinand's court on a diplomatic mission to Margaret of Austria in the Low Countries.³⁶³ There are several aspects of this case, which are contradictory and I am not entirely convinced that the person referred to by Schneidpöck is the same as the wife of Gáspár Horváth.³⁶⁴ An entirely different source does prove, however, that the Lickerke family did have at least one further representative in Mary's court, though this does not clarify the situation. In a charter from Mary's chancery in the Low Countries a charter is known from 12 February 1534 in which there is reference to Jean de Bailleul, gentleman of the chamber ("écuyer, gentilhomme de l'hôtel de la reine") and Catherine de Lickerke, widow of Charles de Bailleul Lord Steward of the queen ("veuve de Charles de Bailleul, grand maître d' hôtel").³⁶⁵ There is no record of Charles de Bailleul in the

³⁶² Johannes Schneidpöck to Gabriel Salamanca. 18 04 1524, Esztergom. HHStA Grosse Korrespondenz 25b.

³⁶³ Gerhard Rill, *Fürst und Hof in Österreich, Vol. 1*, 136. It should be noted that probably due to Salamanca's counter measures Bouton (1473/1474 - Brussel, 1556) never returned to Ferdinand's service, but nevertheless remained an important politician of the Habsburg family. He served as Charles' counsellor and chamberlain, but later also counsellor of the Regent Mary of Hungary. From 1544 he was guardian of the then 11 year old William of Orange, prince of Nassau.

³⁶⁴ Three different readers interpret the letter of Schneidpöck in different ways. Fögel thinks Likerka is scheming with the paladin Báthory, probably a misreading of "Bouton". József Fögel, *II. Lajos udvartartása*, 55. Rill thinks that the queen in question is Juanna, queen of Spain (mother of Mary), but this does not make sense since Schneidpöck is reporting from Buda. Gerhard Rill, "Die Hannart-Affäre. Eine Vertrauenskrise in der Casa de Austria 1524" *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 34 (1981): 126, note 169. Kubinyi gives a different reading of the name than Rill in the following phrase: Bouton "habeat virginem quandam sibi iunctam Lekirch nomine". According to Kubinyi this is "Zekrick (?)", referring to another lady of Mary's household related to the family Cetric. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 16-17. I think Rill's reading is correct and there is one maiden called Lekirk, in other sources given as "Liquerque". "Diese Nachricht findet ihre Bestätigung im Bericht Salinas' vom 21. Juni 1523, wonach Bouton eine Hofdame 'Liquerque' in den Dienst der Königin übersandt habe; manche seien der Meinung, 'que se ha casado con ella.'" Gerhard Rill, "Die Hannart-Affäre": 126, note 169. It does not seem logical however why Lickerke would have been placed in Mary's court if her task was to inform Bouton about Ferdinand's court. It would have been perhaps more practical to place her in the court of Anne, however Anne was in this period not usually referred to as 'Königin' (in earlier periods both Königin and Kaiserin were used). The use of Königin and the fact that Schnaitpeck reports from Buda points to Mary's court after all.

³⁶⁵ André Vanrie, ed., *Cancellerie de Marie de Hongrie. Inventaire analytique*. (Brussel: Archives Générales du Royaume, 1972), 3, Nr.8.

well documented years of Mary's household from 1531, so this probably refers to the years in Hungary. We know of a Count Charles de Bailleul, who was a loyal member of Mary's household and acted in her estate management, who probably died in the Battle of Mohács, though there is no other information that he would have acted as the queen's Steward. These data raise several questions about both the Bailleul family and the leading officers of Mary's court, which we cannot answer at the present.

Catherina Pemfflinger was included in the travel household list, or perhaps she was the lady from Anne's household who could speak Hungarian in exchange for a French-speaking lady. She came from the immensely influential Pemfflinger family, several members of which were in high positions in the royal courts of Hungary and Austria. Catherine was married (9 October 1524) to the young noble Bálint Török, who had lost favour because of his involvement in the loss of the castle of Belgrade in 1521, which was the key of the southern defence zone. The marriage was a way for him to strengthen his position, because the wide-ranging influence of the Pemfflinger family was an effective source of support already in the years preceding the wedding. This was reinforced by the arrival of Johannes Schneidpöck, an uncle of the Pemfflinger children to Mary's court in 1523.

Elisabeth von Ungnad was the daughter of Mary's Hofmeisterin, and probably came with her to the court of the queen. She was married to Ferenc Eruszt of Csáktornya, royal gentleman of the chamber on 15 April 1526.³⁶⁶ Ferenc died in the battle of Mohács, and Elisabeth probably stayed at Mary's court with her mother up to 1531.³⁶⁷ Elisabeth Puchheim was the daughter of Hans von Puchheim, leader of the Austrian reform movement of the estates, executed in 1522 in the "Wiener Neustädter Blutgericht".³⁶⁸ She was married in the years before 1526 to Sebastian Pemfflinger, Master of the Horse (Stallmaister) of the queen.³⁶⁹ The names of several ladies from Mary's Frauenzimmer have only been recorded in the lists of her debts, a whole section of which deals with the unpaid dowries of her ladies-in-waiting: such

³⁶⁶ Marriage charter which the groom and queen Mary signed in German. MOL DL 24279.

³⁶⁷ There was a Barbara von Ungnad in Annes's household, who married Wilhelm von Puchheim. In the beginning of 1531 there is also mention of a Prolixenia von Ungnad in Mary's household. She was married to Don Pedro de Lasso Oberstallmaister of Ferdinand in 1531. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 440.

³⁶⁸ Alfred Kohler, *Ferdinand I.*, 79-80.

³⁶⁹ There is also a Wolfgang von Puchheim, Lord of Gellersdorf, who had served Louis II and fought in the army of Ferdinand after the Mohács Battle. He went with Mary to the Low Countries and served her there for several years.

are Miss Gesertorf , married to Karl von Stierstädt, Margareta Bluemeck, married to Mary's count of the mining chamber Bernhard Beheim, Miss Salm (daughter of the Hofmeisterin of Mary for her travel in 1521 and 1531 married to a certain lord of Pleu, Miss Than, married to a certain lord Rothenberg from Silesia and an unnamed lady married to Helmfried von Makau (Matkow).³⁷⁰ It is also likely that Potentia Dersffy served before 1526 in Mary's Frauentzimmer. She was married to Erasmus von Eyczing, the son of the other noble leaders of the executed "Wiener Neustädter Blutgericht".³⁷¹

The ladies-in-waiting rarely appear as a group in the sources available from these years. One exception is the diary of Szydłowiecki, where it is described how on 24 November 1523 the king and queen returned from a hunting trip accompanied by a retinue of no more than eight knights and also eight ladies on horseback.³⁷² Perhaps as important as identifying the members of the court is the evidence of the above case involving Miss Lickerke. It points to the active participation of Mary's household, even certain women of the Frauentzimmer, in the network of information exchange and court intrigue, the results of which reached beyond the limits of the Buda court. It also emphasizes the close relationship between the courts of the king and queen of Hungary and those of the Archduke and Archduchess of Austria. Kubinyi brings another example of this in the appearance of Ulrich von Eyczing at the court in Buda in 1524.³⁷³ As said above, he was the son of one of the nobles executed in 1522 because of the estates revolt. His appearance in the royal court caused some excitement and Schneidpöck reports to Salamanca that he is rallying support for the regaining of the family wealth confiscated from his father.³⁷⁴ He was in the service of Louis II in 1525 as royal gentleman of the chamber, according to the account books. After 1526 he appears in the service of the queen.³⁷⁵ Considering that Wilhelm and Elisabeth, perhaps also Dorothea von Puchheim³⁷⁶

³⁷⁰ List of Mary's debts which she requests Ferdinand to take over, Augsburg 15 11 1530, HHStA, Familienakten 97.

³⁷¹ Mary still owed her 500 fl as a dowry in 1548. HHStA, Familienakten 13. Quoted by Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 440.

³⁷² „Eodem die hora prima noctis rediit ex venacione serenissimus rex et regina vix octo equitibus precedentibus et totidem ancillis equestribus reginam subsequentibus.” Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 189.

³⁷³ Letter of Ulrich von Eyczing to Katalin Svetkovics, wife of Ferenc Batthyány, 04 11 1525, Buda. MOL DL 104454.

³⁷⁴ András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 18. His brother Christoph went to Madrid to serve Charles V and tried to rally support there. Their effort and financial sacrifices finally brought the wished results and they were reinstated in the properties after five years.

³⁷⁵ Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 165. See letter of Mary to Ferdinand 31 05 1551, Brussel. Mihály Hatvani, ed., *Monumenta Hungariae Historica*, Vol. 2., 251.

also stood in the service of the queen, a pattern seems to emerge where the borders between the courts in Buda and Vienna seem very fluid, with the ever present possibility of placing people who are perhaps out of favour in one court to the other. It would be crucial to know with whom the initiative of the appearance of the children of the executed nobles in Buda lays. Was it arranged by Ferdinand as a kind of care for the wellbeing of the children of the rebels, preferably in a household which is not his own? Or was it on the initiative of those involved, who sought refuge in another court closely connected with that of Ferdinand's from where they could work on finding support for their cause, either by intriguing or by regaining favour? In this case the court of Louis and Mary might even have been considered as a place that was an alternative centre of power, potentially threatening for Ferdinand's court. This latter attitude seems to be the one expressed in the letter of Schneidpöck, when he emphasises to Salamanca that he is not in contact with Eyczing.³⁷⁷

The male household

The queen's household included most of the major household offices present in the king's household.³⁷⁸ Her steward (*Hofmeister*) appointed for the travel, Hans von Lamberg returned to Austria and the next record for a leader of the household is from the diplomatic summit in 1523 which gives the first mention of Johannes Pock as the *magister curiae* of Mary.³⁷⁹ In the meantime one can assume that the court was lead by "Rueperto de Balio" the *Unterhofmeister* appointed for the travel, though this cannot be supported with other documents. It is also possible that Count Charles Bailleul was her Hofmeister in this period. The presence of Hans Pock at the head of the court can be demonstrated up to the autumn of 1525 and again after 1526, probably up to 1531.³⁸⁰ Very little is known of him and the case is made more difficult by the fact that there was a Hans Pock senior and junior in the Buda court – a fact not always recognised in secondary literature –, one of them steward of Mary, the other gentleman of the

³⁷⁶ She became second wife of Péter Erdődy senior and was present at the coronation feast of King Ferdinand on 3 November 1527. Here she was seated at the side of the new queen Anne in a high hierarchichal position, fourth in line after Mary of Hungary, Sophie of Masowia, the wife of the palatin and George of Brandenburg. Géza Pálffy, "Krönungsmähler in Ungarn": 92-93.

³⁷⁷ Grosse Correspondenz fasc. 25/b. 17 02 1524-07 03 1524. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 18.

³⁷⁸ For an overview of her court officials see Appendix I. Many of the male household officials have also been collected by Kubinyi András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary". and Heiss Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*. In this sub-chapter I have made grateful use of their research to supplement my own findings.

³⁷⁹ „...Andreas Trepka regis, J. Phol reginalis Och magistri....” Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 166. J. Phol must be an incorrect transcription, or a mistake made by the copist.

³⁸⁰ MOL DL 104445, and DL 48995.

chamber to Louis.³⁸¹ To make things worse, both seem to have married in the period investigated. I believe that Pock senior headed the queen's court and married the queen's non-noble lady in waiting, Miss Fuchs in 1524, and Pock junior was in the king's service and married in 1526.³⁸² Pock and his wife also corresponded with Catherine Svetkovics, she is addressed as "unser pesünder lieben frau swester", perhaps referring to familial relations between them.³⁸³ Pock is said to originate from Silesia, in the account of Hans Dernschwam, who describes how a group of court officials including Mary's Hofmeister and Bernhard Beheim escorted Imre Szerencsés from the prison in the St Sigismund tower to his house in the St George Square in May 1525 after the riotous Diet of Rákos.³⁸⁴ The queen's Hofmeister receives land possessions jointly with István Amadé of Várkony in October 1525.³⁸⁵ Hans Pock remains Mary's Hofmeister after the battle of Mohács and is at his side in Pressburg.³⁸⁶ He is at the head of her court up to 1529. He does not go with her to the Low Countries and in 1537 Ferdinand refers to him as not living any more.³⁸⁷

Confusingly, two other names appear as steward of the queen's court, that of Wilhelm of Brandenburg, younger brother of the influential George and Albrecht of Brandenburg. As recently has been shown by Zoltán Csepregi, even though he had been present at the queen's court from 1522, when his brothers started negotiations about his acceptance to Mary's court, he is actually only documented as Hofmeister of Mary from 25 May 1525. A few weeks later, in the middle of June Wilhelm left the country together with his brother George, mainly due

³⁸¹ Both owned money to the Fuggers according to their account book in 1527. „Der jung Hanns Pock, Der allt Hanns Pock. Jacob Strieder, ed., *Die Inventur der Firma Fugger*, 108. *aus dem Jahre 1527 (Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft, Ergänzungsheft 17)* (Tübingen, 1905), 108.

³⁸² Notice of 50 fl paid for the celebration of the wedding of Hans Pock royal gentleman of the chamber from the account book in 1526. See also Kubinyi András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 15.

³⁸³ Letter of Hans Pock and his wife to Catherine Svetkovics. 24 06 1525, Buda. MOL DL 104445.

³⁸⁴ The diary of Hans Dernschwam was edited by Engel. Johann Christian Engel, *Geschichte des ungarischen Reichs, und seiner Nebenlander* (Halle, 1797), 190-209. „Als man den Imrich Juden über 14 Tag ausgelassen, und ihme das Hofgesind heim aus dem Schloss auf sein Haus, auf St Georgen Platz gelegen, das Geleid geben, haben unter andern der Königin Maria Hofmeister N. Pockh genannt, in Schlesier, auch Bernhard Böheim Kammer Graf, und andere das Geleid heim Geben" Johann Christian Engel, *Geschichte des ungarischen Reichs*, 200.

³⁸⁵ Louis II's granting charter. 27 10 1525 Buda. MOL DL 48995.

³⁸⁶ From the account books of the town Pressburg for 10 10 1526: "Item Mittwoch nach Francisci geschenckt dem Pock, der konnigin Hofmeister, etlich Zindt, Hechten vnd ruten pro I t. IIII B." Tivadar Ortway, *Mária, II. Lajos király neje*, 214. Mary granted the estate of Lébény-Szentmiklós in 1527. Tivadar Ortway, *Mária, II. Lajos király neje*, 299.

³⁸⁷ "quondam Joanne Pook, tunc Magistro Curiae Sertis Vrac." Ferdinand to Mary. 16 03 1537. Ed. Mihály Hatvani, ed., *Monumenta Hungariae Historica, Magyar Történelmi Okmánytár a Brüsseli országos levéltárból és a burgundi könyvtárból, Vol. 1* (Pest, 1858), 380. 20 10 1527 Ferdinand to Hans Pock Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2*.

to the growing anti-foreigner sentiment, so he did not actually perform the duties belonging to the function for long. He did stay on the queen's pay role and officially kept the title up to the autumn of 1527, when Mary broke up her court and released him from service, owing him a huge debt of unpaid salary.³⁸⁸ János Lengyel of Tóti is the third person referred to as the queen's *magister curiae* in two charters. The first mention in the office is from July 1525, the last from February 1526.³⁸⁹ The dates suggest that Lengyel took over after Wilhelm had left the country, I would venture to suppose that Lengyel, who was previously in the queen's service in the management of the mining towns and presumably a trusted servant, was appointed steward to appease the harsh anti-German sentiment after the Diet of Rákos in May 1525 and the riots in Buda against foreigners and the Jewish population of the town that followed. I believe that Lengyel's appointment should be interpreted as a gesture in the direction of the nobility who repeatedly demanded that official positions be given to Hungarians. Even in this case one must reckon with two stewards simultaneously appointed at the court.³⁹⁰

Some data can be collected of the three other most important offices, that of the Master Carver (*magister dapiferorum*), Master Cup-bearer (*magister pincernarum*), the Master of the Horse (*magister agazonum*). Sebastian Pemfflinger was appointed the queen's Master (Truchsess) and Master of the Horse (Oberstallmeister) for the travel to Buda. He stayed in the latter function up to 1531, but probably also served as the queen's Master Carver. From 1524 the king's Master Carver, László Móré of Csula seems to have acted as Master Carver to the queen.³⁹¹ The queen's Master Cup-bearer for the travel was Ludwig von Lamberg, but it is unlikely that he should have stayed with her. In 1523, in an the invitation to the wedding of

³⁸⁸ „...Es hat auch die konigin zu Hungern unnd Behem, konig Ludwigs loblicher und milder gedechtnus nachgelassene witwe, unser genedige unnd freundliche, liebe frau muhm, kurtz vorruckter tagen seiner l. [Wilhelm] geschriben, das ir konigliche w. iren hoff eingezogenn unnd ir wesenn unnd hoffhaltung zu vorringern geursacht, dardurch sein lieb genugsam verstandenn, das ire konigliche w. derhalbenn weiter zu einen diener nicht notdurfftigk. Nachdem aber ir konigliche w. seiner l. nicht ein geringe suma gulden an irer l. vordient besoldung hinterstelligk und schuldig pleibenn, hat ir lieb unns abermals gebeten, der selben mit sampt ewer l. solche schuld zu erlangen rethig unnd hilfflich zu sein...” Detail of a letter from George of Brandenburg to his brother Albert. Zoltán Csepregi, "Königin Maria und das Haus Brandenburg", 64.

³⁸⁹ DF 235457 Ed. Peter Ratkoš, *Dokumenty k banickemu*, 61, nr.26. DL 47650 (23 02 1526); András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 14.

³⁹⁰ Since the last charter evidence of Pocks holding office before the Battle of Mohács is from 1525 it is in theory possible that he – as many non-Hungarian members of the household left the country in fear of the growing xenophobia and gave way to Lengyel, and only returned to Mary's service after 1526. However, there are records showing that the king's gentleman of the chamber, Hans Pock jr. celebrated his wedding in Buda in 1526, which makes it unlikely that the father would have fled.

³⁹¹ József Főgel, *II. Lajos udvartartása*, 25.

her lady in waiting Catharina Svetkovics with royal cup bearer Ferenc Batthyány, the queen called Batthyány her reginal Master Cup-bearer.³⁹² In 1526 Imre Várdai, having returned to Buda from service in Anne's court, is mentioned as Master Cup-bearer of Queen Mary.³⁹³ Wilhelm von Puchheim is mentioned as Cup-bearer of Mary's household in 1525.³⁹⁴ There is no data on her Master of the Treasury (*magister tavernicorum*) or Master of the chamber (*magister cubiculariorum*). Neither function exists in the list of court officials for the travel. However, one assumes that the *Silberkämmerer*, Hans Selnauer was responsible for the treasury of the queen, and the accounts were kept by the *Pfenningschreyber*, Hans Trummer,³⁹⁵ supported by the *Küchenschreiber*, Christoph Kreutzer.³⁹⁶ The function of the *Garderober*, filled by Philip Feuers comes closest to an official of the chamber, but it is unclear whether this meant any kind of leading function. On the other hand, Mary's *Fürschneider* and her *Unterhofmeister*, appointed for the travel were both considered as high ranking officers, but these posts did not have a corresponding office among the Hungarian court officials. This shows on the one hand the problems encountered by the translation of the officials from one system to another, on the other it cautions that the queen's household may have worked along a different model than the one used at the Hungarian court, which may be the explanation for the lack of certain court functions. Jacob von Stamp acted as Mary's Master of the Hunt (Hofjägermeister), but he also served Mary as an official in the stall (Stallmeister) from 1523.³⁹⁷

³⁹² Queen Mary's letter to Ferenc Várdai, bishop of Transylvania. Pressburg, 01 11 1523. MOL DL 82620.

³⁹³ The king's letter to the government of County Bodrog. Buda 1526 06 25MOL DL 82728. He had returned from Anne's court in February 1524 with the intention of going back, but decided to stay after the death of his brother Ferenc Várdai, bishop of Transylvania. Letter of Archduchess Anne to Ferenc Várdai, bishop of Transylvania, Nürnberg 24 02 1524. MOL DL 82635. Kubinyi notes that in contrast to the royal counterpart Várdai did not bear the title *magnificus*. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 15.

³⁹⁴ Letter of Mary to Peter Raschin to pay Wilhelm von Puchheim from her income in Bohemia. 10 05 1525, Buda. HHStA Familienakten 8. He married a lady in waiting of Anne's court Barbara von Ungnad in the summer of 1523. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 435.

³⁹⁵ It is unclear how long he remained with Mary. In 1525 he is traceable in Anne's household. HHStA Familienakten 8. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 433.

³⁹⁶ The *küchenschreiber* was a controller of the treasurer and had control over the pantry. Kreutzer had been in the same function a member of Bianca Maria Sforza's household and resumed the office in 1517. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 433. He travelled to Hungary with Mary and stayed with her at least up to 1526, when we have data on him receiving a large amount of money for the queen from the Royal Treasury. Johann Christian von Engel, ed., "Fragmentum libri rationarii", 210.

³⁹⁷ He was also Master of the Hunt to Louis II. Mihály Hatvani, ed., *Monumenta Hungariae Historica, Vol. 2.*, 515. He had been a member of Maximilian's court in 1519 Thomas Fellner et al., *Die österreichische Zentralverwaltung*, 140. He was with Mary in Pressburg after the Battle of Mohács. On 3 November 1526 Mary sent him with 300 footsoldiers to Sopron after Szapolyai had invaded Buda and was threatening Sopron. Tivadar Ortway, *Mária, II. Lajos király neje*, 262. After 1526 he served Mary as captain of Magyaróvár between 1532 and 1535, and captain of Zwolen between 1537 and 1540. István Kenyeres, "A királyi és királynéi

We have fragmentary evidence of officials in the different departments of the queen's household, which – besides providing us with names – gives evidence of the existence of these departments. Here also the starting point is the travel household list of 1521, some additional names show up in the department of the table service. Beside Ludwig von Lamberg the Cup-bearer arriving with her, who probably returned to Austria, her new Cup-bearers mentioned in this period include Wilhelm von Puchheim,³⁹⁸ Ferenc Forgách of Gimes,³⁹⁹ Augustinus Hispanus,⁴⁰⁰ and Philippe de Bailleul. In addition to her Carvers (Pemfflinger, Hanoque, Carondolet, Semenitsch, Schnitzenpainer and Hofer) new Carvers are Tomas Mileczki from Bohemia, who left the country in 1525⁴⁰¹, and an unnamed relative of the Spanish Gabriel Salamanca, Lord Treasurer of Ferdinand.⁴⁰² The queen's chamber service also provides additional names in addition to Philipp de Feures, who she brought with her from Innsbruck and who probably stayed with her in these years. New gentlemen of the chamber from this period⁴⁰³ are Ludovicus Hispanus (1525),⁴⁰⁴ Bernát Bárány of Bártfa (Bartfeld, today Bardejov in Slovakia) (1525)⁴⁰⁵ and Ferenc Dóci (1526).⁴⁰⁶ Christoph Thurn

„magánbirtokok” a 16. században [The Royal and Reginal “private domain” in the sixteenth century]" *Századok* 138/5 (2004): 1119.

³⁹⁸ Mary's order to Peter Raschin to pay Puchaim 200 schock groschen from her income from the Bohemian estates. Buda, 10 05 1525. HHStA, Familienakten 8. He was the son of the Hans Puchhaim executed by Ferdinand in the Trial of Wiener Neustadt. In 1523 he married Anna's lady in waiting, Barbara von Ungnad. Ferdinand's letter to Laurentz Saurer, Vizedom in Wien. Innsbruck, 09 08 1523. Copy in HKA, Gedenkbuch 19, fol.262. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 435, note 2.

³⁹⁹ Formerly gentleman of the kings chamber. He is mistakenly identified by Fógel as master cup bearer of the queen. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 24, note 52.; King Louis II's Grant of arms to the Forgách family Buda 27 05 1525 MOL DL 60103.

⁴⁰⁰ He served as the king's cup bearer at the same time and carried a confidential letter from Louis II to Ferdinand. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 16.

⁴⁰¹ Vilmos Fraknói, ed., "Liber rationum Ludovici II.", 62.

⁴⁰² Salamanca arranged his appointment through Schneidpöck. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 21.

⁴⁰³ I believe that Fógel and all those quoting him are wrong in including Paul (Pál) Petrecz (Paul von Petritz, also know as Paul Hunger) as a gentleman of the chamber of Mary: József Fógel, *II. Lajos udvartartása*, 26. He served in the shared household as Carver. Later his name appears as a cup bearer of Anne in 1527 and 1528 (Libri regii 88-89.), was granted a coat of arms for faithful service in the chamber of Archduchess Anne during the diplomatic summit in Pressburg. (Pressburg 21 10 1523, MOL DL 23845. See also the description by Árpád Mikó and Géza Érszegi Orsolya Réthelyi et al., eds., *Mary of Hungary*, 221-222. He is not included in the list of people accompanying Mary and in the grant of arms he is referred to as the faithful gentleman of the chamber of Anne.

⁴⁰⁴ "Eodem die Ludouico Hispano cubiculario Reginalis Maiestatis, per Regiam Maiestatem ad summam Pontificem cum literis Maiestatis sue misso, pro expensis dati sunt fl. C" Vilmos Fraknói, ed., "Liber rationum Ludovici II.", 144.

⁴⁰⁵ He was gentleman of the chamber in the king and the queen's service. MOL DL 24405. 68. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 16.

⁴⁰⁶ First appearing in 1526, he was *ispán* of Bars county, a member of the new aristocracy of the Jagiellon Age and a former gentleman of the chamber of the king. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 16. Mary sent

also served the queen in this period, probably as gentleman of the chamber.⁴⁰⁷ Difficult to place in either of the main departments is Bernát Ákosházy Sárkány, court *familiaris* and flag bearer of the queen.⁴⁰⁸ Elek Thurzó is appointed councillor and *specialis familiaris* of the queen.⁴⁰⁹ The chapel is dealt with in the context of religious aspects of the household in a later chapter of my dissertation. We know of several people who belonged to the queen's narrower household, but without information on their precise function. It is unclear, for instance in what function Hans von Schweinpeck accompanied Mary, and whether he stayed in her household. The account book reveals the names of further courtiers associated with the queen's court, without giving their precise function.⁴¹⁰

Madame de Bailleul, the "Perseresserin" has already been mentioned in the section dealing with Mary's female household. Other members of the Bailleul family who had accompanied Mary from the Netherlands also belonged to her closest circle of intimates. Madame de Bailleul was at the head of her Frauenzimmer, her daughter was a lady in waiting, and Philippe de Bailleul was a cupbearer. No office is known for a further member of the family Count Charles de Bailleul, but he performed the important task of taking over the Mining Chamber from Elek Thurzó in 1522 together with the reginal secretary Wilhelm.⁴¹¹ A later source refers to him as Hofmeister of Mary, and his wife as Catherine Lickerke.⁴¹² A Lord Bailleul was sent by Mary to Ferdinand in 1525. Another Lord Bailleul was sent, together with Ferdinand's Carver Balthasar Persinger to Charles in September 1526.⁴¹³ However there are contradictions in my collected data and the clarification of the family relationships

a letter with him and mentions his name to Albrecht of Brandenburg as early as 1523. Letter of Mary to Albert of Brandenburg 12 07 1523, Buda. Letter of János Dóci reginal chamberer, 01 03 1526, DF 246294, DF 246294.

⁴⁰⁷ Mary later appoints him captain (Hauptman) of Zwolen in 1531. He is also involved in the administration of Végles. István Kenyeres, "A királyi és királynéi „magánbirtokok”": 1138.

⁴⁰⁸ András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 16.

⁴⁰⁹ "ipsum ... accepimus in singularem nostrum protectionem et in specialem nostrum familiarem" 23 09 1525, Buda. 23 MOL DL 24192.

⁴¹⁰ „Farkas Erdélyi”, Mylyczko, Valentin Chwnthan. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 16. Also Antal Lossonczy, referred to in a letter of Ferenc batthyany th Queen Mary on 02 09 1552, Vienna. He says that Ferdinand has "praefererat in ipso conuentu Posoniensi ini Comitem, Spectabilem et Magnificum quondam Dominum Stephanum de Losoncz Vestrae S. Maiestati neforte bene notum. Nam frater suus quondam Anthonius Lossonczy in curia Vestrae S. Maiestatis seruiuit." Mihály Hatvani, ed., *Monumenta Hungariae Historica*, Vol. 2., 352.

⁴¹¹ Mary's authorization for both. Buda 15 02 1522. Ed. Ratkoš: Peter Ratkoš, "Die Entwertung der ungarischen Kleinmünze im Jahre 1521 und Ihre Folgen in der Slowakei bis 1526." *Studia Historica Slovaca* 1 (1963): 48.

⁴¹² See above in note 363.

⁴¹³ Letter of Ferdinand to Mary, 12 03 1525, Innsbruck; Letter of Margaret of Austria to Ferdinand, 07 09 1526, Bergh. Wilhelm Bauer, ed., *Die Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol. I.*, 271 and 439. Persinger was married to Margaretha Bailleul.

between these people requires further research.⁴¹⁴ Several members of the family served the queen in Mary's court in the Low Countries.⁴¹⁵

Chancery

While the queen's household shows much stability in personnel between the Innsbruck and the Buda years, new departments had to be added to her court for the management of her estates and financial affairs. The queen's chancellor was János Gosztonyi of Felsőszeleste (died 1527).⁴¹⁶ We do not know the exact date of his appointment, but a charter names him reginal chancellor already in October 1522, which makes it probable that he filled the position from the queen's arrival, or at least from the date of her coronation.⁴¹⁷ His appointment went against the ancient tradition in the kingdom, according to which the all-time bishop of Veszprém was the queen's chancellor and as such crowned the queen.⁴¹⁸ Gosztonyi was a humanist educated in Vienna, Ferrara, and Paris and had made a career through the patronage of the French Queen Anne of Foix, whom he had served as interpreter and reginal secretary.⁴¹⁹ After her death he became vice chancellor to the king and bishop of Győr. His erudition and command of the French language were probably the main reasons for his appointment as Mary's chancellor. His tasks included delivering speeches in the queen's name, as on the diplomatic summit in 1523 described in the Diary of Polish chancellor Szydłowiecki.⁴²⁰ The queen strove to further Gosztonyi's career by trying to arrange his nomination to the Bishopric of Esztergom in 1524, but failed when this was given to László

⁴¹⁴ Kubinyi believes that Karl de Bailleul was the husband of Madame de Bailleul. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 16.

⁴¹⁵ See for instance the letters of Cornelius Sceper to Oláh in which he sends greetings to the ladies "Bailleiul, Lucretia, de Souastre", as well as Countess Salm. Miklós Oláh, *Codex epistolaris*, 346, 354, 362, 436, 445, 518. Philippe de Bailleul appears on Mary's household lists of 1534, 1539, and 1543. Claude de Bailleul and Jehan de Bailleul only on the list of 1534. Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 287.

⁴¹⁶ Asztrik Gabriel, *Gosztonyi János püspök és párizsi mestere* (1936).

⁴¹⁷ Letter of Louis II to Vid Flanyzer about paying the tithe to Johannes Gosztonyi, bishop of Győr, reginal chancellor. Prague, 13 10 1522. MOL DI 101559. That Gosztonyi was at the queen's side in Prague is demonstrated by a further charter in which the king sends Gosztonyi to Ferenc Várdai, bishop of Gyulafehérvár (Alba Iulia) with important news. Prague 05 02 1523. MOL DI 82603.

⁴¹⁸ The appointed bishop of Veszprém in 1521 was Pál Várdai, but at the time of the queen's coronation (04 12 1521) he was not yet consecrated, so Simon Erdödy, bishop of Zagreb performed the crowning ceremony.

⁴¹⁹ According to Főgel he was also appointed reginal chancellor, but I have not been able to corroborate this with data. József Főgel, *II. Lajos udvartartása*, 24.

⁴²⁰ Eg. in the case of whether the queen is allowed to mint coins at Kremnitz independently of the king: „Hec serenissima regina proposuit maiestati regie et eius consiliariis per reverendissimum dominum episcopum Iauriensem cancellarium suum...”. Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 168.

Szalkai, royal chancellor. Gosztonyi was appointed to the bishopric of Transylvania.⁴²¹ In 1525 again she exerted her influence to have Gosztonyi made royal chancellor in the place of Szalkai, who was dismissed after the Diet of Hatvan, but again her candidate lost, this time to István Brodarics, the candidate supported by the papal diplomacy.⁴²²

It is unclear to whether the secretaries of the king and queen in late medieval Hungary belonged to the chancery, or – as several sources suggest – acted as a group most closely related to the sovereign. Kubinyi suggests that they resembled the gentleman of the chamber in that they also stood in the most intimate personal relationship with the lord, the difference being that while the members of the chamber were mainly men of arms, the secretarial duties necessitated a significant level of education and the knowledge of several languages.⁴²³ There is a significant overlap between royal and reginal secretaries in this period, suggesting that the queen partly recruited her secretarial personnel from the king.⁴²⁴ In one case there is even a written record of the process in a letter by Miklós Oláh, in which he describes how the king appointed him counsellor and secretary and gave him permission to practice these offices in his wife's court as well.⁴²⁵

There is no mention of a secretarial position in Mary's household list of 1521. It is possible that her court chaplain, Johannes Croner filled the secretarial functions – we know that he acted as public notary on the procurational marriage of Anne and Ferdinand in December 1520 – but there is no direct evidence to support this assumption.⁴²⁶ In Hungary records exist of a number of secretaries of the queen, many of them concurrently also active as royal secretaries. The earliest mention of a reginal secretary is “Guilhelm”, who was sent to the

⁴²¹ József Köblös, *Az egyházi közélet Mátyás és a Jagellók korában. (Társadalom- és művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok 12.)* (Budapest: MTA, 1994), 293-294.

⁴²² András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 14.

⁴²³ András Kubinyi, "A királyi titkárok II. Lajos uralkodásának idejében [Royal secretaries in the reign of Louis II.]" *Gesta* 1 (2006): 17.

⁴²⁴ The opposite process can be suspected in the case of the secretary called „Gwilhelmus”, who probably belonged to Mary's court. There is record that Louis calls him his own secretary. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 14.

⁴²⁵ „in numerum suorum, qui a secretis et consiliis dicuntur, ascribere voluerat. Is ipse ut petitioni reginali coniugis suae satisfaceret, me illi ut eandem apud eam quoque agerem statum, concesserat.” Miklós Oláh, *Codex epistolaris*, 155. quoted by Kubinyi. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 14.

⁴²⁶ See more on Croner below. See also Orsolya Réthelyi, "Vallás és nyelv az udvartartásban. Johannes Croner, Habsburg Mária udvari lelkésze [Religion and language in the court. Johannes Croner, court priest of Mary of Hungary]" in *Szentírás, hagyomány, reformáció - Teológia- és egyháztörténeti tanulmányok*, ed. Beatrix F. Romhányi and Gábor Kendeffy (Budapest: Gondolat, 2009).

mining towns in February 1522, probably the same as Gwilhelmus d’Hongville in later sources. From the same year the name of Ferenc Acél appears, who signs his name as royal and reginal secretary in a charter written in Prague,⁴²⁷ and that of Jacobus Piso as reginal secretary.⁴²⁸ From the year 1523 there is mention of Erasmus Waldstram, who had served Ferdinand (?) and later occurs frequently as one of the Czech secretaries of Louis II.⁴²⁹ The queen also had a “Czech secretary” in the person of Johann Altendorfer from Moravia, who served Mary at least from 1525 up to the years after Mohács.⁴³⁰ We know of further secretaries working for both the king and the queen, Bernhard Albisi,⁴³¹ Miklós Bácsi,⁴³² and Gáspár Serédi.⁴³³ Four of the reginal secretaries were from Transylvania; the most famous of them being Nicolaus Olahus (Miklós Oláh) of Romanian descent. He remained an intimate of the queen in the years after 1526 and was one of the few members of her household who accompanied her to the Netherlands. Two reginal secretaries were German-speaking Transylvanians (so-called “Saxons”): Georg Reicherstorffer appears in the sources in 1525⁴³⁴ and becomes a secretary of Ferdinand in 1527 at the recommendation of Mary.⁴³⁵ The name of Martin Hutter (Huet, Pileus, Pylades) member of the influential patrician family in Sibiu appears in 1526.⁴³⁶ Miklós Morgai, of the higher ranks of nobility appears in the sources as the queen’s secretary in 1525.⁴³⁷ None of these last mentioned three reginal secretaries are documented as having worked for the king.

⁴²⁷ MOL Df 243518.

⁴²⁸ MOL Df 260438.

⁴²⁹ Vilmos Fraknói, ed., "Liber rationum Ludovici II.", 96, 228.; József Főgel, *II. Lajos udvartartása*, 25.; András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 14. Since – in contrast to the Hungarian language – Czech was used in administration, it was necessary to have secretaries, with knowledge of this language.

⁴³⁰ Mary orders Peter Raschin to pay 35 fl. to her secretary Johann Altendorf. Buda, 10.03.1525. HHStA, Familienakten 8. Receipt of Altendorfer, Znaim 15 02 1529. HHStA Familienakten 8.

⁴³¹ Mary recommended her secretary Magister Bernhard, Cantor of Eger to Ferdinand in 13 October 1526. Wilhelm Bauer, ed., *Die Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol. I.*, 480.

⁴³² József Főgel, *II. Lajos udvartartása*, 25.

⁴³³ Later data about Serédi as reginal secretary: Libri Regii, quoted by András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", note 19.

⁴³⁴ MOL Df 245854. Mary’s letter to the Mayor and city council of Hermannstadt. Buda 12.10.1525.

⁴³⁵ Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 437.

⁴³⁶ József Főgel, *II. Lajos udvartartása*, 25.

⁴³⁷ MOL Df 82216. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", note 22.

Estate management

After her marriage Queen Mary took possession of a large body of reginal estates, which made her one of the most important, perhaps the most important landowner of the kingdom.⁴³⁸ (For a map of Queen Mary's estates see Appendix 3.) Her annual income was estimated at 40.000 rh.fl. by Burgio.⁴³⁹ Almost all the estates she received had belonged to previous queens of Hungary and she is the last in a line of Hungarian queens to have right to the "reginal estates" and make use of these for the costs of her household and court.⁴⁴⁰ According to the donation charter issued by Louis II on 2 February 1522 in Buda Queen Mary was granted the following estates and rights: the mining towns Kremnitz (Körmöcbánya, today Kremnica in Slovakia), Schemnitz (Selmecebánya, today Banská Štiavnica), Neusohl (Besztercebánya, today Banská Bystrica in Slovakia), Pukantz (Bakabánya, today Pukanec in Slovakia), Weißberg, Libethen (Libetbánya, today Ľubietová in Slovakia), Bries/Brezno, Karpfen (Korpona, today Krupina in Slovakia) with all the gold-, silver-, and all other mines; the town and castle of Altsohl (Zólyom, today Zvolen in Slovakia), the castle and town of Óbuda, the island of Csepel with the town of Keve (Ráckeve), the castle of Hust (Huszt, today Hust in Ukraine) with the salt mining chamber of Máramaros (today Maramureş in Romania) and the towns belonging to the salt chamber (Hust, Sighet/Máramarossziget/Sighetu Marmăției, Técső/Tjaciv, Visk/Vyškovce, the castle of Róna, the castle and burgraviate of Munkács (today Mukacheve in Ukraine) with the towns Beregszász (today Berehove in Ukraine), Munkács, Vári/Vary, the castle and burgraviate Diósgyőr and the market towns of Miskolc, Muhi, Mezökövesd and Mezőkeresztes. These estates were given to Mary as reginal estates („*coronam reginalem eiusdemque coronae jura concernentia*“ and „*bona reginalia*“) with all the properties belonging to them. It is furthermore specified that the estates are

⁴³⁸ „So sehr es einen auch erstaunen mag, so ist es doch Tatsache, dass Maria von Ungarn die letzte ungarische Königin war, die über die sogenannten Domänen der Königin gebot. Sie war also die letzte Königin, die bedeutende Einkünfte aus ihren Besitzungen bezog und dadurch die Kosten ihrer Hofhaltung selbst decken konnte; auch verfügte sie über genügend finanzielle Mittel, um die damals zweifelsohne noch existierende politische Macht der Königin auszuüben.“ István Kenyeres, "Verwaltung und Erträge der ungarischen Besitzungen Königin Marias in den Jahren 1522–1548" in *Maria von Ungarn. Eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2005), 179.; „Eine neue Richtung und grosses Gewicht bekam die Politik der Königin der Königin dadurch, dass Maria jetzt auch zu einem der reichsten Grundherrn Ungarns wurde“ Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 128. The topic of the management of Queen Mary's estates has been most thoroughly treated by Gernot Heiss, András Kubinyi, and most recently by István Kenyeres. I will chiefly rely on their results for the discussion of the topic.

⁴³⁹ Burgio to Sadolet, Buda 13 04 1525. Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum*, 161. Kenyeres calculates her real income for the period before and after Mohács, which basically supports this estimation. István Kenyeres, "Der ungarischen Besitzungen Königin Marias", 190-191.

⁴⁴⁰ István Kenyeres, "Der ungarischen Besitzungen Königin Marias", 179.

granted to the queen with the approval of the barons and prelates of the Hungarian Kingdom.⁴⁴¹ She also received a smaller body of estates in the Kingdom of Bohemia.⁴⁴² In the next years she increased her land possession in Hungary considerably through grants from the king and by purchasing estates.⁴⁴³

It is not clear whether there was an office which acted as the central estate manager reflecting the office of the so called “*provisor curiae castri regii Budensis*”.⁴⁴⁴ Two of her estate managers carry the title of “*provisor curiae reginalis*” in the same time period (1525-1526): the István Amadé of Várkony in service of the queen as castellan of Óvár and Andreas Sarsson serving Mary as castellan of Óbuda and *officialis* of Csepel. Kenyeres suggests that these two reginal estates were the main providers of supplies (food, fodder, wood, etc.) for the reginal household. A part of the estates and incomes were leased out by the queen, which was a common practice in the late medieval period. In 1523 she leased the incomes of the Salt mines (*Salzkammer*) of Máramaros, with the castle of Huszt and the towns belonging to the *Salzkammer* to Pál Ártándi.⁴⁴⁵ Next year she also leased the estate of Munkács to Ártándi and István Báthori of Somlyó.⁴⁴⁶ To the management of the castle of Diósgyőr she nominated Leonard Gallinczer, who was the second husband of Ursula Pemfflinger. Ursula was the mother of the several Pemfflinger children serving in the courts of the king and queen, but also in the court of Ferdinand and Anna he belonged to the trusted circle of the queen.⁴⁴⁷ The

⁴⁴¹ „*civitates nostras montanas Cremniciensem, Semniciensem, Bistriciensem, Pukancz, Diln, Montem Regium, Lebetam, Breznam, Corponam unacum suis auri, argenti aeris, aliorumque metallorum et minerarum fodinis, deinde castrum Zoliense, castrum et civitatem Veteris Budensis, insulam Chepel, oppidum Kewi ac ali ex ejusdem Insulae possessiones, Cameras Salium Maromorusiensem, Castrum Hwzth, castellum Rona, oppida Hwzth, Ziygeth, Thechew et Wysk, castrum Mwnkach, oppida Beregzaaz, Mwnkach, Wary, castrum Dyosegyewr, oppida Myskolcz, Dyosgyewr, Mohy, Mezewkewesd, Kereszthes cum honoribus comitatum dictis castris antiquis coniunctis et annexis...*” Ed. in Hatvani Mihály Hatvani, ed., *Monumenta Hungariae Historica, Vol. I*, 22-23. See also the estates listed and discussed in Heiss Gernot Heiss, "Die Besitzungen I.": 63. and Kenyeres István Kenyeres, "Der ungarischen Besitzungen Königin Marias", 180.

⁴⁴² Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 129.

⁴⁴³ István Kenyeres, "Der ungarischen Besitzungen Königin Marias", 181-184.

⁴⁴⁴ The royal office was created in Buda by Matthias Corvinus in 1458 and as an intimate of the king and responsible for his private treasury was directly answerable only to the king. The provisor curiae managed the royal estates and provided the court with the necessary products and in Buda ranked higher than the chastellain, though the two functions were often given to the same person. András, Kubinyi, "A budai vár udvarbírói hivatala, 1458-1541 : kísérlet az országos és a királyi magánjövedelmek szétválasztására" *Levéltári Közlemények* 35 (1964). Kenyeres does not conclusively solve the question in his latest publication ont he issue. István Kenyeres, *Urak és végvárok*, 67-68.

⁴⁴⁵ Lease contract dated 22 12 1523. MOL DI 32598. See also Gernot Heiss, "Die Besitzungen II.": 86-90.

⁴⁴⁶ Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 129., István Kenyeres, *Urak és végvárok*.

⁴⁴⁷ She served at the child-bed of Anna several times. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 414, note 1. For Queen Mary and the estate of Diósgyőr see Bessenyei. József Bessenyei, "Maria von

majority of her estates stayed in her own management, the most important of these being the so called “lower Hungarian mining towns”⁴⁴⁸ with the Mining Chamber of Kőrmöcbánya (Kremnica) and the right to the Mint Chamber at Kőrmöc.⁴⁴⁹ The mining towns were one of the most important centres for gold and silver mining in Europe and their income was lucrative, however, they had been leased to the Thurzó-Fugger consortium since 1494/95 and only a small percentage of the profit actually went to the queens. Mary sent Count Charles of Bailleul with her secretary Willhelm to take over the Chamber and Castle of Zólyom directly after the marriage in February 1522, but the estates stayed in the hands of the Thurzós. It seems that one of her first counts of the mining chamber (Kamaraispán, Kammergraf) was Wolfgang Prunner/Brunner, from Austria who had been in the Innsbruck household and had come with Mary to Buda as her Master of ceremonies (Stäblmeister).⁴⁵⁰ It is commonly assumed that the estates and incomes practically only passed into her possessions in the beginning of 1524 after the return of the royal couple from Prague. At the advice of Ferdinand the former Münzmeister of the Mint in Hall (Tirol), Bernhard Beheim von Friedesheim was appointed head of the mining chamber in 1524 (he was also put in charge of the large estates of the castle and towns of Zólyom and filled the office of *ispan* of Zólyom).⁴⁵¹ He was assisted by two Hungarians, János Lengyel of Tóti, who would also become one of Mary’s stewards (Hofmeister) from July 1525, and the royal councillor Péter Bornemissza of

Ungarn als Besitzerin von Diósgyőr 1522-1548" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558) : eine Renaissancefürstin (Geschichte in der Epoche Karls V., ; 8.)*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2006).

⁴⁴⁸ These were the seven royal mining towns of Kőrmöcbánya (Kremnitz, today Kremnica in Slovakia), Selmecebánya (Schemnitz, today Banská Štiavnica), Besztercebánya (Neusohl, today Banská Bystrica in Slovakia), Bakabánya (Pukantz, today Pukanec in Slovakia), Libetbánya (Libethen, today Lúbetová in Slovakia), Újbánya (Königsberg, today Nová Baňa in Slovakia) és Bélabánya (Dilln, today Banská Belá in Slovakia). Geographically these were in the northern region of the Kingdom of Hungary (the area that is modern day Slovakia) but they were called „lower” to differentiate them from the group of mining towns to their north east (e.g. Gölnicbánya, Szomolnok (County Szepes); Rudabánya (County Borsod), Jászó, Telkibánya (County Abauj), Rozsnyóbánya (County Gömör) és Igló (County Szepes), which were called the „upper mining towns”.

⁴⁴⁹ For the mint see Gyöngyössi with relevant literature. Marton Gyöngyössi, "Königin Maria und die Kremnitzer Münzprägung" in *Maria von Ungarn (105-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007).

⁴⁵⁰ See Mary’s letter to the notary of Schemnitz Georg [Schmelzer] of Neusohl and Matthias from Schemnitz to come to the court where the Kammergraf Wolfgang Brunner wishes to discuss certain matters with them. 12 09 1523, Visegrad (Plindenburg). DL 84645. 10 07 1522, Prague. Jörg Meier et al., eds., *Deutschsprachige Handschriften in slowakischen Archiven. Vom Mittelalter bis zur Frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2009).

⁴⁵¹ Gernot Heiss, "Die Besitzungen I.": 83., Gernot Heiss, "Die Besitzungen II.": 58.

Kápolna.⁴⁵² Peter Raschin von Riesenburg was in charge of of the Bohemian estates (*unterkammerer*) from 1523 to 1537.⁴⁵³

It is not known how the queen obtained her body of *familiaries*, many of whom were involved in her estate management. Beside the influential politicians István Amadé and Pál Ártándi mentioned above, also Balázs Ártándy, Farkas Dombay from the middle nobility must be mentioned.⁴⁵⁴ It is a curious fact – already noted by Kubinyi – that a significant percentage of the queen's *familiaries* originally came from the *familia* of János Szapolyai. It is not surprising that many of this group returned to serving Szapolyai after the Battle of Mohács. *Familiaries* of the queen from the higher aristocracy included Bálint Török, László Móré of Csula, Elek Thurzó, Gáspár Horváth of Vingárt, Ferenc Batthyány, and Ferenc Dóci. Typically all of these latter lords belong to the group of “new men” (*homines novi*), who had ascended to the baronial rank in the later years of the Jagiellon Age. Kubinyi notes that the cases of elevating of certain members of the nobility to baronial rank coincide with the period of the reign of Queen Anne de Foix and Queen Mary of Hungary. He argues that a conscious strategy of raising a new group of loyal supporters into the baronial rank, and thus into the royal council was the main strategy to strengthen royal authority, which was used by both queens.⁴⁵⁵ We have no records of integration of members of the high nobility in the queen's court. Instead, Mary's strategy seems to involve the raising of a loyal group into baronial ranks and the involvement of the leaders of the middle nobility as *familiaries*. The integration of these people into her court constituted the power base for later political action.⁴⁵⁶ It remains a question how much of this was part of a conscious strategy and to whom the initiative for the integration of these two groups into the queen's court should be attributed.

The queen had access to the meetings of the royal council, however, she also must have had a council of her own to assist her in the administration of her land and generally promoting her interest in the politics of the country.⁴⁵⁷ It is difficult to say anything about the size or

⁴⁵² Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 130.

⁴⁵³ Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 129. Winfried Eberhard, *Konfessionsbildung und Stände in Böhmen, 1478-1530* (München: Oldenbourg, 1981), 251, 311.

⁴⁵⁴ József Bessenyei, "König Ferdinand", 83.

⁴⁵⁵ András Kubinyi, "A magyar állam belpolitikai helyzet", 71.

⁴⁵⁶ András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 19.

⁴⁵⁷ Laynesmith writes the following about the queen's council in England: „Just like any major lord, or the king himself, the queen was expected to act upon the advice of her councillors, and had various staff to carry out her

functioning of such a body. Beside the *familiares*, who had the task to advise, there is in certain cases indication of an advisory function in the title, as in the case of Miklós Oláh who was appointed secretary and councillor. We also have data on legal advice given to the queen by Gergely Mikolai, who is called the queen's "*directoris causarum*". Mikolai was the most sought after lawyer of the period.⁴⁵⁸ The imperial ambassadors accredited to Hungary (Andrea da Burgo, 1521-1523, Hans Schneidpöck, Freiherr von Schönkirchen, 1523-1525) had an advisory function. The effect of this was especially visible under Schneidpöck, who specifically supported Queen Mary, even if this went against the interest of the Habsburg family, or that of Ferdinand.⁴⁵⁹ The best example is Schneidpöck's support of the queen in the case of Mary's attack on the Fugger-Thurzó mining consortium.⁴⁶⁰ Mary also had influential financial advisors, like Bernhard Beheim⁴⁶¹ and Imre Szerencsés (Fortunatus).⁴⁶² Ultimately, George of Brandenburg, and to a lesser extent his brother Albrecht were the people with the most influence on the queen, though this was probably not a formally acknowledged role.⁴⁶³

To recapitulate, it can be said that the basic structure and the personal element of the household of the queen between 1521 and 1526 was provided by the people arriving with her from the Princess' household in Innsbruck, a group of varied social, ethnic and linguistic background. The sources disclose that a surprisingly large percentage of the travel household stayed with the queen. In some cases Hungarian barons and prelates appear early on in new appointments to the strategically important offices (E.g. János Gosztonyi as chancellor, perhaps László Móré of Csula as Master Carver, though there is not enough evidence to prove the latter). In many other cases, however, these offices were kept for people imported from

business, with a secretary to write letters. This was how good queenship, like good lordship, worked. There is no particular foundation for assuming that queens did not behave like lords or kings in taking active involvement with their councils" J. L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, 233. See also Crawford Anne Crawford, "The Queen's Council in the middle ages" *English Historical Review* 116 (2001).

⁴⁵⁸ András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 20.

⁴⁵⁹ On Schneidpöck see Rill 'Schneitpeck in Ungarn' Gerhard Rill, *Fürst und Hof in Österreich, Vol. 1*, 53-57. See also András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 21-22. and Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 127.

