

PETR KOZÁK
Silesian University in Opava
Faculty of Philosophy and Science
Provincial Archive in Opava
ORCID: 0000-0002-2642-0180

Courtiers, diplomats, servants, merchants... Foreigners in account books of the Hungarian court of King Vladislaus Jagiellon from 1494–1495

Keywords: foreigners, Bohemian Crown, court, Jagiellonians, late Middle Ages, Hungary

Klíčová slova: cizinci, Česká koruna, dvůr, Jagellonci, pozdní středověk, Uhry

The accounts kept at the court of the Hungarian monarchs were destroyed during the tragic events in late August and early September 1526 after the Battle of Mohács, during which the commander of the Hungarian army, Archbishop Paul Tomori and, especially, the young King Louis Jagiellon died.¹ The Hungarian royal archives as a whole disappeared during the evacuation of the Buda residence ordered by Queen Mary.² As for records of income and expenditure of the monarch and his court, only a small fragment of the original extensive material is available today. The rarely preserved register of income and expenditure of the Hungarian king, or the kingdom, from 1494–1495 is by far considered the most important source from this group, the original of which is now stored in the Hungarian National Széchényi Library in Budapest.³ The manuscript contains an overview of the Hungarian throne's income for two “accounting periods” and a concurrent summary of the ruler's expenses

¹ From most recent publications on the Battle of Mohács, cf. BOTLIK, ILLIK 2018, or from the Czech perspective VYBÍRAL 2008.

² The ship in which the archive was being evacuated sank on the Danube near Esztergom. See KALOUS 2009, pp. 94–96.

³ OSZK, sign. Cod. Lat. 411. The material has recently been published in two editions, see: KOZÁK 2019; NEUMANN 2019. In addition to the royal revenue and expenditure volume for the years 1494–1495, only a fragment of the accounting records from 1525 and 1526 is now available; its keeping was the responsibility of the office held by treasurer Alexius Thurzó. See ENGEL 1809, pp. 185–236 and FRAKNÓI 1877, pp. 45–236. In addition, a balance of payments from 1522–1523 has been preserved, when the absent King Louis, who resided in the Bohemian lands at the time, was represented by Palatine Stephen Báthory (TÓTH 2010, pp. 231–258). In the Czech circles, the non-existent accounts of the ruler's court are to some extent replaced by the accounting register kept at the Kutná Hora mint (SOKA Kutná Hora, collection: Horní a mincovní fond Kutná Hora, i.e. “verková registra”).

with the final balance sheet by officials of the Hungarian royal treasurer, Bishop Sigismund Ernuszt of Pécs. The aim of the study will be to present the potential of the source in relation to research into personnel at the Hungarian and Bohemian courts during the times of the Jagiellonian monarchs. With regard to the thematic profiling of the presented volume, emphasis will be placed on the group of persons who can be described as “foreigners” on a general level in the context of the Hungarian (or the Hungarian-Croatian) Kingdom at the end of the Middle Ages. As the definition of “foreigner” itself generates some methodological pitfalls, this issue will also be discussed as necessary.

Let us first take a look at the source itself. Given the context and motivation of the registration of persons on the pages of the account book, it will also be useful to at least briefly recall the more general historical context, i.e. the events in Hungary from the first half of the 1490s. It should be noted that the accounting register escaped destruction for the simple reason that it was probably not deposited in the royal archives as other volumes associated with the activities of the royal treasury. This is because it is not a “standard” product of a continually kept accounting agenda, but rather a retroactively (artificially) created copy of a certain portion of the royal income and expenses from the given accounting period, which was intended primarily as a tool to investigate Sigismund Ernuszt and his deputy, vice-treasurer Emeric Dombai, accused by the opposing estates of widespread embezzlement of the monarch’s finances in the summer of 1496. As Tibor Neumann has recently convincingly demonstrated, the manuscript was probably created in just two to three weeks between mid-July and mid-August 1496. The preserved accounting register from 1494–1495 is thus not a list of all incomes and editions of King Vladislaus. In fact, it is “only” a record of the income and expenditure of the monarch that fell under the jurisdiction of the Hungarian royal treasurer and were also subject to the supervision of the Hungarian estates.⁴ Just as it is impossible to create an image of the whole of the fiscal potency of the Kingdom of Hungary by the mere mechanical sum of the registered amounts, it is impossible to get a complete picture of all persons who — in the opinion of the people — belonged to the ruler’s court. Nevertheless, the register remains a key source in this respect, if not (in comparison with other sources, be it narrative or official) the most important one.

