

BRODERITHI DESCRI- PTIO RECOGNITA A SAMB.

REGNABAT eo tempore, quo Solymanus Hungariam validissimo exercitu est aggressus, anno 1526, Ludouicus, eius nominis secundus, Hungariz, Boemizq; rex, Vladislai Cazimiri ex Anna de Candale Galla filius: qui patre in ætate pupillari amisso, agebat eo tempore, quo bellum est ei per Turcam motum, primum & vigesimum annum. Fuerat ei paucis mensibus ante mortuum patrem, desponsata Caroli Imperatoris, ac Ferdinadi archiducis Austriz soror, Maria: quam statim, vt ad annos pubertatis peruenit, duxit in vxorem: sorore sua natu maiore Anna, eodem tempore Ferdinando in matrimonium tradita. Erat Ludouicus iuuenis procerus, forma corporis supra alios æquales egregia, naturæ singulari bonitate, & præclara indole: virtutis ita insignis, vt si eum ad maturiorem ætatem peruenire contigisset, habuisset in eo proculdubio, longè optimum, ac præstantissimū principem. Ingenio erat miti admodum, ac minimè feroci, ad omne rectum & honestum mirè flexibili, & sua etiam sponte procliu. Præterea armorum tractandorum, equitandi, venandi, & alia huiusmodi iuuenilia, & militaria opera exercendi studiosus, verax, constans, & secreti, si quod ei credidisses, tenacissimus. Erat eodem tempore regni Comes Palatinus, quem vocant, quæ prima est à rege inter seculares dignitas, Stephanus Bathori superstes, Stephani Bathori, qui sub Mathia rege impigrè, & magna cum laude rem Translyuanam administrauerat, ex fratre Andrea nepos: & Translyuaniz præerat Ioannes Zapoli, comes Scepusiensis, is qui paulo post regnum est adeptus. A patre Stephano in amplissimis opibus cum fratre Georgio est relictus: tanta apud nobilitatem gratia, & fauore, vt iam inde à puero omnes eum, veluti regni successorem, si illud hæredè legitimo vacuum remansisset, obseruarent, & in eum vnum omnium oculi essent coniecti. Maiori Walachiz, quam Moldauiam appellant, Stephanus; minori, quam Transalpinam vocant, Radul imperabant, vterque regi Hungariz subiectus. Banus Dalmatiz, Croatiz, & Sclauoniz (nam hæ tres prouinciz ab vno magistratu regebantur, quem nos maritimum etiam præfectum dicimus) erat Franciscus Barthiani, obsequiis familiaribus iuuenis olim regi adhuc puero concilians. Arcem Themescensem, & eas regni partes, quas inferiores vocamus, Petrus Pereni tuebatur: & is coronam etiam regni, post mortem patris Emerici Pereni, apud eum relictam, cum eo, quem diximus, Ioanne Zapoli comite Scepusiensi, seruabat. Sirmio, & ei regni parti, quæ inter Sarum & Drauum per ripam Danubij iacet, Paulus Tomonij, archiepiscopus Colocensis præerat, ex ordine eorum, quos fratres minores de obseruantia vocamus: vir strenuus, & qui, antequam eam religionem intrasset, plurima exhibuerat, nec modica suæ virtutis argumenta, cum hoste sæpius cōgressus. Vacante postea archiepiscopatu Colocensi, cum ea bona, amisso paulo antè Belagrado, non minus defensore, quàm sacrorum ministro indigere viderentur: postulatum fuit in publico regni conuentu ab omnibus, vt Paulus è religione, si exire abueret, etiam vi, & autoritate summi Pontificis Romani extractus, illi ecclesiz, illisq; locis ab hoste defendendis præficeretur. Diu, multumq; ac verè, non simulate reluctatum, tandem voluntati regiz ac regni parere coegerunt. In qua præfectura, confessione omnium, perperam etiam de eo iudicantium, (vt nulla excellens virtus sine inuidia est) ita se gessit, vt nihil penitus prætermiserit, non solum quod ad strenuum militem, & Imperatorem, sed etiam, quod ad virum religiosum, & bonum archiepiscopum pertineret: nihil de priore vitæ austeritate, neque in cultu corporis, neque in vlla alia re remittens, aut immutans. Comes Christophorus de Frangepanibus, ante menses aliquot, ab obsequiis Ferdinan-

PÉTER KASZA

A HUNGARIAN DIPLOMAT IN POLISH SERVICE

(New sources for the functioning of István Brodarics as ambassador in Rome)

István Brodarics, who would later record the story of the Mohács defeat, stepped out to the stage of international politics in 1522 as ambassador in Rome. From this time sources from and about him become more plentiful, so he as ambassador becomes easier to research for the historian.

Provost of Pécs István Brodarics arrived to Rome as an envoy of Hungarian King Louis II. His main purpose was squeezing out substantial financial aid from the pope that would make recapturing of key border fortress Nándorfehérvár (today Beograd in Serbia), lost in 1521 to the Turks, possible. Paradoxically, since most of the documents of the Jagiello court in Buda perished due to Turkish ravaging, all-in-all one letter to Louis II¹ is extant from the first two years of Brodarics's mission, and another one written by the king to his ambassador in Rome.² So his activities as Hungarian envoy are hard to trace. Compared to these scarce data we know much more about his activities in Rome on the request and for the sake of Polish king Sigismund I. This, as we will see, provided the basis for his good relationship with the Polish court, and he could always rely on their support in later stages of his life.