⁴⁶⁰ Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 138-142.

⁴⁶¹ For Beheim see especially Heiss. Gernot Heiss, "Die Besitzungen I.": 72. Beheim was the central official in charge of Mary's estate management after she left to Brussel in 1531.

⁴⁶² See for instance the complaints of the papal nuntius about how Schneidpöck has persuaded Mary to entrust her financial matters to "a bankrupt Innsbruck financier", meaning Beheim and a "converted Jew", who have made the queen completely dependant on them. Quoted and discussed in Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 132. On Beheim in Mary's service see especially Gernot Heiss, "Die Besitzungen I.": 83-84. On Szerencsés see Büchler and Scheiber Sándor Büchler, "Szerencsés Imre származása" in *Mahler Ede Emlékkönyv* (Budapest, 1937). and Sándor Scheiber, "A Szerencsés Imre-irodalomhoz [Additions to the literature on Imre Szerencsés]" in *MIOK Évkönyv*, ed. Sándor Scheiber (Budapest, 1976).

⁴⁶³ Zoltán Csepregi, "Königin Maria und das Haus Brandenburg", 66.

abroad, mostly from Austria or the Empire (E.g. Margaretha von Ungnad as *Hofmeisterin*, Johann Pock von Labris and William of Brandenburg as *Hofmeister*, Bernhard Beheim as count of the chamber). An important change is traceable during these years in the officials involved in the estate management. In 1522 there is a predominance of intimates from her Innsbruck household (Wolfgang Prunner/Brunner, Count Carl of Bailleul and her secretary Gwilhelm) there is a gradual involvement of Hungarian lords in this field (János Lengyel of Tóti, who would also become one of Mary's stewards (*Hofmeister*), Péter Bornemissza of Kápolna), often in the person of influential leaders of the lower nobility (Pál Ártándy, István Amadé of Várkony). The presence of Hungarian magnates in the household of the queen can hardly be traced. The female court underwent a change in these years because of the frequent marriages arranged by the queen with members of the Hungarian and Austrian nobility. In many cases such a marriage with a lady-in-waiting of the queen was the means to social rising and court functions, even rising to the baronial rank for the bridegrooms. This resulted in a group of "new men" (*homines novi*), who were connected to the royal couple with many ties on whom the king and queen could rely to stay loyal during the political upheavals of the age (Ferenc Batthyány, Bálint Török, Gáspár Horváth of Vingárt). There is a conspicuous absence of daughters of the Hungarian nobility as replacement for the married members of the queen's Frauzimmer.

4.2.3 Court of a dowager - the queen's court after the Battle of Mohács (1526-1531)

With the death of her husband the position of Mary of Hungary changed from queen consort to the main subject and actor of power transfer in a necessarily unstable transitory period between two sovereigns. As we have suggested above, the household adapts itself to the political position of the ruler and thus closely reflects it. Therefore a good starting point for an investigation of Mary's household in this period is to look at the stages of political function Mary went through in the following years and how this corresponded to changes in the household.

The Battle of Mohács

The first stage of importance is the departure of King Louis to the battle and the queen's flight from Buda after the defeat at Mohács. The royal and reginal households were separated when the king left for the battle on 20th July with an armed force amounting to about 3000 men. We

know that the household knights of the royal court formed the basis of the king's army. The *banderia* of the king, the queen and the archbishop of Esztergom accompanied the king, all together 3000, as reported by István Brodarics.⁴⁶⁴ Much of the menial servant body must also have accompanied him, but we know only of incidental accounts of these people. Slightly more information is available on his chapel,⁴⁶⁵ and the court knights selected for his personal service.⁴⁶⁶ In this case also there is isolated information about the knights of the queen's household who fought in the battle and lost their lives there.⁴⁶⁷

The queen stayed behind with her Frauenzimmer and menial household. The king ordered two magnates to stay behind with the queen, the treasurer Elek Thurzó and Tamás Szalaházy, bishop of Veszprém.⁴⁶⁸ Both were close supporters of Mary and of the Habsburg house. A few days before the battle the king also sent Miklós Oláh to Buda to stay beside the queen and conduct her to the north Hungarian town of Pressburg in case of danger.⁴⁶⁹ These were then the people she had around her when the news of the lost battle reached her in the evening of 30th August. After a short deliberation with Elek Thurzó, the queen decided to flee during the night.⁴⁷⁰ The royal treasury and some personal belongings of the royal couple were loaded on boats while the queen, her household, and several nobles – Thurzó, Szalaházy, as well as János Bornemissza and the papal nuntio Giovanni Burgio – left on horseback, escorted by fifty men at arms.⁴⁷¹ They took the road through Esztergom to Pressburg. The news of the

⁴⁶⁴ “Habuit tunc rex cum Buda egrederetur cum iis, qui Marie regine, et archiepiscopi Strigoniensis erant, quitum et peditum ad tria milia”. Brodarics *De conflictu in Actis Tomic*. VIII., 238. Quoted in Ortvyar Tivadar Ortvyar, *Mária, II. Lajos király neje*, 172, note 2. See also Kalous: Antonín Kalous, "Die Schlacht bei Mohács: böhmische und vatikanische Quellen" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2005).

⁴⁶⁵ His camp preacher was the Franciscan Antal Szegedi, who survived the battle, two royal chaplains Máté Nagy and Tamás Gyöngyösi lost their lives there. György Szerémi, *Epistola de perdicione Regni Hungarorum*, 121.

⁴⁶⁶ The silesian Johannes Czettricz, the Carver István Majláth, and the royal Master of the Horse Gáspár Horváth were selected for this office. Tivadar Ortvyar, *Mária, II. Lajos király neje*, 173.

⁴⁶⁷ Charles de Bailleul from Mary's household and one of Mary's intimates is recorded to have died in he battle.

⁴⁶⁸ Tivadar Ortvyar, *Mária, II. Lajos király neje*, 174., Gabriella Erdélyi, *Ferdinánd és Thurzó Elek levelezése 1526–1532. (Lymbus kötetek 1.) [The correspondence of Elek Thurzó 1526-1532]* (Budapest, 2005), 21.

⁴⁶⁹ Oláh was sent back to the queen by Louis three days before the battle to escort her to Pressburg: “cum belli alea incerta esset, rogare reginam, uti amantissimam coniugem, ut Posonium veluti locum ei tutiorem, proficiseretur.” Miklós Oláh, *Codex epistolaris*, 209.

⁴⁷⁰ As Szerémi describes the scene in his chronicle: “Et erat Turzo cum Regina, ambo colloquia inter se miscebant [...] Magnificium Turzonem Alexium super gradarium, de arce Regina velociter currebat inclinato capite, et nemini nil loquebatur. Qum vidimus ego dixi: Fraters, hoc est malum signum, quia dominus Turzo semper fuerat letus, nunc quidem male.” György Szerémi, *Epistola de perdicione Regni Hungarorum*, 122.

⁴⁷¹ Szerémi writes as an eyewitness of the events: “Extunc Regina Maria de arce Buda quinquaginta equitibus equitabet per januam Logod cum ancillis suis.” György Szerémi, *Epistola de perdicione Regni Hungarorum*, 123.

king's death reached them in Neszmély brought by his trusted gentleman of the chamber, Ulrich Czetriz, who was at the king's side during the battle and at his death.⁴⁷² Mary arrived in Pressburg on the 3rd of September – after the town had sent a delegate to the queen to welcome her and assure her of their loyalty – where she took lodgings in a house in the town on the main square.⁴⁷³ The royal castle on the hill above Pressburg, in which she had resided in 1523, for instance, was not made available to her, because it stood under the protection of the castellan János Bornemissza, who would only hand over the keys to the legitimate elected king. This was then the queen's court – neither comfortable, nor very large – to which different people arrived afar after the catastrophic loss of the battle and the death of the king.⁴⁷⁴

Court in Pressburg – interim centre of power

In the next stage Mary can be considered as temporary head of the regional and royal courts. This period can be put between the arrival of Mary to Pressburg, probably on 3 September 1526 to the arrival of Ferdinand with his troops at the Hungarian border on 31 July 1527. In Pressburg she held court with her entourage which gradually increased in number with those people who had escaped the slaughter at Mohács. Her court became the administrative centre and the base from which Mary could rally support for the claim to the vacant throne by her brother Ferdinand. This court had a changing constitution since several of the barons and nobles hesitated between the two pretenders to the throne, Ferdinand and John Szapolyai, and changes of sides were frequent. It was the task of the queen to use all manners of political patronage and bribes to try to keep the important nobles on her side. She did this in close

⁴⁷² “Dear Mr Hans I cannot write you anything save that unfortunately the Turk has totally defeated my lord and husband in battle, and many people have been killed, as regards his dear person, I am told that he got Away God grant that it be true for I have no certain information about Him. I wish to warn you since my lord and brother Is not in his Austrian Domains, to warn the court councilors to look out well, for I fear the Turk will not stop at my lord brother's borders. I hope In 3 days to be not far from You as today I left Buda at 3 o'clock in the morning. Dear Mr Hans I know nothing else to write to you for You can imagine the situation I am In, but I must obey God's will and endure it. Dated Netzmyll the Friday after Bartholomew's [August 31] in the year 1526. Maria regina” Karl Oberleitner, *Österreichs Finanzen und Kriegswesen unter Ferdinand I. vom Jahre 1522 bis 1564. (Archiv für Kunde österreichischer Geschichts-Quellen)* (Wien, 1860), 124. I quote the English translation from de Jong. Jane de Jongh, *Mary of Hungary*, 105.

⁴⁷³ Most recently discussed on the basis of the town accounts in the article of Katalin Szende on the relationship of Queen Mary and the towns of Western Hungary Katalin Szende, "Maria von Ungarn und die Städte Westungarns" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2005), 120. See also Tivadar Ortway, *Mária, II. Lajos király neje*, 208.

⁴⁷⁴ Szende mentions that the town had the kitchen of the house repaired a number of times. The town house was certainly not the type of residence that Mary was used to living in. Katalin Szende, "Maria von Ungarn", 122.

consultation with Ferdinand with great dedication, using her own means in the process.⁴⁷⁵ She called on the nobles to join her in Pressburg. Three days after her arrival she had a small group of Hungarian lords and clerics around her, including George of Brandenburg, who soon left the town, Elek Thurzó, Tamás Szalaházy, Miklós Oláh and István Brodarics, among whom Thurzó was highest ranking.⁴⁷⁶ Other lords and members of the royal court started arriving in the following weeks, some of them survivors, some others, who had arrived too late to take part in the battle. On 24 September the highest ranking office holder after the king, the palatine, István Báthory also arrived with his family and household.⁴⁷⁷

We know basically nothing of the personal household of Mary other than the majority of her servants and Frauenzimmer must have been present in Pressburg with her. We know of the presence of Hans Pock, her Hofmeister from the account books recording fish given to him by the town on 10 October. The town first supported the widowed queen and her household with food – fish, buns and wine – on 4 September. The amount of food (200 buns, a Dreiling wine) indicates that the amount of people with her was significant. The town continued supporting the queen's kitchen once or twice a month up to the spring of 1527.⁴⁷⁸

Despite the encouragement of Ferdinand to move to any town in Austria, Mary chose to stay in Pressburg within the borders of Hungary despite the discomfort and even the dangers of the location, because she realised that her legitimacy as continuation of the royal power and political activity was made possible by her remaining in the court.⁴⁷⁹ This is also where she called the national Diet to assemble – after the initially planned location, Komárom had had

⁴⁷⁵ For example see the long list of financial claims of Mary from her brother Ferdinand including reimbursement of the cost of provisions and bribes for the Hungarian lords. E.g. „Posonij post miserabilem cladem domini Ludovicj regis nos conflauimus et confusimus omnes nostras credentias aureas et argenteas et exinde numisma cudj fecimus, de qua ad intertencionem hungarorum ut fideles et in parte Romanorum Regis domini et fratris nostri charissimi constantes permanerent, antequam Stephanus Pempflinger superintendens Camerae hungaricae illuc Posonium missus erat, et status erat ordintus exposuimus et rogavimus florenos hung. 3612 qui faciunt flor. rhen. 4515.” Mihály Hatvani, ed., *Monumenta Hungariae Historica*, Vol. 2., 27.

⁴⁷⁶ József Bessenyei, "König Ferdinand", 80-81.

⁴⁷⁷ Very recently Norbert C. Tóth has published a newly discovered source, the household accounts of István Báthory from this period in Pozsony. Beside it being an interesting document regarding aristocratic households in general, it also sheds new light on the presence of certain magnates and prelates in Pozsony at the time of the election of Ferdinand. Norbert C. Tóth, "Ecsedi Bátori István nádor pozsonyi tartózkodásának számadáskönyve. Adalékok Magyarország 1526 végi politikatörténetéhez [The account book of István Báthori of Ecsed during his stay in Pressburg. Additions to the history of politics of the end of 1526]" *Levéltári Közlemények* 80 (2009): 169.

⁴⁷⁸ See the table of food given to the queen, to several lords and to delegates of other towns edited by Katalin Szende. Katalin Szende, "Maria von Ungarn", 131-132.

⁴⁷⁹ Katalin Szende, "Maria von Ungarn", 122. There is also indication that she had spent some time in Kittsee (Köpcsény). Norbert C. Tóth, "Ecsedi Bátori István számadáskönyve": 172.

fallen to the armies of Szapolyai – which Diet elected Ferdinand as king of Hungary on 16 December 1526. The authority of the queen is demonstrated by the fact that she had called together the Diet to assemble even though the role of calling the Diet was normally the task of the palatine, István Báthory, who was at Mary's side in Pressburg. The election was led by the speech of the palatine, followed by several other speeches, including a spokesman for the queen. Since in the meantime János Szapolyai had been elected king of Hungary in Székesfehérvár on 10 November 1526 and crowned the next day by István Podmaniczky, bishop of Nyitra the speakers in Pressburg declared the election and coronation of Szapolyai was declared void and Ferdinand was elected by a minority of the barons and estates.⁴⁸⁰ The result of the election and an official request to accept the crown was taken to Ferdinand by a delegation led by the palatine and received by Ferdinand with great solemnity on 12 January.⁴⁸¹ From this day Ferdinand included among his titles that of king of Hungary and Croatia and addressed the people of Hungary as his subjects.⁴⁸² This marked the official end of the power of Queen Mary as transitional head of the state, but in practice her court in Pressburg remained the centre of administration and support. This was especially true since the crowning of the elected king was vital for his power legitimation and Mary spared no efforts in achieving this. She urged her brother to enter Hungary with armed forces to secure his claim to the throne against Szapolyai with increasing urgency from the beginning of September. Ferdinand, however, lacked money for the campaign and decided to secure the Bohemian crown first. For this reason he appointed Mary his regent in Hungary with authority

⁴⁸⁰ In fact, very recent research has shown that the stereotype voiced in most traditional, often nationalistically prejudiced historiography of Ferdinand being elected by a minority, while Szapolyai was elected by the majority is not true. New sources have led Norbert C. Tóth to conclude that while the majority of prelates was indeed present at the election of Szapolyai (ratio 5:3), the majority of the holders of high-ranking offices of the kingdom were present at Ferdinand's election (ratio 6:4). Norbert C. Tóth, "Ecsedi Bátori István számadáskönyve": 174. For the in depth analysis of the integration and weight of the Hungarian aristocracy in the new government of Ferdinand I see the recent publications of Pálffy, especially the following: Géza Pálffy, "New Dynasty, New Court, New Political Decision-Making: A Decisive Era in Hungary. The Decades following the Battle of Mohács 1526" in *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and Her Court (1521-1531)*, ed. Orsolya Réthelyi et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2005). Géza Pálffy, "Hofwechsel und Einflussverlust. Der ungarische Adel am Hofe der Jagiellonen" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007).

⁴⁸¹ By that time Ferdinand had been elected king by the Bohemian estates on 22 October 1526, and by the Croatian estates on 12 January 1627.

⁴⁸² Ferdinand's charter of 29 12 1526 that he will "Ser(enissi)ma domina Maria Hungariae et Bohemiae regina etc., vidua soror nostra carissima, jnter plurima erga nos amoris et charitatis quae argumenta, post luctuosum Sermi quondam Ludouicj regis, fratris nostrj charissimj, jnteritum, nullj laborj, consilio, opibus suis et suorum pepercerit, vt nos coronam Regni Hungariae ac dignitatem regiam, nobis optimo jure debitam, assequeremur." For these reasons he promises to protect his sister in her dower estates against István Szapolyai and in case these should be lost he will compensate her with estates in his other lands. Mihály Hatvani, ed., *Monumenta Hungariae Historica, Vol. 1*, 50.

to govern jointly with the palatine István Báthori, Tamás Szalaházy, bishop of Veszprém, István Brodarics, chancellor, Elek Thurzó treasurer and Gáspár Horváth of Vingárt royal Master Carver on 19 January and made this decision public on 3 February 1527.⁴⁸³

With this step Mary entered in a new phase with the now official status of regent (*locum tenens*) of the king. The appointment is exceptional because the Hungarian common law prescribes that in the absence of the king for any reason the palatine is his *locum tenens* with full authority. The palatine, István Báthori was in Ferdinand's party and close to Mary, but neither he nor other barons seem to have challenged his decision and her authority.⁴⁸⁴ In trying to estimate the actual administrative power of the widowed queen it is important to note that on the one hand her powers exceeded that of the palatine as regent, who according to the Corpus Juris (laws of 1485 § 10) "was in power to do all that the king can and was obliged to do, with the exception of granting pardon, the granting of lands which returned to the crown and everything else which – according to old laws – was restricted to the king". According to Ferdinand's letter to Stephan Beriszló (Berislavič), Despot of Serbia of 3 February, Mary's power was not restricted in any of these matters: she "is allowed to negotiate in our name in any matter regarding the improvement, gain and profit of person, families and country, she has received from us the broadest authority to act in all matters that she should propose to you. You must therefore consent to the matters she presents to you without hesitation."⁴⁸⁵ On the other hand Mary governed in this period jointly with a body of Hungarian councillors and with the support of the councillors appointed by Ferdinand including the diplomats Christoph

⁴⁸³ Authorization for Mary by Ferdinand, Vienna 19 01 1527 ed. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 8-9. Mary was reluctant to accept the position, but finally is persuaded. Ferdinand makes the appointment public in Kutteneburg on 3 February 1527. „Diebus proximis cum in regnum nostrum Boemiae proficisceremur, iniunximus serenissimae dominae Mariae reginae sorori nostra carissimae, ut inter ceteros istius regni Hungariae dominos atque alios fideles nostros vobiscum per se aut per literas et nuncios suos nostre nomine tractat de hiis, quae ad commodum, utilitatem et augmentum personae, familiae ac patriae vestrae pertinebunt. Vos itaque hortamur, ut consilio Suae Maiestatis reginalis perinde atque nostro obtemperatis; habet enim amplissimam a nobis facultatem, super hiis rebus, quas ab ea intelligetis, vobiscum nostra in persona transigendi. Poteritis igitur secure et citra ullam dubitationem ad omnia, quae vobis per eandem proposita fuerunt, accedere.” István R. Kiss, *A magyar helytartótanács I. Ferdinánd korában és 1549–51. évi leveles könyve [The regency council in the age of Ferdinand I and its documentation 1549-51]* (Budapest, 1908), 334.

⁴⁸⁴ Ortway concludes that the authority of the queen was greater than that of the palatine. The fact that István Báthory was old and in bad health may also have had to do with the decision.

⁴⁸⁵ Ferdinand's letter to Stephan Beriszló Despot of Serbia: "nostro nomine tractat de hiis, quae ad commodum, utilitatem et augmentum personae, familiae, ac patriae vestrae pertinebunt. Habet amplissimam a nobis facultatem, super hiis rebus, quas ab ea intelligitis, vobiscum nostra in persona transigendi. Poteritis igitur secure et circa ullam dubitationem ad omnia, quae nobis per eandem proposita fuerunt, accedere." István R. Kiss, *A magyar helytartótanács I. Ferdinánd korában és 1549–51. évi leveles könyve [The regency council in the age of Ferdinand I and its documentation 1549-51]* (Budapest, 1908), 384.

Rauber, bishop of Laibach, Erasmus Dornberg, and Stephan Pemfflinger, who were in direct contact with Ferdinand. There is no sign of a secret restriction to the authorisation such as she would later receive in the Netherlands when nominated regent of her other brother, Emperor Charles V.⁴⁸⁶

In the analysis of the position of Mary as regent several examples can be brought for her complete field of authority: her rights in advowson, administration of jurisdiction, the right to pardon, the right to grant land, she was in the position to receive the pledge of allegiance of the towns or was allowed to delegate someone to do this in her place, and had administrative competence in affairs concerning Transylvania.⁴⁸⁷ Her charters in this period were sealed with her reginal seal, but this may not be a decisive issue, since in this period it was not common yet to use a special *locum tenens* seal, and her successor in the office did not use a special seal either.

The court offices were partly the same as before the battle of Mohács. Those barons who joined the party in support of Ferdinand's succession, like the palatine, István Báthory, the treasurer Elek Thurzó, the bishop of Veszprém Tamás Szalaházy and many others remained stable members. A second group received positions in the scramble to fill up the places of those who had died in the battle or had joined the party of the supporters of Szapolyai. The changing political situation, the election and crowning of Szapolyai, but especially the desperate lack of money and neglect of fulfilling promises, together with Ferdinand's postponement to enter the country caused several changes of loyalty resulting in a significant instability in the court in Pressburg. The account books of Pressburg – analysed from this aspect by Katalin Szende – provide a good source for indicating the presence of certain nobles at the queen's court at a given stage of events.⁴⁸⁸

The location of the court remained in Pressburg until the middle of 1527, even though the royal castle was still held by the castellan János Bornemissza and later János Szalay meaning that the court was essentially unprotected from the realistic possibility of an attack from the

⁴⁸⁶ Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria van Hongarije*, 145-161. Contrary to Hungarian scholarship, which accredited a larger role to Mary and her councillors Heiss evaluates Mary's role as dependent on Vienna in both financial and military matters Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 153.

⁴⁸⁷ Tivadar Ortway, *Mária, II. Lajos király neje*, 297-299.

⁴⁸⁸ Katalin Szende, "Maria von Ungarn", 131-132.

camp of Szapolyai. After the end of the truce between the two parties Ferdinand mobilized his forces in June. He also gave permission to the widowed queen to move her court to Vienna on 8 July 1527. She moved her court to Vienna and then to Wiener-Neustadt, where she stayed up to October, only making occasional trips to Óvár and Pressburg.⁴⁸⁹ Meanwhile Ferdinand's military campaign left Vienna 30 July and captured Magyaróvár, Győr, Szentmárton, Komárom, Tata, Visegrád, Esztergom and finally Buda on 20 August, which had been abandoned by Szapolyai's forces. This made the crowning of Ferdinand and Anne of Jagiello and king and queen of Hungary possible, which took place in Székesfehérvár on the 3 and 4 November, respectively.⁴⁹⁰ After the coronation Mary travelled to Óvár⁴⁹¹ where she stayed most of the time till the end of the year and up to the summer of 1528. Ferdinand asked her to act as her regent again in February 1528 when he left the country to collect troops and money in the Empire, but she rejected his offer, with the excuse that this would require a person older and wiser than she is.⁴⁹²

The household of the widowed queen

The moving of Mary's court outside the country borders to Wiener Neustadt and Vienna was possible when King Ferdinand entered the country. Therefore – though officially remaining regent – she was in principle free of administrative tasks once the king was present in person. The move to Vienna meant the division between the royal court and her own court, which had merged in the months after the battle of Mohács. The next step in the dissolution of Mary's court was the crowning of Anne, making her officially queen of Hungary. Mary was also present on the occasion. The crowning of the queen was followed by the granting of a wide scale of pardons to those who had returned to Ferdinand's loyalty and the appointment of a new set of royal court officials. Unfortunately no research has been done as to the new appointments to the court of Queen Anne, which must have taken place on the same

⁴⁸⁹ Mary still writes to Ferdinand from Pressburg on 25 06 1527 Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 95. On 09 08 1527 she already writes him from Wiener-Neustadt Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 106. She is still at this residence in the beginning of October, but writes to Ferdinand that she will travel to Buda to join her brother for the coronation on 14 October latest. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 141-142.

⁴⁹⁰ Géza Pálffy, "Koronázási lakomák a 15–17. századi Magyarországon" *Századok* 138/5 (2004).

⁴⁹¹ She arrived here at 21 11 1527 Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 148.

⁴⁹² See Ferdinand's letter to Mary 07 02 1528 Esztergom and Mary's answer to Ferdinand, 09 02 1528 Neusiedl Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 188-192, Nr. 153 and 154. Mary made a memorandum for her own use in which she collected the pros and cons of accepting an offer. I quote from this memorandum in the discussion of languages in chapter 5.3.

occasion.⁴⁹³ Mary did not accept the request of her brother to act once again as governor of Hungary, when he had to leave the country until February 1528. Thus, with the appointment of the palatine István Báthori as regent her official function in the administration of Hungary ended.⁴⁹⁴

This event marks the next change in the status of the queen, which also had an effect on the content and structure of her household. The administrative power and the court from this point centred on the regent, who stood under the supervision of King Ferdinand and was challenged in varying degree by the person and administration of the other crowned king of Hungary, John Szapolyai. The widowed queen's household decreased in importance, size and prestige. The scene of high politics and the focus of patronage was not Mary's court any more, but in the surroundings of Ferdinand and the palatine. The behaviour of Miklós Oláh exemplifies this change. After the crowning of Ferdinand, instead of following the widowed queen he went to Esztergom with Ferdinand, hoping to be able to leave his service in Mary's court and attain the Bishopric of Transylvania or other rich benefices.⁴⁹⁵ Disappointed in his prospects and being offered no more than the office of secretary in the chancellery of Ferdinand, he decided to stay in the service of the queen, whom he respected greatly. When he was overlooked again in the next round of the distribution of bishoprics by Ferdinand at the Diet of Augsburg, he complained bitterly at the injustice of court life.⁴⁹⁶

The widowed queen had not only few favours and benefices to dispose of in the years between 1528 and 1530 her court was also in constant financial problems and members of her household were unpaid for long periods of time. The loss of her administrative role, and her financial circumstances account for a decrease in court personnel, the rate of which is unfortunately unknown, due to the lack of household sources. The Brandenburg brothers refer to this process in a letter written by Albert to George on the day of Ferdinand's coronation.

⁴⁹³ I have received a research grant from the Institute of Habsburg Studies for the year 2009/2010 during which I will investigate sources on the court of Anne of Jagiello and compare these with my findings about the court of Mary.

⁴⁹⁴ Ferdinand's letter to Mary. Esztergom 07 02 1528 Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*; Mary's answer to Ferdinand Neusiedl an See 09 02 1528; the memo written by Mary in which she collects the reasons for and against her acceptance of the office is especially interesting. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 191.

⁴⁹⁵ István Fazekas, "Miklós Oláh", 42. See the article of Fazekas for an in depth treatment of the patronage structure between Oláh and Mary of Hungary.

⁴⁹⁶ István Fazekas, "Miklós Oláh", 43. Miklós Oláh, *Codex epistolaris*, 94.

They discuss the ending of the service of their younger brother Wilhelm, who had been one of the Stewards of Mary's household from 1525 but whom she was forced to send away (still in debt to him for several months of service) because she has to limit and reduce her own court (*iren hoff eingetzogenn unnd ir wesen unnd hoffhaltung zu verringern geursacht*).⁴⁹⁷ The finances of Mary's household were so bad that she and her entourage could not leave Linz in February 1530 at the outbreak of the plague because they were so greatly in debt to the merchants.⁴⁹⁸ Her letters from this period are full of complaints about the humiliation caused by constant problems with finances and creditors. According to the correspondence of Oláh the household was at times at the verge of revolt because of the poor financial circumstances.⁴⁹⁹

It is difficult to estimate the size of the court following the widowed queen from her estates in Óvár, to Pressburg and the reginal estate Znaim, then Linz, Passau, Innsbruck, Augsburg and back to Krems. As far as it can be traced her basic household seems to have stayed in her service.⁵⁰⁰ Her household was headed by the Hofmeister of the pre-Mohács years, Hans Pock, up to 1529. In this year Mary asked Albrecht von Feta to take over the post, who did not accept this for reasons not known.⁵⁰¹ Consequently Mary asked Wilhelm von Zelking in the same year. Wilhelm was a councillor of Ferdinand and had been a member of the body of councillors beside Mary in Pressburg in 1526/27. Zelking accepted the post and was the Hofmeister of the household in Innsbruck and Augsburg, and on the queen's travel to the Low Countries, from where he returned to Vienna and served Mary as a representative of her interests in the years to follow. Margareta von Ungnad remained at the head of the female household. She had filled this office since 1524 and remained in the queen's service until 1531. Many other members of the personal household are documented to have stayed at the

⁴⁹⁷ Letter of Albrecht of Brandenburg to his brother George, 03 11 1527. For full quotation see note 386. The letter was transcribed and brought to my attention by Zoltán Csepregi.

⁴⁹⁸ Letter of Mary to Ferdinand 8 and 13 02 1530 Linz ed. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 597, 600. See also Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 172.

⁴⁹⁹ „Itaque cum pecunias et viaticum expectauremus, dictum est, non posse illud nobis praeberi; dii boni quantum exacerbat sumus. Attamen cogemus ad tempus aliquot habere patientiam. Ego statui reginam sequi pro nostra in eam consueta fide, et in aduersis penes eam ferendis integritate, quoquo versum profectura sit, siue habituri essemus ab ea viaticum siue non. Nolo enim is esse, qui illam in suis necessitatibus sim derelicturus, posteaquam illi in prosperis fuerim addictus.” Letter of Oláh to John of Ferrara. Augsburg 22 11 1530. Miklós Oláh, *Codex epistolaris*, 110.

⁵⁰⁰ Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 443.

⁵⁰¹ Letter from Mary to Ferdinand. Znaim 28 01 1529. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 535.

side of the queen. The household also included the Frauenzimmer.⁵⁰² Some members of her court stepped over into the service of Ferdinand.⁵⁰³ There are even instances of new appointments, as in the case of Wolfgang Puchler, who appeared in her service in 1529 as German secretary and took over the office of treasurer (*Pfennigmeister*) from Hans Selnauer.⁵⁰⁴ It should be noted that Ferdinand had a decisive word in the composition of Mary's court and his permission had to be obtained for the new appointments to court offices. Especially the members of Mary's chapel were of his interest,⁵⁰⁵ but his approval had to be attained for the appointment of a new Hofmeister as well.⁵⁰⁶

As has been discussed above, the financial basis for the functioning of the court is the body of estates and rights that provide the necessary income. According to the terms of her wedding contract, Mary of Hungary as a widow had right either to the compensation for her 200 000 fl dowry or to the income of the reginal estates until she should remarry. Ferdinand had promised his sister the protection of her estates and the compensation for the losses she had suffered from the hands of the troops of Szapolyai as early as December 1526 because of her help in supporting his election as king.⁵⁰⁷ Later he affirmed her right to her possessions as stated in the marriage contract of 22 05 1515⁵⁰⁸ and obliged his heirs to either pay back the 200 000 fl dowry to Mary or pay her a yearly sum of 25 000 Fl.⁵⁰⁹ However the chamber of lower Austria did not pay and Mary, in increasing financial straits, had to take steps for taking the administration of her estates into her own hand. The Hungarian councillors pressured Ferdinand to make efforts to obtain the valuable estates from the widowed queen, especially after she had refused to act as his regent in 1528, but Ferdinand did not succeed in these efforts.⁵¹⁰ Nevertheless, the largest part of Mary's estates was in war zones or territories occupied by Szapolyai and brought little financial relief for the queen. This meant that she

⁵⁰² This is referred to by Henckel in his letter to Erasmus, when he describes how the ladies were moved by his work of consolation dedicated to the queen even though they could not read Latin. See chapter 5.2.5.

⁵⁰³ E.g. Georg Reicherstorffer from Transylvania, who had been reginal secretary from 1525 and joined Ferdinand's court at Mary's recommendation in June 1527.

⁵⁰⁴ Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 443. In 1549 he was not living any more and Georg Krabat von Sparendorf Mary's ex-councillor was hired in his place. István Kenyeres, "A bécsi Udvari Kamarai Levéltár Gedenkbücher Österreich magyar vonatkozású iratainak regesztái, 61-64. köt. (1547-1550)" in *Lymbus. Magyarságtudományi Közlemények*, ed. Gábor Ujváry (Budapest, 2005), 268, 274.

⁵⁰⁵ For a detailed discussion of Mary's chapel see chapter 5.2.2.

⁵⁰⁶ See for instance the case of Albrecht of Feta.

⁵⁰⁷ Mihály Hatvani, ed., *Monumenta Hungariae Historica*, Vol. 1, 50..

⁵⁰⁸ Mihály Hatvani, ed., *Monumenta Hungariae Historica*, Vol. 1, 54.

⁵⁰⁹ Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 168.

⁵¹⁰ The process is described in detail by Heiss. Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 168-171.

was also indebted to members of her household, a debt which amounted to as much as 18 032 fl.rh. and an additional 3 582 fl.rh. for her Hofmeisterin Margarete von Ungnad in 1530.⁵¹¹

The marriage plans made for Mary by her brothers should be considered as part of their strategy to obtain the reginal estates, which – as standard procedure in marriage contracts – were granted for a lifetime, or until the remarriage of the widow. In the months after Mary resigned the regency two marriage candidates appear in the Habsburg correspondence in quick succession, James V of Scotland (1512-1542, 7 years younger than Mary) in June and Frederick II (the Wise) of the Palatinate (Pfalzgraf Friedrich, 1482-1556, 23 years older than Mary) in October.⁵¹² In 1530 László Zsegyei a *familiaris* of Ferenc Batthyány mentions, in a letter written about the Diet of Augsburg, a third potential groom, the son of the French King Francis I, who would later become one of Mary's most bitter enemies.⁵¹³ Mary however stayed adamant in her decision to remain unmarried. Her firmness of resolution may have had to do with the prospect of taking over the governing of the Low Countries from her aunt Margaret. The foot injury that led to the eventual death of Margaret of Austria on 1 December 1530 was signalled in the first days of November.⁵¹⁴ Nevertheless, before the news could possibly have spread through Europe, László Zsegyei in the letter quoted above already writes that when Margaret dies Mary of Hungary will succeed her aunt in the Low Countries and will not return to Hungary.⁵¹⁵ Obviously this possibility for the future of Mary had been discussed in Augsburg and received publicity, though nobody knew at that time how close the actual realisation of the plan was.

⁵¹¹ List of Mary's debts, 15 11 1530, Augsburg, HHStA Familienakten 97.; Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber": 170.

⁵¹² Letter of Ferdinand to Mary, Prague 28 06 1528, ed. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 250f.; Letter of Charles to Ferdinand, Madrid 09 10 1528, ed. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 309.

⁵¹³ Letter of László Zsegyei to Ferenc Batthyany. 04 11 1530, Szombathely. MOL, a hg. Batthyany cs. Törzslevéltára (P 1313), 267. cs. 11-12. fol. This marriage plan is completely unknown in the secondary literature and we do not know which son is mentioned, but since Francis had married Eleanor of Habsburg a few months earlier, on the 7th of August, it does not seem a completely unlikely combination. Especially since the background is formed by the famous *Paix des Dames* peace treaty between France and the Habsburg dynasty that had been concluded a year earlier on 05 08 1529 through the diplomatic efforts of Margaret of Austria representing Charles V and her sister in law, Louise of Savoy representing the French.

⁵¹⁴ Jane de Iongh, *De hertogin*, 466.

⁵¹⁵ See above footnote ??? The same idea is expressed in a letter from Ferdinand to Mary from the beginning of the year, which shows that the prospect was seriously dealt with in the Habsburg dynasty. Letter of Ferdinand to Mary 04 01 1530 Köln, ed. Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3.*, 1ff.

At the very end of the Augsburg Diet Ferdinand, and to a smaller extent Charles also dealt with the most pressing needs of their sister and promised to take over a large part of the debts she had made in the past years.⁵¹⁶ Mary and her household withdrew to Austria in November 1530 to wait for the news of the military campaign to free Buda from the Ottomans and Szapolyai in the town of Krems. The news of her aunt's death and the request of Charles to accept the position of regent in the Low Countries reached her here from Köln where the brothers were together to discuss the details of Ferdinand's election and crowning as King of the Romans and the appointment of Mary as Regent.⁵¹⁷ Mary brought several counterarguments, but finally accepted the appointment.

To summarise: in the beginning of this period the queen's court coincided with the centre of administration which was reflected in its importance and the presence of the influential magnates of the realm. Since Mary, together with the palatine, had the central administrative power both informally and formally in the time of her regency, the court was the actual decision-making centre though working in close cooperation with the administration of Ferdinand. The position of the court in Pressburg was significant since this town was within the Hungarian Kingdom, but close to the western border. Mary remained in this location despite the discomfort of not being able to live in the castle and the danger of the military campaigns of the troops of King John Szapolyai. We know basically nothing about the smaller household of the queen, including her Frauenzimmer in this period. This phase lasted up to the arrival of Ferdinand and the troops when Mary felt free to leave the country and set up residence in various places including Wiener Neustadt, Óvár, Vienna, later Krems, Znaim, and other towns. As much as can be gathered from the sources she moved around with a small following plagued by constant financial difficulties. These were caused by the fact that much of her estates were in areas controlled by King John. Mary's appointment as regent of the Low Countries brought the period to an end. Typically for this period, the widowed queen was dependant on her brothers not only financially to cover the cost of her household, but the

⁵¹⁶ Ferdinand took over different debts of 17 574 rh.fl. and Charles granted her a year pension of 1200 ducats from the tax income of Naples, but this did not solve her financial problems. Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 174.

⁵¹⁷ Letter of Ferdinand to Mary 13 12 1530 Bacharach ed. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 633 ff., Letter of Ferdinand to Mary 29 12 1530 Köln ed. ebd. 638 f.; Charles's letter to Mary 03 01 1531 Köln, ed. Karl Lanz, ed., *Correspondenz des Kaisers Karls V. aus dem Königlichen Archiv und der Bibliothek de Bourgogne zu Brüssel*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1844-1846), vol 1. 416 ff. See also Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 175.

correspondence between Mary and Ferdinand reveals that Ferdinand had control over several aspects of the personal element of her household. Though Mary accepts the authority of Ferdinand their correspondence shows her reluctance to subdue her decisions to her brother's wishes.

Travel to the Low Countries

The next dramatic change in the status of the widowed queen came with the arrangements made for her travel to the Low Countries. It is a well known fact in the scholarship on Mary of Hungary that Charles asked her to leave behind a large part of her household, giving the exact names of those men and women, usually filling high ranks in the household, who should not accompany Mary. Charles mentions her Hofmeister Wilhelm von Zelking, her Hofmeisterin Margarethe von Ungnad, her Count of the Mining Chamber, Bernhard Beheim, her confessor Johannes Henckel, her preacher and almoner Johann von Neuburg. He argues that though he does not in any way question his sister's loyalty to the Catholic Church, but states that certain ideas, which are tolerated in German lands, would be very dangerous and could not be tolerated under any circumstance in the Netherlands and that these members of her household are regarded as supporters of the Lutheran teaching. In broader terms he also emphasises that it would be necessary to leave all the leading officials of her household behind and select new people in the Low Countries since the inhabitants of those lands do not like the presence of foreigners in the surroundings of their rulers.⁵¹⁸

It is less frequently cited that Charles's letter to Mary is an answer to a special envoy sent by her in order to emphasize once more two questions even before he took any steps to appoint her to the post.⁵¹⁹ Firstly she stressed that she wishes not to remarry until the end of her life, secondly that she is true in her faith and is even willing to send away those members of her household, who fall under the suspicion of following the heretic teaching of Luther. It is quite obvious that Mary desired to have the position of regent, despite all her protestations she expressed when she was actually asked. That is why she found it important to emphasize her loyalty and willingness to bring great sacrifices in the two subjects she felt were critical in

⁵¹⁸ Karl Lanz, ed., *Correspondenz des Kaisers Karls V.*, vol. i, 416 ff.

⁵¹⁹ (Lanz (ed.). 1844-1846, vol. i, 416 ff).

Charles' estimation for her appointment, even to the extent of giving up certain members of her household.⁵²⁰

It is worth noting how Charles speaks about his sister's household. He tells her that Ferdinand would make sure that she would be able to travel with a household as fits her rank and she would compose her new household in the Netherlands once she has arrived. She should definitely not make any promises concerning her new household, Charles and Mary will make the choices together. The emperor suggested that she could make sure that her people she is forced to leave behind are provided for with positions in the estates she has in Hungary and Austria.⁵²¹ In her memorandum of 29 January 1531 in which Mary accepts the appointment she also reacts briefly to Charles' requests about her household. She asks her brother's permission to keep a small number of her household in service and to allow that her present Hofmeister and Hofmeisterin accompany her on the travel, because she would consider it very unpleasant to have to conduct such a long travel in the company of strangers.⁵²²

After having left Krems Mary spent three weeks in Linz to prepare for the travel to the Low Countries including the arrangement for the conferring of her remaining debts to Ferdinand, and the discussion of the open questions of estate management. Mary was still in possession of the most significant portion of the reginal estates in Hungary, even after she had resigned from the reginal estates in Bohemia to her sister-in-law, Anne in 1531.⁵²³ This was partly because there was an uncertainty about how long she would function as a regent. She repeatedly expressed, and probably it was understood that she would return to her estates in Hungary when the political situation would allows this. Ferdinand and his supporters still hoped for a victory over Szapolyai and the Ottoman Empire supporting him, however unrealistic this may seem from a modern perspective. A more important reason for Mary keeping her estates was the decision of Charles to confer incomes on Mary which would only

⁵²⁰ Jane de Iongh, *De koningin : Maria van Hongarije, Landvoogdes der Nederlanden 1505-1558* (Amsterdam: Querido, 1981 (first published 1941)), 173-174.

⁵²¹ Karl Lanz, ed., *Correspondenz des Kaisers Karls V.*, vol. i, 416 ff..

⁵²² Mary's memorandum for her answer given to Boussu, s.d. (January 1531), HHStA, Belgien PA 24, fol. 122. Quoted in Heiss Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 175. See also Jane de Iongh, *De koningin*, 178.

⁵²³ Letter of Mary to Ferdinand , 13/14 03 1531 Linz, ed. Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3.*, vol. 2, 61 ff.

partly support the costs of her court in the Netherlands, calculating also with the incomes of her Hungarian estates.⁵²⁴

Charles, who was much less hindered by local considerations in the management of the Empire calculated that the estimated 67 000 fl annual cost of the regentess' court could be secured by 47 000 fl income from the Low Countries, calculating with a further 20 000 fl from Mary's Hungarian and Austrian estates.⁵²⁵ In this decision he did not take account of either the complaints of his sister, who tried in vain to demonstrate that her estates did not provide this amount since they were in the possession of Szapolyai, or in war zones, or burdened with mortgages. Neither did he take into consideration the reasoning of Ferdinand, who understood fully that the queen's estates, especially the mining towns belonged to the most lucrative income sources of Hungary and that those incomes were necessary for the defence of the country and that their export to the Low Countries would cause outrage and justified protest among his Hungarian subjects. This would be a contested issue for the next decades and would be brought up at several Diets by the Hungarian representatives, who were supported by the councillors of Ferdinand. The protest of the Hungarians as well as the Austrians made the long-distance governance of the estates through her local managers increasingly difficult for Mary. Nevertheless, recent research by István Kenyeres emphasizes the very effective estate management and financial controlling system set up by Mary on her Hungarian estates which thus yielded an annual 25 000 hu. fl. in the first half of the 1540s and 35 000 hu. fl. in the second half of the decade.⁵²⁶ These sums are even more remarkable if one takes into account that these amount to a multiple of the income of the king from Hungary, who had not more than a few thousand forints income from Hungary.⁵²⁷ The greater part of the income of the queen was sent directly to Brussels (e.g. 92% in 1546 and 58% in 1547) and a considerable percentage was paid to her Austrian estate managers, withdrawing large sums of money from the country. At the same time she only provided for the defence of her own

⁵²⁴ For a more detailed discussion of the issue see Heiss Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 176-180.

⁵²⁵ Letter of Charles to Ferdinand, 29 07 1531 Brussels, Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3.*, vol 2, Lieferung.

⁵²⁶ István Kenyeres, "Der ungarischen Besitzungen Königin Marias". These amounts include the net profit paid into the queen's central financial office in Vienna and exclude the sums paid to the personnel, soldiers and supplies of the estates. István Kenyeres, *Uradalnok és végvárak*, 75.

⁵²⁷ "König Ferdinand hatte nämlich aus Ungarn z.B. im Jahr 1528 laut eigenen Angaben Einkommen in der Höhe insgesamt 7.000 Gulden; zwischen 1539 und 1541 verbuchte die Ungarische Kammer für den Herrscher abzüglich der von den ungarischen Stände kontrollierten Kriegssteuer ein Einkommen von höchstens drei- bis fünftausend Gulden." István Kenyeres, "Der ungarischen Besitzungen Königin Marias", 205.

castles and did not set up a standing army, as landowners in the kingdom were required to do, a fact resulting in further resentment.⁵²⁸

Again we do not have lists of the exact composition of the household travelling with Mary. As she had requested in her letter to Charles, her court was headed by her Hofmeister Wilhelm von Zelking and his wife Margareta Lady of Sandizell, who would return to Austria in October 1531 where Wilhelm continued to serve Mary as commissioner and councillor in Vienna. A small group of her household travelled with her, her loyal followers who – as she wrote in the memorandum of her answer to Charles – “have been in my service for long and have been at my side through both good and bad times”.⁵²⁹ We have an incidental group of names of those, who we know were with her, or those names that appear in her Dutch household lists, the first of which was compiled in June 1534.⁵³⁰ Lucretia de Caballis, Catharina de Landenberg, Barbara von Maidburg are names that have occurred in earlier years in Mary’s Frauenzimmer. In other cases the names reveal Austrian origin: Louise de Zelking, must have been one of the daughters of the Zelking couple, who stayed in Mary’s court, Miss Salm was the daughter of Elisabeth von Salm, Mary’s Hofmeisterin who went to the Netherlands from Vienna in 1532, while Clara Svetkovics was a sister of Mary’s trusted lady in waiting, Catherina, wife of Ferenc Batthyány. Apoline von Lamberg, Magdalene Oberstaner and Dorothea Hoberch are daughters of Austrian noble families. Two daughters of

⁵²⁸ See the the discussion of Kenyeres and the memorandum by the Regency Council to Ferdinand on 13 04 1545 quoted by him in which the Regency Council ascertain that the widowed queen should have provided for the upkeep of an army (banderium) of 600 horsemen, which she did not do, thus causing about 300 000 loss to the treasury since 1528. They ask Ferdinand to sue his sister and demand a recompensation. ÖStA HKA HFU RN 2. Konv. 1545. fol. 92-95. István Kenyeres, *Uradalnok és végváradak*, 88, n.101.

⁵²⁹ Mary’s lines about her household in the memorandum written by her own hand are worth quoting in length: “I will only take those who are staying with me. They have been in my service for long and have been at my side through both good and bad times. This is why I cannot send them away. But that does not make it less possible to accept Netherlanders in my personal service and in other posts. Though I have lived long in these lands I have not forgotten the love I have received in your [Charles’] country, which can also be seen by the fact that I have never been without them [the Netherlanders] in my service. In accordance with his order I shall not take along those, whom he had named, despite the fact that I see them all as good Christians. Nevertheless I would request that my Hofmeister and his wife may accompany me there because I do not want to take any foreign woman other than the girls who with me at the moment. He shall return immediately, because I will entrust him and some others with the care of my estates in these countries. I want to take him, because otherwise I would have to hire someone only for the travel, which I find an impossible task at such short notice. Not to mention the fact that before somebody new would become accustomed to me and my people he would find it very difficult to keep the affairs in hand and this way it will all be easier.” Summary de se que lempereur m’a mandé. Before 31 01 1531. HHStA, Belgien PA 2/1, fol. 122. I have not seen the original of this unpublished document and have used the Dutch translation of the originally French text given by Gorter van Royen. Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria van Hongarije*, 121.

⁵³⁰ Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 286.

the late Emperor Maximilian born out of wedlock, Dorothea and Anna of Austria also accompanied Mary, or joined her later.⁵³¹ Far less is known about her male household. Her secretary Nicolaus Oláh decided to accompany the queen though with grave doubts and after consulting his friends. Much of what we know about the court in this phase is from small details of his correspondence. An interesting case is Leopold Schreibersdorffer, who had been the Hofmeister of George of Brandenburg before the battle of Mohács.⁵³² Now he went with Mary to the Low Countries, from where he returned to Ferdinand's service to fight against the Ottomans in September 1532.⁵³³ Nevertheless he returned again to Mary's service, and served as her Hofmeister as appears on the lists of 1534 and 1539.⁵³⁴ Philippe de Bailleul had been in Mary's service from the beginnings and served her in the Low Countries as member of the court nobility.⁵³⁵ Wolfgang von Puchheim, Herr zu Gellersdorf had been in King Louis's service and after 1526 had served Ferdinand in the campaigns in Hungary. He accompanied Mary and served in military campaigns for seven years before he returned to Austria and Hungary, where he served Mary as castellan of the castle of Zólyom (Altsohl).⁵³⁶ But we also find the lords Eberstorff, Puchheim, Erasmus de Litzius, Georg von Landenberg in her first Dutch household list compiled in 1534.⁵³⁷

Ferdinand took the opportunity of sending back several people from his own household who were originally from the Low Countries and had come with him to Austria in 1521 and served him there. He requested Charles to find a place for them in Mary's new court.⁵³⁸ Charles took his brother's wishes into account when he appointed two of those lords requested by Ferdinand for the two highest positions in Mary's court. Antoine de Croy, lord of Thou-sur-Marne and Sempy (1460-1546), Ferdinand's High Master of the chamber received the same

⁵³¹ One of them arrived later, together with Elisabeth Countess of Salm in March 1532. Ferdinand explains in a letter to his sister that she is sending her to his sister's court to serve there and make a good marriage because bastards are valued higher in the Netherlands than in the Austrian territories. Letter of Ferdinand to Mary, 08 02 1532, Innsbruck. Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3.*, 500. According to Kerkhoff, Dorothea married Johan, Count of Oost-Friesland, and Anna married Frans van Melun, Count of Espinoy. Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 281.

⁵³² See Mary's letter to the town of Pressburg. Buda, 27 01 1526. MOL DF 241312.

⁵³³ Letter of Mary to Ferdinand 07 09 1532, Brussels. Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3.*, 618.

⁵³⁴ Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 61.

⁵³⁵ Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 289.

⁵³⁶ Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 446.

⁵³⁷ Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 289.

⁵³⁸ Letter of Mary to Ferdinand 27 07 31 Brussels, ed. Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3.*, Nr. 523.

function for Mary's court (*chevalier d'honneur*), and Philippe de Lannoy, lord of Molembaix became her Oberhofmeister (*grand maitre d'hotel*).⁵³⁹ Ferdinand's further requests included his Hofmeister Henri d'Hamericourt (Hemricourt), lord of Neufville, and his Master Falconer Guillaume, baron of Blois, both of whom were appointed to the same function in Mary's court, as well as Jan Hinkart, who would serve as Cup-bearer.⁵⁴⁰ Of the people requested by Ferdinand only Charles of Burgundy, lord of Bredam was not given a place in the regentess' household.⁵⁴¹

The question of Mary's Hofmeisterin in the Netherlands has been left to the end and will be described in somewhat greater detail because the case is demonstrative of how the questions of authority in the composition of the court prevail in theory and in practice between the three Habsburg siblings.⁵⁴² In theory the decision of the composition of Mary's court for the travel, and in the Netherlands was in the hand of Charles, as the highest-ranking male of the Habsburg dynasty. Both Ferdinand and Mary acknowledge and refer to this authority. Charles explicitly expressed to his sister that he wished to appoint a noble lady from the Netherlands to this post.⁵⁴³ He had earlier argued that it is important to give the high offices to locals because the people of the Netherlands do not like foreigners around their rulers.⁵⁴⁴ He had also explicitly asked her not to make promises regarding the posts and leave it to him to find a suitable candidate. Mary accepts her brother's requests and also expresses that the composition of her court is in Charles' hand in a letter to Ferdinand, when the latter tries to place his own people in her household.⁵⁴⁵ Despite all the protestations, before she left Austria Mary started to negotiate with Ferdinand about the possibility of Elisabeth, Countess of Salm taking the place of Margarethe von Ungnad as her Hofmeister. Elisabeth, the sister of

⁵³⁹ Letter of Nicolaus Olah to Johannes Weeze, 06 09 1533, Gent ed. Miklós Oláh, *Codex epistolaris*, 406.

⁵⁴⁰ Letter of Mary to Ferdinand 27 07 31 Brussels, ed. Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3.*, Nr. 523.

⁵⁴¹ Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 446.

⁵⁴² The case was a significant source of tension and continues to be an important subject in the Habsburg correspondence and thus has received attention from different scholars. Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber": 178-179. Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria van Hongarije*, 125-127. Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 61-62.