The accession of Vladislaus Jagiellon to the Hungarian throne after the death of King Matthias Corvinus in 1490 was not without complications. After his election the former (since 1471) Bohemian king had to deal with other pretenders to the Hungarian throne — the illegitimate son of the late ruler, John Corvinus, his younger brother (the later Polish king) John Albert, and the son of Emperor Frederick III, Maximilian I, Holy Roman King. Each pretender to the throne enjoyed the support of a certain part of the aristocracy, which was linked to the system of family connections of socially lower-ranking nobility. The only constant in this fluid period

⁴ KOZÁK 2019, pp. 19–23; NEUMANN 2019, pp. 8–25, 50–67. Cf. KOZÁK 2020.

was constant movement — overlapping, spilling and regrouping between these camps, which responded to the current development of the situation and strength or weakness of individual candidates, or simply stemmed from unsatisfied individual ambitions or animosity among individuals and clans. The Ottoman neighbour also took advantage of the weakening of Hungary — Ottoman pressure reached its peak in 1493, when the Croatian military suffered a catastrophic defeat near the town of Udbina in the Battle of Krbava Field.⁵ Nevertheless, the victor of the internal wars of 1490–1492 was Vladislaus Jagiellon, who succeeded in eliminating the remaining opposition forces while systematically weakening the influence of his overly powerful supporters over the years. This allowed new people with a higher degree of loyalty to the ruler to come to the fore.⁶ Vladislaus quickly asserted his authority in the neighbouring countries of the Bohemian Crown (Moravia, Silesia and Lusatia). The Kingdom of Hungary also began to speak against the empire of Ottoman sultans more assertively. Relations were settled within the Jagiellonian dynasty, whose leaders demonstrated clan solidarity in the spring of 1494 in Levoča, Upper Hungary.⁷ The culmination of the consolidation of the new king's power in the Hungarian-Croatian union came with an exemplary military humiliation of the remaining rebels headed by the son of the last (titular) Bosnian king, Nicholas Újlaki, Prince Lawrence Újlaki.⁸ In November 1494 the royal army attacked the footholds of Újlaki and his allies, and in mid-December the well-fortified Újlak (Ilok in present-day Croatia),⁹ fell and Vladislaus and his entourage publicly celebrated their military victory there. At the beginning of 1495, Lawrence Újlaki was besieged at the castle of Némétújvár (Güssing in present-day Austria), where he surrendered in a hopeless situation. The rectification of relations within the kingdom was also accompanied by its external stabilization, when the kingdom reconciled with the opposition and signed a new three-year truce with the Ottoman Empire during Vladislaus' stay in Pécs.¹⁰ The military expedition against the Bosnian Prince Újlaki, the Jagiellon meeting in Levoča, the peace congress with the Ottomans in Pécs, and the military

⁵ Military events on the Ottoman-Hungarian border were digestedly analyzed by BACZKOWSKI 1997. The Krbava battle was one of the most traumatic crossroads of Croatian history. One of the last studies dedicated to it KUŽIĆ 2014. Also see: GRGIN 2002; RAUKAR 1997, pp. 97–99; FINE 1987, pp. 592–593.

⁶ T. Neumann recently devoted systematic attention to the beginning of Vladislaus Jagiellon's rule. See: NEUMANN 2008; NEUMANN 2009; NEUMANN 2010–2011; NEUMANN 2014a; NEUMANN 2014b; NEUMANN 2016; NEUMANN 2017. And further cf. BACZKOWSKI 2014. This is the second, slightly amended edition of the classic work of the same author (BACZKOWSKI 1995). On the events of the time, cf. from the Czech side MACEK 1991, pp. 39–130.

⁷ Cf. BACZKOWSKI 2003 (especially p. 212). From older literature have retained their significance to this day the studies FINKEL 1914 and DIVÉKY 1913.

⁸ Digestedly by FEDELES 2012a, pp. 92–134 or FEDELES 2017.

⁹ Detailed FEDELES 2012b.

¹⁰ BACZKOWSKI 1997, pp. 335–337.

stabilization of the Hungarian-Ottoman border form the framework of almost all the events captured on the pages of the surviving accounting register.