Since we have very little certain data about the life of Brodarics before 1522, we do not know when he got into contact with the Polish court or with some of its dominant members. The first extant letter of noted humanist Andrzej Krzycki³ to Brodarics proves that at the time the letter was written in 1523 the two persons had possibly been friends for years.⁴ Since Krzycki was the cousin of the influential vice-chancellor Piotr Tomicki,

¹ Rome, 1 September 1522. See text in IVÁNYI Béla, *Adalékok a nemzetközi érintkezések történetéhez a Jagelló-korban* (Additions to the history of international connections in the Jagiello era), Történelmi Tár, 1906, 343–344.

² Buda, 1 June 1523. See text in VERESS Endre, *Akták és levelek Erdély- és Magyarország Moldvával és Havasalfölddel való viszonyához* (Files and letters to the relations of Hungary and Transylvania with Moldova and Walachia), Budapest, 1914, 125. Veress published only the first half of the letter. For the full text see Magyar Országos Levéltár (MOL, Hungarian National Archive, Budapest), DF 276078.

³ On the life of Andrzej Krzycki (1482–1537) recently cf. Leszek BARSZCZ, *Andrzej Krzycki, poeta, diplomat, prymas*, Gniezno, 2005; bibliography: 196–203.

⁴ “Rediens huc ex Lithuania litteras Dominationis Vestrae a quodam, qui dudum istinc ex urbe venerat, accepi, ex quibus quam *non oblita nostrae veteris consuetudinis*, et qua me benevolentia complectatur, abunde cognovi. Quae quidem litterae loco magni cuiuspiam muneris mihi exstiterunt. *Fuit enim spectata semper virtus Vestrae Dominationis et consuetudo iucundissima, quam cum per tot annos tantamque locorum intercapedinem video non extinctam, plurimum mihi gratulor*, et Vestrae Dominationi, quas maiores possum, gratias ago. Equidem nihil magis cupio, quam hunc illius erga me animum aliquibus meis officiis demereri,

it is almost certain that Brodarics already had a good relationship with Tomicki in his time in Rome.⁵

Brodarics set out for Rome in the spring of 1522, and when he arrived, the new pope, Adrian VI, who followed the deceased Leo X, was not in the Eternal City.⁶ It seems that Brodarics occasionally informed the Polish court about events in Rome already in 1522,⁷ but these letters are lost or unlocated. An unexpected event made the person of Brodarics really important for the Polish king. Not long after the arrival of Adrian VI in the end of August, on 9 September 1522 Bishop of Płock Erazm Ciołek,⁸ long-time ambassador of the king in Rome died unexpectedly. The sudden death of his envoy was bad news for Sigismund, because he was supposed to settle important matters with the new pope.⁹ Earlier Poland received permission to announce one-year-long indulgence and spend the collected money on defence against the Turks. Since the papal bull was not announced before Leo's death, lawyers of Sigismund were of the opinion that it was invalid, and the new pope should be petitioned to confirm it.¹⁰ Obviously Bishop Ciołek was supposed to fulfil the task but his sudden death left Sigismund without a commissioner, so the presence of Brodarics came in handy. He wrote to the Hungarian envoy from Vilnius on 22 October 1522 and asked Brodarics to represent him too, just as his own envoys regularly acted for King Louis.¹¹

Besides the kermess, in the same breath he asked for the intervention of Brodarics regarding the appointment of two bishops. Sigismund wanted to install Bishop of Przemyśl Rafał Leszczyński in the now empty seat of the Bishop of Płock.¹² To Przemyśl in turn he wanted to appoint cousin of his vice-chancellor Piotr Tomicki, Andrzej Krzycki, who functioned as provost of Poznań.¹³ Of course, he wrote to the pope¹⁴ and to the apostolic college¹⁵ asking for sanctioning his decision.

meumque vicissim erga illam studium et observantiam testari." Krzycki's letter to Brodarics, Cracow, 18 February 1523, cf. document no. 2, italics mine—P. K.

⁵ They might have met in 1515 in Vienna at the royal meeting, where Tomicki was definitely present and presumably Brodarics too, as secretary of Chancellor György Szathmári.

⁶ Adrian VI (1522–1523) was elected on 9 January 1522.

⁷ King Sigismund alludes in his letter to Brodarics in October 1522 that he had received letter from the Rome envoy before.

⁸ More on the life of Erazm Ciołek: Henryk FOLWARSKI, *Erazm Ciołek biskup i dyplomata*, Warsaw, 1935.

⁹ "Non pridem antequam litterae tuae nobis sunt redditae, accepimus oratorem nostrum episcopum Plo-censem istic vita functum et affecti sumus magna molestia, quod hac eius inopina morte complures res et negotia nostra sunt intricata." Cf. AT VI, 144–145.

¹⁰ Cf. AT VI, 135.

¹¹ "Quia vero et ipse defunctus et alii istic oratores nostri non minus curare solebant negotia nepotis nostri, regis Hungariae, postulamus a te, ut cum in praesens istic sit [!] et nos oratorem nostrum non habemus, non desit [!] una cum collega suo [Francesco Marsupino] apud Sanctissimum Dominum Nostrum rebus et negotiis nostris." Cf. AT VI, 145.

¹² He informed Leszczyński also in the end of October in Vilnius; cf. AT VI, 133–134.