⁵⁴³ Letter of Mary to Ferdinand, 27 07 1531, Brussels Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3.*, Nr. 523.

⁵⁴⁴ See above.

⁵⁴⁵ Letter of Mary to Ferdinand, 24 01 1531 Krems Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3.*, Nr. 450.

Wilhelm von Roggendorff, Margrave of Austria and the widow of Niklas Count of Salm⁵⁴⁶ had been Mary's Hofmeisterin on her travel to Buda, but had left Buda and served Anne as Hofmeisterin. Mary's requesting her to head her court in the Netherlands not only went completely against her promise to Charles, but caused great inconvenience to Anne, who was also very much attached to Elisabeth Salm. Mary persisted in her request and finally Anne – though very reluctantly – agreed to let the Countess go if she would be allowed to stay in with her long enough to assist her at the birth of her fifth child in May.⁵⁴⁷ Meanwhile Charles did not find a suitable Hofmeisterin in the Netherlands, of the possible candidates the lady of Chièvres⁵⁴⁸ and the lady of Egmont⁵⁴⁹ had excused themselves on account of being too old, while the widow of Egmont was too young, and finally agreed to appoint the Countess of Salm.⁵⁵⁰ Before giving his consent he made sure through Ferdinand's assurance that the Countess was at least satisfactory in the other mayor issue, the purity of Catholic doctrine.⁵⁵¹ Elisabeth of Salm left Austria in February 1532 accompanied by her daughter, and stayed at the head of Mary's court up to 1535, when she returned to Vienna on family business and stayed in Austria.⁵⁵²

⁵⁴⁶ Niklas Salm, Count of Salm-Neuburg (1459-04 05 1530) he served Ferdinand as imperial military commander and took part in the siege of Buda in 1527 and the defeat of Szapolyai at Tokaj. As military commander he led the defense of Vienna from the Ottomans in 1529, where he received a bullet wound that became infected and would cause his death in May 1530.

⁵⁴⁷ Letters of Ferdinand to Mary, 10 03 1531, 16 03 1531, and 17 07 1531 ed. Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3.*, Nr.467, Nr. 469, Nr. 517.

⁵⁴⁸ Marie-Madeleine van Hamal, widow of William of Croy, lord of Chièvres. Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria van Hongarije*, 126, n.45.

⁵⁴⁹ Magdalena (1464-1538), widow of Jan III of Egmont (1438-1516), the mother in law of Françoise of Egmont the young widow of Jan IV of Egmont. Françoise became one of Mary's ladies in waiting. Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria van Hongarije*, 126, n.46. She was also the mother of the famous Lamoraal van Egmont (1522-1568), who was beheaded by 5 juni 1568 at the order of the Duke of Alva.

⁵⁵⁰ Letter of Mary to Ferdinand, 06 07 1531, Brussels and letter of Charles to Ferdinand, 29 07 31, Brussels Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3.*, Nr. 508, Nr. 524. Spurred by his sister Ferdinand spoke to Countess Salm's brother Wilhelm of Roggendorff and her son to intervene and persuade the Countess to accept the post. Letter of Ferdinand to Mary, Linz 17 08 1531, ed. Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3.* Her hesitation to accept the office also had to do with her children she would have to leave behind, as referred to in one of Mary's letters. The Countess had eight children, only one of whom she took with her to the Netherlands. Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria van Hongarije*, 126.

⁵⁵¹ Charles was concerned that the younger lady of Egmont would not be a good Hofmeisterin, because she was not strong enough to have authority that would balance that of Mary. He expected that the Countess had enough influence on his sister „especially since she is a good Christian and you have recommended her, whos opinion I trust. I have my reasons to do so. In addition, it is good if both parties agree to the decision. You know why I say this.” Letter of Charles to Ferdinand 01 10 1531 quoted by Gorter van Royen in her discussion of the question. Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria van Hongarije*, 126. The letter is edited in Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3.*, Nr. 548..

⁵⁵² Mary gave her a pension of 1 000 Fl. In 1540 she still writes Ferdinand asking him to persuade her to come back and resume service as Hofmeisterin or at least arrange for somebody in her place, which would not be easy regarding her (Mary's) difficult personality. Mary to Ferdinand, Brussels, 02 06 1540, konzept in HHStA, Belgien PA, fol. 166-169. Quoted in Heiss Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 448.

The analysis of the above-described cases are significant because they allow a closer look at the principles, the interests of the different parties, the possibilities for enforcing one's wishes and the decision mechanisms at play in the question. The hierarchy inside the Habsburg dynasty is crucial in evaluating the process. Charles was the absolute head of the family, a situation which was accepted without challenge by Ferdinand, but the practical meaning of which had to be established in every specific question. Mary, at her marriage stepped out of the official hierarchy of the Habsburgs; it is in line with her loyalty to her new family that in several cases she explicitly acted against the interests of the Habsburgs and in favour of her husband.⁵⁵³ With the death of her husband and especially with the open proclamation of her refusal to remarry, she rejoined the Habsburg hierarchy and swore it absolute loyalty, which meant not only accepting the authority of Charles and to a lesser extent that of Ferdinand, but – as a woman – also laying claim to their protection. It is difficult not to see the diplomatic shrewdness of Mary, who in writing and certainly also in word affirms the authority of her brothers, but in practice is capable of asserting her own interests and using the conflicting authorities of her brothers to reach her goal. In a gendered analysis of the power mechanisms her side is recognizably a female assertion of interests.

⁵⁵³ See examples in Réthelyi Orsolya Réthelyi, "Ambiguous Loyalties?", 18.

5 Life at Queen Mary's court

5.1 The relation of the queen's court to the Royal court

5.1.1 Topography

What can be said about the court of Mary of Hungary in relation to that of the king? Is it justified to speak of a separate household and is it possible to speak of a separate court? Starting with the spatial characteristics, basically nothing is known about the position of the queen's suite within the Buda palace, except for its general location within the southern block of the palace.⁵⁵⁴ Nevertheless there are certain references to separate living quarters, both in Buda and in other residences. One knows from countless European comparisons that the queen's suite was separate and in spatial arrangement often mirrored that of the king. The *Frauenzimmer*, that is the female household lived in these quarters and was kept in isolation to a great extent. This is also the idea supported by the tractate of Carafa quoted above in which he warns the Queen Beatrice to inspect closely the queens quarters and the rooms appointed to the women's household and have all unnecessary door and windows walled up. Nevertheless from the period of Queen Mary there is basically one actual reference to a separate queen's suite in Buda. This is recorded in a letter by a member of Mary's household, the Austrian noble Hanns Schweinpeck to his son about the first impressions in the weeks after the arrival of the queen and her entourage to Hungary. He writes that there is a certain old couple called "parlawyss" (=Bornemissza) the man and woman respectively 80 and 70 years old, who are enemies of the queen because of the shame they have had to suffer on her account.⁵⁵⁵ The couple had occupied the rooms belonging to the queen of Hungary in the period that no queen was present in Buda. To their great annoyance Mary made them vacate these rooms. János Bornemissza was the castellan of Buda and had been the tutor of the young king, while his wife had also been involved in the upbringing of Louis, which seems to have given them enough excuse to use the queen's quarters.

⁵⁵⁴ Károly Magyar, "Mary of Hungary and Buda", 115.

⁵⁵⁵ János Bornemissza was castellan of Buda and Pressburg. Kubinyi convincingly argues that this affair was the cause of a long lasting hate of the couple for the queen Mary. Furthermore since Bornemissza was the chief informant of the papal delagate Baron Burgio, it also accounts for much of the negative sentiment against the queen in these reports, which have been the most important source of the years before Mohács and thus partly responsible for the queen's „negative press”. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary". For an illuminating reinvestigation of the person and position of Bornemissza see Kubinyi András Kubinyi, "Szalkai László".

Es ist einer, heisst parlawyss (?) ist ob 80 unt sein weib ob 70 jar alt, duant der Kuniginn nichts guts, dann was sie schand halber muessen; solche sind jungfrau Barbara freunt; solche alt kortl hat den Kunig in ir Schul gahabt, wallt gern mein gnedigst Frau Kuniginn auch gehabt haben unt Hofmeisterin sein gewesen, hat mein gnedigste Frau keinswegs haben wollen. Sy hat ihr Zymer im Sloss (?) gehabt, die der Kuniginn zugehören, hat sy muessen räumen, das hat sy ein grossen Verdruss empfangen; aber hilft nichts, haben den Kopfh gespitzt, muess hindurch Maister oder knecht zu werden!⁵⁵⁶

The case demonstrates the existence of a suite traditionally used by the queens of Hungary though unfortunately without giving any further information on its position, form or size. The dating of charters also gives an occasional glimpse at a separate reginal court. The queen issued a charter dated in Visegrád “*in curia nostra*” on 14 September 1523.⁵⁵⁷ In another example a notarial deed from 12 October 1524 is dated in the royal castle in the queen’s aula, but it is unclear what the case might have to do with the queen.⁵⁵⁸

The queen’s quarters seem not only to have been a well defined space, but also emerge from the references as a feminine place that is different in its character. In the complaints about the kings behaviour discussed at the diplomatic summit in Pressburg in 1523 one of the points is that “he is always among the women, he spends his whole day at the queen, not because he loves her so much, but to play, which is done there without any order or dignity”.⁵⁵⁹ Beside all the interesting details regarding disorder at the court, this citation also presents the implicitly mentioned queen’s suite, or Frauenzimmer, as a separate space with a different quality. A different, but not less significant aspect of the queen’s space also comes to light during the diplomatic summit, when a severe argument breaks out between the Hungarian chancellor and bishop of Eger, László Szalkai and Ferenc Batthyány who hurl abuses at each other in front of the king. Two days later the chancellor did not want to appear at the council at the King, because he had not received gratification for the insults, so the king took the Polish chancellor to the queen and also invited a small circle of magnates to her suite to discuss the crisis,

⁵⁵⁶ Letter of Hanns Schweinpeck to his son. Ed. Karl Stoegmann, “Über die Briefe des Andrea da Burgo”: 224, note 20. See more about this incident below.

⁵⁵⁷ MOL DL 23822. Ed. Wenzel Gusztáv Wenzel, *Diósgyőr egykori történelmi jelentősége [The former historical significance of Diósgyőr]* (Budapest, 1872).

⁵⁵⁸ The deed records the agreement between a priest from Eperjes and the town represented by an attorney. MOL Df 229765, quoted by Kubinyi. András Kubinyi, “The Court of Queen Mary”, 19.

⁵⁵⁹ „Totus est inter mulieres continuus etc., aput reginam totum manet, non ut eam tantum amet, sed ut ibi intendat iocalibus, ubi omnia sunt sine ordine, sine dignitate etc.” Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 121.

because “if they meet at the king’s place many hard words from both would certainly ensue, which would result in the growth of a small spark into a flames of fire.”⁵⁶⁰ The queen’s space in this case appears as a neutral territory, where political conflicts are less likely to erupt.

Looking at the financial aspects of the queen’s court the existence of the two dower systems in use in late medieval Europe, resulting in radically different political weight of the queen has been discussed above. Hungary was characterised by granting the queen an income of her own covering the expenses of herself and her retinue.⁵⁶¹ This necessitates financial departments, including treasury and estate management, which is separate from that of the king. Typically, a structural recording of expenses of the queen’s court is absent from the account books fragments preserved from the years 1525-1526.⁵⁶² Even more significantly, as Kubinyi has shown, there exists from the same period covered by the account book in 1525 a charter fragment listing the delivery of large amounts foodstuffs to the queen’s kitchen, the costs of which do not appear in the account book, demonstrating not only the existence of a queen’s kitchen, but the separate financial administrative structure.⁵⁶³ The same list giving the consumption of the queen’s household for 1525 including 118 cows, 80 pigs, 300 cured pigs and 40 barrels of wine is also the only, but nonetheless significant source giving some indication as to the size of the queen’s household. It is difficult to say much about the financial matters of the queen’s household. Her husband’s untimely death left her with many unpaid debts,⁵⁶⁴ but there are no sources that describe bad financial conditions in her court. She is said to have been careless with her income, especially by the negatively prejudiced papal nuntio, but later sources show her to be an excellent and severe manager of her financial

⁵⁶⁰ „Nichilominus maiestas regia accepit secum dominum oratorem ad reginam et ibi vacati sunt domini consiliari in angustum consilium, ubi iterum hec differentia inter ipsum dominum episcopum et Boczany facta proposita est taliter, quod si convenerint se adinvicem coram regia maiestate, omnino multa turpia sibi ipsis adinvicem dicent et ex hoc parva scintilla crescet in flammam ignis.” Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kanceliár naplója*, 192.

⁵⁶¹ The economic aspects of the queen’s court will be dealt with below. For the two models see Karl-Heinz Spiess, "European Royal Marriages": 18-19.

⁵⁶² There are a few occasional payments to the queen.

⁵⁶³ MOL DF 260567. András Kubinyi, "Alltag und Fest", 185.

⁵⁶⁴ For instance the numerous unpaid financial contributions to the dowries of her ladies in waiting. See a list of these compiled in 1531. HHStA Familienakten 97.

matters.⁵⁶⁵The reports of the difficult financial circumstances in the household of her sister-in-law, archduchess Anne offers an interesting comparison also in this respect.⁵⁶⁶

5.1.2 The queen's officers - appointment and shared functions

As we have seen above, the appointment of officials in the queen's household typically belonged to the prerogatives of the head of the family, though unofficially the queen also could have influence on the choice. The very few surviving references to appointments to Mary's court have been collected to gain insight in the decision making process. Chronologically the first such case is that of the cleric Simon Keck, who visited Innsbruck and was introduced to Mary by some influential patrons (perhaps Georg of Brandenburg) in March 1520. In his letter to his brother in law he writes that the queen has promised to make him her chaplain when she arrives to Hungary ("*...durch ettlichen grosmechtigen herren anpringn hab ich erlangt von unser allergenedigsten frawen und konigin Maria ein genedigszw trettn und mich auff genomen hatt zw einen capplan als pald sy yn das land kumpt...*").⁵⁶⁷ The incident with the elderly Bornemissza couple must have taken place immediately after Mary's arrival to Buda. It becomes clear from the letter quoted above that the Lady Bornemissza wife of the castellan of Buda wished to obtain the post of Hofmeisterin of the queen's court, but Mary was against the idea. Since the Bornemissza couple was very influential and both had been involved in raising the young king one would expect that their wishes would have the support of the king, but she did not receive the office. The next appointment concerns Thomas Stolzer issued in Prague on 8 May 1522. The letter was written by Louis to the chapter of the church of Breslau (Wrocław in Poland) ordering that they allow Stolzer to come to him as soon as possible since his beloved wife, the queen, who has heard

⁵⁶⁵ For Burgio's critique on the squandering life style of the queen see his report of 17 03 1526 Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum*, 338.

⁵⁶⁶ A letter has survived from Katalin Dersffy, who was a lady-in-waiting at the court of Anne, addressed to her mother. Katalin complains that all the other ladies receive money and dresses from home and asks her mother to send her her clothing she has repeatedly asked for. letter of Katalin Dersffy to her mother, Perpetua Batthyany. 25 05 1526 Linz. Her mother answers that she did not send her daughter to such a mighty court only to hear her constant complaints about poverty. She has sent the clothing, but cannot send money because her husband Miklós Dersffy is ill and all the money was spent on medical care. Letter of Katalin Dersffy to her mother, Perpetua Batthyány. 25 05 1526 Linz. Letter of Perpetua Batthyany, wife of Miklós Dersffy to her daughter. 02 06 1526 Bács. MOL DL 104464. Regesta in Béla Iványi, *A körmendi levéltár missilis levelei. (Körmendi Füzetek. 5.) I. rész.* (Körmend, 1944), 37-38, nr.177-178.

⁵⁶⁷ Letter of Simon Keckh to Veytt Oder, 26 03 1520 Pressburg, MOL DL 47343. A more detailed description of the case can be found below in chapter 5.2.2.

of Stolzer's excellence wishes to make him "*magistrum capelle sue*".⁵⁶⁸ The appointment is evidently in accordance to the queen's wish and almost certainly on her initiative, the king's request only gives extra emphasis to the order. The next example also sheds light on the dynamics of appointments. In a letter to Mary, Albrecht of Brandenburg offers the services of one of his trusted noblemen, Hans von Besenrode to the queen because he knows that the royal couple is in great need of trustworthy people. He also asks the queen that the wife of this man be accepted to Mary's Frauenzimmer.⁵⁶⁹ Functions at the court were much sought after and there are countless examples in which the members of the Jagiellon and Habsburg dynasties exercise patronage by trying to place trusted familiars into each other's courts.⁵⁷⁰ Nevertheless, again this letter provides an example of direct appeal to the queen in questions of appointment to her household posts. The last example of appointment is a charter issued by Queen Mary in 1525 in which she takes Elek Thurzó in her special protection – who had been the target of the attacks against the Fugger-Thurzó mining consortium – and appoints him as her "*specialis familiaris*".⁵⁷¹ In all of these cases an active role of the queen is demonstrated or assumed by the outside world, which cannot be balanced by similar examples when the king would have made decisions about the officials of his wife's household.

⁵⁶⁸ Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht, *Thomas Stoltzer. Leben und Schaffen*. (Kassel, 1964)..

⁵⁶⁹ "...Verner, gnedigste konigin, ßo weiß ich, wie ubel e. mat. mit geschicken leuten verborgt, deshalben thu ich als der getreu diener und vetter, und wil e. mat. nicht bergen, das ich gar mit einem geschickten mendlein, der ein edelman mit namen Bysenrot, gehandelt, domit er zu meinen bruder, marggraf Wilhelm, sich als fur einen hoffmeyster begeben wolt, des er zu thun auch wol gewilt, nachdem er aber ein weib, thut er sich ßolchs beschwern, doch hat er sich erbetn, so yn e. mat. zu einem diener haben wolt, ime auch darumb thun wolt, wolt er sich mit VI pfdn wolgereist zu e. mat. begeben, und alßo das e. mat. sein haußfrau zu sich in das frauen zymer genomen hat, und nach volgens marggraff Wilhelm sein perßon zu einem hoffmeyster geben, wolt er sich e. mat. in allen erlichn und moglichn underthenigklich gebrauchn lassen, die weil ich dan den man geschickt, treu und from, auch erlich und auffrichtig erken, und weiß, das er zu reden, raten und reißen geschickt, hab ich diß nicht allein e. mat. zu schreiben nit underlassen konnen, beßunder ist mein trau hertziger rat, e. mat. wollen ßolchen diener nicht abschlagen, beßunder auch mein dinstlich pit, e. mat. wollen mir schriftlich e. mat. gemuts meynung vorstendigen, domit ich mich weiter, was ich ym zuschreiben ßol, darnach zu richten weiß." Letter of Albert of Brandenburg to Mary, 31 05 1523 Nürnberg. *GStA PK, XX. HA, Ordensfolianten 44:138-141a*. The letter of Albrecht of Brandenburg to Mary of Hungary (dated 31 May 1523) was collected and transcribed by Zoltán Csepregi. I would like to express my thanks for his generosity in sharing his transcriptions with me.

⁵⁷⁰ For just one example: Imre Várdai who had been in the service of Archduchess Anne in the early 1520's after returning to Hungary became a cupbearer in the household of Mary's court. See above.

⁵⁷¹ "ipsum ... accepimus in singularem nostrum protectionem et in specialem nostrum familiarem" Letter of Queen Mary, 23 09 1525 Buda. MOL DL 24192. The political and economic background of the case is very complex, since it was mainly due to the queen's backing of a rival german interest group against the Fugger consortium that brought Thurzó into difficulties. Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 131. For the role of Thurzó in the case see Erdélyi. Gabriella Erdélyi, "Egy kivételes karrier Mohács előtti kezdetei: Bethlenfalvi Thurzó Elek [Beginning of an exceptional career: Elek Thurzó of Bethlenfalva]" in *R. Várkonyi Ágnes Emlékkönyv születésének 70. évfordulója ünnepére [Festschrift for Ágnes R. Várkonyi for her 70th birthday]*, ed. Péter Tusor (Budapest, 1998), 130.

The granting of offices to foreigners was restricted by law, and had been a returning issue for centuries. This is attested already by the decree of 1298 stating that courts offices should be held by Hungarian nobles and the queen should accept the barons appointed by the king to these posts. In our period there were also repeated decrees against foreigners being appointed to either secular or religious offices (e.g. in 1498, 1504, 1525).⁵⁷² Nevertheless, it seems to be a question of personal power to which extent a foreign queen could assign offices of her court to the foreigners in her retinue. The situation is comparable to the frequent decrees brought about the prohibitions and limitation to religious benefices in the late medieval period. Despite the frequent legal steps taken against foreigners in practice their presence was significant and the king could disregard the decrees if he wished.⁵⁷³ The case of Gilibert de Gozon offers an interesting example in our investigation, since he was the son of the noble Jean de Gozon de Melac, administrator of Queen Anne de Foix, who came with her from France. Gilibert – then only 13 – was appointed provost of Székesfehérvár by Wladislas in 1504 without any signs of protest. Gilibert lost his office in 1507 after both his patron, the queen and his parents had died in 1506.⁵⁷⁴

Certain reginal offices seem to have been filled by their royal counterpart, a situation not unprecedented in Hungarian history, but also not a commonly occurring phenomenon.⁵⁷⁵ In Mary's court the office of royal and reginal Master Carver was given to László Móré of Csula.⁵⁷⁶ In invitation to the wedding of her lady-in-waiting Catharina Svetkovics to the ban Ferenc Batthyány, royal Master Cup-bearer, she calls Batthyány her own Cup-bearer.⁵⁷⁷ The royal gentleman of the chamber, Bernát Bárány also occurs once in the same function in the reginal household. Augustinus Hispanus served as royal and reginal cupbearer.⁵⁷⁸ In the case of some of the secretaries also doubled in royal and reginal service. Nevertheless, there is

⁵⁷² Corpus Juris: 1498 §26, p.609, 1504 §10, p.677, 679; 1525 §2, p.829. See also the accounts of the unnamed envoy of Ferdinand (probably Ursinus Velius) to the Hungarian Diet in 1524 reporting that the non Hungarians would have to leave the court within four weeks and that it had been forbidden for not Hungarian to take part in the meetings of the Royal Council. 23 0 1524, HHStA Gr. Korr. 8, fol. 82. Quoted by Heiss Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber": 131.

⁵⁷³ In the four chapters investigated by Köblös the percentage of foreigners is 8%, but he estimates an even higher number in the wider stratum of the clerical middle stratum. József Köblös, *Az egyházi közélet*, 31.

⁵⁷⁴ József Köblös, *Az egyházi közélet*, 31.

⁵⁷⁵ András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 15.

⁵⁷⁶ He bears the title royal Master Carver in 1521. According to Főgel the queen took liking of him and appointed him her own Master Carver as well. József Főgel, *II. Lajos udvartartása*, 25. I have not yet found charter evidence to support this.

⁵⁷⁷ Letter of Mary to Ferenc Várdai bishop of transylvania. 01 11 1523 Pressburg. MOL DI 82620.

⁵⁷⁸ András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 16.

sufficient evidence to support the notion that the household of the queen must have been distinct from that of the King. Sources from the years in Innsbruck show that the household received clothing twice a year and shoes as part of the deal of their service at court. In the years between 1521 and 1526 this practice surely continued - since this was also the practice in Louis's household – and must have given a recognisable group-identity to the queen's household. There are unfortunately no elaborate ceremonial descriptions from this period, but there is reference to the distinction being made between the king's and queen's retinue in a brief description to their presence in Olomouc on Palm Sunday 1523, when it is mentioned that the queen had a more numerous retinue than the king.⁵⁷⁹

5.1.3 The household as a base of power

In the modern scholarship on Mary of Hungary there seems to be a wide consensus that she was a woman of exceptional political talents, intelligence and ambition, which she had put to use in service of increasing the authority of the king in the tumultuous political scene of the years preceding the Battle of Mohács.⁵⁸⁰ This consensus places the function of Mary as queen in a much more prominent position than is generally attributed to queens in the central administration.⁵⁸¹ It is undeniable that in late medieval Hungary the queen's estates were the basis of her power. However, as we have seen, there is a close relation between income and the size of the household which depended on the income, but also because the councillors and administrators of the estates belonging to the queen's household formed a body through which direct political influence was made possible. "The queen's household operating within the court setting, in close proximity to the institutions of central government, could be a sturdy support to her queenship and a sensitive and effective vehicle through which it could operate" – writes Margaret Howell in her analysis of the power of the queen.⁵⁸² What role does the

⁵⁷⁹ For a discussion of the source see below, chapter 5.2.3.

⁵⁸⁰ See especially Kubinyi in greater detail in András Kubinyi, "A magyar állam belpolitikai helyzete", 80-93. See also Engel: „The person most active in seeking a remedy for the chaotic state of affairs in Hungary had for some time been Queen Mary. It was in the spring of 1523 that she returned with her husband from Prague and immediately began to increase royal authority by widening her own influence.” Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 369. Heiss does not deny the political activity of the queen but attributes this to the power conveyed to her by her enormous land holdings, rather than to any personal talent: „Dess Marias politischer Einfluss nicht auf ihrer hohen würde als Königin, sondern vielmehr auf ihrer feudalherrlichen Machtstellung in Ungarn beruhte.” Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 128-129.

⁵⁸¹ Though this may be also caused by the fact that the largest number of studies on queenship were made about the English queens, who seem to have had limited role in the central administration.

⁵⁸² Margaret Howell, *Eleanor of Provence*, 266.

household of Mary of Hungary play in the politics of the country and in which manner was it possible for the queen to exert influence through this body?

Scholarship agrees that Mary's political activity can be summarized by a conscious effort to increase royal power and authority and to strengthen her own position, often by means of winning support from the middle nobility. The short period of her participation in political life and the chaotic political scene of the year before the Battle of Mohács make it difficult to clearly delineate an independent policy of the queen, nevertheless certain actions can be identified. The best-known example is the ousting of the Fugger-Thurzo mining consortium which rented the north Hungarian mining towns and mint, an initiative which would probably have brought long term economic advantages for the kingdom. Though the queen was supported by her councillor Schneidpöck, the action caused great protest from the side of the Habsburgs, who were dependant on the Fuggers for loans.⁵⁸³ Kubinyi also drew attention to the significance of the queen's purchase of a number of estates of in Slavonia from George of Brandenburg, which Ferdinand meant to obtain for one of his supporters, the Count John of Corbavia (Krbava). Mary bought the estates instead, even though the deal was practically settled. With these estates she obtained some strategically and economically important castles, but – as Kubinyi has shown – by owning the castle of Varasd (today Varaždin in Croatia) she could appoint the *ispan* of the county. After this point she owned five counties in Hungary and one in Slavonia, which – through the appointment of her own people – could significantly increase her influence on county nobility.⁵⁸⁴ The above two examples show that the queen did not hesitate to cross Habsburg interests in reaching her own goals. The third example proves that she was willing to go directly against these in support of the king and the kingdom. Csepregi discusses the – wholly unrealistic, but nevertheless serious – secret diplomatic scheme in which Albert of Brandenburg, supported actively by Queen Mary tried to win support for the crowning of Louis II as King of the Romans, instead of Archduke Ferdinand.⁵⁸⁵ Certain signs also point to the existence of tension between the king and queen,

⁵⁸³ András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 22. András Kubinyi, "A magyar állam belpolitikai helyzete", 88. Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 131.

⁵⁸⁴ András Kubinyi, "A magyar állam belpolitikai helyzete", 90.

⁵⁸⁵ "Wir sind hier Zeugen jenes ausserordentlichen Augenblicks, da die in ihren Briefen stets 'gehorsame Schwester' (*obediens soror*) im Interesse ihres Gemahls – wenngleich chancelos – diplomatische Ränke gegen ihren eigenen Bruder spann [...]." Zoltán Csepregi, "Königin Maria und das Haus Brandenburg", 68. For different cases of mediation between the interests of Ferdinand and the Kingdom of Hungary in the period after 1526 in which Mary represented Hungarian interests see the articles of Szende and Kenyeres. Katalin Szende,

as in the case of the reginal rights to the mint at Kremnitz, where the queen claimed to have exclusive rights to the minting, as described in the diary of Szydłowiecki.⁵⁸⁶ But this is brought to compromise in which the officials of the mint also have to swear loyalty to the queen, beside the king and the treasurer.⁵⁸⁷

We have seen that appointing prominent members of the middling nobility to offices in the reginal household, and hereby raising a new, loyal strata of officials to the baronial rank was a method recognised and used not only by the kings, but also certain queens.⁵⁸⁸ In the Jagiellon Age the elevation of a large number of nobles to baronial ranks falls under the reigns of Queen Anne and Queen Mary.⁵⁸⁹ Kubinyi, in a comparison of the queen's *familia* to that of the king says that the former was a "closer body of people, more willing to implement the wishes of their overlord, the queen".⁵⁹⁰ Mary's main source of influence in the politics of the period seem to have been the influential imperial councillors (da Burgo and Schneidpöck) in the early period of her reign and the appointed leaders of the middle nobility to key administrative functions in her estate management (especially Pál Ártándi and István Amadé of Várkony) through whom she could influence wider spheres of the middling nobility.⁵⁹¹

Beside the appointment of officials, the queen had a unique possibility as head of a court of women to increase her network through marriages arranged between the damsels of her court and men of the local nobility. Supplying eligible women and arranging marriages was a traditionally expected and considered and important function of the queen's court.⁵⁹² In the

"Maria von Ungarn", 119. István Kenyeres, "Pacsá János plébános osztrák fogsága. Adalékok Habsburg Mária királyné helytartóságához" *Soproni Szemle* 60 (2006): 155.

⁵⁸⁶ "serenissima domina regina noluit admittere cudere monetam et quod illam maiestas regia non posset cudere, sed ipsa reginalis maiestas." Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 175-176.

⁵⁸⁷ The case is discussed by Kubinyi, who concludes: "Thus it appears that the queen was willing to confront her husband if her financial interests demanded so." András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 22-23.

⁵⁸⁸ See the discussion of Queen Barbara of Cilli in Chapter 3.5.1.

⁵⁸⁹ András Kubinyi, "A magyar állam belpolitikai helyzete", 71.

⁵⁹⁰ András Kubinyi, "A magyar állam belpolitikai helyzete", 81.

⁵⁹¹ See several studies of Kubinyi on the subject. András Kubinyi, "Az 1525. évi "kalandos szövetség" [The "kalandos alliance" of 1525]" in *Ünnepi tanulmányok Sinkovics István 70. születésnapjára [Festschrift for the 70th birthday of István Sinkovics]*, ed. Iván Bertényi (Budapest, 1980). András Kubinyi, "A magyar állam belpolitikai helyzete".

⁵⁹² „Maximilian required a steady supply of young court ladies who could be matched above all with his military and diplomatic entourage. A reasonable turnover was essential for his standing as a patron of young men from well-off families in the region.” Gerhard Benecke, *Maximilian I*, 99. Ferdinand sent two of Maximilian's illegitimate daughters to Mary's court for her to arrange marriages for in 1532 because „bastards are held in higher regard in the Low Countries”. Ferdinand to Mary, Innsbruck 08 02 32, ed. Herwig Wolfram et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 3*.

four and half years of before the Battle of Mohács we know of eight marriages involving ladies from the queen's court and one of the heiress of the Újlaki fortune arranged by the royal couple in favour of László Móré of Csula, royal and reginal Master Carver. The ladies in question are Catharina Svetkovics to Ferenc Batthyány⁵⁹³, Catharina Pemfflinger to Bálint Török royal court *familiaris*⁵⁹⁴, Miss Fuchs to Johannes Pock, the queen's Hofmeister,⁵⁹⁵ Elizabeth Ungnad, daughter of the Hofmeisterin married to Ferenc Ernuszt of Csáktornya royal gentleman of the chamber⁵⁹⁶, Johanna Lickerke to Gáspár Horváth of Vingárt royal Master Carver, Elisabeth Puchheim to Sebastian Pemfflinger, Miss Gesertorf to Karl von Stierstädt, Bernhard Beheim to Margarete von Blumeneck. Reference to three more couples can be found among the list of Mary's debts taken over by Ferdinand in 1531 the list of yet unpaid dowries to be given to her ladies in waiting, but their identification still requites further research⁵⁹⁷: Miss Than married to a certain Herrn von Rothenburg from Silezia, Miss Salm (daughter of Mary's Hofmeisterin) to a Herrn von Pleu, and an unnamed lady from Mary's household in Hungary married to Helfried von Makau (Matkow).⁵⁹⁸

The promotion of the interests of the servants is s further traditional manner of extending networks of influence.⁵⁹⁹ In the kingdom of Hungary the king had the right of investiture in appointing people to ecclesiastic offices, which appointments the Pope could approve of. This patron's right could be granted to others by the king. Louis II granted the right of investiture to his wife Mary before he went to the Battle of Mohács, which Mary used in favour of her secretary and councillor Miklós Oláh by granting him the Provost of Eger a few days before the fatal battle on 29 August 1526.⁶⁰⁰ Curiously the rights of investiture had already been

⁵⁹³ Queen Mary invites Ferenc Várdai, bishop of Transylvania to the wedding of her lady in waiting Catharina Svetkovics "de clara domo et stirpe". 01 11 1523, DI 82620.

⁵⁹⁴ Letter of László Kanizsay to his wife Anna Drágffy reporting that the wedding of the queen's Steward will be held today [9 october], while the wedding of Bálint Török was held yesterday (8 October) "Alias vero novitates[!] eidem scitu dignas habemus nullas, nisi, quod magister curie reginalis M^{tis} habebit nuptias[!] hodie, ac etiam Valentinus Tewrek similiter habebit nuptias[!] in profesto Beati Dionisii Martiris". 09 10 1524, Buda. MOL DL 25708 (Ed. Bessenyei, nr. 8.)

⁵⁹⁵ On 09 10 1524. See footnote above.

⁵⁹⁶ Marriage contract Ferenc Ernuszt of Csáktornya Elizabeth Ungnad. 15 04 1526. MOL DL 24279. Catalogue 222. See also the invitation sent by Queen Mary to Ferenc Batthyány to the wedding. Ed. Béla Iványi, ed., *A körmendi levéltár memorabiliái [Memorabilia from the archive at Körmend]* (Körmend, 1942), Nr. 204.

⁵⁹⁷ Some of these are possibly from the period after 1526.

⁵⁹⁸ Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 443.

⁵⁹⁹ J. L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, 232.

⁶⁰⁰ Charter of Queen Mary 24 08 1526, Buda. MOL DL 89227. Text edited in Katherine Walsh et al., "Eine Erasmianerin im Hause Habsburg": 85. See also Catalogue 223.

granted to the queen years earlier by King Louis when they were in Prague in 1522.⁶⁰¹ Despite the charter, I have not come across other successful acts of investiture on the part of Mary. It is also not discussed by Fraknói in his work on patronage right.⁶⁰² Mary wanted to have him appointed Archbishop of Esztergom in 1524, but loses to Szalkai. After the Diet of Hatvan in 1525 when Szalkai lost his position as royal chancellor Mary again uses her influence to gain the chancellery for her candidate Gosztonyi, as discussed above, but this time the candidate of the Papal diplomacy, István Brodarics was appointed.⁶⁰³ Several other examples can be found for Mary intervening for benefices.⁶⁰⁴

Many other letters promote the causes of servants, but also of people not known to be members of her establishment. Typical in one of her first surviving letters in which she intercedes to the town of Pressburg in favour of a certain widow when she is only 10 years old.⁶⁰⁵ Later she intercedes with her brother Charles to take Stephan Pemfflinger into his court. We also have reference to intercession with the king in a letter of Horváth Gáspár of Vingárt to Ferenc Batthyány in which he reports that he has presented the case of the despoiling of the possessions of the Báthory family to the king by way of the queen. The king has sent one of

⁶⁰¹ Charter of King Louis II 24 08 1522, Prague. MOL DL 89166. „Nos Ludovicus Dei gracia rex Hungarie et Bohemie etc. Memorie commendamus tenore presencium significantes, quibus expedit, universis, quod nos petitionibus serenissime principis domine Marie, consortis nostre charissime, moti et inclinati, id maiestati sue duximus annendum et concedendum, ut preposituram unam, quamcunque primo post harum emanationem per totum nostrum Hungarie regnum vacare contingat, maiestas sua reginalis pro suo beneplacito, cuicunque velit, conferre possit et veleat. Id autem ut sit efficacius, ius patronatus nostrum omne regium, quod ad conferendas huiusmodi preposituras habere dinoscimur, maiestati sue pro hac vice annuendum et concedendum duximus, immo annuimus et concedimus, harum nostrarum vigore et testimonio litterarum mediante.

Datum Prage in festo beati Bartholomei apostoli anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo vigesimo secundo. Ludouicus rex manu propria.”. Text edited by Walsh and Strnad. Katherine Walsh et al., "Eine Erasmianerin im Hause Habsburg": 84.

⁶⁰² He only mentions the investiture of Oláh by the queen. Vilmos Fraknói, *A magyar királyi kegyúri jog Szent Istvántól Mária Teréziáig [The royal patrons right up to the age of Maria Theresia]* (Budapest, 1895), 217.

⁶⁰³ András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 14. See a more detailed presentation of Gosztonyi's case above.

⁶⁰⁴ See in the case of Johannes Croner and Johannes Henckel below as well as two further examples in which she requests benefices for two parish priests to whom I could not identify her relation: Mary recommended the granting of the benefice of the Pressburg Corpus Christi Chapel to Hans Bayer parish priest of Stomfa (27 01 1526) Archív Mesta Bratislavy 4931 = MOL DF 241312) For details of the benefice see Majorossy Judit: A Krisztus Teste Konfraternitás helye a középkori pozsonyi polgárok életében. *Történelmi Szemle* 46 (2004) 1-2, 69-111, especially 110. A second example: On 09 03 1526 Queen Mary requests the promise of the town council of Sopron that they grant the next free coming altarbenefice of the St Michael church to János parish priest of Lózs. Jenő Házi, ed., *Oklevelek és levelek*, 182-183.

⁶⁰⁵ Letter of Archduchess Mary to the town of Pressburg. 26 01 1516, Vienna. MOL DF 241143

his men to investigate the case.⁶⁰⁶ It is worth noting that both magnates were married to the queen's ladies and belonged to the circle around the queen.

5.2 Religion

A renewed interest in ceremonial functions of religious ritual emphasises the strong connection it has to the symbols and practice of royal power. As Fiona Kisby phrases it in her analysis of Chapel ceremonies of the Tudor court:

“Like the procession to the chapel from the royal apartments each ceremonial event gave rise to numerous opportunities for contact between monarch and subject and the rearticulation of power relations between them. It has already been argued that in institutional terms the chapel was not the marginal department it was once thought to be. Ceremonially speaking, it can now be seen that it also lay at the very heart of kingship for the services performed there played a major role in the regular platform for the staging of majesty.”⁶⁰⁷

The religious institution of the court chapel was also an integral part organisation of the royal households. It was responsible for providing the routine of daily, weekly and annual religious activities which was one of the most important structuring elements in the everyday of people in the Middle Ages. Due to the presence of trained scholars it could also become a centre of intellectual and artistic expression and ideas. A separate treatment allowing a deeper scrutiny of the reginal chapel, its form, function and people attached to it is justified because of the established relationship between the power of queens and the practice of piety, but also because of the important role it played in the life of Queen Mary. In this chapter firstly the institutions of the royal and reginal chapels will be introduced, secondly the religious tensions around Queen Mary will be investigated by reconstructing – as much as the scarce source material allows – the everyday religious life of the king and queen and the signs of religious reform at the court. These fields are then analysed in depth with special emphasis on the connections between religion, political influence and ethnic/linguistic identity. The first appearance of signs of religious reform in the Kingdom of Hungary and the attitude of Queen Mary to these has a long scholarly history; in fact it has been the single most researched and

⁶⁰⁶ Letter of Horváth Gáspár of Vingárt to Ferenc Batthyány 22 04 1526 Buda. Ed. Béla Iványi, *A körmendi levéltár*, 37.

⁶⁰⁷ Fiona Kisby, "“When the King Goeth a procession”: Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485-1547" *Journal of British Studies* 40 (2001): 64-65.

debated subject relating to the queen.⁶⁰⁸ Nevertheless, the role of the reginal household in the process has not been treated in previous literature, and even the well researched subject of court priest around the queen has resulted in previously unknown results.

5.2.1 The institution of the king's chapel

In the Carolingian court model the clerics of the chapel were also responsible for the royal administration and stood under the leadership of the chancellor, in the later Middle Ages the specialisation of administrative tasks brought with it a separate chancellery. In this period the chapel increasingly became an institution which combined religious duties with musical tasks in a manner that is basic to understanding its function and hierarchic structure.⁶⁰⁹ This is summarised by Seifert with regard to the chapel of Maximilian I, which I quote here in length, because it was probably very similar to the situation in Buda:

“Nevertheless the chapel was primarily a sacred institution, subordinate during all its future history to the head steward. In its hierarchical structure, and similarly taking the Burgundian *chapelle* of Philip the Good as its model, the clergy persisted. The same model was still valid for Maximilian's successors: Charles V, Ferdinand I, Maximilian II, and Rudolph II. The court preacher held the foremost position, followed by the chaplains. In the second rank was the choir (*Kantorei*), led by the chapelmaster, who at times was supported by a deputy chapelmaster. This musical establishment comprised male singers, boy singers with their teacher, a copyist, an organist and the *Kalkant* (the man who operated the organ bellows and was responsible for the organ's maintenance). The chaplains were expected to be able to sing, too, and the singers on the other hand, were often clergymen.”⁶¹⁰

In the medieval and early modern period the royal chapel was a well distinguishable part of the royal household. The term “royal chapel” is used here in the broad sense of the word, on the one hand it referring to the institution which is responsible for the activities relating to the

⁶⁰⁸ Beside the earlier scholarship the most important recent contributions are those of Walsh and Strnad, Spruyt, and Csepregi, as well as the articles on the subject in the proceedings of the conference. Martina Fuchs et al., eds., *Maria von Ungarn*.

⁶⁰⁹ Péter Király, "Königin Maria von Habsburg und die Musik" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Munster: Aschendorff, 2007).

⁶¹⁰ Herbert Seifert, "The institution of the imperial court chapel from Maximilian I to Charles VI" in *The Royal Chapel in the time of the Habsburgs: music and ceremony in early modern European court*, ed. Juan Jose Carreras and Bernardo José García (Boydell Press: Woodbridge, 2005), 40-41. See also López. Juan José Carreras López, "The Court Chapel: a musical profile and the Historiographical context of an institution" in *The Royal Chapel in the Time of the Habsburgs*, ed. Juan Jose Carreras and Bernardo José García (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2005).

religious life of the prince, comprising the chapel personnel, but also referring to the place where the prince usually attended religious service. The prince could perform religious services in a number of churches or chapels. A differentiation would be made between the private daily services, which usually took place in the royal chapel and the ceremonious public religious events.

In Buda the royal chapel was situated in the royal castle on the eastern side of the courtyard. The two story building was originally consecrated to the Assumption of the Virgin, but was also called St John's Chapel after the relics of St John the Almoner had been acquired by King Matthias Corvinus from the Ottoman sultan and brought to the chapel in 1489, greatly increasing its prestige.⁶¹¹ Rather than a place of private devotion the chapel was the stage for royal representation, for instance when the king heard Mass in the company of ambassadors.⁶¹² The priests of the royal chapel – prescribed at 40 in number by Pope Innocent VIII in 1485 – served the spiritual needs of Matthias and Beatrice. They stood under the supervision of the Archbishop of Esztergom, who was also the parish priest of the royal household. The priest took the smaller church orders and formed a choir, which was renowned throughout Europe for its musical excellence. There are also records of alms being distributed at the gate of the chapel. Generally the royal couple heard Mass daily in the royal chapel, on important feast days they attended religious service in the St Sigismund Church or in the Church of the Blessed Virgin (today the Matthias Church), which was also the church of the German-speaking burghers.⁶¹³ The royal weddings, baptisms and funerals also took place in the latter Church. There is no evidence of the queen having a separate chapel building in the royal castle and it is assumed that she shared the royal chapel with the king for worship. It is assumed that similarly to the habit in other royal courts both king and queen habitually performed their devotion in their private chambers. Presumably religious practice did not change much under the Jagiellon Kings, although the general lack of money must have

⁶¹¹ Károly Magyar, "Residenzen des Königs und der Königin" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007), 108. See also Boda. Zsuzsanna Boda, "Alamizsnás Szent János kultusza és annak emlékei Magyarországon. In:" in *Történelem-Kép. Szemelvények múlt és művészet kapcsolatáról Magyarországon*, ed. Árpád Mikó and Katalin Sinkó (2000).

⁶¹² Report of B. Costabili, ambassador from Ferrara on 16 December 1489. László Gerevich, *A budai vár feltárása* (Budapest, 1966), 224-225.

⁶¹³ Kornél Szovák, "King and Church. Matthias Corvinus and Religion" in *Matthias Corvinus, the King. tradition and Renewal in the Hungarian Royal Court 1458-1490*, ed. Péter Farbaky et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2008), 395-396.

affected the expenses of the royal chapel. Both Wladislas and Louis were known for their piety and continued the tradition of royal display through lavish musical institutions.

The chapel under Louis II

A short survey of the officials of the royal chapel shows, that apart from what can be gathered from the account book fragments from 1525 and 1526, which are invaluable sources for the royal court; there is very little information on the royal chapel. The director of the royal chapel was a certain master Albert (*magister Albert rector Capelle Regie Maiestatis*).⁶¹⁴ A list of names indicates the special chaplains (*speciales capellani*) Mattheus, Joannes, Blasius, Paulus, Thomas.⁶¹⁵ Two of these names (Mattheus and Thomas) can probably be identified with the two chaplains of King Louis Máté Nagy and Tamás Gyöngyösi, who – like their king – also were killed in the Battle of Mohács, as reported in another source.⁶¹⁶ The chaplains earned a salary of 1 fl per week.⁶¹⁷ The king must have had a number of preachers and confessors. One of these known by name was the Franciscan friar, Antal Szegedi.⁶¹⁸ It is reported in Istvánffy's chronicle, that this preacher also accompanied Louis to Mohács. He was left behind in the military camp with some others to guard the personal possessions of the king and when the attack of the Ottoman army reached the camp he fought long and hard with the enemy. Finally after receiving a severe wound on his face he jumped on the king's horse, escaping the attackers and lived long afterwards with a face thus disfigured. Georgius Sirmiensis / György Szerémi whose memoirs are an important, if very untrustworthy source of the years under investigation also identifies himself as a court chaplain of Louis II in the years between 1523 and 1526, this information, however, cannot be supported by evidence from the account books.

Most of what we know of the functioning of the chapel in the investigated period – mainly trivial details – can also be retrieved from the account books. Here we find – for instance – data on the lighting of the royal chapel, which consisted of four torches, eight candles and oil

⁶¹⁴ E.g. Vilmos Fraknói, ed., "Liber rationum Ludovici II.", 58.

⁶¹⁵ "Eodem die magistris Matheo, Joanni, Blasio, Paulo et Thome specialibus Capellanis Regie Maiestatis ad usum ipsorum dedi fl II." Vilmos Fraknói, ed., "Liber rationum Ludovici II.", 84. It is unclear what the term *specialis* designated, I assume that it referred to it was a synonyme of royal chaplain.

⁶¹⁶ György Szerémi, *Epistola de perdicione Regni Hungarorum*.

⁶¹⁷ Vilmos Fraknói, *II. Lajos udvara*, 33.

⁶¹⁸ György Szerémi, *Epistola de perdicione Regni Hungarorum*, 118.; Vilmos Fraknói, *II. Lajos udvara*, 33.

for the sanctuary lamp amounting to 2-3,25 fl per week.⁶¹⁹ On major religious festivals this could increase significantly. Despite the general poverty of the court under Louis II the Royal (St John's) Chapel had a rich collection of vestments and ecclesiastic treasures. These, including the Holy Relic were transported to Pressburg with the treasury and the queen's possessions during the flight of Mary and her household from Buda following the defeat at Mohács.⁶²⁰ Several lists of the treasures exist; one of the earliest was compiled on 7 October 1526, barely a month after the battle and gives evidence to a large collection of richly ornamented chasubles (at least 22), dalmatics (16), caps, altar cloths, numerous golden chalices, crosses and other metal objects.⁶²¹

5.2.2 The queen's Chapel

The queen could have a separate chapel for private devotion, but in many cases she shared the royal chapel with the king.⁶²² Other arrangements could exist, but generally some separation was made for the devotions of the women of the household.⁶²³ In the Buda castle there is no evidence for the existence of a separate chapel building for the queen. In the narrower usage of the word, with reference to the institution and the people, one must conclude that a separate reginal chapel institution must have existed. As in the case of the distinction between the king's and queen's household, it is worthwhile trying to examine the relationship between the king's chapel and the queen's chapel and drawing the border between the two institutions. It is fortunate that we have a relative abundance of information on court priests explicitly invited by the queen or belonging to Mary's chapel, because this makes it possible to look for these persons in the only existing list of court accounts covering the expenses of the court in the first half of 1525.⁶²⁴ The two sets of information, however, do not overlap. For instance in this period we know that Thomas Stolzer was working for the queen, yet there is no mention

⁶¹⁹ As a comparison, the lighting of the palace involved 9 torches and 12 wax candles a week in 1525, and 14 torches and 14 candles a week in 1526. Vilmos Fraknói, *II. Lajos udvara*, 59.

⁶²⁰ Orsolya Réthelyi, "'Maria regina. nuda venerat ad Hungariam.'" The Queen's Treasures" in *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and her Court 1521-1531*, ed. Orsolya Réthelyi et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2005).

⁶²¹ The list is edited by Baradlay. Baradlay, "A budavári főtemplom kincseinek történetéhez" *Archaeologiai Értesítő* (1878): 219-222.

⁶²² "We can establish, for example, that the thirteenth-century royal couples kept separate chapels. [...] members of either royal household could attend these chapels without distinction, but there are indications that the chapels followed different routines." Carmi John Parsons, "Piety, Power and Reputations of Two Thirteenth-Century English Queens" in *Queens, Regents and Potentates*, ed. Theresa M. Vann (Boydell & Brewer, 1995), 108.

⁶²³ „Many castles had a principal chapel for general use and a number of smaller private ones. Where only one chapel existed, or had to be shared, it seems that a private pew or gallery was provided for the women.” Roberta Gilchrist, *Gender and Archaeology: Contesting the Past* (London: Routledge, 1999), 123.

⁶²⁴ Vilmos Fraknói, ed., "Liber rationum Ludovici II."

of him in the accounts. The *specialis capellanus* Thomas mentioned in the account book can be identified with Tamás Gyöngyösi. Nor does the greater part of the names of other chaplains belonging to Mary's court (Wolfgang, Georg, Gregor) occur in the account book, though we do have an occasional occurrence of the queen's musicians – which might be explained with the king having employed them for his own purposes.⁶²⁵ It is therefore safe to assume that – though these probably did not occupy a separate chapel building – the king's and queen's chapel were separate institutions in the Buda court, with separate clergy and independent finances. In the list of her trousseau which Mary brought with her to Buda in 1521, there is a list of objects, mainly textiles. This includes a series of chasubles and other vestments of golden cloth, red velvet and black silk, and white linen for the undergarments as well as many ells of gold cloth, velvet and silk of different colours for the altar cloth, the canopy, the cover of the pews and cushions.⁶²⁶ These were probably meant for the use of the queen and her clergy.

The queen's singers and musicians

The same dichotomy of clerics and musicians typified Mary's chapel.⁶²⁷ It is a commonplace that music played a very important role in the life of the queen. She was an ardent patron of musicians as regent of the Low Countries and left behind an enormous collection of musical instruments. Many sources demonstrate that she also had her own musicians and musical establishment in the years spent in Buda,⁶²⁸ not least importantly the fact that she contracted Thomas Stolzer to be the musical leader of this establishment as early as 1522. The fact that the Latin word *capellanus* can be translated as chaplain, but also as the member of the chapel choir (*capella*) makes it difficult to decide in certain cases the function of certain members of the chapel. Nevertheless, the names of several other singers from Mary's chapel are known: Sigismund Pfandl⁶²⁹, Georg Puechl – both altists – Gregor Liebhart⁶³⁰, bassist, Hans Selbherr

⁶²⁵ Johannes does occur, but this is one of the most frequently used male names.

⁶²⁶ "Stat baiden kunigin rays und überantwortung zu iren gemahl(e)n" HKA Nieder-Österreichische Herrschaftsakten, W-61/A-36, Fol.24v-25v "Ornat und messgewant". See also Orsolya Réthelyi, "The Queen's Treasures".

⁶²⁷ For a recent analysis of Music at the court of Mary see Király. Péter Király, "Königin Maria und die Musik".

⁶²⁸ Both Queen Beatrice and Queen Anne de Foix had had separate music establishments, especially that of Beatrice was renowned. Péter Király, "Königin Maria und die Musik", 367.