Most references to persons of non-Hungarian (non-Croatian) origin also fit into the above context. Whether these were people in the milieu of the monarch's court, which we are primarily interested in, or military professionals, various low-born servants, merchants and craftsmen, or diplomats and envoys who interpreted the will of their masters to King Vladislaus. It is obvious that the ruling courts were always made up of persons of "foreign" origin to some extent. In the case of more important monarchs, including representatives of the Jagiellonian dynasty at the turn of the 15th century, this statement is doubly valid. In addition, the fact that the Jagiellonians ruled in several Central and Eastern European monarchies naturally enhanced mobility between individual Jagiellonian courts.¹¹ After all, people born in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth accompanied Vladislaus Jagiellon in 1471 on his journey from Kraków to Prague, and in 1490 some of them moved with their king to Buda. The Hungarian capital also became a second home for many of Vladislaus' courtiers of "Bohemian" origin (meaning the whole Crown, because Vladislaus ruled only in Bohemia, but his supporters — emigrants from other countries of the Bohemian crown — lived nearby).¹² In Buda they all met with royal courtiers of Hungarian origin (also meaning, of course, Croatia and the "peripheral" parts of Hungary, as represented by Transylvania or Slavonia), as well as with a diverse mix of people from Italy, German regions of the empire and also from the Bohemian lands, because in 1490 the late Matthias Corvinus was (like Vladislaus Jagiellon after 1490) not only King of Hungary but also of Bohemia. The question therefore arises as to who was and who was not a "foreigner" at Vladislaus' court? Doubts about the relevance of the search for foreigners in the environment of a structure with a geographical, social and ethnic scope as diverse as Vladislaus' court are not helped by its insufficient research. We de facto only have a general idea of the personnel composition at the court of King Vladislaus (thanks to research conducted by Josef Macek and Pavel Trnka) for the years 1471–1490, when he ruled in Bohemia.¹³ Research into the personnel composition of his court has not been carried out in Czech or Hungarian historiography for the period of 1490–1516, when he ruled both (this time the whole) Bohemian lands as well as Hungary and Croatia. The methodologically and factually obsolete work of József Főgel from the beginning of the 20th century cannot replace the missing modern prosopographic analysis.¹⁴

¹¹ Cf. KOZÁK 2018.

¹² We should at least mention the career of the Silesian nobleman Bernard Bírka of Násilé. KOZÁK 2011.

¹³ MACEK 1992, pp. 322–329; TRNKA 2010a.

¹⁴ FŐGEL 1913. However, Hungarian historians have a certain advantage over Czech historians, as they have modern archontological manuals at their disposal. See TÓTH et al. 2016; TÓTH et al. 2017. In the Czech context, we must rely on outdated lists of officials by F. Palacký, A. Boček and V. V. Tomek: PALACKÝ 1941; BOČEK 1850; TOMEK 1893, pp. 253–264.

So how should we define a “foreigner” or “foreign courtier”? Officials of the Hungarian royal treasury helped themselves with nouns referring to the country of origin — the pages of the analysed account book therefore contain Czechs or Bohemians (*Bohemi*), Poles (*Poloni*), Germans (*Aleman*), Bosnians (*Bosnaci*), Serbs (*Rasci / Rachyani*), Wallachian Romanians (*Walachus*), Greeks (*Greci*), Turks (*Turci*) or Italians (*Itali*). It is characteristic of the time that it was much more of a geographical than a “national” definition. This is in contrast to the native population of Hungary and Croatia, where ethnic Hungarians (*Hungari / Ungari*) and Croats (*Croati*) are mentioned, as are Cumans (*Cumani*), Jews (*Judei*) and Transylvanian Saxons (*Saxones*) as specific ethnopolitical and ethnocultural units. The Czechs are an ideal example in this regard, as careful reading of the accounting records shows that a *Bohemus* was a person (high-born or low-born) who came from Bohemia. The fact that the source does not include persons explicitly referred to as Moravians, Silesians (with the honorary exception of the Lower Silesian nobleman John of Rechenberg, to whom his personal accounting scribe attached the personal characteristic of *Slesak*)¹⁵ and Lusatians indicates that the nobles from these parts in the service of King Vladislaus were in fact not considered to be foreigners in Buda, namely inhabitants of countries that did not belong to the union of the Crown of St. Stephen. At the same time, they were present among courtiers or otherwise defined servants, as we shall see. However, since the time of the Olomouc peace treaties concluded between Vladislaus Jagiellon and Matthias Corvinus, people settled in the so-called incorporated Lands of the Bohemian Crown had been considered by the Hungarian estates to be inhabitants of the Kingdom of Hungary in a “broader sense”, and the change on the throne after 1490 didn’t change much from their point of view.¹⁶ From this perspective, the Moravian John Mrakeš of Noskov, commander of the Hungarian border castle Landsee (Hungarian Lánzsér, today in Austria), was the same “Hungarian” as Voivode of Transylvania Ladislaus Losonci.¹⁷ After all, even Moravian aristocrats William of Pernštejn¹⁸ and Ctibor Tovačovský of Cimburk do not appear as *Bohemi* in the source.¹⁹ The scribe did not assign any attributes to them. From the perspective of the officials of the Hungarian royal treasury, these were “domestic” noblemen. Not even the influential Buda courtier and military leader

¹⁵ KOZÁK 2019, p. 131 (*Rachenberger Slesako*), 268 (*Iwan Slesak aulicus*).