¹³ Cf. his letter to Bona Sforza, AT VI, 133.

¹⁴ AT VI, 135–136.

¹⁵ AT VI, 136.

However, Adrian VI had his own plans concerning the Płock diocese, so without waiting for Sigismund's nomination he installed Marquis of Brandenburg John Albert, and informed the Polish ruler about his decision in a brief. It said that John Albert was chosen because he was the brother of the grandmaster of the Teutonic Order, which was at war with Poland at the time. The pope hoped that John Albert was the one to establish peace between the Order and Poland, and the latter could finally focus on the fight against Turks, which was so important to the Pope.¹⁶

The brief couldn't have reached Vilnius by 22 October, but Sigismund learnt about the pope's intention from a letter from Cardinal Achilles de Grassis dated 12 September.¹⁷ Accordingly, it was emphasised in the letter to Brodarics that Sigismund could not accept the appointment of anybody else than Rafał Leszczyński, since that would be a violation of the rights of his country, something he could not tolerate.¹⁸

Letters of the Polish king reached Rome in December 1522. Brodarics, in his letter on 1 January 1523, already informed the ruler of Poland that, according to the latter's request, he spoke to the pope regarding the Płock bishopric, the indulgence, and the collection of Peter's pence.¹⁹ In the letter he expounded at length on the love and appreciation with which the pope spoke about Sigismund, a real champion of Christianity, but did not provide anything concrete regarding the pope's decision. Two weeks later he wrote again to Poland. This time he had much more depressing news. He wrote that he had presented the issue of the Płock bishopric to the pope again, and this time Cardinal de Grassis, the protector of Poland was with him. In spite of this they could not dissuade the pope from his earlier intention, and Brodarics thought it was worthless to make further attempts. It turned out that the pope refused all of Sigismund's requests essentially. His candidate for the Płock bishopric remained John Albert, he reduced the time of the indulgence that Pope Leo permitted to half a year from one year, and wanted to commission his own people with the collection of Peter's pence.²⁰ As for the nomination, the pope's position was that since Bishop Ciołek died in Rome, in the territory of the Holy See, it was the Holy See who was to decide about his benefice.²¹

¹⁶ Cf. AT VI, 154–155.

¹⁷ Cf. AT VI, 140.

¹⁸ "...agatque apud illius Sanctitatem, ne quem alium ad episcopatum Plocensem provehere velit praeter reverendissimum dominum Raphaellem, episcopum Premisliensem, virum ecclesiae et reipublicae perquam idoneum et nobis meritissimum, quem nos Suae Sanctitati praesentamus. Nam nos alium nequamquam admittere volumus neque possemus contra iura nostra et statuta regni nostri, quae infringi regnicolae nostri nullo modo paterentur, orireturque inde aliqua turba perniciosissima, quae nescimus quo pacto sedari posset." AT VI, 145.

¹⁹ AT VI, 219–220.

²⁰ Erazm Ciołek obtained the right to collect Peter's pence before. After his death Sigismund requested the pope to transfer this right to Poznań bishop Piotr Tomicki.

²¹ "Et isti latius aliquanto interpretantur et extendunt Sedis Apostolicae iura, eorumque sacerdotia, qui, quacunq[ue] de causa in Urbe manserint et vitam finierint, ad suas provisiones spectare contendunt. Quod quidem iurene an iniuria faciant, viderint alii." AT VI, 225–226.

The Polish court, on the other hand, cited international law, which says that an ambassador is entitled to diplomatic immunity and extra-territorial rights, so it didn't matter that Bishop Ciołek died in Rome, it should have been regarded as if he had died in Poland.²² Sigismund, in his letter to Brodarics in February 1523 didn't conceal his disappointment with the pope's handling of the issue. In the first part he only complains that he had not received Cardinal de Grassis' letter mentioned by Brodarics, and because of this he is unclear about the situation regarding the Płock bishopric, but in the finishing part he states openly that his decision, just like the pope's, is unchangeable. He has no intention of installing in this bishopric anybody but his own nominee.

Brodarics probably received the Polish king's letter together with another from his old friend Andrzej Krzycki, one-time provost of Poznań, elected Bishop of Przemyśl dated 18 February, Cracow, in which Krzycki paints a dark picture of the consequences of the pope's decision in Poland. According to him it caused an outcry and harmed the Polish Church. Since Adrian VI did not approve of the appointment of Rafał Leszczyński to become Bishop of Płock, Sigismund, in an attempt to demonstrate his resoluteness, appointed lay commissioners to govern the diocese. A royal administrator represented the bishop in the Senate.²³ Krzycki could take over the bishopric of Przemyśl but he wasn't sure he could keep his previous benefices without which the impoverishing diocese ravaged by Turkish attacks would have meant trouble rather than honour. So he, too, asked Brodarics to intervene in the matter with the pope.²⁴ Thus, even though his major concern was the case of the Płock diocese promised to John Albert, Brodarics was also supposed to act on behalf of Krzycki.

The atmosphere between the Holy See and Cracow cooled down, and Sigismund sent an experienced diplomat, Hieronym Łasky to Rome to try to overcome the deadlock. The king of Poland informed Brodarics about the arrival of Łasky in a letter in May 1523 and asked him to be at Łasky's service and assist Łasky.²⁵ At the same time he expressed his perplexity over the pope's clinging to a decision with which he gains nothing but causes considerable harm to Poland.²⁶

²² Cf. Sigismund's letter to Jan Łasky, Cardinal of Gniezno, AT VI, 159–160.