⁶²⁹ Sigismund Pfandel is also called a *capellanus* of Mary of Hungary in a royal promise to a position by Ferdinand in July 1527 (Christof Rauber to Ferdinand's Chancellor (9) July 1527, Original HHStA, Ungarn 5; Expectanz Ferdinands, Vienna 24 July 1527. Quoted in Heiss Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 438, note 7. In 1531 he was a priest in Kőszeg (Güns) and in 1532 priest and cantor in Ferdinand's chapel (Gernot Heiss, *Maria*

and Wolfgang Mosel.⁶³¹ Two musicians are included in the court list of 1521, the drummer “Jeorg Pirhinger, genant Sweinhardus” and instructions are given to hire a flutist to accompany him.⁶³² The former musician stayed at Mary’s court, since there is a very similar name in the accounts of 1525 specified as the German “Zweyhander”, the queen’s drummer.⁶³³ In the same account book a lutanist of the queen called Sigismundus also appears, in the account book of 1526 the queen’s trumpet player and fiddler.⁶³⁴

Court priests

The question of priests around Mary is one that has a long scholarly history. Given the signs indicating the role the court played in the spread of early Reformation in the county, the identity and background of the individuals who could most reasonably be suspected with transmitting these ideas has attracted the attention of scholars for more than a century.

Despite the scholarly interest, the first article to address the overall question of Queen Mary’s court priests is of recent date⁶³⁵ and even this summary has left unexplored areas for further research.⁶³⁶ In the following sections the most important information about the court priests of Mary of Hungary will be summarized.

von Ungarn, 438, note 8 and 9.; See also Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht, "Stoltzeriana" *Die Musikforschung* 27 (1974): 25.

⁶³⁰ Both Pfandl’s and Liebhart’s names appear on the list of Ferdinand’s chapel singers as early as 24 July 1527, Pfandl remained here till his death. Bruno Hirzel, "Dienstinstruction und Personalstatus der Hofkapelle Ferdinand’s I. aus dem Jahre 1527." *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, 10. Jahrg., H. 2. (1909): 151-158.

⁶³¹ Mosel only arrived to Mary’s chapel directly before the battle of Mohács in July 1526 from the Court of Württemberg in Stuttgart. He stayed in Mary’s household until 1528 and finally returned to Stuttgart. Gustav Bossert, *Die Hofkapelle unter Herzog Ulrich*. In: *Württembergische Vierteljahrshefte für landesgeschichte* NF 25 (1916), p.394. Quoted by Péter Király, "Königin Maria und die Musik", 371.

⁶³² Orsolya Réthelyi, "Die Anfänge der Ofener Hofhaltung", 243.

⁶³³ "Zweyhander alemano Timpaniste Reginalis Maiestatis, iussu Regie Maiest[atis] pro subsidio dedi fl. XXV." Számadás 147. Kubinyi assumes that this is a ‘nickname’ for a drummer is not to be identical with Sweinhardus. András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 18.

⁶³⁴ „Sigismundo luthiniste, Reginalis Majestatis iussu Regie Maiestatis pro subsidio dati sunt fl. X.” Vilmos Fraknói, ed., "Liber rationum Ludovici II.", 189.; „tubicinoribus et fidicinibus reginalis M[aiesta]tis jussu R[egie] M[aiesta]tis dati sunt in bona moneta per duos fl. 6.” Johann Christian von Engel, ed., "Fragmentum libri rationarii", 191.

⁶³⁵ E.g. Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests".

⁶³⁶ Orsolya Réthelyi, "Vallás és nyelv az udvartartásban".

*Johannes Croner*⁶³⁷

The least known court priest of the queen is the person filling this post at the earliest date. The name of Johannes Croner has been unknown to researchers of religious life in the surroundings of Mary of Hungary till very recently, despite the fact that a meticulous piecing together of the fragmentary evidence of his life and work reveals a man of considerable education and position. Hans Croner was a native of Kronstadt (Brassó, Braşov Romania), hence his name Croner and de Corona. He was educated at the University of Vienna, where he appears in the university enrolment lists (*matricula*) as *baccalaureus* in 1503. The latter reference names him as *Johannes Croner Parisiensis de Corona*, indicating a period of studies at the University of Paris. This can be supported by the matriculation lists of the University of Paris which indicates that he spent the year 1506-1507 year at this University and attained the baccalaureates degree under Martinus Heusden and the magister degree under Berchtoldus Rembolt receptors.⁶³⁸ In 1507 he returned to Vienna and was enrolled as *magister* in 1507 and in 1509 is referred to as the proctor of the Hungarian nation (*procurator nationis Hungaricae*).⁶³⁹ In 1508 his name appears on the testament of Conrad Celtis (1459-1508) humanist and neolatin poet, who had been given the title of *poeta laureatus* by the Emperor Frederic III. Celtes was a professor at the University of Vienna and the founder of the scholarly society in Buda, the *Sodalitas litteraria Danubiana Ungarorum*. Croner's name appears on the will as „Magister Jo. Croner (confessor Celtis)”.⁶⁴⁰ He was enrolled at the Vienna University as late as 1511.⁶⁴¹ At some point he was consecrated priest, because the next time his name appears in the records after a few years' gap it is as the priest of Queen Mary in 1514.

The combination of a pictorial and written source offers the first indirect evidence of Croner in this office. The Grosser Mariazeller Wunderaltar was painted in the studio of an anonymous artist around 1520, at the commission of Valentin Pierer, abbot of the Benedictine

⁶³⁷ More attention will be paid to the first identifiable person, Johannes Croner, than to the other priests, because his name has so far been unknown in earlier scholarship. He is not known to Csepregi, Walsh or Spruyt, neither does Gernot Heiss write about him. His name appears in the dissertation of Jacqueline Kerkhoffnak as a member of the Innsbruck household, but she does not give him any further attention. Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 284.

⁶³⁸ Asztrik Gabriel, *The University of Paris*.

⁶³⁹ Károly Schrauf, *A bécsi egyetem magyar nemzetének anyakönyve 1453-tól 1630-ig. (Magyarországi tanulók külföldön IV)* (Budapest, 1902), 156 and 49.

⁶⁴⁰ The testament is edited by Aschbach: Joseph Aschbach, *Geschichte der Wiener Universität im ersten Jahrhundert ihres Bestehens* (Wien, 1865), 442-445.

⁶⁴¹ Károly Schrauf, *A bécsi egyetem*, 49.

monastery of St Lambrecht.⁶⁴² The retable, 258 cm high and 336 cm wide when opened, consists of 48 wooden panels. Each panel commemorates a miracle worked by the intercession of the Holy Virgin of Mariazell, through a depiction of the wonder in the top part of the panel and the accompanying short text clarifying the events in the lower part. The function of the altar, clearly visible in its artistic programme was to propagate the efficacy of Mariazell as a pilgrimage site through demonstrating that the Holy Virgin of Mariazell can offer help to the needy in the most diverse circumstances, disregarding social status, age, gender and nationality.⁶⁴³

The panel in question is in the third row of the second column on the back side of the left wing, and was visible thus when the retable was closed. The left half of the panel is dominated by the figure of a tonsured priest in black vestments, kneeling in prayer in front of an altar depicting the Holy Virgin of Mariazell with child. Its serenity stands in sharp contrast to the dynamic scene filling the right side of the panel, where a sailboat has evidently just been damaged on the rocks. Five passengers of the boat are visible, three of them wearing rich, red and green, fur lined court clothing. Two of them – a man and a woman – wear crowns. The crowned male figure folds his hands in prayer, as does the third courtly figure. The crowned female figure throws her hands up in a dramatic gesture. All three of them turn their gaze to the plainly dressed male figure who leans over the crack in the ship's hull, perhaps trying to repair this. Between the elegantly dressed group and the mast stands the fifth figure, his body largely concealed by the others. Only part of his face is visible, but even such a small fragment commands attention because his gaze is turned upwards to the stormy sky, where the well known figure of the Holy Virgin of Mariazell appears in a wreath of clouds.

The Latin inscription on the panel explains that Magister Johannes Croner, priest of Mary of Hungary had the panel made to commemorate the deliverance of the archduchess Mary, bride of Louis, king of Hungary and Bohemia from the storm raging on the Rhine.⁶⁴⁴ The miracles

⁶⁴² Helga Hensle-Wlasak, "Kunsthistorische Betrachtung des Grossen Mariazeller Wunderaltars" in *„...da half MARIA au saller Not“*, *Der Grosse Mariazeller Wunderaltar aus der Zeit um 1520 (Veröffentlichungen des Steiermarkischen Landesarchivs Bd. 28)*, ed. Walter Brunner (Graz, 2002), 10.

⁶⁴³ Helmut Eberhart and Gerhard Jaritz, "Der Grosse Mariazeller Wunderaltar und seine Bedeutung aus kulturhistorischer Sicht" in *„...da half MARIA au saller Not“*, *Der Grosse Mariazeller Wunderaltar aus der Zeit um 1520 (Veröffentlichungen des Steiermarkischen Landesarchivs Bd. 28)*, ed. Walter Brunner (Graz, 2002), 7.

⁶⁴⁴ Transcription of the text: "Votum p[er] honorabile[m] m[a]g[ist]r[u]m ioanne[m] croner / sacellanu[m] factu[m] solutu[m]q[ue] no[m]i[n]e serenissi[m]e regine d[omi]ne / marie archidux (sic!) austrie dux (sic!) burgundie serenissimi / ludovici hungarie ac bohemie regis sponse in / rene nam p[er] iculum subeunte"

attributed to the Holy Virgin of Mariazell had been collected through the years in written form by the monks of the monastery and these collections served as a guide to the painter of the Wunderaltar for the panels.⁶⁴⁵ These manuscripts unfortunately have not survived; the earliest known version exists in the early print from 1604 by Christoph Andreas Fischer, the *Historia Ecclesie Cellensis ad Beatam Virginem*, or so-called “First Miracle-book of Mariazell”.⁶⁴⁶ In the 27th chapter a longer description of the miracle can be found, in which Queen Mary, archduchess of Austria, bride of Louis, king of Hungary and Bohemia encountered mortal peril, when in 1514 the stern of the ship sailing on the stormy Rhine in German lands fractured. Her priest, however, who was also present, advised her to pray to the Holy Virgin of Mariazell for deliverance. As a sign of gratefulness for her escape, the queen had a votive panel set up. The term “votive panel” could either imply a tablet with an inscription documenting the miracle, or the panels with painted scenes illustrating the wonder, donated to the holy site by the thankful pilgrims.⁶⁴⁷

The goal of the Wunderaltar, but especially the specification of time, place and participants allow us to take the description at face value as narrating a dramatic event that did actually take place. The year and the location make it obvious that the event took place during the travel of the young Mary and her entourage from the Netherlands to Vienna. The company departed from the court of Margaret of Austria in Mechelen on the 2nd of May, 1514 and

⁶⁴⁵ Helga Hensle-Wlasak, "Kunsthistorische Betrachtung", 9., Lajos Pásztor, *A magyarság vallásos élete a Jagellók korában [The religious life in Hungary in the Jagiellon Age]* (Budapest, 2000 (first edition 1940)), 99.

⁶⁴⁶ Fischer, (Christophorus Andreas): *Historiae Ecclesiae Cellensis ad Beatam Virginem Liber Vnus*, Viennae Austriae. 1604, 4°. My transcription of the text: Naufragium subeuntibus, Virgo Cellensis succurrit Neque veró erga inferioris conditionis homines Beatíssima Virgo Cellensis pia tantu(m), benigna(que) visa est, sed etiam magnates, & Principes personæ eius opem expertæ. Ann(us) agebatur MDXIV. cum Serenissima Regina, Domina Maria Archiducissa Austriæ &c. Serenissimi Ludouici Vngariæ, ac Boëmiæ Regis sponsa, Rheno Germaniæ fluuio celeberrimo se committeret: in eó igitur constituta, puppi iam fatisce(n)te fluctibusq(ue); semi obrutá, de vitâ desperare coepit. Aderat tunc Ioannes Croner, eiusdem Reginæ á sacris, qui & propriæ, & Reginæ volens consulere salutis, ad implorandum patrocinium Virginis Cellensis, ipsam Reginam inducit. Votum ergo ipsum iussu Reginæ Virgini Cellensi nuncupat, quæ nec vota eorum, nec preces sesellit, nam repente Virginis Cellensis præsiðiô omne discrimen vitæ euaserunt, & vtí nomine Reginę votum vouerat, itâ & eius nomine exsoluit, tabellamq(ue) votiuam in Cellis miraculi ad posteros testem, hóc cum titulô reliquit.

Anno MDXIV. Decima quinta Maÿ, votum per honorabilem Magistrum Ioannem Croner Sacellanum factum, solutumq(ue) nomine serenissimæ Reginæ, Dominæ Mariæ Archiducissæ Austriæ, Ducissæ Burgundiæ, serenissimi Ludouici Vngariæ, & Boemiæ sponsæ, in Rheno naue periculum subeunte.

(Christoph Andreas Fischer: *Historia Ecclesie Cellensis ad Beatam Virginem*. 1604. Caput XXVII)

⁶⁴⁷ It is not clear whether the artist of the Wunderaltar used a textual or pictorial source for the panel about Mary of Hungary. It is obvious however; that the circumstances of the travel (the bringing of the bride) was not known to the artist and the transmission of information involved interpretation and added details, since the queen is painted with a king at her side. The artist did not know that Louis was not present on the trip and would have looked very different at the time, since he was only eight and could obviously not have sported the full beard of the king figure on the painting.

arrived to Vienna on 12th of June 1504.⁶⁴⁸ Though no description of the travel survives, we know that they passed through Aachen and Cologne and first followed the route of the Rhine, later the Danube. The description of the miracle adds an interesting piece of new information on the otherwise undocumented travel, but more significantly it gives us information of the elusive figure of Johannes Croner. At this early date he is called the priest of Mary of Hungary, thus belonged to her entourage, and it is explicitly stated that he accompanied the archduchess on the trip.

It is unfortunately not known how he became a member of Mary's household. The choice of personnel of Mary's first separate court was in the hands of Margaret of Austria and Maximilian. Their deliberations would form the size and content of the group of people around the young princess. Croner, however, is a Hungarian subject resident in Central-Europe. As a university educated man and priest he could be ascribed diplomatic tasks by his own sovereign, King Wladislas, but it is conceivable that he had offered his diplomatic services to Maximilian. His presence in the retinue points to the existence of a delegation from either Wladislas or Maximilian to Mechelen, to bring back the bride-to-be.⁶⁴⁹

After this evidence it is not surprising, that Croner's name appears on the court lists available from the years 1516-1521. He is mentioned as a chaplain of the court as early as 1516, in the first list, and his name is recorded the following years up to 1521, with the exception of 1518.⁶⁵⁰ His presence at the "princess court" is further supported by the marriage charter between Anne Jagiello and Archduke Ferdinand, where the groom was present by proxy. The charter is dated to 1520, 11 December in Innsbruck and was authenticated by Johannes Croner as a notary public (*notarius publicus*).⁶⁵¹ A further document pointing to Croner's relationship with Kronstadt (Brassó, today Braşov in Romania) is recorded in a letter written in Vienna by "Queen Mary, bride of the king of Hungary and Bohemia" to the town council of Kronstadt in 17 June 1516.⁶⁵² Mary writes that her court chaplain, who has long been away from home,

⁶⁴⁸ L.Ph.C. van den Bergh, ed., *Correspondance de Marguerite d'Autriche, gouvernante des Pays-Bas, avec ses amis, sur les affaires des Pays-Bas de 1506-1528, 2 Vols.* (Leiden, 1845-1847), 93.

⁶⁴⁹ Unfortunately no written evidence has been found to support the hypothesis making further research necessary to solve the problem. On the travel from the Low Countries to Austria see chapter 4.2.1

⁶⁵⁰ Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 284.

⁶⁵¹ Georgius Pray, *Annales Regum Hungariae Pars V. ab Ludovico II. ad Maximilianum II.* (Vindobonae (Vienna), 1770), 38.

⁶⁵² "Maria dei gratia Regina Serenissimi Hungarie et Bohemie regis etc sponsa

now plans to return to Kronstadt, also because his presence is requested by certain people there who have invited him several times. Therefore the queen asks the town council to give the office of parish priest of Kronstadt to Croner, because of his excellence and faithful service, but also because of her affection for the chaplain. Croner did not become parish priest in Kronstadt, since this post was assigned to Anthonius Revel between 1507 and 1523 and to Marcellus Jacobinus between 1523 and 1527.⁶⁵³ Mary's letter would probably have had little effect in any case, since the Saxons of Transylvania had had the right of electing their own priests since the Golden Privilege (*Goldener Freibrief, Andreanum*) of Andrew II, king of Hungary in 1224. We do not have any further details of the case, nor do we know if Croner personally took the letter to Kronstadt. In any case in 1517 he is still, or once again, at Mary's court.⁶⁵⁴ The last time Croner appears in the sources is in the household list of 1521.⁶⁵⁵ According to this document Croner was in Mary's retinue to Buda as her court chaplain and probably also stayed by her side. We do not have any more sources as to what became of him after this point. There is a possibility that he died. But – given the general lack of sources for the years spent in Hungary, it is also possible that the sources still wait to be uncovered for the person in question to be identified.

The fragmentary evidence attesting to the cultural background of Hans Croner does not give a complete historical and intellectual portrait, but allows certain conclusions to be drawn especially in relation to Mary of Hungary. He was a German-speaking subject of the Kingdom of Hungary from the town of Kronstadt, who spent long years of study at the University of

Spectabiles fideles. Magister Joannes Croner Capellanus noster domesticus. ob fidelia eius servitia et imprimis doctrine, et morum sanctimoniam multum nobis commendatus. Is nobis alioquin supplicavit, ut revisendi suos possibilitatem faceremus, quoniam diu in patria non fuisset, et essent, qui presentem cum commodo suo desyderarent. Animadvertimus itaque pias ipsius preces. Sed tamen illis in presentia morem gerere nequivimus propter assidua, que emergunt in horas servitia, quibus prefatum magistrum Joannem Croner nostrum capellanum indigemus. Quapropter nos hortamur, velitis nostri intuitu et suorum virtutum doctrinarumque contemplatione illum vobis ita commendatum habere, ut inter vestros concives, nam hinc ortus, nostras primas commendationes, potissimum in succedendo plebanatu. Cuius etiam vicem gerentis audimus favorem habere, ante omnes promotus sentiat. Quod nos, siquando occasio se obtulerit, omni gratia, ac favore erga nos recognoscemus.

Date Vienne XVII Junii M.D.XVI.

Maria Regina

Manu propria”

Archive of the town of Brasov: Privilegia et instrumenta publica, U 464 / 327 (MOL DF 247141)

⁶⁵³ I have received this information from Gernot Nussbächer, for which I would hereby like to express my thanks.

⁶⁵⁴ Tracing further information on him in the archives of Brasov is made virtually impossible by the fact that he uses only his town of birth as a family name and possesses one of the most commonly used surnames (Johannes).

⁶⁵⁵ Orsolya Réthelyi, "Die Anfänge der Ofener Hofhaltung", 240-243.

Vienna and also studied in Paris. Since he was elected as the procurator of the Hungarian nation, he must have been an important and recognised student of the Vienna University. He is part of the delegation, which accompanies the eight-year-old granddaughter of Maximilian, bride of the king of Hungary from Mechelen to Vienna. On the voyage and in the next seven years he functions as a court chaplain to Mary, probably selected for this role because of his familiarity with both affairs and languages of the Kingdom of Hungary as well as those of Austria. It is highly probably that he had knowledge of the French language or of the Latin spoken by French native speakers and was a good choice of chaplain beside the young Mary who also spoke French as a native language, and perhaps had little fluency in other languages at this young age.⁶⁵⁶ He also assists in administration acting as a public notary for the Marriage contract of Ferdinand and Anne. Either at the request of Mary or on his own initiative he commissions a votive panel to commemorate the miracle on the Rhine, by which – singularly among the court personnel of Mary – he also leaves behind a painted “portrait”, almost as if it had been done in a teasing compensation for the lack of written records.

Though we do not possess any documents or writing by him, Hans Croner gives the impression of an important man, educated, well-travelled, speaking many languages and moving in influential court and humanist intellectual circles. Unlike the other court priests to follow him, he was not directly selected by Mary, but she did keep him at her court in the next seven years and he accompanies her to her new home in Buda. In the only document in which Mary writes of him she uses words of affection and praise, however formal these may be.⁶⁵⁷ He disappears from our view exactly at the time when Mary had more influence on the composition of her household, but this in itself is not enough to suppose a bad relationship between queen and priest, especially since he does not appear elsewhere, which could indicate that he was sent away, but disappears from the records altogether.

In lack of written works we cannot even speculate on interest in Reformation topics, though some relationship with the Vienna humanist circles is probable, given the contact with Conrad Celtes and his prolonged presence at the University, not to mention suggestive details, such as

⁶⁵⁶ See further argumentation of the question in Chapter 5.4.

⁶⁵⁷ It is important to note that Mary exerted such patronage in the form of letters of recommendation for benefices or positions of parish priests. See for instance in the case of Johannes Henckel below, and the examples brought above.

his enrolment, already as a *magister* at the University of Vienna in 1507, that was followed a half year later by the enrolment of *magister* Johannes Henckel, the most famous of Mary's court priests in later years, acclaimed humanist, correspondent of Erasmus.⁶⁵⁸ It is however not possible to trace any evidence of humanist or Reformation interest or influence from the existing sources, and the evidence of the votive painting point more in the direction of a traditional catholic piety.

Thomas Stolzer

One of the most important German composers of his time, Thomas Stolzer (1485-1526) was born in the Silesian Schweidnitz and was probably a pupil of Herman Finck.⁶⁵⁹ He was invited to the queen's court a few months after the royal wedding took place in Buda. In a charter dated 8 May 1522 in Prague King Louis II orders the chapter of the church of Breslau (Wroclaw) to allow the priest (*presbyter*) Thomas Stolzer to come to him as soon as possible, since his beloved wife, the queen, who has heard of Stolzer's excellence wishes to make him "*magistrum capelle sue*".⁶⁶⁰ Stolzer arrived to Buda in the autumn of the same year and stayed at the court till 1526. Since a function in the queen's chapel involved both religious and musical tasks and Stolzer was renowned as one of the most talented musicians and composers of the region it is almost certain that he functioned as a director of the music in the chapel.

Although the majority of his compositions were for the traditional Latin Catholic liturgy,⁶⁶¹ he also set Lutheran German texts to music. The most famous of these are the motets written to four of Martin Luther's German Psalm translations composed in the years spent in Buda. These were explicitly commissioned by the queen in the years 1525/1526 as Stolzer himself writes this in a letter to Albert of Brandenburg-Ansbach.⁶⁶² In the same letter he offers his

⁶⁵⁸ Károly Schrauf, *A bécsi egyetem*, 49.

⁶⁵⁹ For Solzer see especially the writings of Hoffman-Erbrecht Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht, *Thomas Stoltzer*. Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht, "Stoltzeriana"..

⁶⁶⁰ „Est Inter capellanos Ecclesie divi Joannis Baptiste Thomas Stoltzer presbiter de cuius virtutibus et scientia Informata Serenissima domina Maria regina consors nostra Carissima, optat Illum constituere magistrum capelle sue. Id quo celerius et commodius fieri possit, Vobis committimus et mandamus quaerimus predictum Thomam sine ulla contradictione et mora ad nos liberum venire permittatis. Beneficia preterea, Que istic habet, Eidem cum fructibus et proventibus pacifice relinquatis.” Edited by Hoffmann-Erbrecht Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht, *Thomas Stoltzer*, 26., see also Péter Király, "Königin Maria und die Musik", 366, note 13.

⁶⁶¹ Thirty-nine of his latin Hymns were included in Rhau's Lutheran *Sacrorum hymnorum liber primus* of 1542.

⁶⁶² Detail from Stolzer's letter to Albert: „Durchleuchtiger Hochgeborner fürsth, gnädigster herr. Wie zum Jüngsten E[uere] F[ürstliche] G[nade] abschaid begeren an mich allweg etwas neues zu finden gewesen ist. So hat mein allergnädigste fraw mir den psalm Noli Emulari durch Luthern verteutsch Zu Componieren auffgelegt,

services to Albert referring to a previous oral agreement. In earlier scholarship it was only known that Stolzer died in 1526 by drowning and it was assumed that perhaps he died on the Mohacs battlefield or in the ensuing chaotic circumstances. Hoffmann-Erbrecht has however brought to light an elegy written in 1539 by the Silesian humanist poet and translator Johannes Lang⁶⁶³ to commemorate the death of his compatriot Ursinus Velius, who had drowned in the Danube. In the poem the author draws a comparison with yet another Silesian, “Cantor Thomas”, who met his death by drowning in the icy Thaya (Dyje Czech Republic), close to the town Znaim. It is without doubt that Thomas Stolzer is the man in question, who was probably on his way to Königsberg through Znaim and Prague at the time.⁶⁶⁴

Johannes Henckel

Johannes Henckel (c.1480-1539) is perhaps most widely known among Mary of Hungary’s court priests.⁶⁶⁵ This is mainly due to the amount of extant sources documenting their relationship, but can also be explained by his humanist erudition, his large book collection, his correspondence with Erasmus and the role he played in the mediating Erasmus’ tractate, the *Vidua Christiana* dedicated to the widowed queen. It is, however, a less known fact that the bulk of Henckel’s service as court priest took place in the years after 1526, since the earliest date for his appearance at the court is in the autumn of the year 1525 and only lasted till the early months of 1526, when he returned to his congregation in Kaschau (Kassa, today Košice Slovakia).⁶⁶⁶

He was already a well known man at the time of his invitation to the queen’s court. He had studied in Vienna (1496) and Cracow – where he attained his bachelor (1499) and masters

der dann, vber das er lang, auch sunst, die weill vorhin khainer, das ich wust, der massen auff mottetisch gesetzt ist, mich eben fast bemueht hat.” The complete letter is edited and clarified in Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht, *Thomas Stoltzer*, 33-34.

⁶⁶³ Johannes Lang (1503-1567) Neolatin poet and translator of Greek was a teacher of the boy singers of the royal chapel of Buda up to 1526, a position which he received through the recommendation of Thomas Stoltzer. After Mohács he returned to Silezia. Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht, *Thomas Stoltzer*, 31., Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht, “Stoltzeriana”: 21-23. Peter G. Bietenholz et al., eds., *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, 290.

⁶⁶⁴ Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht, “Stoltzeriana”: 20-23.

⁶⁶⁵ A new summary with data and context is being written by Zoltán Csepregi who has allowed me to read his manuscript. See also Peter G. Bietenholz et al., eds., *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, 175-176. Several older articles exist on Johannes Henckel and his role in the Reformation. See especially that of Vilmos Fraknói with an ample collection of edited letters Vilmos Fraknói, *Henckel János, Mária királyné udvari papja* (Pest, 1872).

⁶⁶⁶ Zoltán Csepregi, “Court Priests”, 54.

(1503) degree and started teaching in the same year at the faculty of arts. He visited the University of Vienna again in 1508 and proceeded to Bologna. At a certain point of his career he attained a doctoral degree in law. He received a number of church benefices and became chaplain (1513) and soon afterwards parish priest in Leutschau (Lőcse, Levoča). From 1522 he was parish priest in Kaschau⁶⁶⁷ from where he is invited to the court of the queen and arrived there in the autumn of 1525. Henckel was a relative of the influential Thurzó family and several times received support from its members. Stanislaus Thurzo, the humanist prelate supported him in his studies and it was probably Elek Thurzó, at the time royal treasurer and an intimate of Mary of Hungary who first recommended Henckel to the queen.⁶⁶⁸ He did not stay in Buda long: despite the protests of the queen and her efforts to offer him further benefices he returned to his parish in Kassau in March 1526 disillusioned by what he had experienced at the court.⁶⁶⁹ Therefore we do not know for sure, but can assume that Queen Mary had Henckel in mind when she petitioned to the pope for a special grace for her confessor and chaplains, as reported by Burgio in April 1526.⁶⁷⁰

Mary showed great attachment to Henckel and summoned him to her court in Pressburg after the battle of Mohács. He did not answer her summons at first, most probably out of political considerations, since he was also invited by King John to the rival court and even offered a bishopric, which Henckel did not accept.⁶⁷¹ The queen's persistence was finally successful and in the letter written by Mary to the town of Kassa in 31 May 1528 she writes about Henckel's acquiescence to leave his parish and become court priest ("*des Er das predigerambt bey uns und an unnsern Hof aufgenommen ... hat*") and orders them to find a new priest for themselves.⁶⁷² The town left the position of parish priest vacant for a year, hoping that Henckel would return to them again. A degree uncertainty may also have existed about how Mary would finance her court priest. The queen's finances were in a very poor condition and an effort to provide Henckel with a source of income is visible in the letters written by

⁶⁶⁷ Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*, 77.

⁶⁶⁸ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests".

⁶⁶⁹ Henckel's letter to magister Andreas town council member in Kassa, Buda, 15 03 1526, Edited in Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*., also by Fraknói Vilmos Fraknói, *Henckel János*, 17-18.

⁶⁷⁰ Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum*, 390.

⁶⁷¹ Leslie Domonkos, "Johannes Henkel" in *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, ed. Bietenholz G. Peter and Thomas B. Deutscher (Toronto, 2003), 175. Csepregi also analyses the religious motivations of not wanting to accept the queen's invitation. In 1527 Henckel took some definitive steps in the direction of Reformation, resigned his church benefices and made contact with reformers. Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", 51.

⁶⁷² Mary's letter to the town of Kassa. Magyaróvár, 31 May 1528. Edited in Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*, Nr. 391., Vilmos Fraknói, *Henckel János*, 19-20..

Ferdinand and Mary to Jacob [Salza]⁶⁷³, bishop of Breslau requesting the first possible benefice for him.⁶⁷⁴ A year later delegates of Kassa came to Znaim, where Mary was holding court at the time and requested her to release Henckel, who would have been willing to return to the town, but Mary refused the request. Again she ordered the town to fill the vacancy and claims to provide for her preacher to his satisfaction.⁶⁷⁵ Henckel resigned his parish on 6 May 1529.⁶⁷⁶ Though he was a preacher and confessor of the queen he obviously was not always in her company, as attested to by a letter of Nicolaus Olah, Mary's secretary to Henckel, commiserating with him for being attacked close to Breslau by thieves, who also stole his horse. A cup meant for Erasmus is also mentioned, which he did not have with him at the time and thus was fortunately not stolen. Olah informs Henckel that the queen had ordered a sum of hundred florins to be paid to him in Breslau.⁶⁷⁷

Henckel's first contact with Erasmus was initiated by his friend Johannes Antoninus Cassoviensis, who had been a physician of Erasmus in Basel and wrote a letter in praise of Henckel's book collection and preaching in 1526.⁶⁷⁸ He also forwarded Henckel's first letter and a gift to Erasmus. Directly after he rejoined Mary's court in 1528 Henckel pled to Erasmus to write a work of consolation for the widowed queen. He emphasises his request by giving a description of the queen that he hoped would appeal to Erasmus and flatter him:

“I have recently returned to her majesty the queen, whom I was forced to leave in this present confused and dangerously chaotic situation. I now do again what I

⁶⁷³ Jacob Salza (1481-1539) diplomat of Wladislas and chief administrator (*Landeshauptmann*) of the principality Glogau, Silezia later he took religious orders succeeded Jan (II) Thurzo as bishop of Breslau (Wroclaw). In 1536 appointed *Oberlandeshauptmann* of the Silezia by Ferdinand. During his career he was a fervent opponent of the Reformation movement. For his election as bishop of Breslau see Csepregi. Zoltán Csepregi, „Es laufft auch der Lutter in alle sachen uberall mitt...” Brandenburgi György örgróf (1484-1543) szerepe Boroszló város reformációjában [The role of Margrave Georg of Brandenburg in the reformation of Breslau] in *Ünnepi tanulmányok Szigeti Jenő 70. születésnapjára [Festschrift for Jenő Szigeti]*, ed. Daniel Heinz et al. (Miskolc, 2006).

⁶⁷⁴ “dadurch Er die erste Prelatur oder Digniteit, so in den mehrgedachten Stiefften ledig wurde, mit sambt der Investitur und Zugehörung erlanget und bekeme” Ferdinand's letter to Jacob, bishop of Breslau. Vienna, 18 10 1528. See also Mary's letter to the same recipient in the same subject on the same date. Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*, Nr 417-418.

⁶⁷⁵ Mary's letter to Kassa town council. Znaim, 05 05 1529. Edited by Fraknói, Vilmos Fraknói, *Henckel János*, 20-21., see also page 9.

⁶⁷⁶ Henckel's letter to the magistrate of Kassa, Znaim 06 05 1529. Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*, Nr 457.

⁶⁷⁷ Oláh to Henckel, Znaim, 19 07 1529. Vilmos Fraknói, *Henckel János*, 25-26.

⁶⁷⁸ Joannes Antonius Cassoviensis (Kassa, 1499 – Krakkó, 1563): humanist physician and author. He was later also invited to be the physician at the royal court in Buda. His relationship with Henckel probably dates back to when they both lived in Kassa. The letter in question is dated Cracow 21 01 1526. Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*, 232.

used to, preach the Lord's word to the court, which is such that you could not find one more intimate, moderate, truly and fervently religious. This is the work of my noble hearted queen – if you saw her in her home you would say you are in a school and not in a women's court! She always has a book in her hand, she learns and teaches and finds consolation to her bereavement in pious books, without neglecting the classics, this to such an extent that what others find difficult in the greatest prosperity she studies in mourning and tears.”⁶⁷⁹

He continues that the queen now reads the Erasmus' Paraphrases in Latin, which she earlier read in German translation. Erasmus hesitated and struggled with the request, but finally did complete the *Vidua Christiana* in 1529 in which he sketches the portrait of a politically active “masculine” widow creating a new model of female behaviour.⁶⁸⁰ Both Mary and Henckel thanked the great humanist for the tractate.

In 1530 Henckel is again requested to take office as parish priest, this time to Leutschau, his town of birth. The town wished to elect him parish priest after the death of their previous priest, Johannes' brother Sebastian Henckel. Their delegation to Linz met the same rejection from the queen as did Kassa, despite that again Henckel is said to have agreed to accept the parish.⁶⁸¹ Henckel also accompanied Mary to the Diet of Augsburg, where he was instrumental in transmitting the queen's questions about the Holy Communion to Luther. Here

⁶⁷⁹ Johannes Henckel to Erasmus, Sopron, 18 July 1528. „Reuersus sum hijs diebus ad Reginam heram meam, quam afflictis nuper hic et turbatis grauissime rebus deserere coactus sum, ueteri functurus officio, hoc est uerbum domini huic aule annunciaturus, qua uix aliam inuenias quietiorem, modestiorem et recte pietatis studiosiorem, id quod optime principis institutione sit, quam si domi uideas, non in gynecio, sed schola esse uiduitatem solatur suam, adeo non obliuiscens ueterum, vtque alijs in summa rerum prosperitate difficilia sunt, in luctu fletuque perdidicerit. Nam paraphrases tuas, delicias plane suas, quas antea germanice uersas legit, nunc latine et ut a te scriptes sunt, quotidie uoluit et reuoluit et intelligit.” Desiderius Erasmus, *Opus Epistolarum denuo recognitum et auctum Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. Percy Stafford Allen and Helen Mary Allen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906–1958), 419, nr. 2011.

⁶⁸⁰ Traditionally the *Vidua Christiana* is considered a work of little inspiration during the writing of which Erasmus did not even bother to collect sufficient information on the familial background of the Queen (i.e. he talks about Louis mourned by his parents, despite the fact that both had been dead for years). Nevertheless Christine Christ-von Wedel has convincingly argued that Erasmus wrote his tractate with such regard for the personality and situation of the addressee as none of his previous works and gives a new model of the active widow. Christine Christ-v. Wedel, "Haben die ungarischen Erasmianer auf Erasmus einen Einfluß ausgeübt? Zur Frauen- und Friedensfrage im Werk des Humanisten" in *Humanismus in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen. Politik, Religion und Kunst im 16. Jahrhundert*, ed. Ulrich A. Wien and Krista Zach (2004).

⁶⁸¹ “1530. Valentinus famulus Civitatis rediit de Lintz, missus a deputatis cum literis feria 2 post Dorotheae, in quibus literis Domini scripserunt, quomodo Ven. D. Doctor Joannes Henckl benignae suscepit Plebanatum, quantum in se erat; sed sive consensus Reginae Mariae non audeban abire, quae postquam rescivit consensum ejus, nequaquam ipsa consentire uoluit; sed eum apud se manere uoluit, ideo frustra est spes nostra.” The Chronicle of Conrad Spervogel, Edited by C. Wagner in *Analecta Scepussii*, II. Vindobonae, 1773, p.155. Quoted in Vilmos Fraknói, *Henckel János*, 10, note 1.

he also met the Strasbourg reformers Capito and Bucer and is confronted by Johann Eck for being on friendly terms with Melanchthon.⁶⁸²

When the news of Mary's invitation to the Low Countries spreads, Henckel seems to be prepared to go with her, but is forced to leave the queen's service after she accepts Charles V's offer to become regent of the Low Countries.⁶⁸³ Charles specifies which of the members of her household Mary must leave behind, and this list includes her preacher and almoner.⁶⁸⁴ Before leaving she granted him an annual pension and arranged for other income sources. Beside his title as canon of Breslau, he becomes parish priest in Schweidnitz (1531-1533) later *officialis* of the bishop of Breslau and preacher. He maintained a good relationship with both Catholics and reformers and represented the increasingly difficult humanistic attitude mediating between the extremes.⁶⁸⁵ He stays in contact with Mary and her secretary Nicolaus Olah and made efforts to commend his nephew, Johannes Henckel junior to the queen's service asking her to first arrange for his education in Köln and Leuven.⁶⁸⁶

Conrad Cordatus

The relationship between Queen Mary and Conrad Cordatus (Conradus Hertz ex Wels, 1483-1546) is less well documented than in any of the above cases. After studies in Vienna, Rome and Ferrara from 1510 to 1522, Cordatus was chaplain at the Church of the Blessed Virgin (today the Matthias Church) of Buda the parish of the German-speaking population of the town. In 1522 he appears in Kremnitz and Schemnitz, mining towns of northern Hungary (today Slovakia). He is probably the unnamed preacher, who reportedly speaks against the Pope and the cardinals in the presence of the royal couple and is persecuted by the royal council, but is given protection by Queen Mary.⁶⁸⁷ In 1524 he flees to Wittenberg, probably

⁶⁸² Leslie Domonkos, "Johannes Henckel", 176.

⁶⁸³ See Henckel's letter to Erasmus of 01 10 1530 which he closes with the news "It is said that we will be moving to Brabant, but as soon as I know more I will let you know". Desiderius Erasmus, *Opus Epistolarum*, IX, 58-60, Nr. 2392.

⁶⁸⁴ Charles's letter to Mary 03 01 1531. "Et affin que sachez ceuls que lon ma nomme, sont votre mestre dostel, camergraf, prescheur, aumonyer, dame d'honneur" Karl Lanz, ed., *Correspondenz des Kaisers Karls V.*, 417.

⁶⁸⁵ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", 58.

⁶⁸⁶ Letter of Johannes Henckel to Nicolaus Olahus. Schweidnitz 22 09 1532. Miklós Oláh, *Codex epistolaris*, 250-251., Vilmos Fraknói, *Henckel János*, 26-28.

⁶⁸⁷ No sources support his being Mary's court preacher in these years. The data cited in much secondary literature arises from a incorrect interpretation of the term „*uno Priosto di S. Maria*” in the Venetian diplomats accounts, which refers to the Church of the Blessed Virgin and not to the queen. Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", 53.

after the Kings bill against the Lutherans.⁶⁸⁸ At the same time a servant of his brother is burned together with Cordatus' books. In 1525 Cordatus starts preaching in Kremnitz (Körmöcbánya, Kremnica) once again with his friend Johannes Kresling. The parish priest of Neusohl (Besztercebánya, Banská Bystrica) Miklós Szebeni denounced them to Archbishop László Szalkai, who persecuted them on the charges of Lutheran preaching and Kresling's marriage. The two priests are forced to spend 38 weeks in the prison of Esztergom. Both of them are released in the spring of 1526 and Cordatus flees to Wittenberg again. In the autumn of 1526 both Cordatus and Kresling serve in lower Silesia, the former as a teacher at the Academy of Liegnitz (Legnica). In 1528 Cordatus serves Mary of Hungary in Magyaróvár, but in 1529 he is a preacher in Zwickau and from 1540 superintendent in Stendal.⁶⁸⁹

There is very little to go by as regards hard evidence of service in Mary's court or even direct contact with the queen. Especially in the years before Mohács the evidence of any relationship is only circumstantial: the arguments for the identification of Cordatus with the preacher reported to have spoken against the pope are convincing. This does not, however, establish a function at the queen's court, rather sympathy for Cordatus and/or his teaching on Mary's part and an effort to help him out of trouble. Another theory is that Cordatus on his way to Wittenberg may have travelled together with Stolzer northwards in the early months of 1526. During this journey he may have transmitted the composer's German motets to his goal Wittenberg, where these gave grounds for hope among those around Luther about the queen's commitment to the Reformation cause.⁶⁹⁰

The first documented case of his service with Mary is in the post-Mohacs period in 1528. One of the independent sources attesting this is a letter from Luther from which it becomes clear that after Cordatus was forced to flee from Austria to Silesia because of the Ferdinand's bull against Lutherans (20 August 1527) he now has returned to Joachimstal where he was awaiting to be invited to be once again in the widowed queen's service.⁶⁹¹ The other is a letter

⁶⁸⁸ For a more detailed analysis of this event see chapter 5.2.5 below.

⁶⁸⁹ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", 55.

⁶⁹⁰ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", 55.

⁶⁹¹ Luther's letter to Cordatus, Wittenberg, 06 03 (?) 1528. "G. et P. in Domino. Charissime Cordate, rediisse te ex Austria iamdum cognovi et spe ac promissione Reginae tuae in Valle morari; porro divinavi, nunquam futurum esse, ut revoceris a Regina; proinde si tibi grave aut incommodum est, istuc morari, nollem te differre, sed maturare vel ad me, vel quo liberet accessum. Nam si regine aliquando libuerit te vocare denuo, apud nos eaque ac in Valle reperire poterit. Apud nos sane conversation et melior et gratior tibi esse potest (ut credo),

by the queen from Magyaróvár to Ferdinand reporting that a wandering preacher has appeared in the area, which she has sent away. Furthermore, to refute the false teachings she has employed a preacher who is well versed in the Bible and is doctrinally correct, disregarding his support of taking the communion in two kinds. On the back of Ferdinand's answer Mary noted that the preacher in question was Cordatus ("her Conrad prediger").⁶⁹² He did not stay in her service for long. In Mary's next answer to her brother she already refers to her new court preacher, Johannes Henckel.⁶⁹³ There is no evidence of further contact.

Gaspar

We know little more than the existence of a further confessor of the queen from the period after Mohács, probably also in the period before 1526. Mary mentions him to Ferdinand in a letter written from Wiener-Neustadt in 31 August 1527 requesting that "*magister Gaspar capellanus et confessor noster*" whom she had appointed canon of Esztergom in the absence of Ferdinand may keep his canonry. From Mary's letter it becomes clear that Gaspar had been with the queen in Prague in 1522-1523.⁶⁹⁴

Johann Neuburg / de Novo Castro

Slightly more data can be retrieved on Johannes von Neuburg (de Novo Castro). He was Mary's chaplain and almoner from 1527, though it is probable that he had been at the court of the queen before 1526. Ferdinand gives to Johann von Neuburg (de novo castro) a promise for position as archdeacon of Neutra (Nyitra) on 7 July 1527, another one is granted as archdeacon of Agram (Zagreb) on 19 December 1529.⁶⁹⁵ Beside Henckel he was the other member of the queen's chapel ("prescheur, aumonyer") explicitly mentioned by Charles V in the list of officials, who would not be allowed to accompany Mary to the Low Countries. It is perhaps surprising then that unlike Henckel he did in fact accompany Mary and his presence is documented in her household lists of 1531/32.⁶⁹⁶ He retained possessions in Hungary as

quam istic inter tui dissimiles. Ego sane, si occasion posceret, Reginae promisso neglecto, rogarem nihilominus te ire interim in obsequium Christi." Martin Luther, *Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Briefwechsel. I-XVIII.* (Weimar, 1930-1985), Nr. 1234.

⁶⁹² Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 208, Nr. 207.

⁶⁹³ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", 57.

⁶⁹⁴ Letter of Mary to Ferdinand, 31 08 1527, Wiener Neustadt, Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 113, Nr 97.

⁶⁹⁵ HHSStA, Reichsregister Ferdinands I, Neutra: Vol I, fol.97; Agram Vol 33, fol.7. quoted by Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 438.).

⁶⁹⁶ Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 61.

documented by a letter by Ferdinand written in the autumn of 1531 to the chapter of Esztergom, in which he orders the chapter to restore the possessions and revenues of Nicolaus Olah, the secretary of the widowed Queen Mary and Joannes de Novo Castro, her almoner, which had been appropriated by Pál Várdai, archbishop of Esztergom. He also orders the chapter to make sure that the divine service is provided in these places by adequate persons while the above-mentioned are away.⁶⁹⁷

Simon Keck

At the end of the list two clerics will be mentioned who were both invited by Mary to serve her as court priests, but did not take the office. The first of these is Simon Keck, who visits Mary in Innsbruck in 1520 through the mediation of certain highly placed people, gains her favour and receives a promise that she will appoint him as chaplain when she comes to Hungary.⁶⁹⁸ Keck expresses very high regard for Mary's wisdom and has great hopes for the country from her arrival to the court ("*An im Gnaden hab ich vernommen unaussprechliche und wunderliche Waysheit, dy ... die dem gantzen Lanndt wirt helffn.*"). All this we learn from the letters of Keck to the brother-in-law of the judge of Schemnitz, Veit Öder.⁶⁹⁹ According to other sources Veit Öder was a count of the mining chamber at Schemnitz up to 1524, when his office was taken over by Queen Mary's official Bernhard Beheim.⁷⁰⁰ Keck is a little known figure of the period. He probably can be identified as the "Simon Reck" from "Puchano" i.e. Pukantz (Bakabánya, today Pukanec in Slovakia) in the matricula of the Vienna University who was inscribed as a baccalaureus in 1499, in the same year as Marcus Pemfflinger, royal judge of the Transylvanian Saxons. It seems that he was parish priest of the St Michael church in Pressburg in 1515 and in Schemnitz in from 1521 to 1526.⁷⁰¹ He does not become chaplain of the queen for reasons unknown, probably because he received a position as parish priest of Schemnitz in the meantime. They stay in contact since he is sent by the town of Schemnitz to negotiate with Queen Mary about the mining towns in 1522 and

⁶⁹⁷ Ferdinand's letter to the Chapter of Esztergom, Speier, 4 October 1531, Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*, Vol. 2, Nr 149.

⁶⁹⁸ See chapter 5.1.2.

⁶⁹⁹ MOL DL 47343 Pressburg, 26 03 1520. Letter of Simon Keckh to Veytt Oder, judge of Schemnitz,

⁷⁰⁰ István Izsó, *Szemelvények a középkori montanisztika magyarországi történetének írott forrásaiból (1000 – 1526)* (Rudabánya, 2006), 48.

⁷⁰¹ Charter of 27 05 1514 Pressburg; 01 12 1523 Pressburg Letter of Simon Keck. See Jörg Meier et al., eds., *Deutschsprachige Handschriften*, 323-324, 531.

1523.⁷⁰² There are no indications of interest in Reformation teaching, but this cannot be excluded. It is more likely that the shared interest of the affairs of the mining towns formed the bond between the two in which Keck acted as an intermediary.

Johannes Hess

Johannes Hess (1490-1547) was also invited to Mary of Hungary's court in 1523 as reported by Karl von Münsterberg, governor of Bohemia. He mentions this in a letter written in Gersdorf, 10 September 1523, answering the magistrate of Breslau who invited Hess to become preacher of the St. Maria Magdalena church.⁷⁰³ He gives the invitation of the queen as a reason why Hess would not be able to accept to offer of Breslau. By that time Hess had studied in different universities, received his doctorate in theology and had also visited Wittenberg and made the acquaintance of Melanchthon there. From 1521, presumably also at the time of the invitation, he was a court priest of Karl von Münsterberg in his court in Öls. No further sources are known since Hess did not accept the invitation of Mary to Buda, but decided to go to Breslau, where he received his office in 21 October 1523. Here he gradually introduced Reformation ideas and became the reformer of Breslau.

5.2.3 Religious life at the royal court

When one tries to form a picture of the everyday religious life of the royal court one is once again hindered by the lack of basic sources for such reconstruction, the account books for daily expenses within the royal court. As described in the previous chapter the only two account book fragments which have survived from the period of our investigation concern a

⁷⁰² Letters of Simon Keck to the town of Schemnitz. MOL DF 235465, Pressburg, 14 12 1523; MOL DF 235519, Pressburg 03 12 1523. Letter of Mary to the town of Schemnitz in which she greets Simon Keck parish priest of Schemnitz. MOL DL 47460 Prague 16 06 1522.

⁷⁰³ Charles Duke of Münsterber and Oels to the magistrate of Breslau, Gersdorf, 10 09 1523. "Demnach Ihr Uns geschrieben, wie der Würdige, Unser Andächtiger und getreuer, Er, Johann Hess, der heil. Schrift Doctor, von Euch und Eurer gemeinde mit embsiger Bitte ersucht und angelanget, dass Er bey Euch das Predigtamt annehmen wollte, dass er sich schuldig finde den Weingarten des Herrn zu bauen; allein er hätte eine Beschwerde, sich damit ze beladen, dieweil er Uns mit Dienste versprochen und eingebunden wäre, welches Wir alles, wie es solch Schreiben in sich begreift, sammt Eurer demüthigen Bitte und Ermahnung, dass wir dasselbe vergünsten wollten, nach der Länge verstanden. Und wiewohl es an dem, dass wir allbereit bey der durchlauchtigsten Fürstin Unserer gnädigsten Frauen und Königin, I. Maj. Obgenannten Herrn Dr. Hess, der christlichen Lehre und geistlichen Lebens wahrhaften Lehrer Fürgeher gerühmt und angesagt, dass I.M. fast begierig worden, ihn in ihrem Amte zu haben und zu gebrauchen, dieweil aber erschollen ist, wie das Licht des Evangelii bey Euch und Eurer Gemeinde herfürbricht und aufgeht, Eure Bitte auch so christl. Pflicht bedacht, wie es unziemlich wäre, Euch in dieser Seelenfahrt Hinderung einzuführen und Eure Seelenspeise zu entziehen." Gusztáv Bauch, "Adalékok a reformatio történetéhez [Additions to the history of the Reformation]" *Történelmi Tár* (1885): 352-353.

period of five months in 1525 and a period of one month in 1526.⁷⁰⁴ Both are account books of the royal court which – as has been argued above – does not necessarily coincide with the queen’s court, a fact which has not been appreciated by previous scholarship using these sources.

Holy feasts and everyday religious practice

There exists a special bond between queenship, power and the public religious rituals. Christine de Pizan mentions conspicuous acts of charity to the needy, going on pilgrimages and interceding with her husband in the interest of his subjects as the most important acts of piety of a princess. We could add the donations to religious foundations, patronage of devotional books and art, the support of religious houses and the cult of saints and prominent participation in processions and religious ceremonies to her list as typical aspects of the piety expected from and often practiced by queens.⁷⁰⁵ Very little of such practices can be identified in the case of Mary of Hungary, a fact that has been traditionally interpreted as a sign of her interest in Reformation teaching instead of traditional forms of catholic piety. Or more precisely it is one of the arguments brought up by those scholars who have wished to categorise her to one or the other side of the debate. However, the lack of reginal household accounts and other sources may also account for this impression

The account books allow us a glimpse at the celebration of religious feasts in the first half of 1525 (12 January to 16 July). This permits a view on at least a part of the liturgical year, including the important liturgical feasts of Candlemas (2 February), the Feast of Annunciation (25 March), the Holy Week (9-16 April), Pentecost and the Feast of Corpus Christi (15 June). The king heard High Mass in the royal chapel on Candlemas.⁷⁰⁶ As many as 44 candles had to be bought for the procession on the feast decorated with tin flowers two of and red bands, which were to be consecrated in the chapel.⁷⁰⁷ The king gave six gold pieces as offertory and

⁷⁰⁴ See above chapter 4.1.

⁷⁰⁵ J. L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, 252-261..

⁷⁰⁶ Also called: Purification of the Blessed Virgin (Greek Hypapante), Observed 2 February “Eodem die emere feci lucernas quatuor, singulas lucernas per denarios sedecim computando, et dedi ad manus aprodianorum Regie Maiestatis, in festo purificacionis beatissime virginis Marie, coram sua Maiestate in magna missa, in Capella sue Maiestatis in castro Budensi fundata, in manibus eorundem arsuras d. LXIII.” Vilmos Fraknói, ed., "Liber rationum Ludovici II.", 68..