¹⁶ On the Olomouc treaties and their consequences, see recently ČORNEJ, BARTLOVÁ 2007, pp. 427–437 and especially KALOUS 2009, pp. 179–185, 193–195.

¹⁷ The Moravian nobleman John Mrakeš of Noskov (originally “Mrakes”, “Mraxi”, see KOZÁK 2019, pp. 244, 266) was first in the military service of King Matthias Corvinus, entering the service of his former opponent, King Vladislaus, after his death. See PILNÁČEK 1930, p. 286. Ladislaus Losonci (originally “de Lossoncz”, “de Lossonch”, “Lossonchy”, see KOZÁK 2019, pp. 78, 91, 106, 112, 113, 115, 234, 249) held the office of Voivode of Transylvania in 1493–1494, see TÓTH et al. 2016, p. 87.

¹⁸ Originally “Perzthenchky” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 267).

¹⁹ Originally “Thawasoczky” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 154).

John Meziřícký of Lomnice, who personally participated in the criminal expedition against Lawrence Újlaki and his allies as one of the commanders and conquered their fortified settlements in today's Croatia, was ever called "Czech" or "Moravian".²⁰ It was the same in the case of the royal chamberlain and *tavernicus* Burian (Albert) Bítovský of Lichtenburk; not even this Moravian nobleman was territorially classified in the source.²¹ And when a certain Kromyan, a courtier (*aulicus*) and a military commander (*capitaneus gentium*) of King Vladislaus Jagiellon, of whose origin we know nothing more in the context of the knowledge of Vladislaus' court, escorted released mercenaries from Hungary back to Bohemia in 1495, in the opinion of the accounting scribe the border between the two kingdoms laid somewhere on the Jihlava line.²²

However, the very fact that the source contains characteristics such as Bohemi, Poloni, Alemanni or Itali, indicates that the opposite categories of foreigner vs. fellow countrymen did exist in the minds of the people of the time.²³ Asking for "foreigners" at the court of King Vladislaus (or generally in the monarch's entourage) may therefore be justified. But the differences between a trained scribe from the 1490s and a historian living at the turn of the 20th century remain important, i.e. when it comes to what content we attribute to the terms "foreign" and "foreigner". From the viewpoint of an official of the Hungarian royal treasury, the matter was theoretically relatively

²⁰ John Meziřícký of Lomnice (originally "Meseryczki", "Mezeryczky", "Mezeryczki" or "Mezerychky") personally participated in the siege of Ilok and conquered the fortresses of Sotin and Slakovci in present-day Croatia as one of the commanders. He was also involved in the hiring of mercenaries, including troops from Bohemia (a group led by John Uher). See KOZÁK 2019, pp. 122, 126, 128, 131–134, 136, 137, 139, 147.

²¹ Originally usually registered under various graphic variants of the first name Burian, once as "Albertus Bwrjan". Functionally classified as a courtier, chamberlain and *tavernicus*. Burian of Lichtenburk and Bítov was a royal chamberlain since 1473, see TRNKA 2010a, p. 122. According to a document issued by the monarch on July 12, 1499, Burian came from the ancestral branch that held Vranov, as it states that some time earlier King Vladislaus had released the estates of Bítov and Vranov to Burian, "his father and his brothers". See TEIGE 1900, pp. 195–196, no. 331. L. Hosák states with reference to the Brno *tabulae terrae* that the king took the Bítov (in 1498) and Vranov (in 1499) estates out of the fief of Henry of Lichtenburk and Bítov, who had sons Henry, Smil and Albert (HOSÁK 1968, cf. especially pp. 63–64). Neither Hosák nor the author of the only comprehensive monograph on the history of the family (URBAN 2003) know a royal chamberlain named Burian of Lichtenburk. However, Urban states that he did not deal with the Bítovský of Lichtenburk family (his book contains only a brief outline in this case), and Hosák's text is a kind of first shot rather than a systematic genealogical analysis. However, in view of the entry in the account book ("Eodem die Alberto Bwrjan ad relationem Bradach fl. IIII."), it is more than probable that Albert and Burian are one and the same person. See KOZÁK 2019, pp. 104, 106, 114, 120, 132, 146, 155, 158, 161, 167, 197, 210, 250, 280–282.