²³ "Episcopatus Plocensis iussus est in manus secularium tradi, electo regio locus in senatu episcopi Plocensis..." Cf. document no. 2.

²⁴ The Polish king requested the pope that Krzycki can keep his other benefices besides being bishop, "sine quibus in episcopatu Premisliensi exili et lacero, ut in finibus infidelium statum suum cum debita dignitate sustinere non posset". (Cf. AT VI, 135.)

²⁵ See document no. 3.

²⁶ It seems from some letters of Tomicki and Krzycki that it was not only the pope's stubbornness that caused delay in the case of the Płock diocese, but Polish internal power struggles also hindered the birth of a decision favourable for Sigismund. Krzycki informed his uncle Piotr Tomicki in a letter that the powerful Archbishop of Gniezno Jan Łasky left no stone unturned to procure the Płock bishopric for his cousin, but he achieved nothing with the king. (Cf. AT VI, 293.) Łasky, it seems, then tried his luck with the Curia. Tomicki, in July 1523 when he congratulated Leszczyński for the decision in his favour in Rome, mentioned that some of their compatriots did everything possible to impede the appointment. (Cf. AT VI, 296.) Łasky, unlike members of the inner circle of the king (Szydłowiecki, Tomicki, Krzycki), who were noblemen from Lesser Poland, was a leader of the so-called Greater Poland party.

We do not know whether it was the new envoy's activity or Brodarics acted in a more fruitful way, in any case Brodarics, in his letter dated 10 June 1523, did not mention any envoys but was happy to report the news that he managed to achieve a breakthrough with the help of Cardinal Achilles de Grassis in the matter concerning the two bishoprics. At the latest consistory of the cardinals all decisions were made in favour of Sigismund. Brodarics attributed the large part of the success to Cardinal de Grassis' support; at the same time pointed out confidently that he himself did all he could do for a favourable decision.²⁷

It seems from a letter of Andrzej Krzycki that the letter of Brodarics about the positive turn of events arrived in Cracow on 7 July.²⁸ Based on this, King Sigismund's letter, in which he says his thanks to Brodarics for his contribution is probably also from July. It seems that Brodarics did not only take the necessary steps but tried to mitigate the tension between the two parties. At least the lines of Sigismund, in which he says he would follow Brodarics's advice and use a gentler tone in his letters to the pope, suggest this conclusion.²⁹ In the closing part of the letter he asks Brodarics to intervene for the final settlement of the issue, so that the two elected bishops could receive papal endorsement without further ado.

He sought Brodarics again in September, and asked for his assistance in settling another matter. Adrian VI agreed to give the two dioceses to Sigismund's candidates but upheld his claim for the annates due, and he even asked for more money than was usual at the time. Sigismund argued that the papal court had remitted the annates earlier in order to spend the money on the struggle against the Turks. For that reason, he says, it would be more just for the Curia to leave the money with the Poles and not to burden the already haggard diocese with the obligation to pay the annates.³⁰

However, by the time the letter reached Rome, Pope Adrian was dead. Brodarics reported to the king on 22 October that he had received the letter about the annates, but he was unable to do anything about it before the end of the conclave, and the election of the new pope.³¹ Nearly one month passed before the white smoke rose finally on 19 November. It heralded the election of Giulio Medici, cousin of the late Leo X. The new pope adopted the name Clement VII. According to Brodarics's letter on 11 December, he was very sympathetic towards demands of the king of Poland.³² This, however, proved to be diplomatic nicety, as it soon became clear to both the Hungarian ambassador and Sigismund.

Four days later, on 15 December, Brodarics wrote to Sigismund that regardless of the niceties, the pope wouldn't budge and accept less than the previously set 2000 ducats for annates. The Curia's position was that this was the usual amount for the two dioceses,

²⁷ Cf. AT VI, 286.

²⁸ Cf. AT VI, 294.

²⁹ Cf. document no. 4.

³⁰ Cf. document no. 5.

³¹ Cf. AT VI, 327.

³² Cf. AT VI, 345–346.

and even if it had been lowered occasionally, that had been the exception which was not to become the norm. Brodarics had to admit that his visits to the pope and the College of Cardinals had been futile; there was little hope that the decision would be changed. He consoled the king with the piece of news that even though he had been unsuccessful concerning the annates, he succeeded in securing Piotr Tomicki's position as Bishop of Cracow.³³

In the extant correspondence of Brodarics this is the last letter and piece of data regarding the bishopric of Płock. Of course, such investiture-controversies could be cited by the dozens from the history of relationships between various European courts and the papacy. What gives this matter its real significance is that even if it was not the complication concerning the Płock bishopric that brought Brodarics into the attention of the Polish court, nevertheless his role in the handling and resolution of the matter brought him high esteem and prestige in Poland. In the year 1523 Sigismund sent envoys to Rome at least three times: the first, as we have seen, was Hieronym Łasky, the second was a physician by the name of Lucas, and finally, the third was a courtier by the name of Stanisław in the autumn. All three envoys were entrusted to the care of Brodarics who gave them substantial support in fulfilling their missions successfully and as quickly as possible.