⁷⁰⁷ “Item feria quinta in festo purificacionis beatissime virginis Marie, emere feci candelas cereas albas, cum floribus staneis ornatas, magnas quatuor, mediocre sedecim, minores quatuordecim, simplices decem, et rubeas ligaturas, duobus in Capella Regie Maiestatis hoc die consecrandis, et dedi ad manus Magnifici domini Petri

gave out money for the lighting of the chapel. On the feast of Annunciation the king heard high Mass...⁷⁰⁸ On Palm Sunday the chaplain Stephanus of the royal chapel sang the passion and received 32 denari for a pint of sweet wine.⁷⁰⁹ The priest of the royal chapel blessed 2 fl worth of branches and flowers. The king specially sent for a canon of Székesfehérvár to sing the Mass of Good Friday, who – several weeks later – was paid 10 fl for the service. The king heard Mass with great ceremony and placed 3 fl in gold on the altar on Palm Sunday, Maundy Thursday and Easter Sunday.⁷¹⁰ The account book records the ritual of setting up the Holy Sepulchre which was lit with 25 candles of different sizes and sealed with red sealing wax on Good Friday.⁷¹¹ Fraknói discusses this as an “ancient and specific ritual of the Hungarian church, not paralleled in other countries”, however it shows close resemblance to the ritual of burying the Cross and Host in the Easter Sepulchre traditionally performed in the western Church on Good Friday.⁷¹² The Feast of Corpus Christi was elaborately celebrated with the throne of the king set up at a square in the Buda castle covered with a tent. From this point the king watched while the Blessed Sacrament was carried in procession by twelve squires with torches. Further squires carried the relics, crucifixes and gilded pictures, or perhaps sculptures from the royal chapel on decorated wooden structures while flowers were strewn on the ground before them.⁷¹³ The rector of the chapel, magister Albert is given money for buying

Korlaczky magistri curie sue Maiestatis fl. XXXI. d. LXXXII.” Vilmos Fraknói, ed., “Liber rationum Ludovici II.”, 69.

⁷⁰⁸ Vilmos Fraknói, ed., “Liber rationum Ludovici II.”, 118-119..

⁷⁰⁹ “Eodem die Stephano capellano Regie Maiestatis, qui hoc die passionem euangelicam coram sua Maiestate cantavit, iussu sue Maiestatis pro una pinta malmatici dedi d. XXXII.” Vilmos Fraknói, ed., “Liber rationum Ludovici II.”, 137..

⁷¹⁰ As well as on Candlemas and Pentecost.

⁷¹¹ “Eodem die emere feci candelas baculares magnas quatuor, penes sepulchrum in Capella Regie Maiestatis in castro Budensi fundata arsuras, pro florenis duobus et candelas parvas tredecim pro floreno uno denariis octuaginta, et candelas albas quatuor, singulas candelas per denarios quinquagintaquinque computando, faciunt florenos duos denarios viginti, et candelas duas pro denariis quadraginta octo, et candelam unam magnam pro decantacione exulte pro florenis duobus denariis viginti quinque, et ceram rubeam pro sigillando sepulchre denariis vigintiquinque, et de thure denariis vigintiquinque, farina similiter pro faciendis oblatis denariis vigintiquinque, et dedi ad manus magistri Alberti rectoris eiusdem capelle, et faciunt fl. VIII. d. XLVIII. Vilmos Fraknói, ed., “Liber rationum Ludovici II.”, 142-143.

⁷¹² “At the completion of the liturgy, the celebrant brought the Host which had been consecrated on Maundy Thursday, and the Cross, and buried them in the Easter Sepulchre in remembrance of the burial of Christ. During the procession before matins on Easter Day, the Host and Cross were taken out of their tomb and replaced on the high altar, symbolizing the resurrection of Christ.” A description of the ritual in the contemporary court of Henry VIII. Fiona Kisby, “Chapel Ceremonies ”: 63.

⁷¹³ On the day before the feast (14 June): “Eodem die Benedicto rutheno Regie Maiestatis, pro emendis securibus, clauiculis et funibus et aliis diuersis rebus pro reparacione solii, ubi sua Maiestas processionem die crastina inspicere habet, dedi fl III. d. X.”

incense to scent/fumigate the Sacrament. The account book gives no evidence to dramatic performances during the procession.⁷¹⁴

None of these items in the account book mention the queen and we can only assume that the queen was also present at the side of the king in the chapel attending High Mass at in the procession. The king and queen are recorded to have attended Mass together in the summer of 1524 in the Church of the Blessed Virgin, when a preacher aroused the anger of some when he talked against the pope and the Cardinals in German.⁷¹⁵ Unfortunately the report does not specify when the event happened, though it would be interesting to establish which feasts gave occasions for the royal couple to hear the Mass in other churches.

A Czech chronicle records a short, but interesting description of the Holy Week celebration of 1523, which the royal couple spent in Olomouc. This description does mention the queen and gives – to my knowledge – the only description of the ceremony of the Maundy Thursday *mandatum* or *pedilavium* (ritual foot washing) from the medieval court of the king of Hungary.

Vorm Palmsonntag ist König Ludwig in Ungarn und Böhmen mit seiner Königin Maria von Prag auf Olmütz kommen um 21 Uhr, ist mit ihr auf den Dohm geritten, und der Bischof hat Ihm ein Rohr in die Hand gegeben, seynd mit der Procession gangen, der Mess, Passion und Fusswaschung eingewohnt. Um grunen Donnerstage auch bei dem Fusswaschen *Eodem anno hic Olomucii, die Jovis sancto, Regina Maria 23 pauperibus pedes lauit, singulis novos Thoraces donauit et ad mensam seruiuit iis.* (**Lat. Uebersetzung zu A.**) *Die Veneris ante s. Margaretham Ambrosius, urbis Olomucensis iudex, suam filiam propter libidines in carcerem iecit. Ubi Rex venisset et omnes captivi dimitterentur, etiam illa dimissa est.* (**Insatz zu A.**) *ad 1523.* A. (Die Königin hatt mehr Volkh mit sych gehabt dann der König). B. Hierbei hat sich befunden Marggraf Georg, Marggraf Wilhelm Georgs Bruder, Herzog Karl, Herzog Friedrich von Liegnitz, der Först von Teschen, der Woywode von Trentschin, Graf Hanns Huniades, Bischoff von Gran Kanzler aus Ungarn, Bischoff von Rehtz(?), Bischof von Olmütz, die 6

⁷¹⁴ For the discussion of the Corpus Christi Feast and procession in the late Middle Ages see Rubin. Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

⁷¹⁵ The report of Burgio of an event that happened a while ago, while he was in Poland. MV 23, Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*, 142-143 (nr. 147). See the case discussed in greater detail below.

Brüder von Meseritz. **A und B.** (B. Die Botschafft Ferdinandi, die Botschafft Babstis).⁷¹⁶

The chronicle records that King Louis and Queen Mary arrive in Olomouc on Palm Sunday where the Bishop hands the king the “Rohr” and they take part in the Procession, the Mass and the Passion as well as the washing of the feet.⁷¹⁷ The second version of the chronicle specifies that it is the queen, who washed the feet of 23 beggars, gave them new garments and served a meal for them.⁷¹⁸ Though the chronicle is not very reliable, this explicit mention of *mandatum* performed by the queen probably does have factual basis and deserves some attention. The *mandatum* – the ceremony of foot washing and the distribution of food and clothing to beggars – performed on Maundy Thursday by sovereigns, in imitation of Christ washing the feet of the apostles before the Last Supper, was common practice by ecclesiastics and royal couples in the late Middle Ages.⁷¹⁹ Charles V is recorded to have performed the rite as well, the details of which are very similar to the account about Mary.⁷²⁰ There is no record of this practice in the Hungarian royal court and no trace of money distributed to beggars on Maundy Thursday in the account book. It is significant that it is specified that the queen performed the rite, though there is usually no special emphasis given to her participations in the few extant ceremonial accounts. Since religious ceremonies are also public demonstrations of power, the action can be interpreted as emphasizing the separate identity of

⁷¹⁶ The capital letters refer to the different versions of the chronicle that the editor of the Olmützer Sammel-chronik had compiled. Beda Dudík, ed., *Olmützer Sammel-Chronik vom Jahre 1432 bis 1656* (Brno: Rudolf Rohrer's Erben, 1858), 5-6.

⁷¹⁷ The “Rohr”, meaning reeds probably referred to the vegetation carried in the Palm Sunday procession. I am not quite sure what to make of the indication “21 Uhr”. Did this really mean 9 in the evening? Or was it delayed because they waited for the king?

⁷¹⁸ This is perhaps a scribal error instead of 13 beggars, which is a more common number at the ritual of *pedilavium*.

⁷¹⁹ For the practice of *pedilavium* in the Habsburg court see Jeroen Duindam, *Vienna and Versailles*, 139, 142, 211, 288. In the English court: Fiona Kisby, “Chapel Ceremonies”: 62-63. The practice was retained up to the twentieth century by the Austrian and Spanish royal house. Klaus Beitzl, “Die österliche Fußwaschung am Kaiserhofe zu Wien. Öffentlicher Brauch zwischen Hofzeremoniell und Armenfürsorge” in *Volkskunde. Fakten und Analysen. Festgabe für L. Schmidt zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Klaus Beitzl (Wien, 1972).

⁷²⁰ “Headed Lavatorio de Jueves Santo, the passage describes how the king (Charles V) ‘when he was in good health and residing in Spain’ performed a ceremony which was both a re-enactment of Christ’s action at the Last Supper and an act of charity. According to this account the king washed the feet of thirteen poor people (‘pobres’), and fed hem, serving each of them with a plate of food and a goblet of wine which he poured himself. The text relates how during Charles V’s time the thirteenth person, representing Judas, was set at a table apart from the other twelve, who sat together on one side of the other table. (During Philip II’s time all thirteen sat at the same table.) After they had finished eating, the king gave them woollen cloth and linen with which to garb themselves and a gold sovereign inside a small bag.” Bernadette Nelson, “Ritual and Ceremony in the Spanish royal chapel, c.1559-c.1561” *Early Music History* 19 (2000): 148.

the queen and her retinue by the queen's performance of a Burgundian/Habsburg tradition brought with her to the Hungarian court.⁷²¹

The diary of the Polish chancellor Krzysztof Szydłowiecki compiled at the diplomatic summit in Wiener Neustadt and Pressburg in 1523 records that the royal couple also attended High Mass on the feasts of All Hallows (1 November), St Martin (11 November) and probably also on the feast of St Luke (18 October).⁷²² It is more difficult to say anything more definite about the daily religious ritual of the royal couple. Here one can do little more than rely on parallels from other courts. Some information on this point has survived in the form of criticism of the behaviour of the king and queen. During the secret negotiations of the diplomatic summit the advisors voiced a number of grievances about the behaviour of the king and queen, a part of these concerning their behaviour in religious matters. These include ill feeling about the royal couple's habit to have a meal before hearing the Mass and that the king does not pray in church.⁷²³

It is assumed that much of the everyday private devotional practice of both the king and queen took place in the oratories of their respective private chambers. This was the general practice in contemporary courts and thus also the routine familiar to Mary in the Innsbruck princess' court. Here the day was started by the entrance of the chaplain, Johannes Croner, accompanied by two ministrants (pages) who served at the altar in the locked women' court (Frauenzimmer) with no other male persons allowed. After the Mass was performed the men had to withdraw immediately.⁷²⁴ The fact that the account books only mention paying for candles and oil for the lamps on major feast days and occasionally the vespers on the day before also supports the practice of daily devotions in the relative seclusion of the chamber. This must have meant a significant difference between public and private ritual.⁷²⁵

⁷²¹ On the importance of religious rituals for the demonstration of queenly power see for instance: Carmi John Parsons, "Piety, Power and Reputations", 111. as well as the many examples from late medieval queens brought by Laynesmith J. L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, 252-261.

⁷²² Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 58.

⁷²³ Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 121.

⁷²⁴ „Unnd sol das Frauenzimmer Morgens zu der Zeit so gewonndlich Mess gehalten wirdet geoffnet werden alsdann sol der Caplan und zwen Edlknaben zu Altar diennen an wellgem dann der Diennst ist und sonst kain anndere Monsperson hinauf geen unnd so die Mess fur ist so sollen derselb Capplan und Edlknaben vonstundan wider aus dem Zimer geen.” Jacqueline Kerkhoff, *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof*, 268.

⁷²⁵ For an interesting discussion of the public and private spheres of Mary's life as reflected in her correspondence with her brothers see Laferl and Lutter. Christopher F. Laferl and Christine Lutter, „Innere" und „äußere"

Donations, pilgrimages and piety

The frequently mentioned account book gives indication of donations and alms paid by the king to different monastic orders. This includes donations of 1 to 6 Florins paid to the Franciscans of Óbuda, the Dominicans of Buda and Pest, the Paulines of Budaszentlőrinc, the Poor Clares of Óbuda, the Beguines of Pest, Buda and Székesfehérvár. The Franciscans seem to have been in special favour of the king. His court preacher came from this order and this is perhaps one of the reasons why the king gave a generous donation of 360 fl for food supplies to the Franciscan convent that took place in the Óbuda monastery at the Pentecost of 1525.⁷²⁶ Alms were given to the poor and infirm, on a regular basis of one forint per week to the two “kings beggars”, and on an irregular basis to other beggars, but also to clerics and widows, who were infirm or had fallen into poverty. On larger feast days the students of the schools of Buda who collected money by singing at the houses of the rich also received support from the royal chamber.⁷²⁷

The relics of St John the Almoner played an important role in the late medieval piety of Hungary because of the relics kept in the royal chapel and were displayed in processions.⁷²⁸ However it is the retrieval of the head-relic of St Paul the Hermit took pride of place in the period under investigation and perhaps also in the personal piety of King Louis. The relics of Saint Paul, the spiritual father of the Pauline Order⁷²⁹ were obtained from Venice by Louis I (1326-1382), king of Hungary and Poland and placed in the Pauline monastery of Budaszentlőrinc in 1381. The order was very popular in the 14th and 15th centuries and the relics were an important site of local and international pilgrimage.⁷³⁰ Saint Paul's head was separated from the body during the fifteenth century and for many years the whereabouts of the head-relic were unknown. It was located again by King Louis II with much trouble during

Autonomie einer Fürstin der Frühen Neuzeit. Maria von Ungarn am Beginn ihrer niederländischen Statthalterschaft (1531-1534)" *Frühneuzeit-Info* 8/2 (1997).

⁷²⁶ Vilmos Fraknói, *II. Lajos udvara*, 62-63.

⁷²⁷ András Kubinyi, "A királyi udvar".

⁷²⁸ János Vég, "Alamizsnás Szent János a budai Várban [St John the Almoner in the Buda Palace]" *Építés és Építészettudomány* 10 (1980). See also Zsuzsanna Boda, "Alamizsnás Szent János kultusza", 221.

⁷²⁹ The Order of Saint Paul the First Hermit (*Ordo Sancti Pauli Primi Eremitae*) named after Saint Paul of Thebes (d. c. 345), canonized in 491 by Pope Gelasius I the only religious order founded in Hungary in 1215 by the Blessed Eusebius of Esztergom. Many details of this story, esp. the person of Eusebius, are questioned in a recent article by F. Romhányi, Beatrix F. Romhányi, "A pálos rendi hagyomány az oklevelek tükrében. Megjegyzések a pálos rend középkori történetéhez [The tradition of the Pauline Order reflected in the charters. Comments on the medieval history of the Pauline Order]" *Történelmi Szemle* 3 (2008).

⁷³⁰ The strong attachment of King Matthias (and perhaps Wladislas) to the order could have served as a model for Louis.

his travel to Bohemia in 1522/23 in the castle of Karlstejn. It was kept here as the relic of another saint. After having established the true identity of the relic the king persuaded the Bohemian estates to allow it to be brought back to Hungary and reunited with the body.⁷³¹ The relics were reunited in the Budaszentlőrinc monastery on 25 May 1523, amid great ceremony. A few years later the monks – escaping from the Ottoman threat – transported the relic to the North, finally ending up in the castle of Trencsén (today Trenčín in Slovakia). When the castle was attacked by the Ottomans in 1527 the relic was destroyed in the fire.

The details of Louis search for the relic have not been recently studied, but even the bare facts reveal that the action was very important for the king. The envoy of Charles V, who was also in the royal entourage on their stay in Bohemia reports that the recovering of the head relic was a greater joy for Louis than if he had been given 50 thousand ducats.⁷³² The main goal of the visit to his other kingdom in 1522-1523 was to obtain support, money and soldiers, from Bohemia against the Ottoman threat. In this context the recovery of the relic must have been experienced as a measure that increases divine protection for the threatened kingdom. It must also have been significant for the young king that Louis I, his predecessor on the Hungarian throne of glorious memory – with whom he also shared his name – had been the one who originally brought the relic to Hungary. One cannot but speculate that the success in obtaining the relic was an attempt at self-promotion and emphasising the bonds as well as at raising the morale of the nation. As far as we know, Mary was present during the search for the relic, but there are no records of her involvement. The Pauline order must have had a special significance for Queen Mary as well – perhaps through these activities on the part of her husband – since there is record of her supporting the monastery of the order at Máriavölgy/Maria-Thal.⁷³³ There is also record of the Paulines turning to Mary for help after the devastation of their monastery at Csót (Fejér county) by the Ottoman army after the Battle

⁷³¹ On 18 March 1523 the king rejoices to inform István Báthori, palatine that the Holy Relic has been identified and he has received it and given it for safekeeping to János Országh, bishop of Vác in his entourage. Letter of King Louis to István Báthory, 8 March 1523 Prague MOL DL. 23725, Letter of János Országh, bishop of Vác to István Báthori, palatine on the same matter. 9 March 1523, Prague. MOL DL 25676.

⁷³² Wilhelm Stracke, *Die Anfänge der Königin Maria von Ungarn, späteren Statthalterin Karls V. in den Niederlanden. (Phil. Diss.)* (Göttingen, 1940).

⁷³³ Ferdinánd confirms the donation given by Mary to the Paulines of Marienthal (de Thal).

of Mohács.⁷³⁴ These examples are especially noteworthy since there is no other known record of the queen having made religious foundations or having donated to the church.⁷³⁵

Neither the king nor queen is known to have made pilgrimages. In Hungarian historiography it is treated as an established fact that the royal couple had visited the popular pilgrimage site of Mariazell in Lower Austria. There is, however, nothing to support this assumption in the itinerary of either. The assumption is based on the supposed donation of a set of elaborate garments by the royal couple to the monastery, one of these being the so called “wedding dress of Mary of Hungary”.⁷³⁶ The identification of the donator of the garments with Louis and Mary, or the supposition that they belonged to the couple is tenuous and in any case does not necessitate visiting the site. There is a less known link between Queen Mary and church of Mariazell, however, in the form of a votive panel on the Grosser Mariazeller Wunderaltar (c. 1520) – discussed briefly above – which was commissioned by Mary of Hungary commemorating the her deliverance from mortal danger. The votive panel documents a form of traditional catholic piety typical of the Innsbruck court of Maximilian and probably predominating the early years of the queen.⁷³⁷ No other signs of Marian devotion related to the queen survive, despite the possibility provided by the association through her name or the traditional association of queens with the Virgin Mary.

5.2.4 Early signs of religious reform in Hungary (1521-1526)

How early Reformation ideas reached Hungary and what can be interpreted as signs of religious reform has a long history of scholarship.⁷³⁸ Here it will suffice to give a short

⁷³⁴ “*Ad eandem pro subsidio brevior.* Sacra reginalis maiestas graciosa. Supplicant humilime vestre pietati religiosi fratres ordinis sancti Pauli primi heremite in claustro Cheeth (*Csőt*) degentes in eo, quod ipsorum claustum infidelissimi Turci penitus combusserunt et contriverunt, quatinus maiestas vestra serenissima dignaretur eosdem ad restauracionem ipsius monasterii ac presertim ecclesie Dei reedificacionem aliquibus auxiliis pecuniariis aut blado seu aliis quibuslibet subsidiis adiuuare. Niterentur enim illud monasterium iterum reparare, ut Dei laudes, sicut prius in eodem Deo redderentur pro felici statu serenissimi domini regis ac maiestatis vestre ac tocius Regni Hungarie et omnium in eodem incolarum conservacione. Graciosam a vestra serenitate expectamus relacionem.” Date not known, but after the Battle of Mohács after which the Ottoman troops plundered and burnt the monastery of Csőt. Probably also after the coronation of Ferdinand, who is referred to as king. ELTE EK Cod.Lat. 131. 59v-60r. I would like to express my thanks to Beatrix Romhányi who provided me with this reference.

⁷³⁵ Vilmos Fraknói, *Mária magyar királyné állása a reformatio irányában* (Esztergom, 1879).

⁷³⁶ The most recent discussion of the garments with the listing of the earlier literature can be found in the description of the garments by Lilla Tompos. Orsolya Réthelyi et al., eds., *Mary of Hungary*, 177-179.

⁷³⁷ For Maximilian's piety see: Hermann Wiesflecker, *Kaiser Maximilian I.*, 152-154.

⁷³⁸ Though most of this is only accessible to speakers of Hungarian. A good synthesis is provided by the work by Jenő Súlyom, whose collected data I followed used for much of the summary below. Jenő Súlyom, *Luther és*

summary of the points necessary for my own argumentation. The arrival of Mary in Hungary coincided with the first appearances of Reformation ideas in Hungary. The timing in itself is a coincidence but the consequences are manifold and impossible to ignore. A valuable chronicler of the Hungarian Kingdom in the years before the defeat at Mohács, but at the same time one of the most vehement of Mary critics was the well informed Sicilian papal diplomat baron Antonio Giovanni da Burgio (died 1538). Burgio left his native Sicily and stepped into papal service and was first sent in the summer of 1523 to Hungary by Pope Hadrian VI to accompany the papal legate Cardinal Thomas de Vio (Cajetanus). He succeeded in winning the sympathy of both the papal curia and the Hungarians and was affirmed as papal nuntius to Hungary despite his secular status by the new pope Clement VII. The Holy See had had a permanent diplomatic post in the Hungarian kingdom since 1516 to support the country against the threatening Ottoman invasion. Burgio's main task was to control the distribution of the papal aid sent to finance troops and defence systems. He remained in Hungary till the days after the defeat of the Hungarian troops in August 1526 and sent detailed reports throughout his mission on the Hungarian political situation. His accounts are an invaluable source of these turbulent years and have been very influential in the historiography of the period.⁷³⁹

Burgio's information, however, has been treated – till the very recent years – with uncritical acceptance. This has had a long lasting negative influence on the historiography of Mary of Hungary, since Burgio painted a very negative picture of the queen. Recent Hungarian historiography has begun to approach the text in a more critical manner. Pioneer of this re-evaluation was András Kubinyi, who showed on several examples how the overrepresentation of the personal likes and dislikes of the favourite informants of the papal nuntio lead to a distorted evaluation of certain prominent figures of contemporary political life.⁷⁴⁰ Queen Mary was severely disliked by Burgio, mainly because his chief informant was János Bornemissza, who hated the queen and was her political enemy.⁷⁴¹

Magyarország. For recent collection of articles accessible for non-Hungarian speaking scholars see for instance: Eszter Andor and István György Tóth, eds., *Frontiers of Faith. Religious Exchange and the Constitution of Religious Identities 1400–1750* (Budapest, 2001).

⁷³⁹ They were collected and edited by Vilmos Fraknói. Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum.*

⁷⁴⁰ András Kubinyi, "Egy üzletelő és diplomata várúr Mohács előtt: Ákosházi Sárkány Ambrus"; András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary".

⁷⁴¹ See also Kovács. Péter E. Kovács, "Erzherzog Ferdinand und Ungarn (1521-1526)" in *Kaiser Ferdinand I. Ein Mitteleuropäischer Herrscher*, ed. Martina Fuchs et al. (Münster: Aschendorff, 2005).

It is not well documented how much of the Reformation ideas were present in the Kingdom of Hungary between the symbolic date of Luther's publication of his 95 Theses in 1517 and Mary's arrival to Hungary in 1521. There must have been some knowledge of the movement in certain circles and also considerable anxiety. A good example for this anxiety is the behaviour of István Werbőczy⁷⁴² who, together with the humanist Hieronymus Balbi, was sent as a delegate to the Imperial Diet of Worms in the spring of 1521 to ask for imperial aid for Hungary against the Ottoman threat. On the way to Worms he encountered the vehemently anti-Lutheran tractate of the Dominican theologian Ambrosius Catharinus (Lanciloto Politi), which appealed to Werbőczy to such an extent that he arranged for a second edition in Vienna, offering to finance the costs of the printing.⁷⁴³ Beside the author's dedication to Charles V, Werbőczy also included a dedication to King Louis II, in which he urged the king to protect the Kingdom of Hungary from the devastating effects of the Lutheran doctrines.⁷⁴⁴ During the Diet the Hungarian delegates took the opportunity to invite Luther – who was at the time under excommunication – for dinner and try persuading him to renounce his false teachings.⁷⁴⁵ Both actions can be regarded as the delegates' efforts to show the emperor that Hungary supports his fight against Luther and for the Catholic Church and were interpreted as such by the contemporaries.⁷⁴⁶

Several royal decrees were passed against Lutheranism in the period between 1521 and 1526, some of them uncommonly harsh. Following the edict of worms in 28 05 1521, which excommunicated Martin Luther in the lands of the Holy Roman Empire, the Hungarian King Louis II also published an edict against heretics on 24 12 1521. The first decree against Lutherans was issued on the Diet of Buda in the spring of 1523 (§54): "The royal majesty, as a Catholic prince shall deign to punish all Lutherans and their partisans as well as the adherents of their sect as public heretics and enemies of the most holy Virgin Mary by capital

⁷⁴² István Werbőczy (1458 – 1541) see Martyn Rady, "Stephen Werbőczy and his Tripartitum" in *Stephen Werbőczy - The Customary law of the Renowned Kingdom of Hungary in Three Parts (1517)*, ed. János M. Bak et al. (Budapest: CEU, 2005).

⁷⁴³ "IV-28. tractate of the Dominican Priest Ambrosius against luther, Defending the Roman Catholic Faith". In Orsolya Réthelyi et al., eds., *Mary of Hungary*, 217-218.

⁷⁴⁴ Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*, 25-26.

⁷⁴⁵ Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*, 33.

⁷⁴⁶ Jenő Sólyom, *Luther és Magyarország. A reformátor kapcsolata hazánkkal haláláig [Luther and Hungary. The relationship of the reformer with our country]* (Budapest, 1996 (reprint of the first edition of 1933)), 54-56.

punishment and the forfeiture of all their goods.”⁷⁴⁷ The decree is a hardly concealed attempt to decrease the influence of the “German” element at the royal and reginal court and especially of the influence of the Brandenburg brothers.⁷⁴⁸ Among the resolutions of the same Diet (§17) it is also decreed that the king and queen shall only keep Hungarian officials in their courts. The most severe wording was brought on the Diet of Pest the next year (1524) that only decreed on the Diet of Rákos in May 1525. The decree, in shorthand the “*Lutherani comburantur*” stated that “all Lutherans should be exterminated from the country and wherever they are found should be freely captured and burnt not only by ecclesiastical authorities, but also by secular persons.”⁷⁴⁹ The decrees of the Diet of Rákos were only ratified when it was reissued on the Diet of Hatvan (July 1525). This time it was extended with a clause that the confiscated goods of the Lutherans should devolve on the royal chamber or their landlords (1525 §4). The decree was short lived because all decrees of the Diet of Hatvan were made invalid by the Diet of Rákos in 1526 (§17), nevertheless the decree remains in the Corpus Juris.⁷⁵⁰ Again this was mainly directed against the “German” influence at the court, but there are records of its implementation.⁷⁵¹

In the early period the teachings of Luther spread mainly through his books among the primarily German-speaking population of the royal towns in Transylvania and the Northern Hungarian regions. These groups of people had a strong linguistic and cultural identity and many connections with the German-speaking territories of Central and Western Europe.⁷⁵² As early as August 1521 there is record of Luther’s books being sent from Königstein in Saxony to the parish priest of Schemnitz.⁷⁵³ The royal visit to Olomouc at Easter in 1523 gave the setting for a demonstrative burning of not only books of Luther, but also his translation of the New Testament (“*Lutherischen Bücher samt neuen Testament in Gegenwart Ludwig Königs*

⁷⁴⁷ This decree, which is more severe than the edict of worms is in fact a renewal with the same form of punishment of already existing decrees against heresy brough on the Diets of 1462 and 1498. I use the English translation from the edition of the Corpus Juris by János M. Bak, Péter Banyó and Martyn Rady. I hereby thank the authors for giving me access to the still unpublished material. See also Dezső Márkus, ed., *Corpus juris hungarici*, 824.

⁷⁴⁸ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests".

⁷⁴⁹ „Lutherani etiam omnes de regno extirpentur et ubicumque reperti fuerint, non solum per ecclesiasticas, verum etiam per seculares personas libere comburantur.”

⁷⁵⁰ For a summary of the events around the Diets of 1525 and 1526 see Rady. Martyn Rady, "Rethinking Jagiello Hungary".

⁷⁵¹ Jenő Zoványi, "A „Lutherani comburantur” és a Corpus juris hungarici" *Protestáns Szemle* (1917).

⁷⁵² Vilmos Fraknói, *A Hunyadiak és a Jagellók kora (1440-1526) [The age of the Hunyadi and Jagiellon dynasties]* (Budapest: Athenaeum, 1896)., 4. VII.

⁷⁵³ Jenő Súlyom, *Luther és Magyarország*.

auf dem Ring verbrennt”).⁷⁵⁴ The first investigation and book-burning within the Kingdom of Hungary took place not long after this event in Sopron. During the investigation preceding this event it was reported according to the burghers of the town that the books of Luther could be bought freely in the town.⁷⁵⁵ That the popularity of Lutheran books was not restricted to the western border area where these writings were easily accessible through trade contacts is proved by very similar processes concerning the German-speaking towns of Transylvania. King Louis sent a letter to Hermannstadt (Nagyszeben, today Sibiu in Romania) even before the completion of the investigation in Sopron in March 1524 to express his severe disapproval of the rapid spread of Luther’s teachings and books in the town. He ordered these books to be collected and burnt. His actions did not meet with much success, because a few months later forbidden books again caused unrest in both Hermannstadt and Kronstadt.⁷⁵⁶ The possession of Luther’s books could, however, have more severe consequences, as in the case of Johann Baumgartner, the servant of Conrad Cordatus’ brother who was burnt somewhere in western Hungary together with the Lutheran book Conrad had sent with him to Hungary.⁷⁵⁷ It is quite clear that Hungary had been receptive to early Reformation ideas in different geographical areas and in certain areas the books and teaching of Luther were easily accessible.⁷⁵⁸

Closer to the space that the queen inhabited is the reports from the town of Buda. We know of several priests and teachers active in Buda at this time who in their later years openly chose the road of the Reformation, and who gave outward signs of their sympathies already in these early years. Most of these people were joined by bonds of close friendship, religion, humanism and patronage. For our present purpose it is important to mention some names of people, who were active in Buda in the period, may have been acquainted with the queen and have had influence on her. A good friend of Cordatus was Simon Grynaeus⁷⁵⁹, who taught

⁷⁵⁴ Beda Dudík, ed., *Olmützer Sammel-Chronik*, 5-6..

⁷⁵⁵ “Iterum Paulum dixisse, quod haberet magnam copiam librorum lutheranorum, nec propter eos libros posset eum ense excoriare, quum tamen venduntur publice.” Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*, 169.

⁷⁵⁶ Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*, 140. For more recent literature on the early Reformation in Transylvania see for instance Maria Craciun, Ovidiu Ghitta, and Graeme Murdock, (Eds.), *Confessional Identity in East-Central Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate 2002. see also Maria Craciun and Ovidiu Ghitta (ed.), *Ethnicity and Religion in Central and Eastern Europe* (Cluj, 1995).

⁷⁵⁷ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", 53.

⁷⁵⁸ As Jenő Sólyom argues some of these reports should be treated with caution, since there is no clear terminology at this stage and all signs of religious reform within the catholic church easily received the term “Lutheran” or even more frequently “heretic”. Jenő Sólyom, *Luther és Magyarország*, 26.

⁷⁵⁹ Simon Grynaeus (Griner) (1493-1541). See Peter G. Bietenholz et al., eds., *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, Vol. 2, 142-146.

(*ludimagister*) for a short period at the school attached to the St George Chapel together with Veit Oertel of Windesheim.⁷⁶⁰ Grynaeus fled Buda in early 1522 on account of his accusation and arrest for heretical teaching. The priest/rector of the same chapel was magister Johannes Kresling.⁷⁶¹ At the same time Conrad Cordatus was active as a preacher in the neighbouring Church of the Blessed Virgin for the German population of the town. All four were friends with close contacts with the humanist circles in Vienna and were early recipients of Luther's teachings. Many of them visited Wittenberg.

A further name that must be mentioned in this context is that of Paulus Speratus⁷⁶² who was invited to Buda in 1521, perhaps to replace Cordatus. On his way to Buda he gave a sermon in Vienna in which he preached against celibacy. On account of his sermon he was excommunicated by the University of Vienna in January 1522 and did not proceed to Buda. He became preacher of Iglau (Jihlava) where he was arrested for Lutheran preaching and imprisoned by Stanislaus Thurzo, bishop of Olomouc. He was sentenced to death by burning as a heretic. It is not generally known that King Louis II and Queen Mary were present in Olomouc at the time of his ordeal. A Czech chronicle narrates how Speratus is thrown into prison on the on the 16th of April in the period when the royal couple were in the town to celebrate Easter there and attend the Moravian Diet. Next day the Lutheran books and the New Testament – referring to Luther's German translation of the scripture – were publicly burnt in the presence of the King, presumably also the queen. The same day the royal couple left the town for Buda. A few weeks later on the 8th of May the council deliberated the case of Speratus and set him free on the 9th of June.⁷⁶³ We know from the same chronicle that a

⁷⁶⁰ Veit Oertel Winshemius (1501-1570).

⁷⁶¹ Johannes Kresling (1489-1549) was born in Buda. Educated in Vienna and Cracow together with Francofordinus he was the author of an oration dedicated to György Szathmáry in a volume published on the occasion of the double engagement in Vienna 1515. From 1517 the parish priest of the St George chapel of Buda. In 1525 active in the mining towns with his friend Conrad Cordatus. At the Easter of 1525 both are prosecuted and imprisoned in Esztergom for Reformation preaching and Kresling's marriage. After being freed both serve in lower Silesia, Kresling as priest in Breslau.

⁷⁶² Paulus Speratus (Paul Sret v. Hoffer, 1484-1551) – theologian, protestant hymn writer. Educated in Freiburg, Paris, Italy and Vienna, obtained doctorates in philosophy, law and theology. Ordained a priest in 1506. He was canon in Salzburg and Denkelsbühl, preacher in Wurzburg. Strongly influenced by the writings of Luther he marries losing his canonicate. He was invited to Buda as a preacher in 1522, but was excommunicated in Vienna on account of his preaching against celibacy. Becomes reformed preacher of Iglau and is imprisoned as a heretic and sentenced to death by the Bishop of Olomouc. He is freed thanks to the intervention of powerful supporters. He becomes the court preacher to Albrecht of Brandenburg, later bishop of Pomerania (Prussia). He is known also for his chorale compositions and is the author of a number of Protestant hymns.

⁷⁶³ „Am Donnerstag vor Misericordiae [1523 04 16]hat man den Paul Sperat, Prediger von Iglau, in den Thurm gesetzt, und den Freytag darauf die Lutherischen Bücher samt neuen Testament in Gegenwart Ludwig Königs

number of magnates were also present in the retinue of the king and queen, as well as the envoy of Ferdinand, Andrea da Burgo and the papal representative.⁷⁶⁴ The list of names includes Margrave George of Brandenburg and his brother William, who later became the queen's steward. It does not include the name of a third Brandenburg brother, Albert, who was instrumental in the release of Speratus a few weeks later and whom Speratus thanks for his intervention, dedicating to him the 1524 version of the sermon for which he was excommunicated in Vienna.⁷⁶⁵

5.2.5 Religious reform and the queen's court⁷⁶⁶

Intellectual context

The first mention of Luther in relation with the queen is the well-known episode narrated by Jacobus Piso to his friend Erasmus. He describes a dinner in June 1522 in Prague attended by the king and queen, two Czech lords, the margraves of Brandenburg George and Albert, Andrea da Burgo and Piso himself and tell how the discussion turned to Luther – much to the displeasure of the royal couple – one of the margraves argued that Luther had learnt practically all from Erasmus and that there is hardly any difference in their teaching. Piso disagreed strongly with the opinion and to prove his point had a letter from Erasmus fetched. The queen was the first to take the letter eagerly from his hands.⁷⁶⁷ With great sensitivity for

auf dem Ring verbrennt. A. und B. (B. König Ludwig ist denselben Tag weggefahren). Den Freytag nach Auffarthstag [1523 05 08] hat der Rath eine Zusammenkunft wegen des Sperats gehabt, den Dienstag vor Margaretha ist er wider ledig worden [1523 06 09] . A. und B.“ Beda Dudík, ed., *Olmützer Sammel-Chronik*, 5-6.

⁷⁶⁴ “Hierbei hat sich befunden Marggraf Georg, Marggraf Wilhelm Georgs Bruder, Herzog Karl, Herzog Friedrich von Liegnitz, der Först von Teschen, der Woywode von Trentschin, Graf Hanns Huniades, Bischoff von Gran Kanzler aus Ungarn, Bischoff von Rehtz(?), Bischof von Olmütz, die 6 Brüder von Meseritz. A und B. (B. Die Botschafft Ferdinandi, die Botschafft Babstis).”

⁷⁶⁵ See Csepregi and Spekner ‘IV-27. Sermon of Speratus on Baptism’ in Orsolya Réthelyi et al., eds., *Mary of Hungary*, 217.

⁷⁶⁶ A recent in depth investigation of the sources and previous secondary literature on the question of Mary's Lutheran sympathies has recently been undertaken by Zoltán Csepregi, the results of which he has published in a number of articles. In this chapter I use much of his findings and conclusions for my argumentation.

⁷⁶⁷ A detail from the letter of Piso: “Cenebant Prage cum Rege et Regina forte nuper Andreas Burgus, Cesaris orator, raro vir ingenio, ac illustrissimi Marchiones Brandenburgenses fratres, Albertus (Prussie Magister et Georgius) Bohemique proceres duo. Ibi casu nescio quo obortus de Lutero sermo, non admodum gratus principibus meis. Id vbi obseruaret ex Marchionibus alter, vt principium Erasmo regie fauentium animos leniret, adiecit, principio luterum omnia ex Erasmo hausisse, et probe inter sese conuenire. Id ego, ingenue audisse me quidem a multis, etiam non negabam. Ceterum longe se rem aliter habere, non paucis argumentis ostendi, presentissimo autem eo, quod ex tuis ad me literis recens tunc mihi redditis proferebam. tuebantur nihilominus priorem nonnulli sententiam. Iussi interea literas tuas afferri. Allatas primum Regina peripuit, agnoscende manus auida, mox et Rex ipse, hanc tamen prius cognouerat, ex ijs, quas ad me adhunc Romam olim Sena

his subject Zoltán Csepregi Argues that the manner in which Mary reaches out for the manuscript of the famous author is the most authentic and informative detail of the deliberately biased narrative because it expresses the intellectual and spiritual curiosity that emerges as a basic characteristic of the queen from the sources.⁷⁶⁸

I would add that the description gives a rare view on a relatively informal court meal where the fashionable topics of Erasmus, Luther and his teaching are discussed in a lively manner. It is impossible to say whether the royal couple really expressed displeasure about Luther as a topic of discussion – though this is not entirely unlikely –, or whether this was a flourish with which Piso wanted to please Erasmus. In any case the queen must have been familiar with Luther's name by that time. Even more importantly Piso describes a scene, which transcends the actual episode in symbolic interpretation and at the same time frames one of the problems of the interpretation of the sources about the queen's religious inclination. Erasmus and Luther were both very fashionable topics in Hungary exactly in these years. They were popular in different strata of the population, partially due to the difference in accessibility of the writings, and the existence of vernacular translations of the writings in Luther's case. Still there is something very similar in the way the people in Sopron sit in the pub in great crowds and listen to one of them, who is more literate, reading the works of Luther aloud and the way the Latinate people – clerics, teachers, and chancery humanists – fervently read Erasmus and try desperately to become one of his correspondents. In this one scene the two circles come together at the royal table with the addition of Mary as an active player of the event.

The queen's court priests and Reformation ideas

Turning our attention to the court priests around Mary one is struck by the reappearance of Lutheran involvement – though with varying degree of depth – in the people she selects as priests or chaplains for her court. No Lutheran sympathies can be demonstrated in the case of Croner, but as soon as she has the choice in her own hand involvement with the Reformation becomes a recurrent element in the lives of the people selected. To our present knowledge the invitation of Simon Keck in March 1520 was not realised after her arrival to Buda. We also have little information on Keck from the early 1520s. Thomas Stolzer, invited in May 1522 is

dederas. Volat deinde epistola per omnium manus, fit silentium, legitur, lentescit vulgaris opinio.” Gusztáv Bauch, "Adalékok a reformatio történetéhez": 342.

⁷⁶⁸ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", 49.

also known for his Lutheran sympathies, though he can certainly not be regarded as a hard liner. Mary's main motivation for inviting Stolzer to her chapel was probably an effort to obtain famous artists to heighten the prestige of the court. We know of the importance of music in both courtly display in general and in Mary's life specifically. It can be supposed that Stolzer's attraction for the queen lie more in his musical qualities than his alleged Lutheran sympathies, nevertheless these cannot be disregarded. This is even more true for the person of Johannes Hess, allegedly invited by the queen in the summer or autumn of 1522.⁷⁶⁹ Hess by the time of his invitation was much more involved in the Reformation than any of the previously mentioned clerics. He had visited Wittenberg, made the acquaintance of Melanchthon. Unlike Cordatus he was not a *persona non grata*, since he was the court priest of Charles of Münsterberg, but his invitation cannot be defended with representational aspects and is difficult to interpret in any other way than by Mary's conscious interest in Reformation ideas. The invitation of Johannes Henckel in the early months of 1526 fits into the same pattern. Though he only took his first careful steps toward Reformation in his public life in 1527, but definitely had a familiarity with the teachings in the years preceding this date.

In the years after 1526 the same pattern emerges. Again Henckel is invited, who – though never actually breaking with the Catholic Church – in this period shows growing signs of affinity for Reformation ideas, culminating in his behaviour at the Diet of Augsburg. Conrad Cordatus has a short lived appearance at the court, but is by this time stigmatised with his sympathy for Lutheranism to such an extent that his presence in Mary's proximity results in strong protests from Ferdinand. Finally, Johannes von Neuburg is also on Charles' black list of people who may not accompany Mary to the Netherlands for religious reasons. A long term interest in people with Reformation contacts and an effort to tie them to her court emerges as a characteristic of Mary's choice of court priests for the whole period of 1521-1530.

Religious views of members of the queen's court

It is worth noting that the accusations of sympathy for the Reformation ideas was often not expressed as something relating to herself as an individual, but in reference to her and her household. This is characteristic not only in the cases mentioned above, when Charles singles out by name those members of his sister's household, who are not allowed to go with her

⁷⁶⁹ See above.

because of their suspected affiliation to the Lutheran ideas, or when Ferdinand reprimands his sister about news of Lutheran sympathies in her household. The same tone characterizes the accusations already in the years before 1526. No research has been done about the presence of Reformation ideas in Innsbruck at the time of the presence of the Anne and Mary there, but it can be supposed that news of Luther and his doctrines had reached the princesses' court. Nevertheless in the investigations of religious aspects it is important to look at the personal element of the household, the people around the queen.

In Hungary the Venetian legates report in January 1524 that several members of both the king's and queen's household are "Lutherans".⁷⁷⁰ The same opinion was also expressed by the papal nuntio Burgio.⁷⁷¹ Several ladies from the Frauenzimmer of Mary as well as men from the closest circle around the queen were later associated with the Reformation. Of the women most importantly her Hofmeisterin, Margarete von Ungnad was treated with suspicion, who was also rejected on these grounds by Charles, and probably also her daughter, Elisabeth. The Pemfflinger family were known to have been early sympathisers of Luther, several of whom played important roles in Mary's household. Catharina Pemfflinger, wife of Bálint Török was known as a supporter of the Reformation of the Transdanubian region.⁷⁷² Catharina Svetkovics and her husband Ferenc Batthyány also belonged to supporters of the Reformation, as well as Elek Thurzó. The Puchheim family also belonged to this group, as well as the uncle of the Pemfflinger children and imperial ambassador in Mary's service, Johan Schneidpöck,⁷⁷³ and her count of the chamber Bernhard Beheim. Most importantly, Albert and Georg of Brandenburg was a strong supporter, who had shown and in Albert's case declared their support of Reformation before 1526.⁷⁷⁴ Not to mention the members of her chapel discussed above.

⁷⁷⁰ "Si dice de qui assai aperamente, perfino li predicatori ne li pergola, che non meno ne la corte de la Regia et Reginal Maesta si atrovano lutherani ... et qui si dice, che vengono favoriti et ajutati da Sua Maesta" Guidoto 1524 jan. 24. István Balogh, ed., *Velencezi diplomaták*.

⁷⁷¹ „Apriso lo Re et Regina sono molti Tudeski et principali, di li qua li credo che non sia in tutto bugio che siano alcuni lutherani” 17 08 1524. Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum*.

⁷⁷² Despite the opinion expressed in older scholarship Bessenyei does not find conclusive evidence for Bálint Török as supporter of the Reformation. József Bessenyei, *Enyingi Török Bálint*, XIII. Szerémi describes Catharina Pemfflinger as "Lutheran lioness" "Et Valentinus spondidit et copulavit eam latronculam, quae demumerat leona lutteriana". György Szerémi, *Epistola de perdicione Regni Hungarorum*, 100.

⁷⁷³ Campeggio 1524 nov 27, dec 29; Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum*., Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber".

⁷⁷⁴ Zoltán Csepregi, "Brandenburgi György szerepe Boroszló reformációjában ", 62.

Books

The first signs of Luther's teachings reached the Hungarian kingdom through his books – states Jenő Sólyom in his study on the early Reformation in Hungary.⁷⁷⁵ It would be important to know to what extent Mary was exposed to Lutheran writings. However, no inventory of the queen's books exists from this period, and there is very little information on books she owned. All we have are scarce references in letters, which nevertheless also show a significant pattern. In the years before Mohács there is both direct and indirect evidence of the queen's reading. It is reported that in 1523 Albert of Brandenburg sent Lutheran books to the queen.⁷⁷⁶ The account does not give details about which books were actually sent but using textual analysis techniques of the vocabulary of one of Mary's letters to Albert led Csepregi to the conclusion that one of these books could have been Luther's treatise *On the Freedom of the Christian* (1520).⁷⁷⁷ The queen must also have had access to Luther's translation of the Psalms (1524) since she commissioned Thomas Stolzer to set four of these psalm translations to music.

More reference to books and reading habits follow in the years after 1526. In 1527 Luther dedicates and sends a volume containing four Psalm translations to the queen. This is intercepted by Ferdinand and sent on to his sister accompanied by a letter of severe disapproval. Mary firmly defends herself with much wit and states that she cannot forbid Luther to dedicate his books whomever he pleases.⁷⁷⁸ Ferdinand in a next letter returns to the subject and explicitly asks her to promise him to agree to two points: not to read Luther's damned books and make sure that members of her household do not behave in a way that would make people think her to be a Lutheran.⁷⁷⁹ To this Mary answers that she has not read Lutheran books for a while, but following Ferdinand's request will make her avoid them even

⁷⁷⁵ Jenő Sólyom, *Luther és Magyarország*, 19.

⁷⁷⁶ 15 October 1523 Hans von der Planitz, reports to Frederick III, Elector of Saxony (Frederic the Wise) "das ich weiss, das ir der hoemeister aus Preussen von hinnen vill lutherisch bucher auf ir [i.e. the Queen's] begere zugeschickt" berichte aus dem Reichsregiment in Nürnberg 1521-1523. Ed. E. Wülcker, H. Virck. Leipzig, 1899. = Hildesheim/New York 1979, 356. Quoted in Zoltán Csepregi, "Mária királyné és udvari papjai": 2003.

⁷⁷⁷ *Von der freyheit eins Christen menschen*. See Zoltán Csepregi, "Jámbor volt-e Georg der Fromme? Egy készülő Brandenburgi György-monográfia módszertani előfeltételei" *Lelkipásztor* 78 (2003): 291-294. See also 'IV-26 Treatise of Martin Luther on the Freedom of the Christian', in Orsolya Réthelyi et al., eds., *Mary of Hungary*, 216-217.

⁷⁷⁸ Ferdinand's letter did not survive, only Mary's answer in which she acknowledges the receipt of her brother's letter of 12 April 1527 and Luther's book and repudiates Ferdinand's accusation. Mary's letter to Ferdinand 15 April 1527. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 57-58, Nr44.

⁷⁷⁹ Ferdinand's letter to Mary 19 04 1527. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 58-59, Nr 45.

more.⁷⁸⁰ She also defends her household from the accusations. Her promise does not stop her from consulting a book by Luther a year later when during her illness a wandering cleric appears in the neighbourhood preaching against baptism and the Eucharist. She decides to appoint somebody else – who turns out to be Conrad Cordatus – to preach against these false doctrines and reads a book on the subject by Luther, and finds it good enough to send a copy to Ferdinand himself.⁷⁸¹ It is no surprise that Ferdinand disapproves of her way of handling the problem and sends his sister an edition of Luther’s New Testament translation which is amended with long list of the reformer’s errors.⁷⁸²

The queen’s interest in books was not restricted to those by Luther. There is also an emphatic reference to books in Henckel’s depiction of the queen in his letter to Erasmus. She is said to “have a book in her hands at all times”, to “find consolation in pious books”, “to be reading the classics“, “to be rereading Erasmus’ Paraphrases in Latin, after she had read them earlier in German”.⁷⁸³ Even if one justly regards this a piece of flattery directed to Erasmus and to the queen, and uses the *topos* of the widow finding consolation in pious books combined with an effort to create a paragon of a woman of letters it is striking how much emphasis is placed on books and writing. The tractate, *De vidua Christiana* was personally brought to the queen in Znaim by a disciple of Erasmus Felix Rex (also known as Polyphemus) on 28 May 1529, after having delivered a copy to Ferdinand in March.⁷⁸⁴ We do not know the contents of Mary’s letter – accompanied by a precious cup – thanking Erasmus for the dedication, since this has not survived. In Henckel’s letter of thanks, he tells of how Mary values the work, reads and rereads it. He adds that the ladies of the court are also display moved by the tractate, even though they do not speak a word of Latin.⁷⁸⁵

⁷⁸⁰ Mary’s letter to Ferdinand 29 04 1527. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 62-64, Nr 48.

⁷⁸¹ Mary’s letter to Ferdinand 1 05 1528. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 214-217, Nr 183. According to Csepregi the book in question must have been Luther’s *Von der Wiedertaufe an zwei Pfarrherrn*. Zoltán Csepregi, "Mária királyné és udvari papjai": 206.

⁷⁸² Ferdinand’s letter to Mary. 15 07 1528, Prague. Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, 268-270, Nr 207.

⁷⁸³ See the letter of Henckel to Erasmus above.

⁷⁸⁴ Letter of Nicolaus Olahus to Erasmus, Augsburg 1 07 1530. Miklós Oláh, *Codex epistolaris.*, “Polyphemus” to Erasmus Speyer 23 March 1529. Cited by Katherine Walsh et al., "Eine Erasmianerin im Hause Habsburg": 69.

⁷⁸⁵ “Quin etiam virgines forma, opibus, genere, pudicicia conspicuae, quae in reginae officiis sunt, hoc exemplo commotae, etsi Latine nescia”. Johannes Henckel to Erasmus, Linz 13 April 1530. Desiderius Erasmus, *Opus Epistolarum*, 420, Nr 2349.