²² This is indicated by the entry "Vigesimo nono Maii ad commissionem regie maiestatis Cromyan capitaneo gentium regie maiestatis et ut sequatur gentes suas licentiatis a regia maiestate usque ad confinia huius regni versus Bohemiam, ut non inferant dampnum, dati sunt fl. VI." KOZÁK 2019, p. 198.

²³ Of course, this is not surprising; the medieval man (as well as people living in other periods) distinguished between the categories of "we" and "they". Cf. at least ŠMAHEL 2000 or ŠMAHEL 2002.

uncomplicated. A foreigner was simply anyone who was not born in Hungary (perceived, however, as shown above, within the borders of the Corvinus monarchy). It was therefore not enough to have estates in the country and thus be considered an inhabitant de jure. The Bohemian Chancellor John of Šelmberk remained a foreigner in this perspective, despite the fact that in addition to his Bohemian dominions, he held the Zborov castle estate in Hungary in the Šariš County and King Vladislaus credited him with 2,200 florins from his Transylvanian income to pay off the Strečno fortress.²⁴ Thus, even those who lived in Hungary for a long time and pursued their trades here did not receive unconditional acceptance as “fellow countrymen”. Typically, these were Italian merchants who were based in Buda and supplied the highest social circles with luxury goods, especially precious substances. Raggione Bontempi, Ottaviano da Volterra, Francesco di Jacopo Marsupini, Franco Fiorentino, Felice di Stagio di Nicolo, Marco Cotta, Battista di Francesco Ammannati — their names were consistently accompanied in the accounting source by the nouns *Italus* or *Florentinus*, as they were predominantly members of merchant families originating from Florence, Italy.²⁵ The painter Bartolo (Italus)²⁶ and top technical experts involved in ensuring the defence of the hot Hungarian-Ottoman border — the rifleman Jacob of Genoa (Italus) active in the key Bosnian fortress Jajce,²⁷ Chynthius (Italus), who participated in the construction of warships in Belgrade,²⁸ or carpenters George (Jíra) and Michael, originally from Bohemia who, together with their men, built mills in the royal service in the Belgrade fortress and in the Slavonian town of Virovitica.²⁹ On the other hand it is true that neither the royal court physician Julius Milius (Aemilius), who oversaw the health of Matthias Corvinus and Vladislaus Jagiellon, and perhaps came to Buda from Naples, Italy,³⁰ nor the official court historian Antonio Bonfini, born in the vil-

²⁴ Written in the source as “dominus cancellarius”, “Salembergh”, “de Sellembergh”, “de Sellenbergh”, and sometimes erroneously as “de Sterembergh” (meaning “of Šternberk”). For his tenure of the Zborov estate and preparations for the payment of Strečno castle, see KOZÁK 2019, pp. 225, 260. John of Šelmberk and Kost acquired a number of estates in Silesia for his family from the monarch as well; he even managed to get closer to the socially exclusive class of princes when the king granted him the Duchy of Krnov. Cf.: MAŤA 2004, p. 138; STARÝ 2018; KOZÁK 2017.

²⁵ Originally “Rason”, “Octavianus”, or “Athauiano” (P. Kozák erroneously wrote “Athianiano”), “Marchepin”, or “Marsupon”, “Franko”, “Felice”, or “Felix”, “Marthinkotha”, “Baptista”. See: KOZÁK 2019, pp. 155–158, 160, 183, 259–261; NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1338, 1343, 1347, 1348, 1362, 2769. For identifications, cf. an extensive monograph devoted to art and patronage at the court of King Matthias Corvinus BALOGH 1966. As well as PRAJDA 2017 and TEKE 2007.

²⁶ Originally “Bartha” (*pictor*), KOZÁK 2019, p. 155.

²⁷ KOZÁK 2019, pp. 152, 200.

²⁸ KOZÁK 2019, pp. 129, 150.

²⁹ Originally “Gyra”, or “Georgius” and “Michael”, see KOZÁK 2019, pp. 139, 197.