Brodarics was compensated for his services. In the spring of 1524, when his Hungarian patron Archbishop of Esztergom György Szathmári died, Brodarics approached Sigismund and requested him to intervene with the Hungarian court so that Brodarics would receive some richer benefices besides or instead of his provost position in Pécs. The king of Poland indeed took steps on behalf of the eminent Hungarian diplomat. In 1524 he was unsuccessful in helping Brodarics to become a bishop, but two years later, backed by the papal court, he succeeded in getting Brodarics installed as chancellor and Bishop of Szerém.

The letters that Sigismund wrote to Brodarics in the spring of 1525 are prime examples of his appreciations and trust. He wrote these upon learning that Brodarics, after a short stay in Hungary, was acting again as ambassador in Rome.³⁴

On the other hand, nothing demonstrates Brodarics's commitment to Sigismund more than the way he portrays the king in his work on the Mohács defeat.³⁵ Sigismund is pictured as a reliable, true Christian; the author tries to give a credible and genuine explanation of the fact that Sigismund stayed away from the battle in which his cousin died in the end.³⁶

³³ Cf. AT VI, 348.

³⁴ Cf. documents nos. 6–7.

³⁵ Earlier Hungarian and Polish literature held that *Historia verissima* was produced on the expressed request of Sigismund. My latest research has shown that this claim is not justifiable: Péter KASZA, "Because I Can See that Some [...] Tell the Events Differently to How They Happened..." *Comments to the Story of the Formation of István Brodarics's Historia verissima*, *Camoenae Hungaricae*, 4–5(2007–2008), 47–62.

³⁶ "Nam de rege Poloniae Sigismundo, patruo regis alia prorsus ratio esse videbatur, quod is foedus cum Turca paulo ante pepigerat extremum excidium a suis regnis, quando aliter inter tot Christianorum principum dissidia non posset, vel hoc pacto avertere conatus, neque videbatur princeps integerrimus et fidei observantissimus contra confoederatum principem auxilia ulla praestiturus." Cf. Stephanus BRODERICUS, *De conflictu*

The cordial relationship between the eminent Hungarian humanist and the great Polish ruler proved long-lasting and solid. The foundations of this relationship undoubtedly date back to the year 1523, the diplomatic storm over filling the position of the Bishop of Płock.

Appendix

The letters by Brodarics to Sigismund from Rome in the years 1522–1523 have been known to the scholar community for a long time. All were published in volume VI of *Acta Tomiciana*. However, responses by Sigismund were included exclusively in the first compilation of *Tomiciana* in manuscript, put together by Stanisław Górski. Volumes of this were in the Imperial Public Library in Sankt-Petersburg until the 1920s. Presently these are kept in the Jagiello Library (Biblioteka Jagiellońska) in Cracow. The collection consists of 17 codices. Volume 10 marked BJ 6556 contains letters by various statesmen, and mainly by King Sigismund to Rome. I came across six letters to Brodarics among these during my research in Poland.³⁷ The first four concern the issue regarding the Płock bishopric. These previously unpublished documents are presented here for the first time, supplemented by a letter found in Kórnik written by Andrzej Krzycki, the publication of which I considered important because it is closely related to the events discussed here. The letters are presented following the new practice of text publication: using unified orthography, without peculiarities of humanistic orthography.

1. King of Poland Sigismund to István Brodarics

[Cracow], [February 1523]

Manuscript used: Biblioteka Jagiellońska 6556, 71r–v³⁸

1. Letters from Brodarics left him in uncertainty regarding the cases of the bishoprics of Płock and Przemyśl.—2. He asks for clarification of the situation. Should the pope decide otherwise as he wishes, nothing can dissuade him from his intention.

Reverendissime devote nobis dilecte.

[1.] In negotio episcopatum Plocensis et Premisliensis, quod ut istic curares, a te postulavimus, binas tuas litteras accepimus,³⁹ quarum alteris refers te ad litteras pontificis, ex quibus nihil pro voto nostro cognovimus, alteris item reverendissimi domini cardinalis

Hungarorum cum Solymano Turcarum imperatore ad Mohach historia verissima, ed. Péter KULCSÁR, Budapest, 1985, 27.

³⁷ The research trip was made possible by a grant from the Hungarian Scholarship Committee (MÖB).

³⁸ See also: Biblioteka Czartoryska, Teki Naruszewicza, tom. 35, 397–398.

³⁹ Presumably letters by Brodarics written on 1 January 1523 (AT VI, 219–220) and on 15 of the same month (AT VI, 225–226) are referred to.

protectoris nostri, quas non habuimus, allegas, unde in dies magis in ipso negotio incerti reddimur. Quae res molestior est nobis, quam dici possit, nihilque nobis magis praeter spem accidere potuit, quam cum nos et serenissimus dominus nepos noster unum simus, et illius maiestatis negotia non secus istic Romae, quam nostra propria per oratores nostros curabantur. Nunc istud negotium nostrum talibus involucris et ambagibus tractari.

[2.] Et proinde postulamus a te, ut nobis tandem aperte scribas, quid agatur in ipso negotio, nam non dubium est, quin summus pontifex, cum ita res succedit, parvi faciat postulata nostra iustissima, aliudque facere in hoc ipso negotio, quam quod nos volumus aut ferre possumus, contendat, de quo, quidquid id sit, vellemus quam primum certiores fieri, ut rebus nostris opportuno modo prospiciamus. Nam quidquid illius Sanctitas tam de episcopatibus, quam etiam de sacerdotiis aliter disponere voluerit, quam nos constituerimus, et illius Sanctitati declaravimus, nos id nullo pacto admittemus, et licet Sanctitas Sua, ut scribis, de sua sententia, quam semel concepit, non facile decedat, tamen et nos de iustitia et dignitate nostra nulli hactenus gratia Dei cessimus, neque cessuros nos ipso Deo iuvante confidimus. Datum.