At the Diet of Augsburg rumours about the evangelical sympathies of the queen abound. The subject of the expectations and rumours about the queen is treated in detail below; however Spalatin's account of how Henckel described Queen Mary gives further evidence to her relationship with books. Mary is said not only to have had an excellent command of the Latin language but also keeping a copy of the Scripture in Latin with her at all times, even while hunting. She does not hesitate to argue with preachers, who do not sufficiently base their sermons on biblical grounds. Once she even refused to listen to a sermon of Medardus, the chaplain of her brother Ferdinand, because the cleric had criticised Erasmus' philological method in the interpretation of a word from the Magnificat.⁷⁸⁶

The wonderful picture of Mary publicly challenging of the theological teachings which were not based on the Scripture, or were critical of the philological humanistic treatment of texts as described by Henckel may be disqualified by the cautious historian on account of the double transmission (Spalatin recording the words of Henckel about the queen), its propagandistic-anecdotal quality and the general style recalling popular *topoi*. Nevertheless if we contrast the account with another book conflict mentioned above – between Mary and Ferdinand – this second instance reflects the same characteristically modern, practical use of books and on closer investigation provides just as attractive a picture of Mary's intellectual capacities and methods as the first. Furthermore it is recorded in a first-hand account by Mary in a private letter which can therefore be treated as trustworthy source. When the wandering clerics preaching Anabaptist ideas showed up in the vicinity of Znaim in 1528 Mary's threefold actions were to send the man away, to appoint a preacher to publicly refute the heretic ideas, and to consult a book by Luther on the subject of Anabaptism. Her actions show that beside finding a quick solution to stop the spread of the ideas considered as disruptive, she simultaneously wanted to understand these ideas and for this reason consulted the most recent literature available on the topic, which happened to be a book by Luther. She did this despite the general ban on Luther's books and the personal promise she made to her brother a year earlier to avoid any further reading of the Reformer's works. It is also worthwhile noting that the tractate was readily available to Mary, probably in more copies, since she sent one to her

⁷⁸⁶ Cited in "Georg Spalatin's Erzählung, was sich auf dem Reichstag zu Augsburg anno 1530 zugetragen hat", in: Dr Martin Luther's Sämtliche Schriften. Edited by Johann Georg Walch Vol. 21, Halle im Magdeburgischen 1749 [New edition: St. Louis, Mo., 1892-1910] 3267-3282. Katherine Walsh et al., "Eine Erasmianerin im Hause Habsburg": 77., Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", Bart Jan Spruyt, "'En bruit d'estre bonne luteriene': Mary of Hungary (1505-58) and Religious Reform" *English Historical Review* 109 (1994): 288.

brother. If we accept Csepregi's identification of the tractate as the *Von der Wiedertaufe an zwei Pfarrherrn* the composition of which is dated to either late 1527 or early 1528, this shows a fast reception of Luther's works in the surroundings of the queen.

There can be no doubt about the bookishness of the queen. The emphasis of her reading habits and the importance of books in her surroundings must have factual basis, even if – as Walsh and Strnad caution – when Erasmus praises Mary's love of manuscripts and Latin book culture, he gives expression to his beloved *topos* of the reversed world, where monks are uneducated and women are bookish scholars.⁷⁸⁷ Neither can all the accounts of Henckel be accepted at face value, because of their propagandistic quality. Nevertheless, books were an obvious source of teaching and consolation, which Mary made use of to satisfy her curiosity about the new ideas of Humanism and Reformation. Beside the oral transmission of information by preachers, clerics and other members in the court, also books were available to her, in German and Latin – including the Bible, theological works and Erasmus' writings – and were intensively used by her in private contemplation, even perhaps in public discussions and debate.

Commissioning and authorship

Artistic or intellectual commission and production can also reflect religious interest or beliefs. Relatively few sources of this kind have survived regarding Mary of Hungary in the investigated period of time nevertheless the surviving examples provide some of the most convincing evidence to Mary's religious affinities.

As it has been mentioned above, Queen Mary commissioned her *magister capellae* Thomas Stolzer to set four of Luther's Psalm translations to music, hereby facilitating the composition of the first non-Latin polyphonic hymns in musical history.⁷⁸⁸ More importantly for our subject, she commissioned work which made use of a book which was forbidden by royal decree in Hungary at the time. In fact Mary had been personally present at the public burning of Luther's New Testament in Olomouc two years previously and must have heard of the other book burnings going on in different regions of the kingdom. It is possible that in these

⁷⁸⁷ Katherine Walsh et al., "Eine Erasmianerin im Hause Habsburg": 70.

⁷⁸⁸ See the section on Thomas Stolzer above.

years her interest in the Reformation ideas had ripened into a conviction. It is also conceivable that given the public role of the queen she was expected to play in the given context in Olomouc there was no possibility to intervene into the course of action.⁷⁸⁹ It is difficult to interpret this artistic commission in any other way than a deep commitment to the new teaching. This is also how Luther interpreted Mary's attitude – perhaps also on account of the music commission – when he talks about the queen's sympathy for the “evangelical” faith in his dedication of 1527.⁷⁹⁰

Turning to the queen's correspondence, only scanty references to questions of faith can be found. Interestingly, the most explicit mentioning of the Lutherans occurs with a negative connotation. In September 1524 Mary her written instructions for her delegates to the Archbishop of Mainz, the elector Albrecht of Brandenburg (1490-1545)⁷⁹¹ includes a reference to exhorting the Archbishop to fight “wider die luterischen secten”.⁷⁹² The context of the letter however is significant for the interpretation. Albert involved Mary in a scheme which aimed at the – politically completely realistic – goal of campaigning for the election of her husband, Louis II as King of the Romans instead of her brother Ferdinand. The instructions written by Mary form part of a secret mission in which she tried to rally support for this cause.⁷⁹³ Another private letter, written in 1523 to another Albert of Brandenburg, the Grand Master reveals a different side of the queen's affinities.

Honourable Prince, dear vicious cousin, greetings to you. My dear vicious cousin, I think you must have completely forgotten your pious sister and that must be why you have not written for such a long time. I have not forgotten to include you in my fervent prayers: I have prayed to God to make you as pious as I am. I beg you to write to me whether my prayers have been efficacious. If they have not, you can buy some piety from me for a penny or two, I will sell it to you willingly, since I have too much of it

⁷⁸⁹ It is worth noting that the queen did intervene at least in one case when in the tumultuous summer of 1525 a preacher accused of heresy was tortured condemned to death and named several people including that of Imre Szerencsés and the count of the queen's mining chamber as Lutherans. The charge was finally dropped because the queen had interceded in his favour. 9 and 30 08 1525 Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum*.

⁷⁹⁰ Shortly after their composition the manuscripts of the music notes show up in Wittenberg, probably transported by Cordatus. Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", 55.

⁷⁹¹ This is not the Albert of Brandenburg, grand master of the Teutonic Order with whom Mary had a close friendship, but his cousin who had obtained permission from Pope Leo X to conduct the sale of indulgences in his diocese, which prompted Luther's 95 Theses.

⁷⁹² Zoltán Csepregi, "Königin Maria und das Haus Brandenburg".

⁷⁹³ Zoltán Csepregi, "Königin Maria und das Haus Brandenburg", 67-68.

myself. I should like to write you more, but I must rush off to have lunch in your brother George's garden and the messenger will not wait any longer.

Written in Buda in haste, on Sunday after Corpus Christi in the 1523rd year of the Lord.

Your pious sister, Mary, by her own hand.⁷⁹⁴

The letter has been known to Hungarian scholarship since Vilmos Fraknói published it in 1886 and has generated a number of puzzled, often dismissive reactions because of its frivolous, if not sacrilegious tone. It is indeed the first known instance when Mary's ironic sense of humour is expressed in writing.⁷⁹⁵ In a recent analysis Zoltán Csepregi has given the text a new interpretation in which he analyses the use of the terms "*fromm*" and "*Frömmigkeit*" as key words in the early Reformation movement. According to his interpretation Mary uses these important terms, central to the new theology intentionally, by use of irony she also shows her knowledge of the "Lutheran jargon" with the "pride of those initiated" in her letter to Albert.⁷⁹⁶

The authorship of three songs from the sixteenth century is attributed to Mary of Hungary according to contemporary tradition. Two of these are worldly (*Ach Gott was soll ich singen* and *Mag ich dem glück nit danken vil*)⁷⁹⁷ and one religious *Mag ich unglück nit widerstan*.⁷⁹⁸ The latter is the most well known as the lyrics have a decidedly Reformation character and have been used in the pro and contra argumentation involving the religious affinities of the

⁷⁹⁴ „Hochgeborner furst fruntlicher poßer vetter, mein grus zu vor.

Lieber pößer vetter, ich gelaub, ir habt die frume muem gar vergessen, das ir nun so lang nichts geschriben habt. Ich hab euch in mein andechtig gebet nit fergesen. Ich hab Gott alle tag fleisiglich gepeten, das er euch wel frum machen, als ich pin. Ich pit euch, ir welt mir schreiben, ob mein gepet geholfen hat oder nit. Wo es nit geholfen hat, welt ir mir um ein pfenich oder zwen frumkait ab kaffen, wil ich euchs gern fer kaffen, wen ich hab fil zu fil frumkayt. Ich wolt euch gern mer schreiben, so mus ich in euers bruder marchgraff Jorg garten gen essen, so wil der pot nit lenger warten. Datum Offen, eilens am sonntag nach unsers hern fronleichems tag anno domini etc. im XXIIIten.

Euer frume muem/Maria manu propria

[Address:] Dem erwirdigisten hochgebornem furstn unnserm lieben vettern hern Albrechtn deutsch ordens hochmaistern marggrafen zu Brandenburg und burggraff zu Nurnberg unnd fursten zu Rugn in seiner lieb hande und sunst nymants oftzubrechn“ The letter can be found in several editions and articles on the subject e.g. Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*, 85-86., Ute Monika Schwob, "Der Ofener Humanistenkreis der Königin Maria von Ungarn" *Südostdeutsches Archiv* 17/18 (1974/1975): 63.

⁷⁹⁵ For several more examples from Mary's correspondence with her brothers see Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria von Hongarije.*, and Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, "Maria von Ungarn als Korrespondentin" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007).

⁷⁹⁶ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", 52.

⁷⁹⁷ Johannes Bolte, "Königin Maria von Ungarn und die ihr zugeeigneten Lieder" *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* (1891).

⁷⁹⁸ Because the songs have been published in publications, which are difficult to access I have included these in the Appendix II.

queen.⁷⁹⁹ Despite the traditional attribution in the earlier (mainly German) scholarship Mary's authorship is generally not accepted, mainly on basis of her supposed lack of German language knowledge necessary for the composition of hymns, as well as her catholic orthodoxy in the years spent as regent of the Netherlands. While in this literature the author of the song is given as unknown or identified with Martin Luther⁸⁰⁰, firm support to Mary's authorship has been given by the evidence from a letter discovered by a researcher of the Ansbach-Brandenburg family, Theodor Kolde in 1896. The letter was written by Georg of Brandenburg to the Magistrate of Ansbach on January 15, 1529. In it he writes that he is sending a "song composed by Queen Mary, sister of the king, which she had written against her brother, who had sent away her preacher". Recent research consequently either assumed Mary's authorship without dealing with the question in detail,⁸⁰¹ or does not take a stand as to the authorship (probably ignorant about Kolde's find).⁸⁰² Recently Csepregi has given the question a thorough analysis and puts the letter by George in the context of the relationship between the queen and the Brandenburg family. He suggests that the preacher referred to in the letter can probably be identified with Conrad Cordatus.⁸⁰³ Following the identification of the first version of the hymn as having been written by Albrecht of Brandenburg⁸⁰⁴, he also gives convincing support to the authorship of Mary, who had rewritten the existing hymn to suit her circumstances.⁸⁰⁵ It should be noted that in his letter George sends the letter home with instructions to his own chaplain, Hans Rurer with instruction to compose the other two voices to accompany the song ("das er vnns dy andern zwo stym darczu seczen lasse"), meaning that the song also had a melody and was not merely a contrafact.⁸⁰⁶

⁷⁹⁹Subject of debated authorship in scholarly literature and alternatively argued to be written by Martin Luther the powerful hymn was included in the Hungarian Lutheran Hymn Book until 1982 Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", note 52.

⁸⁰⁰ Christiaan Sepp, "De bibliotheek eener koningin [The library of a queen]" *Bibliographische Mededeelingen* (1885): 110..

⁸⁰¹ Katherine Walsh et al., "Eine Erasmianerin im Hause Habsburg": 75.

⁸⁰² Bart Jan Spruyt, "Mary of Hungary and Religious Reform".

⁸⁰³Letter of George of Brandenburg to the Statthalter and Magistrate of Ansbach. Frankfurt an der Oder, 15 January 1529. "Wir schicken euch auch hierinnen verschlossen ein lied, da des konigs Swester Konigin Maria wider iren bruder gemacht, do er ir einen Cristlichen prediger verjagt hat, und dieweyl im land zu Mehren, das Euangelion lauter gepredigt, wurdet sich di Konigin yczt doselbsthien uf etliche ire eigene guter thun" Quoted in Theodor Kolde, Theodor Kolde, "Markgraf Georg von Brandenburg und das Glaubenslied der Königin Maria von Ungarn" in *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kirchengeschichte 2/1*, ed. Theodor Kolde (Erlangen, 1895), 82-89. See also Spitta, Friedrich Spitta, "Die ungarischen Königslieder. Ein Blatt aus der hymnologischen Geschichte der reformationszeit" *Monatsschrift für Gottesdienst und Kirchliche Kunst* 14 (1909).

⁸⁰⁴ Friedrich Spitta, "Die ungarischen Königslieder": 340.

⁸⁰⁵ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", 58.

⁸⁰⁶ Theodor Kolde, "Markgraf Georg von Brandenburg", 88.

Though no other songs are known to have been composed by the queen in later stages of life, she certainly had the musical background and interest to wish to express herself through a hymn.⁸⁰⁷ On the other hand her creativity with the German language is also sufficiently demonstrated, not only by the amount of autograph private letters written in the years between 1521 and the date of the composition (1529), but also by her ability to make creative use of different language registers, for instance the demonstration of sarcastic humour in her letter to Albrecht of Brandenburg.

Problems of Mary's future as well as her struggle with questions of faith seem to have reached a decisive point at the Diet of Augsburg (1530), where she arrived on August 30 with her court priest Johannes Henckel and secretary Nicolaus Olah in her entourage. Rumours about the queen's religious sympathies abounded in both the pro- and anti-Lutheran parties.⁸⁰⁸ These however provide only a partially credible context to her state of mind about which we have an uncommonly distinct source. This is the list of five questions she sent to Luther, who was not present at the Diet due to the imperial ban, but assisted the events from the fortified Veste Coburg.⁸⁰⁹ The questions were transmitted to Luther through Henckel and Melanchton and concerned the taking of the Eucharist in both kinds. All five questions address the problem of communion in public and private worship: Is it possible to receive only the bread and not the wine at public communion, similarly is it allowed to receive both bread and wine in private and not acknowledge this publicly?⁸¹⁰ Luther, probably greatly disappointed at

⁸⁰⁷ On Mary's musical interest see above and the articles of Gloss Thomson and Boer. Glenda Goss Thompson, "Mary of Hungary and Music Patronage" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 15 (1984)., Glenda Goss Thompson, "Music in the Court records of Mary of Hungary" *Tijdschrift van der Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 34 (1984)., Johannes Boer, "Muziek aan het hof van Maria van Hongarije" in *Maria van Hongarije. Konigin tussen keizers en kunstenaars*, ed. Bob van Boogert and Jacqueline Kerkhoff (Zwolle, 1993).

⁸⁰⁸ See below.

⁸⁰⁹ See Keller for a discussion of the circumstances and the questions. Rudolf Keller, "Maria von Ungarn und Martin Luther: Luthers Verbindung zur Königin" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007), 275-278.

⁸¹⁰ "Questiones D. Reginae Mariae anno 1530. Augustae.

Primo. An sufficiat accipere eucharistiam sub panis specie tantum, neque sit necesse ex calice bibere, eo quod usus calicis in multis locis sit interdictus? Secundo. An cupiens integrum sacramentum excusari possit, quod calicis usus negatur ei, ut pane tantum utatur, aut quaerere debeat locum, ubi nihil ei denegetur? Tertio. An secreto in cubiculo accipi possit integra eucharistia, neque opus sit publicae confessionis? Quarto. An excusari possit coram Deo, quisquis magistratus obedientiam revertus pane tantum utatur, siquidem aliqui magistratus exilio puniunt inobedientiam? Quinto. An satis sit non admodum desideranti integrum sacramentum, pro veteri atque adeo pro communi more, pane tantum uti?" Included in a letter sent from Melanchton to Luther, Augsburg, 28 July 1530. Martin Luther, *Werke*, Vol.5. p.511, Nr. 1664.

Mary's hesitation to take a public stand for the Reformation strongly rejects her covert proposal to adhere to Reformation teaching only in private life.⁸¹¹

The Brandenburg influence

Regarding the outside influence on the religious interests of the queen the influence of George of Brandenburg has long been a suspected source,⁸¹² mainly since this idea was also voiced by the contemporary chroniclers of the age.⁸¹³ The question received new scholarly attention in the publications of Zoltán Csepregi in the recent years who – as part of a monograph on the margrave George of Brandenburg – investigated his role in the early Reformation movement of the region, and hereby also the relationship between the royal couple and the Brandenburg family.⁸¹⁴ Though neither George, nor Albert belonged to the household of the queen, they both exerted an immense influence on both Louis and Mary. George was present at the court and in the retinue of the king and queen for the largest part of the period before Mohács, while Albert visited Buda frequently and maintained a frequent correspondence with the queen and George. Their third brother, Wilhelm was also present in the circles of the queen at least from 1523 onwards and employed in the queen's court as Hofmeister from 1525.

Both George and Albert were in correspondence with Luther, as early as 1523 and Albert publicly stood up for the reformers at the Diet of Nuremberg and met the reformer personally in Wittenberg on November 29, 1523.⁸¹⁵ It is hard to overestimate the influence the brothers had on the royal couple in political matters, probably also in matters of faith. The relationship between them was intensive, George was a Hungarian subject and spent much time in Buda until he left the country in June 1525 and Albert maintained a correspondence of friendly, even intimate tone with both Louis and Mary. We have mentioned the fact that Albert was one of the sources for Lutheran books read by the queen and that Mary's letter to Albert can be regarded as an insider's indication on matters of faith. The notion expressed in much

⁸¹¹ Included in a letter sent from Luther to Melancton, Veste Coburg, 04 08 1530. Martin Luther, *Werke*, Vol.5, 257-259, Nr. 1667.

For a good summary and discussion of Luther's answer see Bart Jan Spruyt, "Mary of Hungary and Religious Reform": 289-290.

⁸¹² Argued by Ortway, Fraknói, Payr and others. Recently expressed by Kohler. Alfred Kohler, *Ferdinand I.*, 63-64.

⁸¹³ Eg. Burgio.

⁸¹⁴ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", Zoltán Csepregi, "Königin Maria und das Haus Brandenburg". and other articles.

⁸¹⁵ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", 52.

secondary literature about the Brandenburg brothers being the transmitters of reform minded court priests into the court of Queen Mary does not stand up to critical investigation. Still the existing evidence suggests that the Albert and George were both important sources of inspiration and information for Mary's intellectual hunger in matters of faith. As on many topics in Reformation history it is difficult, if not impossible, to separate faith from politics. Winning the royal couple for the cause of the Reformation certainly had advantages for the Brandenburg political machinations and it is difficult to distinguish the elements of power play from matters of faith in the relationship from the Brandenburg point of view, since the scanty evidence can, more often than not, be evaluated to support both motivations. I agree fully with Csepregi's emphasis on the relationship as a possibility for Mary to escape from the overpowering patriarchal tutelage of her brothers.⁸¹⁶ Nevertheless if one looks at it from Mary's point of view the Brandenburg brothers also seem to have provided the context in which intellectual matters of faith and fashion were discussed, as in the episode related in the letter of Piso. They were also an important source of readings and new ideas, as in her receiving of Lutheran books from Albert. In many cases they also provided an intellectual and artistic context for self-expression through creative use of language and music, as in the case of Mary's ironic letter to Albert and the hymn composed by her on basis of his original.

Religion and identity

The evaluation of the appearance of early Reformation in the Hungarian kingdom is made more difficult because of the strongly marked role it very soon received in the definition of identity. The examples given above of the appearance of Reformation books and preaching in Sopron, Hermannstadt and Kronstadt, and Buda clearly indicate how Reformation ideas first were received in Hungary among the German-speaking communities.⁸¹⁷ Since the question of language, ethnic background and identity in the court is discussed in detail below here I will only analyse how the question of religion influences the general picture.

In the early 1520s the traditional expressions of xenophobia, most typically negative sentiments about the "Germans" which had been increasingly present in the common talk,

⁸¹⁶ Zoltán Csepregi, "Court Priests", 60.

⁸¹⁷ See also Csepregi. Zoltán Csepregi, "A reformáció mint nyelvi esemény a Mohács előtti Magyarországon" in *Mindennapi választások: Tanulmányok Péter Katalin 70. születésnapjára [Festschrift for Katalin Péter on her 70th birthday]*, ed. Gabriella Erdélyi and Péter Tusor (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2007).

especially in the culture of the middle and lower nobility since the reign of Sigismund in the Hungarian kingdom was coloured by the new parameter of religious identity.⁸¹⁸ The most direct expression was given to this sentiment by the papal ambassadors who observed and commented on the situation from the position of involved outsiders. In their report both Burgio and Campeggio reassure the secretary of the Pope that though they are concerned about the appearance of Reformation ideas there is no need to be worried about the spread of the Reformation because “Hungary and Germany are natural enemies of each other, if one supports a cause, the other will never desire this”⁸¹⁹ and the “Hungarians, because of their hate of the Germans will never discard something that these condemn.”⁸²⁰ In fact Burgio was more concerned that the Hungarians, driven by their hate of Germans, will use the pretence of religious dissent as an excuse for riots against them.⁸²¹

In the latter passage the keen observer and analyst of the local circumstances gives a very precise diagnosis of the phenomenon. From the point of view of the Hungarian nobility, the label “Lutheranism” at this stage was little more than negative quality attributed to the traditionally mistrusted “Germans”⁸²², all the more useful since it could give a politically, legally and religiously valid new reason to hate this ethnic group and provide an excuse for the demonstration of aggressive hostility. Burgio expresses this idea most clearly when he says that the queen favours the Lutherans at the court not because they are Lutherans, but because they are in her service and they are Germans.⁸²³ Later he became much more critical of the queen and repeatedly accuses her of favouring the Reformation ideas. Many more examples can be given of the strong demarcation of the borders between orthodox Catholicism, as a self designated characteristic of the Hungarians, and Lutheranism, as a quality belonging to the opposing “German” side. The identification could take the form of the defence of the “true faith” demonstrated by the vehement reaction of a group of the

⁸¹⁸ Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 211-212.

⁸¹⁹ Report of Cardinal Campeggio to Jacob Sadolet. Buda, 1525 February 8. Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum*, 139-140.

⁸²⁰ Report of Burgio to Jacob Sadolet. Buda, 1525 February 6. Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum*, 133.

⁸²¹ “Ungari sono inimicissimi di Tudeschi, et mi dubito che un giorni non seguit alcun gran scandalo cum dire, che non volino Lutherani.” Report of Burgio to Nicholas Schönberg. Vienna, 1524 August 17. Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum*, 17. Vince Bunyitay et al., eds., *Monumenta ecclesiastica*, 142, 143.

⁸²² For the discussion of ethnic labels see chapter 5.4 below.

⁸²³ “La veritá di la cosa é che li Re sono Christianissimi, la Regina favorisce Tudeschi non como Lutherani, ma como suoi servitor, et perché sono di sua natione” Burgion Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum*, 24.

middle nobility to the news of a preacher who gave a sermon in German against the Pope and the cardinals in the spring of 1524. They appeared in a large group before the royal couple and claimed that they “would cut to pieces those who dared speak against the catholic faith and the Apostolic See, even in the presence of the royal majesties”.⁸²⁴ The same threatening, paternalistic message is discernable in an episode half a year later when the nobility appeared in Buda before the royal couple with a number of requests. When the king said that he would tell them his decision on the next day, which happened to be the feast of Candlemas (2 February) the representative of the nobles answered that they would rather wait a day longer since “they are not Lutherans, thank God, and wish to celebrate the feast of the Blessed Virgin, patron of the country in a devout manner” referring thus to the queen and her Germans – explains Burgio.⁸²⁵ The same sentiment is expressed again by the Hungarian nobility when they say “these Germans are all Lutherans, we do not want to mingle with such people, we want to stay true to God and the apostolic See.”⁸²⁶ But religious labelling is not only used for evidently ethnic groups but can be used for expressing political statements, as is demonstrated by the queen herself. Lutheranism is used as a marker of group identity, for instance in the – slightly frivolous case – when Mary upon hearing that the Pope is negotiating with the enemies of the emperor is reported to have said that in this case she and her people will join Luther.⁸²⁷

At the very beginnings of confessionalisation in the Hungarian Kingdom and especially in the Royal Court the question of religious identity was laden with political and ethnic/linguistic content and is in all practicality inseparable from these issues. In the early years, including the period 1521-1526, the ideas of Reformation essentially spread in the German language both in written (books) and spoken (preaching) form and thus first reached the German-speaking communities. In the multilingual household of the queen the native tongue of many members, but also the lingua franca was German. Furthermore it included many members – especially in

⁸²⁴ “Fra li altri era uno predicatore, lo quale havendo io inteso che dicia alcune cose Avanti le loro Maestá in lingua tedesca, che erano contro lo Papa et Cardinali, ni fece querela a le Maestati Sue. “ Report of Burgio to Nicholas Schönberg. Vienna, 1524 August 17. Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum*, 23-24.

⁸²⁵ “I nobili replicaro che haverian aspettato insino a la venerdi piú presto, perché lo giorno di nostra Donna volevano honorare devotamente como protettrice del Regno, ché per grazia de Dio anchora non erano diventati Lutherani, mordendo la Regina et suoi Todeschi.” Report of Burgio to Jacob Sadolet. Buda, 06 02 1525. Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum*, 133.

⁸²⁶ Vilmos Fraknói, *Magyarország a mohácsi vész előtt: a pápai követek jelentései alapján* (Pest: Szent-István Társulat, 1884), 102.

⁸²⁷ 1525 02 06 “Tutte el contrario la fatto la Regina con li suoi Tudeschi, cum dire: se nostro Signore e contra Cesare, che vogliono farsi Lutherani” see also Fraknói Vilmos Fraknói, *Magyarország a mohácsi vész előtt*, 121.

the chapel, responsible for the spiritual guidance of the queen and her *familia* – who were supporters of the new ideas. These were associated with the queen's court by those who denounced this from outside, but probably also by those who embraced these ideas as a form of group identity from inside. The greatest appeal of these teachings for Mary in these years was probably this identity forming quality, their association with people she respected like the Brandenburg brothers, Henckel and Erasmus, and their intellectual novelty. It is important that during the whole period all of Mary's court priests – without exception – were of German linguistic and ethnic background. The years after Mohács seem to be characterised by a deeper religious search into the questions of faith culminating in the question to Martin Luther, which primarily addressed the theme of public and private piety.⁸²⁸

5.3 Language and ethnicity

The Hungarian Kingdom had a long tradition of linguistic plurality due to the presence of different ethnic groups in the area speaking a number of different languages.⁸²⁹ Questions on how these groups interacted linguistically, the presence of bilingual and multilingual groups, diglossia and the role of Latin and the hierarchies of the used languages in an urban setting have been recently given thorough analysis by Katalin Szende.⁸³⁰ In the following paragraphs the presence and use of languages in the royal and reginal court will be given attention, a topic which has received little attention in the scholarship of court studies. The question of languages used at the court by the different groups and individuals, for different occasions and in different media is very difficult to study because one tries to collect information on language, which was predominantly used in oral communication through the investigation of written sources. My goal is to give an overall analysis of languages in the court, nevertheless it is necessary to treat the question because beside the town the court was typically a forum of

⁸²⁸ For a discussion of public and private roles a religion in Mary of Hungary's early years see Hein. Markus Hein, "Maria von Ungarn, der ungarische Hof und die Reformation in Ungarn" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007).

⁸²⁹ Some of the literature treating the question: András Kubinyi, "Zur Frage der Toleranz im mittelalterlichen Königreich Ungarn" in *Toleranz im Mittelalter (Vorträge und Forschungen 45)*, ed. Alexander Patschovsky and Harald Zimmermann (Sigmaringen, 1998).; J. M. Bak, "Linguistic Pluralism in Medieval Hungary" in *The Culture of Christendom: Essays in Medieval History in Commemoration of Denis L.T. Bethell.*, ed. Marc Anthony Meyer (London: The Hambledon Press, 1993).; Erik Fügedi, "Das mittelalterliche Ungarn als Gastland" in *Die deutsche Ostsiedlung als Problem der Europäischen Geschichte*, ed. W. Schlesinger (Sigmaringen, 1974).

⁸³⁰ Katalin Szende, "Integration through language: the multi-lingual character of late medieval Hungarian towns" in *Segregation – Integration – Assimilation. Religious and Ethnic Groups in the Medieval Towns of Central and Eastern Europe*, ed. Derek Keene et al. (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009).

linguistic interaction. Even more significantly sources indicate that for contemporaries linguistic/ethnic diversity at the royal court was an issue and often encountered as a problem.

It is a commonplace that despite the tradition of a multi-ethnic and linguistically pluralist society in the Hungarian Kingdom, the late medieval period was characterised by a growth of a frequently expressed ideology of ethnic intolerance. Hungary was by no means exceptional since this seems to be a general phenomenon of the age with the same signs discernable in Bohemia as well as the Holy Roman Empire.⁸³¹ In the Hungarian Kingdom the Austrian wars and the claim of the Habsburg dynasty to the throne channelled the traditional mistrust of foreigners and xenophobia of the nobility into an intense hatred of the “Germans”. Language and nationality, therefore, became an issue pertaining to the person of the king. It is interesting to see how one of the most important documents expressing this ideology, a strongly propagandistic charter summarising the demands of the nobility at the Diet of 1505 also refers to language as the mark of “national” unity.⁸³² One of the central points of the ideology – the wording and dissemination of which is mainly due to the talented rhetorician of the nobility, István Werbőczy – is the question of the contrast between the splendour of the past of the ‘Scythian nation’ and the miseries of the present state of affair.⁸³³ The responsibility for the present situation was laid on the government of Hungary which was foreign, “under foreign domination and not of its own language”.⁸³⁴ The resolution was read out on the Diet in Latin and Hungarian languages, met fervent approval of the armed nobility, and was copied out for the counties.⁸³⁵ Though the resolution attributed the present miseries of the nation to the fact that foreign kings “did not make the morals and customs of the

⁸³¹ Václav Bůžek, "Strangers in their own country. King Louis II (Jagiello) and Mary of Hungary's stay in Bohemia at the turn of 1522-1523" in *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and her Court 1521-1531*, ed. Orsolya Réthelyi et al. (Budapest: BTM, 2005)., András Kubinyi, "Az 1505. évi rákosi országgyűlés és a szittya ideológia [The Diet of Rákos in 1505 and the "scythian" ideology]" *Századok* 140 (2006).

⁸³² The most recent analysis of the Resolutions of Rákos see Kubinyi. András Kubinyi, "A rákosi országgyűlés".

⁸³³ It is not possible to treat the ideology and the role of István Werbőczy here in detail, but the topic has received some treatment in literature also available for non-Hungarian speakers. See especially the works of János Bak and Pál Engel. János M. Bak, *Königtum und Stände*, 158., Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen*, 349-352, 361. See also Martyn Rady, "Stephen Werbőczy". The text is edited in István Katona *Historia regum stirpis mixtae*. Pestini, Budae 1788-93, vol. 11, pp. 425-36.

⁸³⁴ Martyn Rady, "Rethinking Jagiełło Hungary": 15.

⁸³⁵ It is important to emphasise that the text of the Resolutions was not the same as the decreta brought before the Diet. Kubinyi has shown in his recent article that though confusion between the two exists in older and even recent secondary literature, it is important to differentiate between the two. The decreta of the Diet did not survive, but we know of their existence as well as of the content a few of the decreta, which were approved by the king including the decree that if the king should die without an heir only a Hungarian should be chosen as his successor. András Kubinyi, "A rákosi országgyűlés": 365.

Hungarians their own and lived lives of inactivity and indolence, rather than activity on the battlefield” the issue of language was also present in the complaints. There are several indications that the knowledge of the language had been an important argument in political considerations regarding the rulers of Hungary.⁸³⁶ After the battle of Mohács the Venetian ambassador, analyzing the possibilities of the election of Ferdinand emphasizes that he has a major disadvantage in not speaking the Hungarian language.⁸³⁷ It is no coincidence that in Ferdinand’s letter to the people of Hungary in which he claims his right to the throne he also promises the protection of the laws and language of the kingdom.⁸³⁸

Queen consorts usually came from abroad and it was accepted that their native language was different, but were also expected to learn the language as soon as possible. This is most clearly expressed in the tractate of Diomede Carafa analysed in detail above. Carafa advises Beatrice on this issue in his usual practical manner:

“You can be certain that you will have grave difficulties in communication with your husband as well as with the people – especially the women – until you learn their language. So have somebody, who knows the language ride beside you every day of the travel to learn the basics. Once you have arrived you will learn the language with ease from the women in your household.”⁸³⁹

Beatrice did learn the language,⁸⁴⁰ as probably most queens did as well, though this is difficult to prove in the absence of written documents. But the same was expected of other office holders in the kingdom. The same sentiment is expressed in a letter written by Queen Beatrice

⁸³⁶ For just a handful of examples: Sigismund was brought to Hungary as a boy to be raised in the kingdom and learn the customs and languages of his future subjects. In 1469 Jiří Poděbrad contacted the group of the Hungarian aristocracy, who were unsatisfied with the rule of their king Matthias Corvinus and wanted to incite them to rebel, offering his own son, Prince Henry as a candidate to the throne. He emphasised that the prince has learnt the Hungarian language and therefore can count on the nations support. Vilmos Fraknói, *Hunyadi Mátyás király*, note 342. In the election of the pretendent to the throne the Polish king Władysław III Warneńczyk in 1440 it was also emphasized that Władysław spoke fluent Hungarian. Vilmos Fraknói, *A Hunyadiak és a Jagellók kora*.

⁸³⁷ “La prima è la diversità della nation, et della Lingua, perche pare cosa Strana à quelli Popoli non intender il Suo Re, ne esser intesi da Lui.” Relazione mss. Michele Soriano Ambrasciadore per la Republica di Venezia presso Ferdinando d’Austria Re dei Romani. 1554. Albert Nyáry, “A turini királyi államlevéltár magyar történeti szempontból” *Századok* 3 (1869): 297.

⁸³⁸ Acta Tomiciani IX, 223-24. Quoted in Ortway. Tivadar Ortway, *Mária, II. Lajos király neje*, 313.

⁸³⁹ “*De lingua pannonica edocenda*. Nec dubitare debes magnaē tibi futurum molestiae, quoad illius gentis linguam perdidiceris, tum consuetudine viri, tum commertio gentis, praesertim mulierum, quae te visent. Igitur in itinere quotidie aliquem te adequitare iubeto illius linguae primum, a quo aliquod docearis, nam postquam in regnum perveneris, ex iis ancillis, quae in tua familiaritate erunt, quam facillime discere poteris.” Diomede Carafa, *De institutione vivendi*, 41.

⁸⁴⁰ Vilmos Fraknói, *Hunyadi Mátyás király*, Book II, chapter IV.

to her sister about Beatrice's nephew Hyppolite d'Este travelling to Hungary to take the seat of Archbishop of Esztergom at the age of seven. Transmitting the wishes of the king she instructs her sister to send only a small number of Italian retinue to accompany her son, he should be surrounded by Hungarians instead, to be able to learn the language, customs and lifestyle of the Hungarians.⁸⁴¹

The increased use of the vernacular in official diplomatic relations is also an important feature of the age. In the selection of diplomats sent to the Hungarian court the knowledge of the Hungarian language was desirable.⁸⁴² That the Czech lords delivered their speeches in their own vernacular at the Hungarian court in the Jagiellon period was not surprising since the royal court at Buda counted as the royal court for Bohemia as well. More significant is the use of Polish by the official delegate of the King of Poland, the Chancellor Szydłowiecki on the diplomatic summit in 1523.⁸⁴³ There is also record of István Werbőczy – an excellent Latinist and experienced diplomat – delivering a speech in Venice in Hungarian and having it translated to Latin. The use of the vernacular in an official diplomatic situation was symbolic and constituted a political statement. This is well documented in a similar situation after the death of Emperor Maximilian in 1519, when the Austrian estates instructed their delegates departing to Spain to his heir Charles V to deliver their speech in German language despite the well-known fact that Charles did not speak German. The delegates partially realised the instructions even though they were cautioned to renounce their plans.⁸⁴⁴ The use of the vernaculars could also have ceremonial significance. Cuspinianus records in his diary that during the diplomatic summit of 1515 in Pressburg and Vienna, the Mass on 2 April marking the official beginning of the congress was ended in a request to the congregation in Latin, Hungarian, Czech and German to pray for the accord between the sovereigns.⁸⁴⁵ During the same occasion when the betrothal between the Emperor and Anne of Jagiello was celebrated

⁸⁴¹ „Imparare la lingva Ungara, pigliare li modi e costume del paesà.” Quoted by Vilmos Fraknói, *Hunyadi Mátyás király*, note 697.

⁸⁴² In the letter of Albrecht, margrave of Brandenburg to the Elector of Mainz from 12 06 1473 about his delegate Sebastian von Wallenrod. I do not agree with Fraknói that this proves that the status of Hungarian in the field of diplomacy was necessary beside Latin and German. Vilmos Fraknói, *Hunyadi Mátyás király*, 694.

⁸⁴³ Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*.

⁸⁴⁴ András Kubinyi, "A magyar állam belpolitikai helyzete", 81-82.

⁸⁴⁵ “Altera die, iterum conuenerunt in hoc templo tres reges, cum Cardinalibus ambobus: Strigioniensis celebrauit officium de Spiritu Sancto. Finito, admonita est plebs per suffraganeum Strigoniensem, vt deuotissime, pro concordia Caesaris et Regum, deo supplicarent: lingua Latina, Hungarica, Bohemica, et Alemannia: pronuntiatae sunt interim indulgentiaa plenariae.” From the diary of Cuspinianus, quoted by Ortway. Tivadar Ortway, *Mária, II. Lajos király neje*, 40.

it is recorded that Maximilian pledged himself to marry Anne in Latin, while Anne answered in Hungarian.⁸⁴⁶

The royal court

In linguistically and ethnically diverse kingdom the royal court was the focal point of this diversity. In trying to account for the different languages one has to begin with the specific historical fact that – as has been discussed above – the Jagiellon kings were sovereigns of two crowns, that of Hungary and Bohemia. In one of the two Letters of Majesty (Majestätsbrief) issued by Wladislas in 1510 in Czech language to the Bohemian estates he proclaims that in the case that his son Louis should die without a heir, the Bohemian throne should pass on to his daughter Anne, who will be the true heir of the throne, according to the rights and customs of the Kingdom of Bohemia.⁸⁴⁷

”For this reason – he continues – and because we see that our subjects in both kingdoms are moved by much love in our direction and are prepared to show submission in our direction in all questions we want to make it possible that these subjects should be able to approach my heirs, their future lords, about the needs of these crowns and kingdoms in a manner better and more adequate, to be able to speak with them in their own born languages. Therefore we have decided, and with this charter confirm that our heirs will be raised in a place which is suitable and to which both subjects of the Hungarian and the Bohemian crown have equally easy and free access; Furthermore we pledge to keep with them an equal number of subjects, concerning both men and women, from Bohemia and Hungary, so that they hereby freely learn both languages, Hungarian and Czech, so each crown may use their own language to negotiate and speak about their needs to the Royal Majesties.”⁸⁴⁸

Later evidence from the court of Louis II corroborates the promise in the letter of Majesty in the more or less even distribution of Bohemians and Hungarians. Anne had a household including both Hungarian and Bohemian subjects when she went to Austria in 1515.

⁸⁴⁶ “Nach Verlesung der entsprechenden Erklärung durch einen der Notare sprechen Maximilian in lateinischer (*ore proprio et latino sermone*), Anna in ungarischer (*ore proprio et lingua Hungarica*) und Kardinal Bakócz ebenfalls in lateinischer Sprache laut und verständlich (*alte voce*) ihr Placet.” Werner Ogris, “Doppelheirat ”: 329.

⁸⁴⁷ Both Letters of Majesty were issued on 11 01 1510 and they were considered the basis for the sucession of the Habsburg House to the throne of Bohemia. Franz Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, 195, note 151.

⁸⁴⁸ Since the charter is originally in Czech I have used the German translation provided by Palacký. Franz Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, 195.

Wladislas assigned the Czech education of his son to Dietrich von Tandorf.⁸⁴⁹ Wladislas was of Polish origin and a number of courtiers were from the kingdom of Poland. His brother Sigismund, later king of Poland had spent three years at the court of Wladislas in Buda between 1498 and 1501. According to Kubinyi's calculations the Polish element in the household of Louis II was approximately 10%. The wife of Wladislas, Anne de Foix was French, and brought with her some of her French personnel. Though Louis did not know her since she died a few weeks after his birth, Princess Anne was three years old at the time of her mother's death and there must have been some kind of French linguistic influence at the court, though no letters of either royal children attest to their written knowledge of French. The town of Buda was to a great extent made up of German speakers, not to mention the presence at the court and in the young king's immediate vicinity of the nephew of Wladislas, Georg of Brandenburg who brought with him a specific German linguistic and cultural influence. Several autograph letters of both Louis and Anne to the brother of Georg, Casimir of Brandenburg have survived written in German, attesting to the knowledge of the language in writing.⁸⁵⁰ Several autograph letters written in Latin also attest to the Latin knowledge of the young king.⁸⁵¹ Louis must have had a considerable command of the language of diplomacy, Italian as well, since the delegates of the Venetian Republic report this. According to the report of Lorenzo Orio, which there is no reason therefore to doubt in knowledge of the above details, King Louis was proficient in six languages: Hungarian, Czech, Polish, French, Italian and Latin.⁸⁵² That the knowledge of Hungarian was vital at the royal court is demonstrated by a letter written by reginal counsellor Schneidpöck about an unnamed relative of Gabriel Salamanca, who obtained a position as Carver in the household of Mary of Hungary. After the appointment Schneidpöck tells Salamanca to put pressure on his relative to learn Hungarian.⁸⁵³ Interpreters were employed for translating from less widely known languages.

⁸⁴⁹ Wladislas made efforts to put the financial responsibility of their education on the Bohemian estates (01 20 1514). Franz Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, 288-289.

⁸⁵⁰ The letters were written between 1519-1525 e.g. MOL DF 267662, DF 267658, DF 267659, etc.

⁸⁵¹ See for instance the autograph letter written by the then fourteen year old Louis to Casimir of Brandenburg. 13 07 1520, Buda. MOL DF 267661. Csepregi is preparing an edition of these.

⁸⁵² Vincenzo Guidoto, another diplomat mentions the knowledge of German instead of French.

⁸⁵³ Correspondence between Johann Schneidpöck and Gabriel Salamanca, 18 04 1524-29 04 1524. HHStA Grosse Correspondenz fasc. 25/b. Quoted by Kubinyi András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 16.

Languages in Mary's court

What can be said about languages in the court of Mary? We know that the royal children in the court of Margaret of Austria in Mechelen received education in “studia humanitatis”, theology, law, mathematics and music, but also in the Latin, French, Dutch, Spanish, German and Italian languages. In practice it is difficult to say about the depth of the education in the case of the youngest of the four children, Mary. The main language used in the court of Mechelen and by the children's aunt was French, which is also reflected in the later correspondence of Margaret with the children and the siblings with each other. Thus French can safely be regarded as the dominant language of Mary's early years, supported by the occurrence of autograph letters in French.⁸⁵⁴

The years spent in Vienna and Innsbruck were the next formative environment for language acquisition. The joint court of the princesses had a highly multilingual character. As we have seen above Anne had brought with her a household of both Hungarian and Bohemian subjects,⁸⁵⁵ though neither of these determine the ethnic group and spoken language, since the population of the towns in both countries was overwhelmingly ethnically and linguistically German.⁸⁵⁶ Mary also brought with her a household of mixed background. Her household from the Low Countries must have been predominantly French-speaking, as suggested by their names Poitiers, Bailleul, Carondolet, etc. though it is impossible to exclude a Dutch-speaking element. Her household and that of Anne was filled up with officials and servants from Austria. The leading officials, the Hofmeister and the Hofmeisterin were also German-speaking ethnic Austrians. One supposes then that three languages dominated in the joint court at Innsbruck, German, French and Hungarian, with some presence of Czech, Latin, Italian (the doctor was Italian) and perhaps even Dutch. This is attested to by a short but significant note on the ordinance of 1521 about the separation of the courts of Anne and Mary analyzed in detail above. At the end of the list of names who should accompany Mary to Buda there is the following instruction:

⁸⁵⁴ Letter of Mary to Ferdinand. 28 02 1519, Innsbruck. Wilhelm Bauer, ed., *Die Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol. I.*, 10.

⁸⁵⁵ E.g. in 1520 noble two sisters – Anna and Elisabeth – from Bohemia were recorded in the Frauenzimmer. Gernot Heiss, *Maria von Ungarn*, 427. Cuspinian reports that the Hungarian magnates had sent their children to Vienna to Anne's court. Wilhelm Stracke, *Die Anfänge der Königin Maria*, 11.

⁸⁵⁶ To give an examples: the Hungarian subject Christoph Ressman from Transylvania was a gentleman of tgh chamber of Anne in Innsbruck. He was probably an ethnic German since we know a letter from him written in German to Georg of Brandenburg asking for his patronage.

Item ain oder zwo Junckfrauen aus kunigin Anna frauen zimer zu kunigin Maria die ungrisch konnen und widerumb ain oder zwo aus kunigin Maria frauen zimer zu kunigin Anna die frentzosisch kunden abzuwechseln nach rat der rete und hofmaister⁸⁵⁷

This instruction suggests that the chief language spoken by the ladies around Anne was Hungarian, while around Mary French was a dominant language, or more specifically it suggests that Mary's Frauenzimmer did not include Hungarian personnel, since speakers of this language had to be supplemented from among Anne's ladies and *vice versa*.⁸⁵⁸ It also suggests a pragmatic attitude from those in charge of the princess courts, to ensure suppleness of communication with the prospective husbands and their surroundings. Mary could probably count on some knowledge of French from the part of Louis, while they certainly could communicate in German, which was also useful in communication of a significant part of Louis's household. On the other hand Anne could certainly count on problems in communication with Ferdinand, who – having been raised in Spain, by his maternal grandfather – spoke Spanish as a first language, and was surrounded by a largely French-speaking household from the Low Countries and probably used French in the early years after his arrival to Austria in 1521.⁸⁵⁹

Despite the uncertainties surrounding Mary's court ordinance for the travel of 1521, it is possible to make comparisons of the ethnic/linguistic background of the personnel. The household was multiethnic with at least 18 people from the Low Countries, at least 28 (but probably much more) people from the Austrian provinces, at least four people from the Hungarian kingdom, the doctor was supposedly Italian. It is important to note furthermore that two officers of the four people from the Hungarian kingdom were of German ethnicity from Transylvania (Hans Croner and Christoph Ressimann), one officer of German-speaking urban population of Buda (Sebastian Pemfflinger) and one Hungarian from the menial servant

⁸⁵⁷ „Stat baiden kunigin rays und überantwortung zu iren gemahl(e)n“, 3 May 1521, Worms. ÖStA, HKA, Nieder-Österreichische Herrschaftsakten, W-61/A-36, Fol.36r.

⁸⁵⁸ The court lists in Innsbruck include an officer of Anne (sometimes as member of the Silberkammer, sometimes as kammerer) called Peter Tulmatsch, whose name (*tolmács* (Hung.) = *Dolmetscher* (Germ.)) probably refers to his function as interpreter.

⁸⁵⁹ For a discussion of Ferdinand's lack of German see Wolfram. Herwig Wolfram, "Gegenstände des Briefwechsels zwischen Ferdinand I. und seinen Geschwistern Karl V. und Maria von Ungarn" in *Beiträge zur neueren Geschichte Österreichs*, ed. Heinrich Fichtenau and Erich Zöllner (Wien, 1974), 98.; Later diplomats' reports contrasted Ferdinand's competence in several languages (Spanish, German, latin, French, Italian, in some cases Hungarian and Flemish) favourably to the lack of spoken languages other than French and Castilian. Alfred Kohler, *Ferdinand I.*, 91-92.

body working in the kitchen (Valentin Hunger). None of the ladies in waiting or female servants was of Hungarian ethnic/linguistic background.⁸⁶⁰ In the household of Mary German and French must have been the two most frequently used languages.

Mary thus probably learnt German in the years spent in Vienna and Innsbruck, since a significant autograph correspondence in German exists from her after 1521, including the use of the language for a style of linguistic playfulness as is attested in her famous letter to Albrecht of Brandenburg quoted above. It can be supposed that she spoke German with Louis, at least in the beginning of their shared life. She also had a sufficient knowledge of Latin. Henckel writes in 1528 about Mary reading the Paraphrases in Latin and Spalatinus comments in 1530 that the sister of the emperor speaks good Latin. Did she speak Hungarian? Circumstantial evidence supports a positive answer, since – as we have seen – queens were expected to learn Hungarian. Furthermore, she was criticised by contemporaries for several reasons, but these did not include her unwillingness to learn and speak the language, which she could have had sufficient time to learn, given the Hungarian element of the shared princess' court in Innsbruck. Most significantly, it is difficult to imagine that she should have reached the level of success in her political endeavours without a sturdy knowledge of Hungarian. Not even this much can be said of whether Mary had any command of the Czech language. It cannot be excluded and as has been said before accounts in Czech of her Bohemian secretary Peter Raschin von Riesenburg have survived among her charters, but this provides no proof either pro or contra.

As it has been stated above, little is known about the newly acquired members of Mary's household in the years spent in Buda. Nevertheless the people we do know about seem to have been predominantly speakers of German or French. This is exclusively so in the case of her ladies court, where among the names of the ladies appearing in the sources after her arrival to Hungary we find one from the Low Countries (Johanna Lickerke), five from German ethnic/linguistic background (Elizabeth von Ungnad, Lucretia Caballis, Miss Puchheim, Miss Gesertorf, and Miss Bluemeck), and one from the German-speaking town population of Buda (Catharina Pemfflinger). There is no data on the appearance of daughters

⁸⁶⁰ This situation was probably amended before the actual departure by the suggested exchange of one or two ladies between the fruenzimmers of Mary and Anne.

of the Hungarian nobility in Mary's court.⁸⁶¹ Among the men of the household there are also a larger percentage of non Hungarian courtiers.⁸⁶² The idea that trusted people should be recruited from German-speaking areas is most strongly expressed in Mary's correspondence with the Brandenburg brothers, who seem to respond to her explicit wishes in sending her suitable people for her court from the Empire.⁸⁶³

This evidence is reflected in the reaction of the environment, for instance by the grievances of the Hungarian magnates directed to the Archduke Ferdinand on the Summit of 1523 when they complain about how his wife, "Anne is not allowed to have Hungarians, Bohemians and Poles in her household, while at the same time Queen Mary has in her household and kitchen Germans, Italians and Spanish as many as she pleases".⁸⁶⁴ While the contrast is surely exaggerated, it does signify a difference between the ethnic/linguistic composition of Mary's court. At the same diplomatic summit one of the secret talks treated the personal safety of the royal couple, which some feared might be in danger also because of certain threats. The negotiations took place in the queen's apartment and were attended by a select group of people including the royal couple, the ambassador of the emperor and the Polish king, George of Brandenburg and the archbishop Szalkai. Related to the safety of the royal couple the hate and enmity between the Hungarian and the foreign courtiers was also a topic of discussion, which – according to those present – had already manifested itself in serious ways. The Chancellor Szydłowiecki therefore cautioned both the king and the queen to "employ Hungarian and non-Hungarian officials and servants in their court, since the Hungarians complain that the king, but especially the queen shows greater favour to the foreigners than in the direction of the Hungarians, but if the royal Majesties will show as much favour to the Hungarians as this is proper, these complaints will surely cease."⁸⁶⁵ As has been discussed

⁸⁶¹ While we do have data on daughters of the nobility being sent to Anne's court.

⁸⁶² See also Heiss: „Gegen den enspruch der eifersüchtigen Ungarn, die den Hofamter für sich beanspruchten hatte Maria ein grossen teil ihrer Höflinge aus Österreich behalten und liess noch in den folgenden jahren wichtige Beamten von dort kometen“. Gernot Heiss, "Politik und Ratgeber ": 120.

⁸⁶³ Zoltán Csepregi, "Königin Maria und das Haus Brandenburg", 66.

⁸⁶⁴ „Adiunxerunt eciam domini Hungari: oportet quod loquamur cum serenissimo domino archiduce, quia res est indigna, quod serenissime domine Anne non admittunt tenere in curia sua Hungaros, Boemos, Polonos, cum domina serenissima Maria teneat in curia et in coquina sua Almanos, Italos, Hispanos et alios, quos vult, observat.“ Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 135.

⁸⁶⁵ From the diary of Szydłowiecki on 30 November 1523. „Unum quod tam apud regem quam apud reginam sint officiales et aulici Hungari et alterius nacionis, quia passim dicunt Hungari, quod maior gratitudo ostenditur per regem et maxime reginam alienigenis quam Hungaris, sed dum suae maiestates eam gratiam ostendunt Hungaris, prout debent, omnia ista tollentur.“ Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 192.

above the whole issue of Mary and her “German” courtiers seemed to be the main trigger of the severe decrees brought against Lutheranism in the kingdom. Politics, religion, language are intertwined around the household of the queen with the central question of who is close to the centre of power.