2. *Bishop of Przemyśl Andrzej Krzycki to István Brodarics*

Cracow, 18 February 1523

Manuscript used: Biblioteka Kórnicka 243, 222v–223r⁴⁰

1. *Krzycki expresses his joy over receiving letter from Brodarics and the fact that neither the long years nor the distance between them made him forget their old friendship.*—2. *He thanks for Brodarics's congratulation for his appointment as Bishop of Przemyśl, something he didn't seek, had not even thought of. He is afraid that the diocese, which is so near the Turks, will prevent him from achieving his literary aims.*—3. *He has heard about the election of the pope and is worried that the Church's situation will not improve in Poland, especially because of plots of its neighbours, mainly the Czech.*—4. *He is informed that there are manoeuvres regarding his benefices in Rome, but he cannot accept the position without those benefices.*

[1.] Reverendissime domine, domine et amice honorandissime. Rediens huc ex Lithuania litteras Dominationis Vestrae a quodam, qui dudum istinc ex urbe venerat, accepi, ex quibus quam non oblita nostrae veteris consuetudinis,⁴¹ et qua me benevolentia complectatur, abunde cognovi. Quae quidem litterae loco magni cuiuspian muneris mihi exstiterunt. Fuit enim spectata semper virtus Vestrae Dominationis et consuetudo iucundissima, quam cum per tot annos tantamque locorum intercapedinem video non exstinctam, plurimum mihi gratulor, et Vestrae Dominationi, quas maiores possum, gratias ago.

⁴⁰ Further manuscript: Biblioteka Kórnicka 245, 29r–v.

⁴¹ This is the earliest letter in the Krzycki–Brodarics correspondence. It is not known exactly how long they had known each other and where they had met. The phrase “per tot annos” in the next sentence indicates that they had known each other for years.

Equidem nihil magis cupio, quam hunc illius erga me animum aliquibus meis officiis demereri, meumque vicissim erga illam studium et observantiam testari. Quod ut aliquando praestare possim, nihil operae meae, nihil occasionis praetermittam.

[2.] Quod vero Vestra Dominatio eam mihi gratiam, qua me valere apud serenissimum dominum meum intellexit, gratulatur, ago quidem illi immensas gratias, verum mallet, ut aliquando quieti meae, cuius sum amantissimus, praesertim in tantis rerum publicarum turbis ac discriminibus gratulari possit. Nescio autem, quo meo fato sit, ut quo magis me in portum refero, hoc magis aestus me in altum repellit. Nam ipse clementissimus dominus meus me non vulgaribus sacerdotiis auxisset, et ego iam mihi et litterulis meis vivere destinassem, ecce me adeo non ambientem, ut ne cogitantem quidem haec unquam ad Premisliensem pontificatum⁴² evexit, tanquam e sinu quodam, ubi lenior fluctuatio, ad pelagus fluctuosissimum. Primum enim episcopatus ipse situs est in faucibus infidelium, ubi continuo casus et ruina est metuenda. Deinde in quantis turbis versetur res ecclesiastica in his regionibus, credo Vestram Dominationem non ignorare, in quibus nihil consultius videatur, quam latere.

[3.] Porro intelligimus summum pontificem, quem sperabamus redempturum Israel, huic incendio faces etiam addere,⁴³ quo haud dubium est aliquod grave discrimen secuturum, et si Vestra Dominatio hic adesset, et animum principis ac regnicolarum omnium exacerbatum videret, iudicaret prorsus de ipsa re ecclesiastica hic actum. Non desunt Bohemi et alii vicini, qui ignem succendant, nisi quod aegre adhuc per pontifices nostros arcetur incendium. Ego me huic aleae admixtum vehementer doleo, meque, si iuris mei essem, ex hac turba libentissime subducerem. Episcopatus Plocensis iussus est in manus secularium tradi, electo regio locus in senatu episcopi Plocensis, et mihi Premisliensis est assignatus imperio principis ac procerum omnium. Quid reliquum futurum sit, ubi pontifex et vos istic ita rem, ut coepistis, tractaveritis, non libet augurari.

[4.] Scribitur etiam nobis, quod de meis istic sacerdotiis nescio quid cudatur, sine quibus ego nunquam episcopatum hunc recipiam,⁴⁴ et proinde rogo et obsecro Vestram Dominationem, ut me quamprimum certiolem reddere dignetur, quid monstri istic alatur, et in hoc saltem mihi opituletur, si in alio non libet, ut in hac re, quomodocumque successerit, diutius non pendeam. De reliquis viderint alii. Commendo me Dominationi.

Cracoviae die 18 Februarii 1523.

⁴² After the death of Bishop of Plock Erazm Ciołek (1522) King Sigismund appointed Bishop of Przemyśl Rafał Leszczyński as his successor, and former provost of Poznań Krzycki got the latter's vacant position.

⁴³ Obvious allusion to the dispute over the appointments of bishops between the pope and the Polish court.

⁴⁴ The Polish king too requested the pope to allow Krzycki to keep his other benefices besides those of a bishop, "sine quibus in episcopatu Premisliensi exili et lacero, ut in finibus infidelium statum suum cum debita dignitate sustinere non posset". (Cf. AT VI, 135.)