The knowledge of languages was certainly a decisive factor in access to the queen and thus to the advantages that this could mean. It is significant that the number of people with multilingual background, often including the French language is significantly high in the proximity of the queen. The earliest and perhaps best example is Johannes Croner, a true representative of the multilingual tradition of the Hungarian kingdom. His cultural background as a native of the Hungarian kingdom gave him a knowledge of the local situation and probably of the Hungarian language, his German native language, his education and intellectual contacts in Vienna gave him the background knowledge of the Austrian affairs as well as the Latin education, his years at the University of Paris must have provided him with the knowledge of French language and culture. All this made him the ideal choice to give spiritual guidance to Mary and enhance her cultural and linguistic integration when she arrived to the region, and later to be the priest and probably confessor in the multicultural and multiethnic princess court. The Paris education and the knowledge of French must have been an important factor in the appointment of János Gosztonyi as reginal chancellor, just as it had been in his service in the court of Anne de Foix as her secretary and interpreter.⁸⁶⁶ French letters from the correspondence between Queen Mary and Tamás Szalaházy, bishop of Veszprém attest to the use of this language between them. Szalaházy was also trusted courtier of the queen and was one of the people appointed to stay at her side at the king’s orders when the Hungarian troops marched off to the Battle of Mohács.⁸⁶⁷ The knowledge of Hungarian and German must have been relatively frequent in court circles, just as in many towns and makes it problematic to try to pin down linguistic and ethnic identity. Examples where we have the rare occurrence of written use of both are provided by two intimates of the queen. One of these is Catharina Svetkovics. Originally from an Austrian family, she came with Mary to Buda in 1521 and in 1524 married an influential *homo novus*, Ferenc Batthyány, *ban*

⁸⁶⁶ József Köblös, *Az egyházi középréteg*, 294.

⁸⁶⁷ For Szalaházy and his relation to Mary of Hungary see Fazekas. István Fazekas, "Die Laufbahn eines Habsburg-treuen hohen Geistlichen Tamás Szalaházy" in *Maria von Ungarn (1505–1558) - Eine Renaissancefürstin (Geschichte in der Epoche Karls V. Bd. 8)*, ed. Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007).

of Dalmatia-Croatia. His frequent letters to her from the road to the Battle of Mohács are dictated to a scribe in Latin and end with a few lines by his own hand written in Hungarian, full of loving concern for his wife.⁸⁶⁸ It seems that by this time the couple had the habit of communicating in Hungarian. The other example is also from a member of the closest circle around Queen Mary, the treasurer Elek Thurzó. Born in a wealthy mine-owner noble family in Cracow he is notoriously difficult to pin down as member of any linguistic or ethnic group more narrowly than saying that he was a multilingual subject of the Hungarian crown.⁸⁶⁹ From Thurzó's – predominantly Latin – correspondence we have a letter in Hungarian written to Ferenc Batthyány and letters in German, written to Catharina Svetkovics and Queen Mary.⁸⁷⁰

Despite the presence of the French language in the Frauenzimmer and in some cases in her relation to certain individuals, the predominant language used by Mary in the years between 1521 and 1531 was probably German. In her formal correspondence the dominant language is Latin, while her private correspondence – most frequently autograph letters with the Brandenburg brothers – is in German. In the years after 1526 her French correspondence, especially with her brothers increases again, but an underlying German syntax is often discernible in her French.⁸⁷¹ In some cases her private letter drafts were composed in German, even in cases when she wrote the final letter in French.⁸⁷² She read German books, as well as

⁸⁶⁸ See the description by Géza Érszegi of one of these letters (MOL DL 104476) in the Mary of Hungary catalogue. Orsolya Réthelyi et al., eds., *Mary of Hungary*, 249.

⁸⁶⁹ Gabriella Erdélyi treats the early career of this exceptionally talented politician and quotes Thurzó's tutor and friend the acclaimed humanist. Gabriella Erdélyi, "Egy kivételes karrier", 121, note 24. In a letter to Jacob Fugger from 1517 Balbi brings argument as to why it is important that Thurzo does not step out of the consortium because his talents and knowledge of the Hungarian language as well as his agreeable personality and influence in the Buda court are invaluable: "Nam et superioribus annis inter tot procellas et fluctuationes, quae ingruerunt, si eius opera, industria et autoritas opitulata non fuisset, vix hae res salvae et integrae hucusque permansissent. ... ad quas arcendas et propellendas neminem ex his fratribus praeter dominum Alexium fore idoneum, qui et commercium linguae hungaricae callet, et in hac aula maxime est versatus, ad unius cuiusque studia et voluntates facile se accommodare potest, jamque non parum autoritatis et gratiae apud optimum et potentissimum quemque sibi comparavit" Gusztáv Wenzel, "Okmánytár a Fuggerek magyarországi nagykereskedésének és rézvállalatának történetéhez [Sources for the history of the Fugger's Hungarian economy and coppertrade]" *Történelmi Tár* 5 (1882): 657-659.

⁸⁷⁰ Letter of Elek Thurzó to Ferenc Batthyany beginning of July 1527, Pressburg; Letter of Elek Thurzó to Catherine Svetkovics, wife of Ferenc Batthyany 06 02 1530 Sempte. Both edited by Gabriella Erdélyi. Gabriella Erdélyi, *Ferdinánd és Thurzó Elek levelezése 1526–1532. (Lymbus kötetek I.) [The correspondence of Elek Thurzó 1526-1532]* (Budapest, 2005), 105-106, 188-189. A large body of Hungarian correspondence of Catherine Svetkovics from the 1530s has been preserved which is as yet not edited.

⁸⁷¹ For a sensitive discussion of language see Gorter. Laetitia Gorter-van Royen, *Maria van Hongarije*.

⁸⁷² See for instance her German memorandum written to herself about the pro and contra arguments concerning Ferdinand's offer for a second regency. (Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, nr.

German translations of Latin works. If we accept the authorship of the song attributed to her than it must even be concluded that she also gives form to artistic expression in the German language. Her confessors, court priests and preachers from the whole period are also German speakers. This starts changing only at the end of 1530 and beginning of 1531 with the intensified correspondence between the Mary, Ferdinand and Charles concerning Mary's future in the Low Countries.

Courts were by nature multilingual, bringing together peoples and cultures and with all the tension inherent in such linguistic and cultural encounters. These were the focal points of the linguistic pluralism described by Peter Burke as typifying the period: „linguistic pluralism was commonplace in early Modern Europe, as it had been in the Middle Ages, and this at official and unofficial levels.”⁸⁷³ The court of the queen consort, since she was usually from abroad, added significantly both to the multilingual nature and to the tensions surrounding the language issue. The knowledge of languages meant a source of information and thus a source of power. The description of the Chronicler Szerémi – though factually not necessarily reliable – is typical in the way it treats the language aspect. He describes how the news of the defeat at Mohács reached the Buda castle through a German servant of the queen and how the news spread among the German inhabitants of Buda, who started packing and fleeing from the town. According to his description the Hungarian speakers were surprised and did not understand the reason of the commotion. They watched the German population leave the town but they did not move “because they were folks who stayed at home and therefore spoke only Hungarian.”⁸⁷⁴ Power struggle for influence in the court between different linguistic/ethnic groups was characteristic of court life and was especially characteristic for queens' courts, since they often brought with them their own household from her native country and tended to favour these individuals. The situation was in no way restricted to queens however, as evident in the power struggles in the court of Ferdinand who surrounded himself at first with advisors and officials from the Low Countries and Spain and only started exchanging his foreign advisors for locals after a severe pressure of the estates as well as financial promises given by

154. and her final letter to Ferdinand written 09 02 1528 declining his offer Wilhelm Bauer et al., eds., *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol 2.*, nr. 154/2.

⁸⁷³ Peter Burke, *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004), 63.

⁸⁷⁴ György Szerémi, *Epistola de perdicione Regni Hungarorum*.

them in exchange.⁸⁷⁵ The Hungarian-Bohemian royal court may have been especially complex regarding languages, but language was universally an issue at the court in this period. It is difficult to isolate issues of linguistic identity from other forms of identity, such as ethnic, and – typically for this period – also religious identity. Much of the rivalising between diverse groups at the court was expressed in groups labelled as language communities.

⁸⁷⁵ “Vor kurzem hat Gerhard Rill die bislang älteste Hofstaatliste von 1524 gefunden und identifiziert. Daraus ergibt sich vor allem, dass Ferdinand ‘nicht erst auf den massive, unnachgiebigen Druck der Stände, der einem Bruch zusteurete, bereit [war], deutschsprachige Höflinge anzustellen. Die Forderung des Generallandtages von 1525 ist dahingehend abzuwächen, dass der Anteil des deutschsprachigen Elementen is den Augen der Stände zu gering war und verstarckt werden sollte’ Daraus wird auch ersichtlich, dass das ‘niederländische Monopol’ schon 1524 in Frage gestellt war.” Alfred Kohler, *Ferdinand I.*, 139.

6 Conclusion

6.1 Characteristics of the queen's household and court

One of the prominent characteristics of the queen's household is the quality that it is a flexible organisation, which can be formed to adapt to the age, marital status, location, financial situation of the queen. Central to this adaptability is the dynamic balance between factors of stability, on the one hand, especially represented by certain people, but also discernible in certain organisational forms, and factors of change, on the other, especially present in changes of size, finances and the independence in action it provided the queen. A queen cannot exist without a retinue, the size of which serves as a form of reginal display and differentiates the queen from other people. Inherent to this function is that usually the medieval queen – in most cases as queen consort – is not born a queen, but has to be transformed into one through the ritual of marriage to a king, a change which must also be indicated in the outward appearance. The household should then be considered as a sort of extended communal identity of the queen, which reflects her standing and situation. The flexibility of the household is especially striking in Mary's case, because of the frequency of the changes in status in her life from unwed royal daughter, to wed, but uncrowned queen, to queen of Hungary, to widowed queen, to regent, to retired widowed queen in numerous different lands and places, to mention only the main stages of her life. Though in my study I only analyse the changes in her household in the first 26 years of her life, this period contains the most frequent and dramatic changes in her situation, which is clearly visible in the changes in the form, function and appearance of the household.

A girl who is the daughter of a royal family and thus a pawn in the dynastic marriage plans is thereby destined to make at least one big change in life, when she is taken to her husband's land the household. The court as a form of identity also means that it is the basis of continuity from the language, culture, customs and sometimes religion of her home country. It is a *familia* in many ways resembling the sense of the modern term of 'family', as a circle of intimates one can count on. It forms therefore a buffer around the royal daughter, who is often a young girl at the time of the change, which eases the radical nature of the change. We can find the buffer role in all stages of Mary's courts. It is visible in the insistence of her aunt Margaret of Austria that certain people from the Low Countries should be kept in her

household wherever she may go, in the insistence of Queen Mary to keep her “German” courtiers against the pressure of the nobility in Buda, in the loyalty with which she defends her household against charges of Lutheranism to Ferdinand after 1526, and in how the Austrian and German element stayed significant in her household after 1531, despite the warning of Charles.

Beside the conservative aspect of retaining the culture and languages of an earlier stage and acting as a buffer, the court can also be the means of gradual integration of the queen, the stage on which she can learn the rules of the new homeland in the hands of caring family members and surroundings. The educational integrating aspect of the court is very well visible in the Innsbruck princess court. Here, one of the goals of common court was the education of both princesses in the languages, cultures and political realities and problems of the region, as well as providing them with the training in the more conventional aspects of courtly behaviour like music, conversation, dance, and other faculties. The educational aspect was reinforced by the presence of other young people from royal and noble families, who shared the educational program with the princesses.

Closely related to the educational aspect is the role of the court as religious, intellectual and artistic centre. The concentration of people with higher education and intellectual interests, as well as the necessity for artistic expression of courtly display, makes the court an intellectual and artistic centre of ideas and fashions. The queen’s court is often associated with such religious and artistic expression and can be the channel of courtly culture. In the case of Mary’s court, the artistic expression predominantly presents itself in the form of music and less as architecture and painting, though this may be a distortion of the short time investigated and the loss of sources. The presence of intellectuals around the queen is pronounced, as is her personal interest in the religious and intellectual trends of her age.

The queen’s court as the tool of integrating the queen into the kingdom has already been touched upon, but the integration of the nobility was an even more significant function of the queen’s court. The marriages of the queen’s ladies-in-waiting to members of the local nobility was an efficient tool to bind nobles to the court, but also to raise a new group of loyal subjects. The method of binding *homines novi* to the court through marriage with someone from the queen’s *Frauenzimmer* was common practice, as we have seen in the case of Bálint

Török, Ferenc Batthyány, Gáspár Horváth of Vingárt, among others. In many cases the marriage was a step in gaining the title of baron through a court office or other favours. Influence at the court through an advantageous marriage could be a step in the direction of obtaining pardons and regaining possessions, like in the case of Bálint Török. Beside marriage involvement in the management of the queen's estates and administration also had an integrating function. There are several signs indicating that Mary gained the support of the common nobility through the influence of leaders of this group in her service.⁸⁷⁶

6.2 Mary's courts in a European and Hungarian context

The picture emerging from the accumulation of data about Mary's courts shows a reginal institution that can be compared to those of other late medieval queen's courts of Europe in size, form, function, even inherent problems. On the other hand Mary can be placed in the succession of queen consorts of the Kingdom of Hungary in the later middle Ages with considerable power and influence on the political life of the Kingdom. The extent of Mary's influence on politics, despite the short period under investigation is significant. In my analysis I have argued that two factors play a decisive role in the power of Mary of Hungary, both of which express themselves in the queen's household.

One of these is the vast size of the reginal domains, which made the late medieval queens one of the most wealthy, if not the wealthiest landowner of the kingdom. As discussed above this great increase of reginal domains can be traced back to the first half of the fifteenth century, when Emperor Sigismund systematically increased the estates of his wife Barbara of Cilli.⁸⁷⁷ Though scholars have not yet uncovered the motives behind this extreme empowerment of the queen by Sigismund, we know that in the years to follow the queen was repeatedly a source of ready cash in the form of loans for the Emperor's military campaigns and acted as a stabilising factor in the Kingdom.⁸⁷⁸ Because of the unique position of the queen, being a female landowner bound with strong ties of loyalty to the king and dependant on him, thus with lesser risk of power ambitions at the expense of the king, her empowerment may have been part of Sigismund's larger strategy in decreasing the power of the magnates. Unsurprisingly, as much as a large body of reginal estates meant a stabilising power in the

⁸⁷⁶ András Kubinyi, "The Court of Queen Mary", 23.

⁸⁷⁷ See chapter 3.1.

⁸⁷⁸ The idea is suggested by Pál Engel. Pál Engel, *Királyi hatalom és arisztokrácia*.

lifetime of the king, they became a destabilising feature and a problem if the king died and the bond of loyalty was broken. The potential of power inherent in the reginal estates as well as the destabilising aspect in the case that the king predeceased the queen can be traced in the case of several Hungarian queens of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. When Mary received the management of the reginal estates, much of these were mortgaged to others and brought her limited profit, nevertheless both her income from the estates and her potential to gain influence through patronage and appointments were very large in European context. She was the last in the line of queens from Barbara of Cilli to profit from the immense reginal estates. She can also definitely be said to have recognised the potential and have utilised the possibilities provided by the estates, both financially and politically.

The second factor is the right to appoint members to court functions. Besides being an obvious means to exercise patronage and win supporters, authority in appointment also meant a personally selected, close body of loyal followers around the queen. Traditionally the king has the authority to appoint officials of the queen's court, a practice reflected both in the comparative European examples, and in the stages of Mary's court before 1521, when she was under the authority of her grandfather, Maximilian, and after 1526, when she stood under the protection of her brothers, Ferdinand and Charles. The sources indicate Mary's high grade of authority in decisions about the members of her household. In the period between 1521 and 1526, no signs of any kind of limitation on the number, or person of her appointed officials can be found. This observation is underlined by the complaints of the nobility regarding the high number of foreigners in the queen's household and their repeated requests to the king to limit this – with no perceptible results. The intriguing question is whether the apparent lack of intention by Louis II to limit or influence the composition of the household of his wife should be considered as yet another sign of the youthful sovereign's careless negligence in state matters – a frequent complaint about the king –, or can it perhaps be regarded as another form of empowerment of the queen. In lack of conclusive evidence it is difficult to argue this latter version, but it is worth keeping in mind that Louis II and Mary also showed a conscious strategy to build a new power basis against the magnates with the help of the lower nobility. Furthermore, several members of the queen's household and officials seem to have played a significant role in the political events of the Diets of 1525-1526. It is conceivable that the queen had a free hand in appointments because those forces at the court which wished to

strengthen the authority of the king realised that her political ambitions and intelligence backed by the weight of the reginal estates could act as a stabilising factor for the kingdom.

There is a third significant characteristic of the court of Mary of Hungary, which is not usually recognised, but contributes a distinctive element to its functioning. This is the position of Mary's court within the complex matrix of the courts of the king and queen of Hungary-Bohemia and the archduke and archduchess of Austria, related by the double marriage between the Jagiellon and Habsburg dynasties. The results of the investigation show that a close relationship existed between the royal and archducal courts. This manifested itself primarily in the close ties between the households of Mary and Anne, with roots often going back to the shared princess court in Innsbruck. Several families had members in more than one of the four households (E.g. Pemfflinger, Svetkovics). We have seen examples of movements of officers from one of the households to another (E.g. Imre Várdai, Christoph Ressmann, and Elisabeth von Salm). In some cases the king's and queen's court at Buda seemed to act as a place for politically undesirable elements of the archducal court (E.g. Puchheim, Eyczing). There is also a stream of information and intrigue being passed back and forth through official and unofficial channels, which only surfaces in the sources occasionally, but which must have been a central characteristic of the relationship between the four households. A closer investigation of the household element of the much better documented court of Archduchess Anne would considerably widen the possibilities for comparison and also further our understanding of the functioning of the court of Mary. It seems likely, for instance, that the conspicuous lack of daughters of the Hungarian nobility in the *Frauenzimmer* of Queen Mary can be explained with the fact that these daughters were rather sent to Anne's court in hope of a good marriage, while Mary's *Frauenzimmer* was expected to provide heiresses from outside Hungary for the sons of the Hungarian nobility. However, these must remain hypotheses until more research is done.

In addition to the strong connections existing through the personal element there is a more conceptual connection between the four courts. Several sources indicate that the specific circumstances of the double marriage made the contemporaries envision the Hungarian-Bohemian and the Austrian courts in contrast to each other, expressed especially in the comparison of the position of Anne with that of Mary. I have quoted examples from the diary of Christoph Szydłowiecki (1523) in which the Hungarian lords make official complaints

about Anne's estates not having been given to her by Ferdinand, and contrasting this with Mary who had already received her estates.⁸⁷⁹ At the same diplomatic summit they demand from Ferdinand that he allows more Hungarians in the household of Anne, just as Mary is allowed to have as many foreign officers in her household as she wishes.⁸⁸⁰ The same type of comparison is made and is the cause of outrage in 1525, when the nobility sent a delegation to Louis during the Diet of Rákos and demanded that all Germans be sent away from the Hungarian court, since Ferdinand had done the same with the Hungarian officials of Archduchess Anne.⁸⁸¹ The early years of the courts of Hungary and Austria had many similarities and the royal couples had to struggle with similar challenges, like the demands of the estates, the spread of Reformation ideas, and the distrust of foreign advisors in the household. I believe that such a comparison gives the possibility for future scholarship to gain further insight in the working of the separate courts, their relationship and the dynamics of politics, gender, and power.

⁸⁷⁹ Krzysztof Szydłowiecki, *Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója*, 134.

⁸⁸⁰ See note 848 above.

⁸⁸¹ Vilmos Fraknói, ed., *Relationes oratorum pontificiorum*, 190. See also Péter E. Kovács, "Erzherzog Ferdinand", 73.

7 Bibliography

Primary sources – unpublished

Magyar Országos Levéltár, Budapest [Hungarian National Archives, Budapest]:

Q szekció: Mohács előtti gyűjtemény [“Q” section: Pre-Mohács collection]

Diplomatikai levéltár [Archive of charters]

Diplomatikai fényképtár [Photo collection of charters]

A szekció: Magyar Kancelláriai Levéltár [“A” section: Archives of the Hungarian Chancery]

A 57 Libri Regii

Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Wien:

Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv:

Ungarische Akten, Hungarica, Specialia, Haus-archiv

Hofkammerarchiv:

Vermischte Ungarische Gegenstände

Primary sources – published

Ányos, Lajos. "Szilágyi Erzsébet oklevelei 2 [The charters of Erzsébet Szilágyi 2]." *Levéltári Közlemények* (1928): 240-258.

Ányos, Lajos. "Szilágyi Erzsébet oklevelei 1 [The charters of Erzsébet Szilágyi 1]." *Levéltári Közlemények* (1927): 59-82.

Balogh, István, ed. *Velencei diplomaták Magyarországról 1500-1526* [Venitian ambassadors' reports about Hungary 1500-1526]. Szeged 1929.

Baradlay, ?. "A budavári főtemplom kincseinek történetéhez [Additions to the history of the treasures of the church of Buda Castle]." *Archaeologiai Értesítő* (1878): 219-222.

Bauch, Gusztáv. "Adalékok a reformatio történetéhez [Additions to the history of the Reformation]." *Történelmi Tár* (1885): 528–529.

Bauer, Wilhelm and Robert Lacroix, eds. *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. II: Familiekorrespondenz 1527-1530, 2 vols. (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs, 30-31)*. Wien 1937-1938.

- Bauer, Wilhelm, ed. *Die Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Vol. 1.: Familienkorrespondenz bis 1526. (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs 11)*. Wien 1912.
- Bergh, L.Ph.C. van den, ed. *Correspondance de Marguerite d'Autriche, gouvernante des Pays-Bas, avec ses amis, sur les affaires des Pays-Bas de 1506-1528, 2 Vols.* Leiden 1845-1847.
- Bessenyei, József. *Enyingi Török Bálint*. Budapest 1994.
- Bonfinis, Antonius de. *Rerum Ungaricum Decades, Vol 4.*, Edited by I. Főgel, B. Iványi, and L. Juhász. Leipzig 1941.
- Bunyitay, Vince, Rajmund Rapaics, and János Karácsonyi, eds. *Egyháztörténelmi emlékek a magyarországi hitújítás korából. Monumenta ecclesiastica tempora innovatae in Hungaria religionis illustrantia. 1521-1552* [Sources of ecclesiastical history from the age of the Hungarian Religious reform], Vol. 1. Budapest 1902.
- Bunyitay, Vince, Rajmund Rapaics, and János Karácsonyi, eds. *Egyháztörténelmi emlékek a magyarországi hitújítás korából. Monumenta ecclesiastica tempora innovatae in Hungaria religionis illustrantia. 1521-1552, Vol. 2.* Budapest 1904.
- C. Tóth, Norbert. "Ecsedi Bátori István nádor pozsonyi tartózkodásának számadáskönyve. Adalékok Magyarország 1526 végi politikatörténetéhez [The account book of István Báthori of Ecsed during his stay in Pressburg. Additions to the history of politics of the end of 1526]." *Levéltári Közlemények* 80 (2009): 169-208.
- Carafa, Diomedede. *Il memoriale a la serenissima regina de Ungaria De institutione vivendi*, Edited by Péter Ekler. Budapest: OSZK, 2006.
- Divéky, Adorján. "Zsigmond lengyel herceg budai származása (1500–1502, 1505)." *Magyar Történelmi Tár* 26 (1914).
- Dudík, Beda, ed. *Olmützer Sammel-Chronik vom Jahre 1432 bis 1656*. Brno: Rudolf Rohrer's Erben, 1858.
- Engel, Johann Christian von, ed. "Fragmentum libri rationarii super erogationibus aulae regis Hungariae Ludovici II." In *Monumenta Ungarica*. 187-236. Wien 1809.
- Engel, Johann Christian. *Geschichte des ungarischen Reichs und seiner Nebenlander*. Halle 1797.
- Engel, Pál and Norbert Tóth C. *Királyok es királynék itineráriumai 1382-1437. Itineraria regum et reginarum 1382-1438*. Budapest: MTA, 2005.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Opus Epistolarum denuo recognitum et auctum Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*, Edited by Percy Stafford Allen and Helen Mary Allen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906–1958.
- Erdélyi, Gabriella. *Ferdinánd és Thurzó Elek levelezése 1526–1532. (Lymbus kötetek 1.) [The correspondence of Elek Thurzó 1526-1532]*. Budapest 2005.

- Fellner, Thomas and Heinrich Kretschmayr. *Die österreichische Zentralverwaltung. I. Abteilung. Von Maximilian I. bis zur Vereinigung der Österreichischen und Böhmisches Hofkanzlei (1749). 2. Band. Aktenstücke 1491–1681.* Wien 1907.
- Fraknói, Vilmos, ed. *Monumenta Vaticana 1884 Relationes oratorum pontificiorum 1524-1526 (Mon. Vat. Hung. Ser. II. vol. 1).* Budapest 2001 (1884).
- Fraknói, Vilmos, ed. "Liber rationum Ludovici II. Hungariae et Bohemiae regis 1525 / II. lajos számadási könyve, 1525." *Magyar Történelmi Tár.* 45-235. Budapest 1877.
- Gorski, Stanislaus, ed. *Acta Tomiciana. Epistolae, legationes, responsa, actiones, res geste, Serenissimi principis Sigismundi, ejus nominis primi, regis Poloniae etc.* Posnaniae 1852-1960.
- Hatvani, Mihály, ed. *Monumenta Hungariae Historica, Magyar Történelmi Okmánytár a Brüsseli országos levéltárból és a burgundi könyvtárból, Vol. 2.* Pest 1858.
- Hatvani, Mihály, ed. *Monumenta Hungariae Historica, Magyar Történelmi Okmánytár a Brüsseli országos levéltárból és a burgundi könyvtárból, Vol. 1.* Pest 1858.
- Házi, Jenő, ed. *Sopron Szabad Királyi Város története. Part 1, Vol. 2. Oklevelek és levelek 1407-1427.* Sopron 1921.
- Hirzel, Bruno. "Dienstinstruction und Personalstatus der Hofkapelle Ferdinand's I. aus dem Jahre 1527." *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, 10. Jahrg., H. 2. (1909): 151-158.
- Iványi, Béla, ed. *A körmendi levéltár memorabiliái [Memorabilia from the archive at Körmend].* Körmend 1942.
- Iványi, Béla. *A körmendi levéltár missilis levelei. (Körmendi Füzetek. 5.) I. rész.* Körmend 1944.
- Kottaner, Helene. *The memoirs of Helene Kottanner (1439-1440)*, Edited by Maya Bijvoet Williamson. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1998.
- Kottanerin, Helene. *Die Denkwürdigkeiten der Helene Kottannerin. Die ältesten Frauenmemorien des deutschen Mittelalters, 1439-1440 [=Wiener Neudrucke II.Bécs, 1971,* Edited by Karl (Károly) Mollay. Vienna 1971.
- Laferl, Christopher F. and Christina Lutter, eds. *Die Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. Bd. 4: Familienkorrespondenz 1533 und 1534. (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs 90).* Wien 2000.
- Lanz, Karl, ed. *Correspondenz des Kaisers Karls V. aus dem Königlichen Archiv und der Bibliothek de Bourgogne zu Brüssel , 3 vols.* Leipzig 1844-1846.
- Le Glay, A.J.G. *Correspondance de l'empereur Maximilien Ier et de Marguerite d'Autriche, sa fille, gouvernante des Pays-Bas, Vol.1. (1507 à 1519).* Paris 1839.
- Le Glay, A.J.G. *Correspondance de l'empereur Maximilien Ier et de Marguerite d'Autriche, sa fille, gouvernante des Pays-Bas, Vol.2.* Paris 1845.

- Luther, Martin. *Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe (1883). I.* Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1883-.
- Luther, Martin. *Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Briefwechsel. I-XVIII.* Weimar 1930-1985.
- Márkus, Dezső, ed. *Corpus juris hungarici. Magyar törvénytár. 1000-1526.* Budapest: Franklin, 1899.
- Meier, Jörg, Ipo Tapani Piirainen, and Klaus-Peter Wegera, eds. *Deutschsprachige Handschriften in slowakischen Archiven. Vom Mittelalter bis zur Frühen Neuzeit.* Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2009.
- Nyáry, Albert. "A turini királyi államlevéltár magyar történeti szempontból." *Századok* 3 (1869): 240.
- Oberleitner, Karl. *Österreichs Finanzen und Kriegswesen unter Ferdinand I. vom Jahre 1522 bis 1564. (Archiv für Kunde österreichischer Geschichts-Quellen).* Wien 1860.
- Oláh, Miklós. *Codex epistolaris. Oláh Miklós levelezése. (Monumenta Hungariae Historica I/25),* Edited by Arnold Ipolyi. Budapest 1876.
- Pray, Georgius. *Annales Regum Hungariae Pars V. ab Ludovico II. ad Maximilianum II.* Vindobonae (Vienna) 1770.
- R. Kiss, István. *A magyar helytartótanács I. Ferdinánd korában és 1549–51. évi leveles könyve [The regency council in the age of Ferdinand I and its documentation 1549-51].* Budapest 1908.
- Ratkoš, Peter. *Dokumenty k baníckemu povstaniu na Slovensku [Documents concerning the miners' revolt in Slovakia] (1525-1526).* Bratislava 1957.
- Schrauf, Károly. *A bécsi egyetem magyar nemzetének anyakönyve 1453-tól 1630-ig. (Magyarországi tanulók külföldön IV).* Budapest 1902.
- Strieder, Jacob, ed. *Die Inventur der Firma Fugger aus dem Jahre 1527 (Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft, Ergänzungsheft 17).* Tübingen 1905.
- Szerémi, György. *Epistola de perdicione Regni Hungarorum. (Szerémi György emlékirata Magyarország romlásáról (1456-1543). (Monumenta Hungariae historica II. Scriptores I.),* Edited by Gusztáv Wenczel. Pest 1857.
- Szydłowiecki, Krzysztof. *Krzysztof Szydłowiecki kancellár naplója 1523-ból [The diary of Chancellor Krzysztof Szydłowiecki from 1523],* Edited by István Zombori. Budapest: METEM, 2004.
- Vanrie, André, ed. *Cancellerie de Marie de Hongrie. Inventaire analytique.* Brussel: Archives Générales du Royaume, 1972.
- Weiss, Christopher, ed. *Papiers d'Etat du Cardinal de Granvelle, Vol. 4.* Paris 1843.
- Wenzel, Gusztáv. "Okmányi adalék Borbála és Erzsébet magyar királynék birtokáról (1424–1439) [Charter evidence on the domains of the Hungarian queens Barbara and Elisabeth]." *Magyar Történelmi Tár* 12 (1863): 268–287.

- Wenzel, Gusztáv. "Okmánytár a Fuggerek magyarországi nagykereskedésének és részvállalatának történetéhez [Sources for the history of the Fugger's Hungarian trade and copper company]." *Történelmi Tár* 5 (1882): 628-632, 640-648.
- Wenzel, Gusztáv. "Marino Sanuto világkrónikájának Magyarországot illető tudósításai III. 1515-1526 [Fragments from the world-chronicle of Marino Sanuto relating to Hungary]." *Magyar Történelmi Tár* 25 (1878).
- Werbőczy, István. *The Customary Law of the Renowned Kingdom of Hungary: A Work in Three Parts Rendered by Stephen Werbőczy (The "Tripartitum") (1517)*, Edited by János M. Bak, Péter Banyó, and Martyn Rady. Budapest: CEU Press, 2005.
- Wolfram, Herwig and Christiane Thomas, eds. *Der Korrespondenz Ferdinands I. III. 1531-1532 (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs)*. Wien 1985.
- Zeissberg, H[einrich] von, ed. "Kleinere Geschichtsquellen Polens im Mittelalter." In *Archiv für Kunde österr. Geschichtsquellen. Vol 4, 1. Hälfte*. 99-136. 1877.

Secondary literature

- Andor, Eszter and István György Tóth, eds. *Frontiers of Faith. Religious Exchange and the Constitution of Religious Identities 1400–1750*. Budapest 2001.
- Ankwicz-Kleehoven, Hans. *Der Wiener Humanist Johannes Cuspinian Gelehrter und Diplomat zur Zeit Kaiser Maximilians I*. Graz, Köln: Böhlau, 1959.
- Asch, Ronald G. "Introduction: Court and Household from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries." In *Princes, patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c.1450-1650*, Edited by Ronald, G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke. 1-38. Oxford 1991.
- Aschbach, Joseph. *Geschichte der Wiener Universität im ersten Jahrhunderte ihres Bestehens*. Wien 1865.
- Bak, J. M. "Linguistic Pluralism in Medieval Hungary." In *The Culture of Christendom: Essays in Medieval History in Commemoration of Denis L.T. Bethell.*, Edited by Marc Anthony Meyer. 269-279. London: The Hambledon Press, 1993.
- Bak, János M. *Königtum und Stände in Ungarn im 14.-16. Jahrhundert*. Weisbaden: Franz Steiner, 1973.
- Bak, János M. "Queens as scapegoats in medieval Hungary." In *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, Edited by Anne J. Duggan. 223-33. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997.
- Bak, János. "Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpadian and Angevin. Hungary (1000–1386)." In *Medieval Queenship*, Edited by Carmi John Parsons. 13–24. New York 1986.

- Bariska, István. "III. Frigyes gyámsági kormányzása és Nyugat Magyarország." *Századok* (2007): 1153-1192.
- Bauer, Wilhelm. *Die Anfänge Ferdinands I.* Wien, Leipzig 1907.
- Beitl, Klaus. "Die österliche Fußwaschung am Kaiserhofe zu Wien. Öffentlicher Brauch zwischen Hofzeremoniell und Armenfürsorge." In *Volkskunde. Fakten und Analysen. Festgabe für L. Schmidt zum 60. Geburtstag*, Edited by Klaus Beitl. Wien 1972.
- Benecke, Gerhard. *Maximilian I (1459-1519) : an analytical biography.* London, Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.
- Berzeviczy, Albert. *Beatrix királyné. Történelmi élet- és korrajz.* Budapest 1908.
- Bessenyei, József. "König Ferdinand und die ungarische Aristokratie." In *Kaiser Ferdinand I. Ein Mitteleuropaischer Herrscher*, Edited by Martina Fuchs, Teréz Oborni, and Gábor Ujváry. 79-94. Münster: Aschendorff, 2005.
- Bessenyei, József. "Maria von Ungarn als Besitzerin von Diósgyőr 1522-1548." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558) : eine Renaissancefürstin (Geschichte in der Epoche Karls V., ; 8.)*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 153-161. Münster: Aschendorff, 2006.
- Bietenholz, Peter G. and Thomas B. Deutscher, eds. *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Boda, Zsuzsanna. "Alamizsnás Szent János kultusza és annak emlékei Magyarországon. In." In *Történelem-Kép. Szemelvények múlt és művészet kapcsolatáról Magyarországon*, Edited by Árpád Mikó and Katalin Sinkó. 220-230. 2000.
- Boer, Johannes. "Muziek aan het hof van Maria van Hongarije." In *Maria van Hongarije. Konigin tussen keizers en kunstenaars*, Edited by Bob van Boogert and Jacqueline Kerkhoff. 175-178. Zwolle 1993.
- Bolte, Johannes. "Königin Maria von Ungarn und die ihr zugeeigneten Lieder." *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* (1891): 435-439.
- Borkowska, Urszula. "Marital contracts of the house of Jagiellon." *Majestas* (2006): 75-93.
- Burke, Peter. *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Bůžek, Václav. "Strangers in their own country. King Louis II (Jagiello) and Mary of Hungary's stay in Bohemia at the turn of 1522-1523." In *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and her Court 1521-1531*, Edited by Orsolya Réthelyi, Beatrix F. Romhányi, Enikő Spekner, and András Végh. 63-68. Budapest: BTM, 2005.
- Büchler, Sándor. "Szerencsés Imre származása." In *Mahler Ede Emlékkönyv.* 406-414. Budapest 1937.
- Christ-v. Wedel, Christine. "Haben die ungarischen Erasmianer auf Erasmus einen Einfluß ausgeübt? Zur Frauen- und Friedensfrage im Werk des Humanisten." In *Humanismus*

in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen. Politik, Religion und Kunst im 16. Jahrhundert, Edited by Ulrich A. Wien and Krista Zach. 135-154. 2004.

Costa Gomes, Rita. *The Making of a Court Society: Kings and Nobles in Late Medieval Portugal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Crawford, Anne. "The Queen's Council in the middle ages." *English Historical Review* 116 (2001): 1193-1211.

Csapodi, Csaba. "Újabb ismeretessé vált hiteles és ál-korvinák [Newly discovered authentic and fake-Corvinas]." *Magyar Könyvszemle* 102 (1986): ?

Csepregi, Zoltán. "Court Priests in the Entourage of Queen Mary of Hungary." In *Mary of Hungary: The Queen and Her Court 1521 - 1531*, Edited by Orsolya Réthelyi, Beatrix F. Romhányi, Enikő Spekner, and András Végh. 49-61. Budapest: BTM, 2005.

Csepregi, Zoltán. ""Ich wil alle ding wol erfahren." Mária királyné és udvari papjai [Queen Mary and her court priests]." *Lelkipásztor* 75 (2000): 202-208.

Csepregi, Zoltán. "„ich will kain fleis nit sparen” – Königin Maria von Ungarn und das Haus Brandenburg." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin. (Geschichte in der Epoche Karls V. Bd. 8.)*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 59-72. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.

Csepregi, Zoltán. "„Es laufft auch der Lutter in alle sachen uberall mitt...” Brandenburgi György örgróf (1484-1543) szerepe Boroszló város reformációjában [The role of Margrave Georg of Brandenburg in the reformation of Breslau]." In *Ünnepi tanulmányok Szigeti Jenő 70. születésnapjára [Festschrift for Jenő Szigeti]*, Edited by Daniel Heinz, Csaba Fazekas, and Zoltán Rajki. 54-62. Miskolc 2006.

Csepregi, Zoltán. "Jámbor volt-e Georg der Fromme? Egy készülő Brandenburgi György-monográfia módszertani előfeltételei." *Lelkipásztor* 78 (2003): 291-294.

Csepregi, Zoltán. "A reformáció mint nyelvi esemény a Mohács előtti Magyarországon." In *Mindennapi választások: Tanulmányok Péter Katalin 70. születésnapjára [Festschrift for Katalin Péter on her 70th birthday]*, Edited by Gabriella Erdélyi and Péter Tusor. 391-406. Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2007.

Domonkos, Leslie. "Johannes Henkel." In *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, Edited by Bietenholz G. Peter and Thomas B. Deutscher. 175-176. Toronto 2003.

Duindam, Jeroen. "Early Modern court studies: an overview and a proposal." In *Historiographie an europäischen Höfen (16.-18. Jahrhundert): Studien zum Hof als Produktionsort von Geschichtsschreibung und historischer Repräsentation*, Edited by Markus Völkel and Arno Stroyemeyer. 37-60. Berlin 2009.

Duindam, Jeroen. *Vienna and Versailles: The Courts of Europe's Dynastic Rivals, 1550–1780*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Duyse, van, Florimond. *Het oude Nederlandsche lied. Eerste deel*. Den Haag, Antwerpen: Martinus Nijhoff, 1903.

- E. Kovács, Péter. "Erzherzog Ferdinand und Ungarn (1521-1526)." In *Kaiser Ferdinand I. Ein Mitteleuropäischer Herrscher*, Edited by Martina Fuchs, Teréz Oborni, and Gábor Ujváry. 57-78. Münster: Aschendorff, 2005.
- E. Kovács, Péter. "Magyarország és Nápoly politikai kapcsolatai a Mátyás-korban [Political contacts between Hungary and Naples in the age of Matthias Corvinus]." In *Tanulmányok Szakály Ferenc Emlékére [Studies in memory of Ferenc Szakály]*, Edited by Pál Fodor, Géza Pálffy, and György István Tóth. 229–247. Budapest 2002.
- Eberhard, Winfried. *Konfessionsbildung und Stände in Böhmen, 1478-1530*. München: Oldenbourg, 1981.
- Eberhart, Helmut and Gerhard Jaritz. "Der Grosse Mariazeller Wunderaltar und seine Bedeutung aus kulturhistorischer Sicht." In „...da half MARIA au saller Not“, *Der Grosse Mariazeller Wunderaltar aus der Zeit um 1520 (Veröffentlichungen des Steiermarkischen Landesarchivs Bd. 28)*, Edited by Walter Brunner. Graz 2002.
- Eichberger, Dagmar. "A cultural centre in the southern Netherlands: The court of Archduchess Margaret of Austria (1480-1530) in Mechelen." In *Princes and princely culture, 1450-1650*, Edited by Martin Gosman, Alisdair Macdonald, and Arjo Vanderjagt. 239-258. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Engel, Pál. *Királyi hatalom és arisztokrácia viszonya a Zsigmond-korban (1387-1437) [The relation of royal power and aristocracy in the Age of Emperor Sigismund]*. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1977.
- Engel, Pál. *The Realm of St Stephen*. London: Tauris, 2001.
- Erdélyi, Gabriella. "Egy kivételes karrier Mohács előtti kezdetei: Bethlenfalvi Thurzó Elek [Beginning of an exceptional career: Elek Thurzó of Bethlenfalva]." In *R. Várkonyi Ágnes Emlékkönyv születésének 70. évfordulója ünnepére [Festschrift for Ágnes R. Várkonyi for her 70th birthday]*, Edited by Péter Tusor. 118-132. Budapest 1998.
- F. Romhányi, Beatrix. "A pálos rendi hagyomány az oklevelek tükrében. Megjegyzések a pálos rend középkori történetéhez [The tradition of the Pauline Order reflected in the charters. Comments on the medieval history of the Pauline Order]." *Történelmi Szemle* 3 (2008): 289-313.
- Fazekas, István. "Die Laufbahn eines Habsburg-treuen hohen Geistlichen Tamás Szalaházy." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505–1558) - Eine Renaissancefürstin (Geschichte in der Epoche Karls V. Bd. 8)*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 91-102. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.
- Fazekas, István. "Miklós Oláh, Secretary to Queen Mary of Hungary (1526-1539)." In *Mary of Hungary*, Edited by Orsolya Réthelyi, Beatrix F. Romhányi, Enikő Spekner, and András Végh. 41-47. Budapest: BTM, 2005.
- Federinov, Bertrand and Gilles Docquier, eds. *Marie de Hongrie. Politique et culture sous la Renaissance aux Pays-Bas*. Morlanwelz: Musée royal de Mariemont, 2008.
- Fógel, József. *II. Lajos udvartartása [The household of King Louis II]*. Budapest 1917.
- Fógel, József. *II. Ulászló udvartartása [The household of King Wladislas II.]*. Budapest 1913.

- Fössel, Amalie. *Die Königin im mittelalterlichen Reich. Herrschaftsausübung, Herrschaftsrechte, Handlungsspielräume (Mittelalter-Forschungen 4)*. Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2000.
- Fössel, Amalie. "Barbara von Cilli. Ihre frühen Jahre als Gemahlin Sigismunds und ungarische Königin." In *Sigismund von Luxemburg. Ein Kaiser in Europa. Tagungsband des internationalen historischen und kunsthistorischen Kongresses in Luxemburg, 8.–10 Juni 2005*, Edited by Michel Pauly and François Reinert. 95–112. Mainz am Rhein 2006.
- Fössel, Amalie. "The Queen's Wealth in the Middle Ages." *Majestas* 13 (2005): 23-45.
- Fraknói, Vilmos. *II. Lajos udvara. Történeti rajz*. Budapest: Franklin-Társulat, 1878.
- Fraknói, Vilmos. *Mária magyar királyné állása a reformatio irányában*. Esztergom 1879.
- Fraknói, Vilmos. *A Hunyadiak és a Jagellók kora (1440-1526) [The age of the Hunyadi and Jagiellon dynasties]*. Budapest: Athenaeum, 1896.
- Fraknói, Vilmos. *Hunyadi Mátyás király 1440-1490*. Budapest 1890.
- Fraknói, Vilmos. *Magyarország a mohácsi vész előtt: a pápai követek jelentései alapján*. Pest: Szent-István Társulat, 1884.
- Fraknói, Vilmos. "Brandenburgi György, II. Lajos nevelője." *Budapesti Szemle* (1883): 337-356.
- Fraknói, Vilmos. *Henckel János, Mária királyné udvari papja*. Pest 1872.
- Fraknói, Vilmos. *A magyar királyi kegyúri jog Szent Istvántól Mária Teréziáig [The royal patrons right from St Stephan to the age of Maria Theresia]*. Budapest 1895.
- Fuchs, Martina and Orsolya Réthelyi, eds. *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.
- Fügedi, Erik. "Das mittelalterliche Ungarn als Gastland." In *Die deutsche Ostsiedlung als Problem der Europäischen Geschichte*, Edited by W. Schlesinger. 471-508. Sigmaringen 1974.
- Gabriel, Asztrik. *The University of Paris and its Hungarian Students and Masters during the Reign of Louis XII. and Francois. I*. Frankfurt a. M. 1986.
- Gabriel, Asztrik. *Gosztonyi János püspök és párizsi mestere*. 1936.
- Gatt, Anneliese. *Der Innsbrucker Hof zur Zeit Kaiser Maximilians I. 1493-1519, Diss. Univ. Innsbruck*. Innsbruck 1943.
- Gerevich, László. *A budai vár feltárása*. Budapest 1966.
- Gilchrist, Roberta. *Gender and Archaeology: Contesting the Past*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Given-Wilson, Chris and Alice Curteis. *The royal bastards of medieval England*. Routledge, 1984.
- Gorter-van Royen, Laetitia. *Maria van Hongarije regentes der Nederlanden*. Hilversum: Verloren, 1995.

- Gorter-van Royen, Laetitia. "Maria von Ungarn als Korrespondentin." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 47-58. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.
- Goss Thompson, Glenda. "Mary of Hungary and Music Patronage." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 15 (1984): 401-418.
- Goss Thompson, Glenda. "Music in the Court records of Mary of Hungary." *Tijdschrift van der Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 34 (1984): 132-73.
- Griffiths, Ralph. "The political institutions of the realm." In *An Illustrated History of Late Medieval England*, Edited by Chris Given-Wilson. Manchester University Press, 1996.
- Gyöngyössi, Marton. "Königin Maria und die Kremnitzer Münzprägung." In *Maria von Ungarn (105-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 161-178. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.
- Harris, Barbara Jean. *English aristocratic women, 1450-1550: marriage and family, property and careers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Hein, Markus. "Maria von Ungarn, der ungarische Hof und die Reformation in Ungarn." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 261-272. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.
- Heinig, Paul-Joachim. "Theorie und Praxis der "höfischen Ordnung" unter Friedrich III. und Maximilian I." In *Höfe und Hofordnungen 1200-1600 (Residenzenforschung 10)*, Edited by Holger Kruse and Werner Paravicini. 223-242. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1999.
- Heinig, Paul-Joachim. "Umb merer zucht und ordnung willen. Ein Ordnungsentwurf für das Frauenzimmer des Innsbrucker Hofes aus den ersten Tagen Kaiser Karls V. (1519)." In *Das Frauenzimmer. Die Frau bei Hofe in Spätmittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, Edited by Jan Hirschchbiegel and Werner Paravicini. 311--323. Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2000.
- Heinig, Paul-Joachim. "How large was the Court of Emperor Frederick III?" In *Princes Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, cc. 1450-1650*, Edited by Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke. 139-156. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Heiss, Gernot and Orsolya Réthelyi. "Maria, Königin von Ungarn und Böhmen (1505-1558), als Thema der Forschung." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 11-23. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.
- Heiss, Gernot. "Die ungarischen, böhmischen und österreichischen Besitzungen der Königin Maria (1505 - 1558) und ihre Verwaltung I." *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 27 (1974): 61- 100.
- Heiss, Gernot. "Die ungarischen, böhmischen und österreichischen Besitzungen der Königin Maria (1505 - 1558) und ihre Verwaltung. II." *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 29 (1976): 52-121.
- Heiss, Gernot. *Maria von Ungarn (Unpublished dissertation)*. Wien 1974.

- Heiss, Gernot. "Politik und Ratgeber der Königin Maria von Ungarn in den Jahren 1521 - 1531." *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 82 (1974): 119-180.
- Hensle-Wlasak, Helga. "Kunsthistorische Betrachtung des Grossen Mariazeller Wunderaltars." In „...da half MARIA au saller Not“, *Der Grosse Mariazeller Wunderaltar aus der Zeit um 1520 (Veröffentlichungen des Steiermarkischen Landesarchivs Bd. 28)*, Edited by Walter Brunner. Graz 2002.
- Hirschbiegel, Jan and Werner Paravicini, eds. *Das Frauenzimmer. Die Frau bei Hofe in Spätmittelalter und früher Neuzeit. (Residenzenforschung 11)*. Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2000.
- Hoensch, Jörg K. *Kaiser Sigismund. Herrscher an der Schwelle zur Neuzeit 1368–1437*. München 1996.
- Hoffmann-Erbrecht, Lothar. *Thomas Stoltzer. Leben und Schaffen*. Kassel, 1964.
- Hoffmann-Erbrecht, Lothar. "Stoltzeriana." *Die Musikforschung* 27 (1974): 18-36.
- Horváth, János. *Az irodalmi műveltség megoszlása*. Budapest 1935.
- Howell, Margaret. *Eleanor of Provence: Queenship in Thirteenth-Century England*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
- Howell, Margaret. "The Resources of Eleanor of Provence as Queen Consort." *English Historical Review* 102 (1987): 372-393.
- Iongh, Jane de. *De hertogin. Margaretha van Oostenrijk, Hertogin van Savoie, 1480-1530*. Amsterdam: Querido, 1981 (first published in 1943).
- Iongh, Jane de. *De koningin : Maria van Hongarije, Landvoogdes der Nederlanden 1505-1558*. Amsterdam: Querido, 1981 (first published 1941).
- Iongh, Jane de. *Mary of Hungary, Second Regent of the Netherlands*. New York: Norton, 1958.
- Izsó, István. *Szemelvények a középkori montanisztika magyarországi történetének írott forrásaiból (1000 – 1526)*. Rudabánya 2006.
- Johnstone, Hilda. "The Queen's Household." In *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England: The Wardrobe, the Chamber and the Small Seals, Vol. 4*. 231-289. Manchester University Press, 1967.
- Kalous, Antonín. "Die Schlacht bei Mohács: böhmische und vatikanische Quellen." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 103-112. Münster: Aschendorff, 2005.
- Keller, Rudolf. "Maria von Ungarn und Martin Luther: Luthers Verbindung zur Königin." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 273-281. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.
- Kenyeres, István. "A bécsi Udvari Kamarai Levéltár Gedenkbücher Österreich magyar vonatkozású iratainak regesztái, 61-64. köt. (1547-1550)." In *Lybus*.

Magyarságtudományi Közlemények, Edited by Gábor Ujváry. 253-294. Budapest 2005.

Kenyeres, István. "Die Einkünfte und Reformen der Finanzverwaltung Ferdinands I. in Ungarn." In *Kaiser Ferdinand I. Ein Mitteleuropäischer Herrscher*, Edited by Martina Fuchs, Teréz Oborni, and Gábor Ujváry. 111-146. Münster: Aschendorff, 2005.

Kenyeres, István. "Pacsa János plébános osztrák fogsága. Adalékok Habsburg Mária királyné helytartóságához." *Soproni Szemle* 60 (2006): 146-165.

Kenyeres, István. *Uradalmak és végvárok. A kamarai birtokok és a törökellenes határvédelem a 16. században*. Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2008.

Kenyeres, István. "Verwaltung und Erträge der ungarischen Besitzungen Königin Marias in den Jahren 1522–1548." In *Maria von Ungarn. Eine Renaissancefürstin*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 179-208. Münster: Aschendorff, 2005.

Kenyeres, István. "A királyi és királynéi „magánbirtokok” a 16. században [The Royal and Reginal “private domain” in the sixteenth century]." *Századok* 138/5 (2004): 1103-1148.

Kerkhoff, Jacqueline. "Die Hofhaltung Marias von Ungarn." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558)*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 209-244. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.

Kerkhoff, Jacqueline. *Maria van Hongarije en haar hof (1505 - 1558) : tot plichtsbetrachting uitverkoren [Mary of Hungary and her court: chosen for devotion to duty]*. Hilversum: Verloren, 2008.

Kerkhoff, Jacqueline. "The Court of Mary of Hungary 1531-1558." In *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and her Court 1521-1531*, Edited by Orsolya Réthelyi, Beatrix F. Romhányi, Enikő Spekner, and András Végh. 137-151. Budapest: BTM, 2005.

Kerkhoff, Jacqueline. "'Getrouwd met de dynastie', 'Madame Marije'." In *Maria van Hongarije. Koningin tussen keizers and kunstenaars, 1505-1558*, Edited by Bob van den Boogert and Jacqueline Kerkhoff. 17-54. 1993.

Kintzinger, Martin. "Die zwei Frauen des Königs. Zum politischen Handlungsspielraum von Fürstinnen im europäischen Spätmittelalter." In *Das Frauenzimmer. Die Frau bei Hofe in Spätmittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, Edited by Jan Hirschbiegel and Werner Paravicini. 377-398. Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2000.

Király, Péter. "Königin Maria von Habsburg und die Musik." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 363-379. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.

Kircher-Kannemann, Anja. "Organisation der Frauenzimmer im Vergleich zu männlichen Höfen." In *Das Frauenzimmer. Die Frau bei Hofe in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit (Residenzenforschung 11)*, Edited by Jan Hirschbiegel and Werner Paravicini. 235–245. Stuttgart 2000.

- Kisby, Fiona. "'When the King Goeth a procession": Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485-1547." *Journal of British Studies* 40 (2001): 44-75.
- Kohler, Alfred. "Die Doppelhochzeit von 1496/ 97: Planung, Durchführung und dynastische Folgen." In *Hispania - Austria: Die katholischen Könige. Maximilian I. und die Anfänge der Casa de Austria in Spanien*, Edited by Alfred Kohler and Friedrich Edelmayer. Wien, München 1993.
- Kohler, Alfred. *Ferdinand I. 1503–1564. Fürst, König und Kaiser*. München: C. H. Beck, 2003.
- Kolde, Theodor. "Markgraf Georg von Brandenburg und das Glaubenslied der Königin Maria von Ungarn." In *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kirchengeschichte 2/1*, Edited by Theodor Kolde. 82-89. Erlangen 1895.
- Koltai, András. "Udvar és rendtartás a 17. századi Magyarországon." In *Magyar udvari rendtartás. Utasítások és rendeletek 1617-1708*, Edited by András Koltai. Budapest 2001.
- Kovács, Zsuzsanna. "De gedroomde echtgenoot. Het Hongaarse hof van Maria van Hongarije, echtgenote van koning Lodewijk II (The dream-spouse. The Hungarian court of Mary of Hungary, wife of Louis II)." In *Maria van Hongarije : koningin tussen koningin tussen keizers en kunstenaars (Mary of Hungary. Queen between emperors and artists), 1505-1558 (exhibition catalogue)*, Edited by Bob van den Boogert and Jacqueline Kerkhoff. Zwolle: Waanders, 1995.
- Köblös, József. *Az egyházi középréteg Mátyás és a Jagellók korában. (Társadalom- és művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok 12.)*. Budapest: MTA, 1994.
- Köfler, Margarete and Silvia Caramelle. *Die beiden Frauen des Erzherzogs Sigmund von Österreich-Tirol*. Innsbruck: Wagner, 1982.
- Kropf, Lajos. "Anna királyné, II. Ulászló neje [Queen Anne, wife of Wladislaw II]." *Századok* 29 (1895): 689-709.
- Kubinyi, András. "A királyi tanács köznemesi ülnökei a Jagelló-korban (The Royal council members from the middle nobility under the Jagellos)." In *Mályusz Elemér emlékkönyv*, Edited by Éva Balázs H., Erik Fügedi, and Ferenc Maksay. 257-268. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1984.
- Kubinyi, András. "A királyi titkárok II. Lajos uralkodásának idejében [Royal secretaries in the reign of Louis II.]." *Gesta* 1 (2006): 2-22.
- Kubinyi, András. "A királyi udvar kormányzati szerepe mohács előtt [The role of the royal court in the government before Mohács]." *Székhogyalók a Magyar Tudományos Akadémián* (2005): 241-268.
- Kubinyi, András. "A királyi udvar a késő középkori Magyarországon [The royal court in late medieval Hungary]." In *Idővel paloták.: Magyar udvari kultúra a 16 - 17. században [In time palaces.: Hungarian court culture in the 16th and 17th centuries]*, Edited by Gabriella Etényi and Ildikó Horn. 13-32. Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2005.

- Kubinyi, András. "A magyar állam belpolitikai helyzete Mohács előtt [The internal politics of the Hungarian state preceding Mohács]." In *Mohács. Tanulmányok a mohácsi csata 450. évfordulója alkalmából.*, Edited by Lajos Rúzsás and Ferenc Szakály. 59-100. Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó, 1986.
- Kubinyi, András. "Alltag und Fest am ungarischen Königshof der Jagellonen 1490-1526." In *Alltag bei Hofe (Residenzenforschung 5)*, Edited by Werner Paravicini. 197-215. Sigmaringen 1995.
- Kubinyi, András. "Die Pemfflinger in Wien und Buda. Ein Beitrag zu wirtschaftlichen und familiären Verbindungen der Bürgerschaft in den beiden Hauptstädten am Ausgang des Mittelalters." *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Wien* (1978): 67-88.
- Kubinyi, András. "Az 1505. évi rákosi országgyűlés és a szittyia ideológia [The Diet of Rákos in 1505 and the "scythian" ideology]." *Századok* 140 (2006): 261-374.
- Kubinyi, András. "Bárok a királyi tanácsban Mátyás és II. Ulászló idején [Barons in the Royal Council in the time of Matthias Corvinus and Wladislas II]." *Századok* (1988): 147-213.
- Kubinyi, András. "Der königliche Hof als integrationszentrum Ungarns von der Mitte des 15. bis zum ersten Drittel des 16. Jahrhunderts und sein Einfluss auf die satdtische Entwicklung Budas." In *Metropolen im Wandel. Zentralität in Ostmitteleuropa an der Wende vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit*, Edited by Evamaria Engel, Karen Lambrecht, and Hanna Nogossek. 145-162. Akademie Verlag, 1995.
- Kubinyi, András. "Egy üzletelő és diplomata várúr Mohács előtt: Ákosházi Sárkány Ambrus." In *Gerő László emlékkönyv*, Edited by Nóra Pamer. 263-289. Budapest 1994.
- Kubinyi, András. *Matthias Rex*. Budapest: Balassi, 2008.
- Kubinyi, András. "Nemzetiségi és vallási tolerancia a középkori Magyarországon [Ethnic and religious tolerance in medieval Hungary]." In *Főpapok, Egyházi intézmények és vallásosság a középkori Magyarországon (High-priests, religious institutions and religion in medieval Hungary)*. 123-138. Budapest: METEM, 1999.
- Kubinyi, András. "Szalkai László esztergomi érsek politikai szereplése [The political role of László Szalkai archbishop of Esztergom]." In *Főpapok, egyházi intézmények és vallásosság a középkori Magyarországon*. 147-160. Budapest 1999.
- Kubinyi, András. "The Court of Queen Mary of Hungary and Politics between 1521 and 1526." In *Mary of Hungary: The Queen and Her Court 1521 - 1531*, Edited by Orsolya Réthelyi, Beatrix F. Romhányi, Enikő Spekner, and András Végh. 13-25. Budapest: Budapesti Történeti Múzeum, 2005.
- Kubinyi, András. "The Road to Defeat: Hungarian Politics and Defense in the Jagiellonian Period." In *From Hunyadi to Rákóczi. War and Society in Late Medieval and Early Modern Hungary*, Edited by János M. Bak and Béla K. Király. 159-178. Brooklyn 1982.

- Kubinyi, András. "Zur Frage der Toleranz im mittelalterlichen Königreich Ungarn." In *Toleranz im Mittelalter (Vorträge und Forschungen 45)*, Edited by Alexander Patschovsky and Harald Zimmermann. 187-206. Sigmaringen, 1998.
- Kubinyi, András. "A budai vár udvarbírói hivatala, 1458-1541 : kísérlet az országos és a királyi magánjövédelmek szétválasztására." *Levéltári Közlemények* 35 (1964): 67-98.
- Kubinyi, András. „Wende in der historischen Beurteilung Königin Marias von Ungarn: Ergebnisse einer Tagung und weitere Aufgaben.“ In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*. Edited by Martine Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.
- Kubinyi, András. "Az 1525. évi "kalandos szövetség" [The "kalandos alliance" of 1525]." In *Ünnepi tanulmányok Sinkovics István 70. Születésnapjára [Festschrift for the 70th birthday of István Sinkovics]*, Edited by Iván Bertényi. 141–153. Budapest 1980.
- Kurcz, Ágnes. *Lovagi kultúra Magyarországon a 13-14. században*. Budapest 1988.
- Laferl, Christopher F. and Christine Lutter. „„Innere" und „äußere" Autonomie einer Fürstin der Frühen Neuzeit. Maria von Ungarn am Beginn ihrer niederländischen Statthalterschaft (1531-1534).“ *Frühneuzeit-Info* 8/2 (1997): 170-177.
- Langer, Andrea. "Frauen - Kunst - Kulturtransfer. Forschungsstand und Perspektiven zur Rolle der weiblichen Mitglieder der jagiellonischen Dynastie im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert." In *Die Jagiellonen. Kunst und Kultur einer europäischen Dynastie an der Wende zur Neuzeit.*, Edited by Dietmar Popp and Robert Suckale. 85-94. Nürnberg 2002.
- Laynesmith, J. L. *The Last Medieval Queens. English Queenship 1445-1503*. Oxford: OUP, 2004.
- Lemaire, Claude. "De librije van Maria van Hongarije [The book collection of Mary of Hungary]." In *Maria van Hongarije, koningin tussen keizers en kunstenaars (1505-1558)*, Edited by Bob van den Boogert and Jacqueline Kerkhoff. 162-174. Zwolle: Waanders, 1993.
- López, Juan José Carreras. "The Court Chapel: a musical profile and the Historiographical context of an institution." In *The Royal Chapel in the Time of the Habsburgs*, Edited by Juan Jose Carreras and Bernardo José García. 8-22. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2005.
- Löcher, Kurt. "Der Maler Hans Krell aus Crailsheim in den Diensten des Markgrafen Georg von Brandenburg-Ansbach und König Ludwigs II. Von Ungarn." *Jahrbuch des historischen Vereins für Mittelfranken* 97 (1994-1995): 151-186.
- Löcher, Kurt. "Hans Krell - Court painter to King Louis II of Hungary and his Consort, Mary of Hungary." In *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and Her Court 1521-1531*, Edited by Orsolya Réthelyi, Beatrix F. Romhányi, Enikő Spekner, and András Végh. 69-78. Budapest: BTM, 2005.
- Magyar, Károly. "'Et. introivit ad Hungariam sola germanica ancilla nomine Maria.' Mary of Hungary and Buda." In *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and her Court 1521-1531*,

Edited by Orsolya Réthelyi, Beatrix F. Romhányi, Enikő Spekner, and András Végh. 97-119. Budapest: BTM, 2005.

- Magyar, Károly. "Residenzen des Königs und der Königin." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 381-399. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.
- Mályusz, Elemér. "Az első Habsburg a magyar trónon [The first Habsburg on the Hungarian throne]." *Aetas* 1 (1994): 120-150.
- McEntee, Brian. "The Burial Site Selection of a Hungarian Queen: Elizabeth, Queen of Hungary (1320–1380), and the Óbuda Clares' Church." *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU* 12 (2006).
- Mikó, Árpád. "Queen Beatrice of Aragon." In *Matthias Corvinus, the King: Tradition and Renewal in the Hungarian Royal Court, 1458–1490*, Edited by Péter Farbaky, Enikő Spekner, Katalin Szende, and András Végh. 251-253. Budapest: BTM, 2008.
- Moltke, Konrad von. *Siegmund von Dietrichstein : die Anfänge staändischer Institutionen und das Eindringen des Protestantismus in die Steiermark zur Zeit Maximilians I. und Ferdinands I.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- Müller, Rainer A. *Der Fürstenhof in der Frühen Neuzeit (Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte, Bd. 33)*. München: Oldenbourg, 2004.
- Nelson, Bernadette. "Ritual and Ceremony in the Spanish royal chapel, c.1559-c.1561." *Early Music History* 19 (2000): 105-200.
- Ogris, Werner. "Die habsburgisch-jagiellonische Doppelheirat von 1515." *Österreichisches Archiv für Recht und Religion* 50 (2003): 322-335.
- Orme, Nicholas. *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy, 1066-1530*. London, New York: Methuen, 1984.
- Ortvay, Tivadar. *Mária, II. Lajos magyar király neje 1505-1558 [Mary, wife of Louis II king of Hungary]*. Budapest: Athenaeum, 1914.
- Palacký, Franz. *Geschichte von Böhmen: Größtentheils nach Urkunden und Handschriften. Fünfter Band: Das Zeitalter der Jagelloniden. Zweite Abtheilung: König Wladislaw II und König Ludwig I. Von 1500 bis 1526*. Prague: In Commission bei Friedrich Tempsky, 1867.
- Pálffy, Géza. "A török elleni védelmi rendszer néhány alapkérdése a XVI. század első felében." In *hagyomány és korszerűség a XVI-XVII. században*, Edited by Tivadar Petercsák. Eger 1997.
- Pálffy, Géza. "Der ungarische Adel am Wiener Hof König Ferdinands I." In *Kaiser Ferdinand I. Ein Mitteleuropäischer Herrscher*, Edited by Martina Fuchs, Teréz Oborni, and Gábor Ujváry. 95-110. Münster: Aschendorff, 2005.
- Pálffy, Géza. "Hofwechsel und Einflussverlust. Der ungarische Adel am Hofe der Jagiellonen." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 245-260. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.

- Pálffy, Géza. "Koronázási lakomák a 15–17. századi Magyarországon." *Századok* 138/5 (2004): 1005–1101.
- Pálffy, Géza. "Krönungsmähler in Ungarn im Spätmittelalter und in der Frühen Neuzeit. Weiterleben des Tafelzeremoniells des selbständigen ungarischen Königshofes und Machtrepräsentation der ungarischen politischen Elite, Teil 1." *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 115, Heft 1-2 (2007): 85-111.
- Pálffy, Géza. "New Dynasty, New Court, New Political Decision-Making: A Decisive Era in Hungary. The Decades following the Battle of Mohács 1526." In *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and Her Court (1521-1531)*, Edited by Orsolya Réthelyi, Beatrix F. Romhányi, Enikő Spekner, and András Végh. 27-39. Budapest: BTM, 2005.
- Pálffy, Géza. "A Magyar Királyság a 16. századi Habsburg Monarchiában [The Kingdom of Hungary within the Habsburg Monarchy of the sixteenth century]." *Századok* 141/5 (2007): 1075–1120.
- Paravicini, Werner. "Europäische Hofordnungen als Gattung und Quelle." In *Höfe und Hofordnungen 1200-1600 (Residenzenforschung 10)*, Edited by Holger Kruse and Werner Paravicini. Sigmaringen 1999.
- Parsons, Carmi John. "Piety, Power and Reputations of Two Thirteenth-Century English Queens." In *Queens, Regents and Potentates*, Edited by Theresa M. Vann. 107-123. Boydell & Brewer, 1995.
- Pásztor, Lajos. *A magyarság vallásos élete a Jagellók korában [The religious life in Hungary in the Jagiellon Age]*. Budapest 2000 (first edition 1940).
- Péter, Katalin. "A Reformáció és a művelődés a 16. Században (Reformation and education in the sixteenth century)." In *Magyarország története 1526-1686 (The history of Hungary), vol. 1*, Edited by Ágnes R. Várkonyi. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1985.
- Rady, Martyn. "Stephen Werbőczy and his Tripartitum." In *Stephen Werbőczy - The Customary law of the Renowned Kingdom of Hungary in Three Parts (1517)*, Edited by János M. Bak, Péter Banyó, and Martyn Rady. xxvii-xlvi. Budapest: CEU, 2005.
- Rady, Martyn. "Rethinking Jagiełło Hungary 1490–1526." *Central Europe* 3 (2005): 3–18.
- Ratkoš, Peter. "Die Entwertung der ungarischen Kleinmünze im Jahre 1521 und Ihre Folgen in der Slowakei bis 1526." *Studia Historica Slovaca* 1 (1963).
- Rensing, Elfriede. "Sigmund von Herberstein am Hofe König Ludwigs II. von Ungarn." *A Bécsi magyar történeti intézet évkönyve. Jahrbuch des Wiener Ungarischen Historischen Instituts* 1 (1931): 72-97.
- Réthelyi, Orsolya, Beatrix F. Romhányi, Enikő Spekner, and András Végh, eds. *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and her Court 1521-1531*. Budapest: BTM, 2005.
- Réthelyi, Orsolya. "Főhercegnői udvarból királynéi udvar: Habsburg Mária királynéi udvartartásának kezdetei [From the archducal court to the queen's court. The beginnings of the reginal court of Mary of Hungary]." *Századok* 5 (2007): 1193-1216.

- Réthy, Orsolya. "Ambiguous Loyalties? Mary as Queen of Hungary (1521-1526)." In *Marie de Hongrie. Politique art et culture sous la Renaissance aux Pays-Bas*, Edited by Bertrand Federinov and Gilles Docquier. 13-24. Morlanwelz: Musée Royal de Mariemont, 2008.
- Réthy, Orsolya. "Maria regina. nuda venerat ad Hungariam." The Queen's Treasures." In *Mary of Hungary. The Queen and her Court 1521-1531*, Edited by Orsolya Réthy, Beatrix F. Romhányi, Enikő Spekner, and András Végh. 121-128. Budapest: BTM, 2005.
- Réthy, Orsolya. "Die Anfänge der Ofener Hofhaltung der Königin Maria von Ungarn." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558) : eine Renaissancefürstin*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthy. 221-244. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.
- Réthy, Orsolya. "Vallás és nyelv az udvartartásban. Johannes Croner, Habsburg Mária udvari lelkésze [Religion and language in the court. Johannes Croner, court priest of Mary of Hungary]." In *Szentírás, hagyomány, reformáció - Teológia- és egyháztörténeti tanulmányok*, Edited by Beatrix F. Romhányi and Gábor Kendeffy. Budapest: Gondolat, 2009.
- Réthy, Orsolya. "King Matthias on the Marriage Market." In *Matthias Corvinus, the King: Tradition and Renewal in the Hungarian Royal Court, 1458–1490*, Edited by Péter Farbaky, Enikő Spekner, Katalin Szende, and András Végh. 247-250. Budapest: BTM, 2008.
- Reynolds, Philip L. "Marrying and Its Documentation in Pre-Modern Europe: Consent, Celebration, and Property." In *To have and to hold: marrying and its documentation in Western Christendom, 400-1600*, Edited by Philip L. Reynolds and John Witte Jr. 1-42. Cambridge: CUP, 2007.
- Reynolds, Philip L. "Marrying and Its Documentation in Pre-Modern Europe: Consent, Celebration, and Property." In *To Have and to Hold. Marrying and Its Documentation in Western Christendom, 400–1600*, Edited by Philip L. Reynolds. 1-42. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Rill, Gerhard. "Die Hannart-Affäre. Eine Vertrauenskrise in der Casa de Austria 1524." *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 34 (1981): 89-146.
- Rill, Gerhard. *Fürst und Hof in Österreich. Von den habsburgischen Teilungsverträgen bis zur Schlacht von Mohács (1521/22 bis 1526). Band 2: Gabriel von Salamanca, Zentralverwaltung und Finanzen*. Wien: Böhlau, 2003.
- Rill, Gerhard. *Fürst und Hof in Österreich: von den habsburgischen Teilungsverträgen bis zur Schlacht von Mohács (1521/1522 bis 1526). Vol. 1*. Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1993.
- Rubin, Miri. *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

- Sághy, Marianne. "Aspects of Female Rulership in Late Medieval Literature: The Queen's Reign in Angevin Hungary." *East Central Europe - L'Europe du Centre Est Special Issue* vol. 20-23, part I (1993-1996): 69-86.
- Scheiber, Sándor. "A Szerencsés Imre-irodalomhoz [Additions to the literature on Imre Szerencsés]." In *MIOK Évkönyv*, Edited by Sándor Scheiber. 295-305. Budapest 1976.
- Schwob, Ute Monika. "Der Ofener Humanistenkreis der Königin Maria von Ungarn." *Südostdeutsches Archiv* 17/18 (1974/1975): 50-73.
- Seifert, Herbert. "The institution of the imperial court chapel from Maximilian I to Charles VI." In *The Royal Chapel in the time of the Habsburgs: music and ceremony in early modern European court*, Edited by Juan Jose Carreras and Bernardo José García. 40-47. Boydell Press: Woodbridge, 2005.
- Sepp, Christiaan. "De bibliotheek eener koningin [The library of a queen]." *Bibliographische Mededeelingen* (1885): 110-182.
- Sólyom, Jenő. *Luther és Magyarország. A reformátor kapcsolata hazánkkal haláláig [Luther and Hungary. The relationship of the reformer with our country]*. Budapest 1996 (reprint of the first edition of 1933).
- Spekner, Enikő. "'To be judged worthy of your illustrious father and to rule over the Hungarians.' Matthias' struggle for John Corvinus' Succession." In *Matthias Corvinus the King. Tradition and Renewal in the Hungarian Royal Court 1459-1490*, Edited by Péter Farbaky, Enikő Spekner, Katalin Szende, and András Végh. 525-527. Budapest: BTM, 2008.
- Spekner, Enikő. "Die Geschichte der habsburgisch-jagiellonischen Heiratsverträge im Spiegel der Quellen." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, Edited by Martine Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 25-46. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.
- Spiess, Karl-Heinz. "European Royal Marriages in the Late Middle Ages. Marriage Treaties, Questions of Income, Cultural Transfer." *Majestas* 13 (2005): 7-21.
- Spiess, Karl-Heinz. "Fremdheit und Integration der ausländischen Ehefrau und ihres Gefolges bei internationalen Fürstenheiraten." In *Fürstenhöfe und ihre Außenwelt. Aspekte gesellschaftlicher und kultureller Identität im deutschen Spätmittelalter*, Edited by Thomas Zotz. 267-290. Würzburg: Egon Verlag, 2004.
- Spiess, Karl-Heinz. "Unterwegs zu einem fremden Ehemann. Brautfahrt und Ehe in europäischen Fürstenhäusern des Spätmittelalters." In *Fremdheit und Reisen im Mittelalter*, Edited by Irene Erfen and Karl-Heinz Spiess. 17-36. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997.
- Spitta, Friedrich. "Die ungarischen Königslieder. Ein Blatt aus der hymnologischen Geschichte der reformationszeit." *Monatsschrift für Gottesdienst und Kirchliche Kunst* 14 (1909): 325-343.
- Spruyt, Bart Jan. "'En bruit d'estre bonne luteriene': Mary of Hungary (1505-58) and Religious Reform." *English Historical Review* 109 (1994): 275-307.

- Spruyt, Bart Jan. "Verdacht van Lutherse sympathieën. Marie van Hongarije en de religieuze controversen van haar tijd [Suspected of lutheran sympathies. Mary of Hungary and the religious controversies of her age]." In *Maria van Hongarije : koningin tussen koningin tussen keizers en kunstenaars* [Mary of Hungary. Queen between emperors and artists], 1505-1558 (exhibition catalogue), Edited by Bob van den Boogert and Jacqueline Kerkhoff. 87-117. Zwolle: Waanders, 1995.
- Stoegmann, Karl. "Über die Briefe des Andrea da Burgo, Gesandten König Ferdinands, an den Kardinal und Bischof von Triest, Bernhard Cles." *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften Wien, phil.-historischen Klasse* 24 (1857): 159-252.
- Stracke, Wilhelm. *Die Anfänge der Königin Maria von Ungarn, späteren Statthalterin Karls V. in den Niederlanden. (Phil. Diss.)*. Göttingen 1940.
- Sweeney, James Ross. "The Tricky Queen and Her Clever Lady-in-Waiting: Stealing the Crown to Secure Succession, Visegrad 1440." *East Central Europe - L'Europe du Centre Est Special Issue* vol. 20-23 (1993-1996): 87-100.
- Szende, Katalin. "Integration through language: the multi-lingual character of late medieval Hungarian towns." In *Segregation – Integration – Assimilation. Religious and Ethnic Groups in the Medieval Towns of Central and Eastern Europe*, Edited by Derek Keene, Balázs Nagy, and Katalin Szende. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009.
- Szende, Katalin. "Maria von Ungarn und die Städte Westungarns." In *Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558). Eine Renaissancefürstin*, Edited by Martina Fuchs and Orsolya Réthelyi. 113-132. Münster: Aschendorff, 2005.
- Szende, László. *Piast Erzsébet és udvara 1320-1380. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. Budapest 2007.
- Szende, László. "Mitherrscherin oder einfache Königinmutter. Elisabeth von Łokietek in Ungarn (1320-1380)." *Majestas* 13 (2005): 47-63.
- Szovák, Kornél. "King and Church. Matthias Corvinus and Religion." In *Matthias Corvinus, the King. tradition and Renewal in the Hungarian Royal Court 1458-1490*, Edited by Péter Farbaky, Enikő Spekner, Katalin Szende, and András Végh. 393-396. Budapest: BTM, 2008.
- Thurston, Herbert. "Washing of Feet and Hands." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia. Vol. 15*. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1912.
- Vale, Malcom. *The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe, 1270-1380*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Végh, János. "Alamizsnás Szent János a budai Várban [St John the Almoner in the Buda Palace]." *Építés és Építészettudomány* 10 (1980): 455-467.
- Walsh, Katherine and Alfred A. Strnad. "Eine Erasmianerin im Hause Habsburg: Königin Maria von Ungarn (1505-1558) und die Anfänge der Evangelischen Bewegung." *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft* 118 (1998): 40-85.
- Ward, Jennifer C. *Women in England in the Middle Ages*. New York: Continuum, 2006.

- Wenczel, Gusztáv. "II Ulászló magyar és cseh király házas élete 1501-1506 [The Married Life of Wladislaw II, King of Hungary and Bohemia]." *Századok* 11 (1877): 630-641, 726-757, 816-840.
- Wenzel, Gusztáv. *Diósgyőr egykori történelmi jelentősége [The former historical significance of Diósgyőr]*. Budapest 1872.
- Wiesflecker, Hermann. *Kaiser Maximilian I., das Reich, Österreich und Europa an der Wende zur Neuzeit, vol. 5, /Der Kaiser und seine Umwelt*. München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag, 1986.
- Winterling, Aloys. ",Hof". Versuch einer idealtypischen Bestimmung anhand der mittelalterlichen. und frühneuzeitlichen Geschichte." In *Hof und Theorie. Verstehen durch Erklären eines historischen Phänomens*, Edited by Reinhardt Butz, Jan Hirschbiegel, and Dietmar Willoweit. 77-90. Köln: Böhlau, 2004.
- Wolf, Armin. "Reigning Queens in Medieval Europe: When, Where, and Why." In *Medieval Queenship*, Edited by John Carmi Parsons. 169-88. Stroud 1994.
- Wolfram, Herwig. "Gegenstände des Briefwechsels zwischen Ferdinand I. und seinen Geschwistern Karl V. und Maria von Ungarn." In *Beiträge zur neueren Geschichte Österreichs*, Edited by Heinrich Fichtenau and Erich Zöllner. 84-101. Wien 1974.
- Woolgar, C. M. *The Great Household in Late Medieval England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Woolgar, C. M. *The senses in late medieval England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Zombori, István. "A magyar királyi udvar 1523-ban. Krzysztof Szydłowiecki lengyel követ beszámolója [The Hungarian Royal Court in 1523. The report of the Polish envoy Krzysztof Szydłowiecki]." In *Idővel paloták... Magyar udvari kultúra a 16–17. században*, Edited by Nóra G. Etényi and Ildikó Horn. 33–44. Budapest 2005.
- Zoványi, Jenő. "A „Lutherani comburantur” és a Corpus juris hungarici." *Protestáns Szemle* (1917).
- Zsoldos, Attila. *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik (A királynői intézmény az Árpádok korában) [The Arpadians and their women. The reginal institution in the Age of the Arpadian dynasty]*. Budapest: Történettudományi Intézet, 2005.

List of Abbreviations

MOL Df	Magyar Országos Levéltár, Diplomatikai fényképtár
MOL DI	Magyar Országos Levéltár, Diplomatikai levéltár
ÖStA	Österreichisches Staatsarchiv
HHStA	Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv
UA	Ungarische Akten

8 Appendix 1 - Court personnel of Mary of Hungary (1521-1531)

This list contains all those members of the household of Mary of Hungary from the years between 1521 and 1531 who can be identified in the present state of scholarship by name, or at least by relationship. It does not include the people indicated only by occupation (e.g. “the smith”, “a servant”).

Name	Function
(Anonym)	Lady-in-waiting in Mary’s court, married Helmfried van Makau (Matkow).
Acél, Ferenc	Reginal secretary from 1522.
Albisi, Bernhard	Royal and reginal secretary. Mary recommended him (Cantor of Eger) to Ferdinand on 13 October 1526.
Altendorfer, Johann	M’s Bohemian secretary at least from 1525, served her after 1526 (1529)
Amadé of Várkony, István	Estate manager of Magyaróvár from 1524, from 1526 M’s “ <i>provisor curiae</i> ”, <i>ispán</i> and captain of Magyaróvár; after 1526 in the service of Szapolyai.
Antonietta, Miss	M’s serving lady originally from the Low Countries (1521)
Ártándi, Pál	Influential politician from the middle nobility involved in M’s estate management (<i>ispán</i> of Máramaros (today Maramureş in Romania), castle of Huszt (today Hust in Ukraine) and the towns belonging to the <i>Salzkammer</i> , Munkács (today Mukacheve in Ukraine)) before 1526.
Bácsi, Miklós	Royal and reginal secretary.
Bahi (Balio), Rupert	“Fürschneider” in Innsbruck, M’s “ <i>unterhofmeister</i> “ in the travel household 1521
Bailleul, Charles de	From the Low Countries and in Mary’s service in Innsbruck and Buda. Sent by her with her secretary Wilhelm to Kremnitz (Körmöcbánya, today Kremnica in Slovakia) and Altsohl (Zólyom, today Zvolen in Slovakia), to take over the Chamber and the Burghaupmannschaft from Thurzó (1522). Perhaps husband of Margarethe Bailleul (Perseresserin), according to other sources husband of Catherine de Lickerke. Perhaps Mary’s Hofmeister.
Bailleul, Frau = Perseresserin	Probably the Perseresserin. Very influential perhaps Mary’s Hofmeisterin. Perhaps wife of Charles of B. Perhaps mother of Margarethe von Bailleul.
Bailleul, Margarethe von	M’s lady-in-waiting, married to Hans Presinger Doorward in Innsbruck (1518).
Bailleul, Philip de	M’s cup-bearer in Buda. Stays with her and follows her to the Low Countries (1531).
Bárány, Bernát	Royal and reginal gentleman of the chamber (1525), from Bartfeld (Bártfa, Bardejov in Slovakia).
Batthyány, Ferenc	Royal Master Cup-bearer, M calls him her own Cup-bearer in one document, married to M’s lady-in-

		waiting Catherina Svetkovics.
Battista, Johannes		Serves in M's stall at the end of 1526.
Beheim (Behem), Bernhard von Friedensheim		Count of the Chamber (Kammergraf) of Kremnitz and Captain of Altsohl (Oberster Burghauptmann) in the begin of 1524. Main figure in Mary's estate management up to 1537 when he lost favour.
Brandenburg, Margrave Wilhelm von		Unofficially at Mary's court from 1523, appointed Hofmeister from May 1525. He officially kept the title up to the autumn of 1527, when Mary broke up her court.
Burgo, Andrea da		Imperial envoy who accompanies M to Buda and stays at her court as her councillor up to the November 1523. Very influential, member of the royal council.
Burgstaler, Hans		Cook for the household ("Frauenzimmer und Gesind Kuchl") in M's travel household (1521).
Caballis, Lucretia de (von Ross)		M's most influential lady-in-waiting at least from 1523 up to her court in the Low Countries, where she becomes M's Hofmeister. Wife of Count Leonard Noguero, related to Paula von Firmian, (née Caballis), Hofmeisterin of the princess court.
Carondolet, (Garundelet) Thomas		From the Low Countries, assigned carver for the travel to Buda 1521. Perhaps Thomas Perrenot, brother of cardinal Anton van Perrenot, Lord of Granvelle.
Caspar		Chaplain and confessor of M (1527).
Caudron, Jean (Janny)		M's servant of the Silverchamber in Innsbruck and Buda.
Cerf (Serp, Seef), Miss		M's lady-in-waiting from the Low Countries in Innsbruck and Buda. Perhaps a niece of Jehan de Castro.
Cicolin, Jacob doctor		M's physician in M's travel household (1521). Formerly in the household of Maximilian (1519).
Cordatus, Conrad		Probably only in M's service after 1526 for a short while as preacher.
Croner, Hans		M's first court chaplain from Kronstadt (Brassó, today Braşov in Romania), accompanies her from Mechelen to Vienna and stays in her court up to 1521, when he accompanies her to Buda.
Dersffy, Potentia		Probably M's lady-in-waiting before 1526. Married to Erasmus Frh. von Eyczing, niece of Ferenc Batthyány.
Dóci, János	CEU eJID Collection	Reginal gentleman of the chamber 1526, he was <i>ispán</i> of Bars county, a member of the new aristocracy of the Jagiellon Age and a former gentleman of the chamber of the king.
Eis, Catherina		In the Innsbruck household, non-noble, in M's travel household 1521 as "Cammerjungfrau"
Engl, Hanns		Waggoner in M's travel household (1521).
Ennsner, Erhard		Cellar Master in M's travel household (1521).
Eyczing, Ulrich		Son of the executed Michael von Eyczing, in the service of Louis II in 1525 as royal gentleman of the chamber, according to the account books. After 1526 he appears in the service of the queen.
Feta, Albrecht von		M requested him to be Hofmeister in 1529, but this did not take place for unknown reasons.
Feure (Feuers, Fence), Philip v.		M's gentleman of the chamber from the Low Countries in Innsbruck, gentleman of the wardrobe for

	the travel to Buda, stays with M and goes with her to the Low Countries, where he serves in her chamber (1532).
Firmian, Bartholomaeus von	Hofmeister of the princess court, leads Anne and Mary to Linz 1521
Firmian, Lady,	Hofmeisterin of the Frauenzimmer in Innsbruck, wife of Bartholomaeus von Firmian.
Firmian, Paula von (née Caballis)	Hofmeisterin of the Innsbruck court, previously Hofmeisterin of Bianca Maria Sforza, second wife of Niklas Herrn von Firmian an der Etsch
Forgách of Gimes, Ferenc	M's Cup-bearer 1525. Formerly gentleman of the kings chamber. He is mistakenly identified by Fögel as Master Cup-bearer of the queen.
Fuchs, Fraulein	Lady in M's Frauenzimmer, "Cammerjungfrau", in Innsbruck and Buda, non-noble. Married to Hans Pock von Labris, Mary's Hofmeister.
Gallinczer, Leonard	In M's service in the management of the castle of Diósgyőr, second husband of Ursula Pemfflinger.
Georg	Servant of Hans Burgstaler in the kitchen for the household in M's travel household (1521).
Georig	Waggoner in M's travel household (1521).
Gesertorf, Miss	Lady in M's Frauenzimmer in Innsbruck and Buda. Married to Karl v. Stierstädt,
Gosztonyi of Felsőseleste, János	Reginal chancellor from October 1522 and bishop of Győr. Has humanist erudition and Paris education. From 1526 Bishop of Transylvania until his death in 1527.
Halsreiter, Hans	Silverwasher in M's travel household (1521). It is not certain that really went, since the source notes that he, or another in his place should be included in the household.
Hanns	Groom (stable) in M's travel household (1521).
Hanoque, Heinrich / Hanoque (Hanika), Johann	M's Carver in Innsbruck and Buda from the Low Countries, non noble. Perhaps one and the same as the gentleman of the chamber (1521-26) Hänigken Oels and Hans Hanoque
Henckel, Johannes (c.1480-1539)	Erudite, humanist parish priest from Kassau, with Reformation sympathies. M's court priest and confessor from the autumn of 1525 to early 1526. He rejoins her in 1528 and remains in her service up to 1531. Explicitly mentioned in the list of officials, who would not be allowed to accompany M to the Low Countries
Heystein	Noble page of M's travel household (1521).
Hild, Johannes	M's "factor" [business representative] in Buda
Hispanus, Augustinus	M's Cup-bearer, also royal Cup-bearer at the same time (1521-1526)
Hispanus, Ludovicus	M's Gentleman of the Chamber (1525)
Hofer	M's carver in the travel household (1521).
Holzinger, Ludwig	Official of the stable in M's travel household (1521).
Hongville, Guilhelm de	M's secretary from the Low Countries 1521-1526.
Hunger, Valentin	Cook in Innsbruck, cook in M's service in the travel list in 1521.

Hutter (Huet, Pileus, Pylades), Martin	M's secretary from Transylvania, member of an influential patrician family in Hermannstadt (Nagyszeben, today Sibiu in Romania).
Jobst	Pastry baker in Innsbruck and Buda (1521).
Kalbeck, Miss	In the Innsbruck household, non-noble, in M's travel household 1521 as "Cammerjungfrau".
Koch, Martin	Groom (stable) in M's travel household (1521).
Königsberger	Noble page of M's travel household (1521).
Krabat von Sparendorf, Georg	M's secretary and councillor after 1531.
Kreuzer (Kreitzer), Christof	Kitchen administrator ("küchenschreiber") in M's household in Innsbruck and Buda (formerly in the same function under Bianca Maria Sforza). He stayed with M's in Buda and received money in her name (1526).
Krews, Simon	Waggoner in M's travel household (1521).
Lad, Christof von der	Doorward in M's travel household (1521).
Lamberg, Hans Herr zu Saunstein	Steward of the princess' court. M's steward (<i>Hofmeister</i>) appointed for the travel (1521), afterwards returned to Austria to be the Hofmeister of Anna's court.
Lamberg, Ludwig Herr zu Saunstein	M's Master Cup-bearer for the travel, probably did not stay in Buda. Relative of Hans Lamberg.
Landenberg, Catherina de	M's lady-in-waiting in Innsbruck and Buda (1521). From a Swiss noble family; sources testify her presence in Mary's court up to 1537.
Lengyel of Tóti, János	Involved in M's estate management in Neusohl (Besztercebánya, today Banská Bystrica in Slovakia) (1525). M's steward at least from 07 1525. Marriage to Korothnay Katalin arranged by her guardian István Amadé of Várkony.
Leuser, Georg	In M's service (1526).
Liebhart, Gregor	Base singer in M's court chapel (1521-1526), from 1527 in Ferdinand's chapel.
Likerka (Lytgerkhen), Catharina	Perhaps married to Charles de Bailleul, who was perhaps M's Hofmeister.
Likerka (Lytgerkhen), Johanna	M's lady-in-waiting in Buda, married to Gáspár Horváth de Vingart royal Master Carver.
Lossonczy, Antal	In M's service (before 1526).
Maicka aus Brüssel	In M's Frauenzimmer in Innsbruck and Buda "Cammerjungfrau", from the Low Countries, non-noble.
Maidburg, Barbara	In princess' court in Innsbruck and in M's court in Buda, noble from Austria. Her sister Katharina served in Anne's court (1515-1528).
Mikolai, Gergely	M's advisor in legal matters, the queen's " <i>director causarum</i> ", the most sought-after lawyer of the period.
Móré of Csula, László	Royal and perhaps reginal (1524) Master Carver.

Morgai, Miklós	Reginal secretary (1525) From the higher ranks of the nobility.
Mosel, Wolfgang	Singer in M's court chapel (at least from 1526 summer), He stayed in Mary's household until 1528 and finally returned to the court of Württemberg in Stuttgart.
Nassenthaler	Official responsible for the fodder for the horses ("Fuettermeister") in M's travel household (1521).
Neuburg, Johann v. (de Novo Castro)	M's chaplain and almoner from 1527, probably at the court before 1526. Explicitly mentioned in the list of officials, who would not be allowed to accompany M to the Low Countries, nevertheless he stays in her household (household lists of 1531/32).
Nobis, André	Butcher ("zueschroter"), from the Low Countries in M's travel household (1521).
Oláh (Olaus), Miklós (Nicolaus)	Royal and reginal (1526) secretary, stays with M and goes with her to the Low Countries, returns to Hungary in 1539, later Archbishop of Esztergom.
Pauer, Sixt	The tailor in M's travel household (1521).
Pemfflinger, Katharina	M's lady-in-waiting (Buda), married to Bálint Török (1524), Influential family, several sisters and brothers in the courts of Mary, Anne, Ferdinand and Charles.
Pemfflinger, Sebastian	M's Master Carver for the travel, Master of the Horse up to 1531, then served as the castellan of Diósgyőr and Bruck an der Leitha. Married Elisabeth Puchheim, M's lady-in-waiting in Buda; his brother Christoph served in Louis's court, his other brother Stephan in Ferdinand's court, related to Ulrich von Eytzing, nephew of Markus Pemfflinger, nephew of Johann Schneidpöck.
Pemfflinger, Ursula	Mother of the Pemfflinger children, Anne's governess and later (after 1526) also serves in her court, second marriage to Leonhard Gallinczer (Kallnitzer), in charge of Diósgyőr after 1526 in M's service.
Pfandl, Sigismund	Singer (alto) in M's chapel (before 1526), also called her <i>capellanus</i> . In 1531 he was a priest in Kőszeg (Güns) and in 1532 priest and cantor in Ferdinand's chapel.
Pirhinger, Georg	A drummer in M's travel household (1521).
Piso, Jacobus	Royal and reginal secretary, erudite humanist diplomat, friend of Erasmus.
Pluemeck (Bluemeck, Bluemeneck), Margarethe von	M's lady-in-waiting in Buda, married to Bernhard Beheim .
Pock von Labris, Hans	M's Hofmeister at least from 1523 up to 1530, his relative (probably son) was Louis' gentleman of the chamber, married Miss Fuchs (1524), from Silesia.
Poitiers, Katharina von	M's lady-in-waiting in Innsbruck and Buda. Came with M from the Low Countries with her parents and siblings, married to Sigismund von Pfirt (1521).
Poitiers, Margarethe von	M's "bercheresse" had not left her side since her birth, travelled with her with husband and children to Vienna and Innsbruck (Buda?, Some identify her with the Perseresserin, but the question cannot be settled at present due to contradictory data.)

Premberger, Hackin	From the Low Countries, master of the tapestries in M's travel household (1521).
Prenner Fuchs, Hans	Tinwasher in M's travel household (1521). It is not certain that really went to Buda, since the source notes that he, or another in his place should be included in the household.
Prunner, Wolfgang	M's Master of the Ceremonies (Stäblmaister), had served in Innsbruck court (1516), became an important figure in M's early estate management of Mary as count of the salt and mining chambers (Kammergraf). After 1523 he disappears from the sources.
Puchheim (Puchaim), Elisabeth Frll. v.	M's Lady in waiting (Buda), married her Master of the Horse Sebastian Pemfflinger, daughter of the executed Hans von Puchheim, her brother Wilhelm, perhaps also her sister Dorothea served in M's court.
Puchheim (Puchaim), Wilhelm von; Frh. zu Raps und Krumpach	M's Cup-bearer in Buda (1525), married Barbara von Ungnad (1523) Anne's lady-in-waiting.
Puchheim (Puchaim), Wolfgang von, herr zu Gellersdorf	In Louis's service and after 1526 had served Ferdinand in the campaigns in Hungary. He accompanied M to the Low Countries and served in military campaigns for seven years before he returned and served M as castellan of the castle of Altsohl.
Puchler, Wolfgang	In M's service in 1529 as German secretary and took over the office of treasurer (<i>Pfennigmeister</i>) from Hans Selnauer, stayed in Austria and server in M's financial management. Died before 1549.
Puechl, Georg	Singer in M's court chapel (before 1526).
Raschin von Riesenburg, Peter	M's Bohemian financial officer from 1523 (Unterkammerer) to 1537 when he died.
Rauch, Wolfgang	M's cook ("Mundkoch") in M's travel household (1521).
Reicherstorffer, Georg	M's secretary from Transylvania (Sibiu) from at least 1525 and becomes a secretary and diplomat of Ferdinand in 1527 at the recommendation of Mary.
Ressmann, Christof	M's Doorward for the travel household (1521), had been in Anne's service. originates from Transylvania, probably only included in Mary's retinue to be sent home to Hungary.
Salm, Countess. Elisabeth v. (née Roggendorf)	Elisabeth, the sister of Wilhelm von Roggendorff, Margrave of Austria and the widow of Niklas Count of Salm had been Mary's Hofmeisterin on her travel to Buda (1521), but had left Buda and served Anne as Hofmeisterin afterwards. M wanted her as Hofmeisterin to the Low Countries, she stayed at the head of Mary's court from 1532 to 1535, when she returned to Vienna.
Salm, Miss (Margarethe ?)	M's lady-in-waiting (perhaps only after 1532), daughter of Elisabeth von Salm, Mary's Hofmeisterin who went to the Netherlands from Vienna in 1532.
Sárkány of Ákosháza, Bernát	M's court <i>familiaris</i> and flag-bearer in Buda before 1526.
Sarsson, Andreas	M's castellan of Óbuda and <i>officialis</i> of Csepel (1525-1526), originates from Tyrnau (Nagyszombat, today Trnava in Slovakia), bears the title " <i>provisor curiae reginalis</i> , probably stays in her service after she leaves to the Low Countries.

Schneidpöck (Schnaitpeck) Freiherr von Schönkirchen, Johann dr.	Imperial ambassador of Charles and Ferdinand in Hungary 1523-1525, M's councillor, uncle of the Pemfflinger children.
Schnitzenpainer	M's carver in the travel household (1521), may be the same as the Niklas Schnitzenpainer, who as a captain of the armed cavalry was the temporary vice-officer in command of Ferdinand I for several months in 1536.
Selbherr, Hans	Singer in M's court chapel (before 1526).
Selnauer, Johannes	Official of the silver chamber at the Innsbruck court and the same function in M's household in Buda. Selnauer can be traced up to 1527, when he was her treasurer and councillor.
Semenitsch	M's carver in the travel household (1521).
Serédi, Gáspár	M's secretary, also royal secretary.
Sims, Lienhard	Groom (stable) in M's travel household (1521).
Spät, Sigismund	Groom (stable) in M's travel household (1521).
Stamp, Jacob von	M's Master of the Hunt (Hofjägermeister), but he also served Mary as official in the stall (Stallmeister) from 1523. After 1526 he served Mary as captain of Magyaróvár between 1532 and 1535, and captain of Altsohl between 1537 and 1540.
Steyr, Valentin	Official in charge of the coaches ("Senfftenmeister") in M's travel household (1521).
Steyrer, Jacob	Waggoner in M's travel household (1521).
Stoltzer, Thomas (1485-1526)	One of the most important German composers of his time, born in the Silesian Schweidnitz. The head of M's musical establishment (<i>Magister Capellae</i>) from the autumn of 1522 up to 1526.
Svetkovics (Schmeckawitz/ Swetkovics/ Schwetkowitsch/ Schwetkowitz), Catharina	M's lady-in-waiting in Innsbruck and Buda, daughter of a rich Salzburg burgher, married to royal Master Cup-bearer and <i>ban</i> of Dalmatia-Croatia, Ferenc Batthyány in 1523, maintains correspondence with the queen up to the 1550s, several siblings in the courts of Anne and Ferdinand.
Symandl	Guard of the lower door ("Portier an die undter Tür") in M's travel household (1521).
Szerencsés (Fortunatus), Imre	Royal vice treasurer 1520-24, M's financial councillor. Born in Spain as member of the Jewish Seneor family, converted to Christianity in 1519, died in 1526.
Thann, Miss	M's lady-in-waiting, married Herr Rothenburg of Silesia.
Thunner	Noble page of M's travel household (1521).
Thurn, Christoph	M's noble page before 1526, later involved in her estate management as captain (Hauptman) of Altsohl in 1531. Related to the Pemfflinger family.
Thurzó, Elek (Alexius)	Influential member of the court nobility, royal secretary, involved in the Fugger-Thurzó consortium, economic opponent, later ally of the queen, in 1525 she appoints him her " <i>specialis familiaris</i> ".
Trummer, Hans	Member of the Innsbruck court, M's treasurer (Pfenningsschreiber) in the travel household (1521), he can be traced in Anne's court in 1525 in the same function.

Ungnad, Elisabeth v.	M's lady-in-waiting in Buda, daughter of M's Hofmeisterin, Margaretha von Ungnad, married to Franz Ernst (Ernusz) von Csáktornya, royal gentleman of the chamber (1526), who died in the Battle of Mohács. She probably stayed at Mary's court with her mother up to 1531. Sister in law of Wilhelm von Puchheim, M's Cup-bearer
Ungnad, Margareta von (Lochner von Liebfels)	M's Hofmeisterin „obriste Hoffmaystarin” from 1524 to 1531, not allowed to accompany her to the Low Countries. Widow of Johann von Ungnad.
Uterman, Carrolius	Groom (stable) in M's travel household (1521).
Valdstram, Erasmus	M's secretary in 1523, had earlier served Ferdinand and later occurs frequently as one of the Czech secretaries of Louis II.
Várdai, Imre	M's Master Cup-bearer in 1526 earlier in Anne's court up to 1524.
Verner, Paul	Kitchen assistant (“Kuchlknecht”) in M's travel household (1521).
Wien, Hans von	Waggoner in M's travel household (1521).
wife of Jobst the cook	Washerwoman in M's travel household (1521).
Wilhelm (Guilhelm)	M's secretary 1522, probably from the Low Countries.
Wolfstein	Noble page of M's travel household (1521).
Wuldersdorfer (Walderstorfer), Niklas	M's quartermaster in Innsbruck and Buda (1521).
Zanger, Johann (1517-1587)	Singer in M's court chapel (before 1526).
Zelking, Margareta	M's Hofmeisterin for the travel to the Low Countries 1531 and returns, married to Wilhelm v. Zelking.
Zelking, Wilhelm v.	Served at M's court as Ferdinand's councillor in 1526-27, M's Hofmeister from 1529 to 1531, accompanies her to the Low Countries and returns, because of his religious sympathies, here he serves M as commissioner and councillor in Vienna.
Zsigmond	Musician (lutanist) in the chapel of M.
Zwayhander	Musician (drummer) in the chapel of M.

9 Appendix 2 - Gazetteer of the place names

Bakabánya, Pukantz, today Pukanec in Slovakia
Bártfa, Bartfeld, today Bardejov in Slovakia
Bélabánya, Dilln, today Banská Belá in Slovakia
Beregszász, today Berehove in Ukraine
Besztercebánya, Neusohl, today Banská Bystrica in Slovakia
Brassó, Kronstadt today Braşov in Romania
Breslau, today Wrocław in Poland
Breznóbánya, Bries, today Brezno in Slovakia
Cserög, today Čerević in Serbia
Erdőd, today Arduđ in Croatia
Érsomlyó, Versec, today Vršac in Serbia
Eszék, today Osijek in Croatia
Huszt, today Hust in Ukraine
Karánsebes, today Caransebeş in Romania
Kassa, Kaschau, today Košice Slovakia
Kolozsvár, Klausenburg, today Cluj-Napoca in Romania
Komárom, Komorn, today Komarno in Slovakia
Korpona, Karpfen, today Krupina in Slovakia
Kölpény, today Kupinovo in Serbia
Körmöcbánya, Kremnitz, today Kremnica in Slovakia
Libetbánya, Libethen, today Ľubietová in Slovakia
Liegnitz, Legnicain Poland
Lőcse, Leutschau, today Levoča in Slovakia
Lugos, today Lugoj in Romania
Lukavec today in Croatia
Máramaros, today Maramureş in Romania
Medvevár, today Medvedgrad in Croatia
Munkács, today Mukacheve in Ukraine
Nagyszeben, Hermannstadt, today Sibiu in Romania
Nagyszombat, Tyrnau, today Trnava in Slovakia
Nyitra, Neutra, today Nitra in Slovakia

Orsova, today Orșova in Romania
Pétervárad, today Petrovaradin in Serbia
Pozsony, Pressburg, today Bratislava in Slovakia
Rakonok, today Rakovec in Croatia
Róna, today Costiui in Romania
Selmecbánya, Schemnitz, today Banská Štiavnica
Szalánkemény, today Slankamen in Serbia
Sziget, today Sighetu Marmației in Romania
Técső, today Tyachiv in Ukraine
Temesvár, today Timișoara in Romania
Trencsén, today Trenčín in Slovakia
Újbánya, Königsberg, today Nová Baňa in Slovakia
Újlak, today Ilok in Croatia
Várad, today Oradea in Romania
Varasd, today Varaždin in Croatia
Vári, today Vari in Ukraine
Verbovec, today Vrbovec in Croatia
Visk, today Vyshkove in Ukraine
Zimony, today Zemun in Serbia
Zólyom, Altsohl, today Zvolen in Slovakia

10 Appendix 3 - Map: The estates of Mary of Hungary in the kingdom of Hungary

THE ESTATES OF QUEEN MARY OF HUNGARY
IN THE KINGDOM OF HUNGARY