3. *King of Poland Sigismund to István Brodarics*

[Cracow], [May 1523]

Manuscript used: Biblioteka Jagiellońska 6556, 71r–v⁴⁵

1. *Sigismund does not understand why decisions on the bishoprics of Plock and Przemyśl take so long when this brings nothing to the pope while causes considerable harm to his candidates.—2. He asks Brodarics to assist his envoy to the pope in every possible way, because he is not going to let the story end differently than what he has decided.*

Reverendissime sincere nobis dilecte.

[1.] Nescimus, quid sibi velit, quod negotium episcopatus Plocensis et Premisliensis tam diu istic haereat, idque absque ulla necessitate et commodo summi pontificis cum maxima tamen perturbatione regni nostri et servorum ac consiliariorum nostrorum, quos ad eos episcopatus designavimus impendio et iactura.⁴⁶

[2.] Itaque postulamus a te ut huic nuntio nostro⁴⁷ auxilium et consilium omne praebeas, quo negotium ipsum ex tricis istis evolvatur. Nam ut prius tibi scripsimus, non patiemur ullo pacto, ut aliter id ipsum negotium, quam designavimus, transigatur. Quando quidem intelligimus, quorsum haec involucra et ambages tendere, ut nobis contumelia et difficultates in rebus nostris inferantur, quibus si, ut debes, cum nos et serenissimus nepos noster unum simus, afficeris, consulas et adsis, ut tandem haec tragoedia finem capiat, ne quid deterius huic emanet. Quam operam tibi uberrima gratia nostra referemus.

4. *King of Poland Sigismund to István Brodarics*

[Cracow], [July 1523]

Manuscript used: Biblioteka Jagiellońska 6556, 74v–75r⁴⁸

1. *He thanks Brodarics for his help so far regarding the bishoprics of Plock and Przemyśl. He follows the advice of Brodarics and uses a more gentle tone in his correspondence with the pope, even though he has been restraining himself already in a matter that harmed his country more than his subjects suggested.—2. He asks Brodarics to settle the matter of the two dioceses without further delay and difficulties. Benefices due to the canon of Cracow should go to Opaliński.*

⁴⁵ See also: Biblioteka Czartoryska, Teki Naruszewicza, tom. 35, 731.

⁴⁶ This argument recurs in a letter to Rome on 25 May 1523, and this supports the dating of the letter. Cf. AT VI, 275.

⁴⁷ Sigismund sent Hieronymus Łasky to Rome to protest appointment of Marquis of Brandenburg John Albert as Bishop of Plock. (Cf. AT VI, 214–216.)

⁴⁸ Further manuscript: Biblioteka Czartoryska, Teki Naruszewicza, tom. 35, 747.

Reverendissime sincere nobis dilecte.

[1.] Agimus et habemus gratias, quod negotium episcopatus Plocensis eo curaveris deducendum, ubi iam res citra ulteriorem difficultatem confici possit.⁴⁹ Rescribimusque Sanctissimo Domino Nostro, uti suades, lenius, quamvis nescimus, quid in tanta nostra molestia subditorumque nostrorum perturbatione scripserimus aequo asperius,⁵⁰ quandoquidem nimio plus patienter et mansuete, quam ab ipsis subditis nostris ac aliis nobis consulebatur, negotium hoc tractavimus, utcunque est, quoniam iam illius Sanctitas voluntati et iuribus suis satisfecit.

[2.] Postulamus a te, ut tandem finis fiat huic tragoediae, fiatque provisio tam de episcopatu Plocensi, quam etiam Premisliensi, ita ut prius scripsimus, sine ulla pensione ac onere et sine aliqua mora et difficultate. Similiter ut de canonicatu Cracoviensi reverendissimi Raphaelis electi Plocensis servo nostro Opalenicio⁵¹ provideatur. Quod tibi uberiori gratia et favore regio curabimus inferre.

5. *King of Poland Sigismund to István Brodarics*

[Cracow], [September 1523]⁵²

Manuscript used: Biblioteka Jagiellońska 6556, 76r⁵³

1. *Doctor Lucas returned from Rome and reported how active Brodarics had been regarding the bishopric of Plock. For this Brodarics can count on the king's gratitude.—*
2. *He resents the fact that, because of the raised sum of the annate the matter has not been settled, although the money was meant to be spent on the war against the infidel. It would have been fairer to leave the sum with them rather than ransacking the country.—*
3. *Brodarics should take steps so that the letter of the Bishop of Plock is discussed and the idea of raising the annate is dropped.*

Reverendissime sincere nobis dilecte.

[1.] Rediens istic ex Urbe doctor Lucas, quem in negotio episcopatus Plocensis miseramus, narravit nobis, quantam curam et diligentiam adhibueris in ipso negotio ex ipsis labyrinthis extricando. Qua re persuadeas tibi te nobis acceptissimum factum ac in eorum esse numero, quibus libenter commodare vellemus, prout hoc per omnem occasionem non praetermittimus.

⁴⁹ See the letter of Brodarics dated 10 June 1523. Cf. AT VI, 286–288.—One of the letters by Krzycki tells us that the letters from Rome arrived to Cracow on 7 July 1523. Cf. AT VI, 294.

⁵⁰ Adrian VI also noted in a letter to apostolic nuncio Thomas Negri that Sigismund used a fairly harsh language in his letters. (Cf. AT VI, 223.)

⁵¹ Sebastian (Opalencki) Opaliński, canon of Cracow.—Sigismund informed Bishop of Przemyśl Rafał Leszczyński from Vilnius already in October 1522 that he is supposed to resign from his post as canon of Cracow so that the king can use it freely. (Cf. AT VI, 132–133.)

⁵² Neither the death of Adrian VI nor the conclave is mentioned in the letter, so presumably it was written before the pope's death (14 September).

⁵³ See also: Biblioteka Czartoryska, Teki Naruszewicza, tom. 35, 749–750.

[2.] Ceterum quod haereat adhuc istic ipsum negotium propter auctam annatam est nobis molestissimum, praesertim cum non ignoremus eas annatas fuisse primitus ad defensionem contra infideles concessas, quam nos cum serenissimo domino nepote nostro soli assidue sustinemus. Et proinde magis congrueret illas nobis contribui, quam eiusmodi auctionibus nos et regna nostra expilari.

[3.] Postulamus a te, operam facere velis, quo litterae ipsius episcopatus Plocensis expedire permittatur iuxta praedecessorum ipsius solutionem, nam nullo modo id ferre possumus, ut maioribus oneribus graventur ecclesiae nostrae satis alioquin superque gravatae. Faciet nobis rem gratissimam, quam tibi favore nostro regio curabimus referre. Datum.

6. *King of Poland Sigismund to István Brodarics*

[Cracow], [April 1525]⁵⁴

Manuscript used: Biblioteka Jagiellońska 6556, 8v

1. *He learnt from Statileo that Brodarics is in Rome again as an ambassador. Knowing the fidelity of Brodarics he is pleased to hear that.*—2. *He asks Brodarics to represent him and his subjects in the future and also report about developments there.*

Reverendissime sincere nobis dilecte.

[1.] Retulit nobis reverendissimus Ioannes Statilius, praepositus Eursiensis et serenissimi domini Ludovici Hungariae et Bohemiae regis nepotis nostri carissimi apud nos orator te iterum Romae oratorem agere, quae res sint nobis acceptissima, experti enim sumus tuam erga nos fidem et propensionem, experti diligentiam et curam in obeundis negotiis nostris, quae istic Romae eveniebant. Proindeque et commendavimus iam saepe ipsi serenissimo domino nepoti nostro virtutem et merita tua et commendare in dies magis non desistemus.

[2.] Postulamus vero a te impense et tibi curae istic sint, ut solebant, nostra subditorumque et procerum nostrorum negotia, quae incident, nobisque ea, quae nova emergent, scribere per omnem occasionem non gravare, ut et tua erga nos merita et nostrum vicissim erga te favorem reddas in dies cumulatiorem. Datum.

⁵⁴ The letter can be dated based on Statileo's mission and Brodarics's return to Rome. Statileo visited Cracow as an envoy in the spring of 1525, and received a response from the king on 12 April. (Cf. AT VII, 241). Brodarics set out for Rome in the end of February 1525. On 5 March he was still in Pécs (he got credential from Bishop of Pécs Fülöp Csulai Mór at that time), so the earliest he could arrive to the Eternal City was in April.

7. *King of Poland Sigismund to István Brodarics*[Cracow], [April 1525]⁵⁵

Manuscript used: Biblioteka Jagiellońska 6556, 16r–v

1. *He learnt that observant Franciscans in Rome try to get hold of monasteries of the conventuals in Poland and Bohemia. It seems that Sigismund has the same intention.—2. He asks Brodarics to take steps against this, because this is contrary to his wishes. He regards conventual highly. They help much in the battle against spreading heresy. Their provincial Marcus de Torre is highly respected throughout the country. His leaving would be a great loss for the Church in Poland.*

[1.] Intelleximus fratres Sancti Francisci de observantia id agere, ut loca conventualium in regno nostro et Bohemiae sibi a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro impetrarent, quasi haec sit voluntas nostra, ut ea illi potius haberent.

[2.] Postulamus a te, obstes, quo minus id perficere valeant. Tantum enim abest, ut haec voluntas nostra sit, ut etiam nobis non posset esse non molestum quidquam praeter veterem eorum ordinem in regno nostro constitutionem renovari, praesertim nunc invalescente in dies magis circumquaque perniciosissima heresi, ad quam retundendam magno nobis ex usu sunt ipsi fratres conventuales, praesertim venerabilis Marcus a Turri⁵⁶ commissarius et provincialis regni nostri, qui et monasteria hic sua in debitum redegit ordinem et religioni sua doctrina suaque sanctimonia plurimum conducit. Proinde nobis et regnicolis nostris est multo gratissimus, qui si amoveri hinc deberet, magno omnino praesidio res haec ecclesiastica privaretur. Quare illum ac eius ordinem tam in regno nostro quam etiam Bohemia consistentem patrocínio tuo etiam atque etiam commendamus.

⁵⁵ Date uncertain. Brodarics says in his letter on 17 May 1525 (cf. Biblioteka Narodowa, Teki Górskiego, tom. 6, 33r–v) that he had received several letters from Sigismund but we cannot take it for granted that he refers to these two.

⁵⁶ Marcus a Turri or Marcus de Torre Franciscan provincial. He taught theology at the Cracow University in 1519. See also AT V, 242, 253; VI, 268, 306; VII, 63, 83.