³⁰ In the source, Julius Milius (Italian: Giulio de Milio) only appears under his first name; the northern Italian native from the city of Piacenza (although southern Italian Naples is also mentioned) was explicitly considered to be a royal courtier (*aulicus regius*). See KOZÁK 2019, pp. 210, 260. A separate biogram devoted to him JENŐ 1880, pp. 76–79.

lage of Patrignone near Ascoli Piceno, was referred to as “foreigner” of Italian origin in the books.³¹

In the case of diplomats and envoys sent to the court of King Vladislaus by the rulers of other state departments, everything should be relatively clear as well. All of them, without exception, were foreigners in the country and their origin was always related to the authority in whose service they were (characteristics such as “Polonus” or “Alemanus” were therefore not necessary in this case): they were anonymous delegates of the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid II,³² as well as anonymous delegates of the Moldovan prince Stephen III,³³ an envoy of the Wallachian prince Vlad V (Stephen),³⁴ a delegate of Maximilian I, Holy Roman King (Wolfgang Grappler),³⁵ an envoy of John Cicero, Elector of Brandenburg, (John),³⁶ envoys and diplomats in the service of John I Albert of Poland (Chodecki, Rafael Leszczyński, John Mały, John Trnka of Raciborzany, Peter),³⁷ Grand Duke Alexander of Lithuania (Ivan, Vasily, Wenceslas, Anthony Mykycha, John Sewelczyk),³⁸ or Cardinal and Arch-

³¹ Originally “Bonfyn”, author of the famous work *Rerum Ungaricarum decades*. For the latest findings on Bonfini’s life and work, see e.g. the collective work *Antonio Bonfini* 2018.

³² We don’t know how many there were. KOZÁK 2019, pp. 142, 143, 147, 149, 188, 193, 211, 252.

³³ KOZÁK 2019, p. 115.

³⁴ KOZÁK 2019, pp. 134, 141.

³⁵ Originally “Gropler”. KOZÁK 2019, pp. 137, 142. Identified by NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1083.

³⁶ KOZÁK 2019, p. 279.

³⁷ KOZÁK 2019, pp. 194, 200, 203, 211, 269. It is impossible to responsibly say which of the sons of Stanislaw Chodecki of the Powal coat of arms (†1474) it was. Stanislaw Chodecki was also the starost of Galicia. Since his sons held this office in pledge after him, they were usually referred to as the lords of Galicia (in Polish “Halicki”) — so in the analyzed account book, this envoy of King John Albert is registered as “Halleczyk”. In the mid-1490s, Stanislaw Chodecki’s sons Nicholas and Andrew, who was also in the service of the Church (he was a bishop in Kamieniec Podolski in present-day Ukraine), were no longer alive. However, John, Raphael, Peter, Sanislaw, Otto and Spytek were still in play. They were all in the service of the Polish king. See POCIECHA 1937. Raphael Leszczyński only appears in the source under his first name (Rahfal), but his identification is unquestionable. It was Raphael Leszczyński of the Wieniawa coat of arms, deceased in 1501, a Polish nobleman who lived at the court of Emperor Frederick III in his youth, later entering the service of Polish-Lithuanian ruler Casimir IV, and subsequently his son, John Albert. See GAŚSIOROWSKI 1972. On John Trnka of Raciborzany (originally Trenka), a Polish nobleman who was in the service of Matthias Corvinus and the Jagiellonians (he held estates in Poland, the Bohemian lands and Hungary), cf. FUKALA 2001. We do not know anything more about the remaining pair of envoys of the Polish King John Albert (the term *nuntius*, not *orator*, is used in the original).

³⁸ KOZÁK 2019, pp. 207, 268, 269, 282. Identifying the envoys and diplomats of the Grand Duke of Lithuania Alexander is extremely difficult. Wenceslas (originally Waczlaw) and Vasily (originally Wazyll) were perhaps low-born servants serving as envoys (*nuntii*). Ivan (originally Iwan) and Anthony Mykycha, “people of Alexander, the king’s brother” according to the source, stopped in Buda on their return from a diplomatic mission at the court of the Ottoman sultan. Unfortunately, the latest research in the field of foreign diplomatic relations of the grand duchy in the late Middle Ages and early modern times for the analysed period does not mention any of the envoys to the Sublime Porte by name. Simi-

bishop of Gniezno Frederick Jagiellon (Prokop / Prokúpek).³⁹ On the other hand, the fact that even officials in charge of the income and expenditure of King Vladislaus' court in Buda were not unconditionally consistent in labelling persons as “foreign” and “native” cannot be ignored. For example, Frederick Weissinger, a royal steward and a Sopron burgher, appeared in the source as “Alemanus”, although he came from Hungary.⁴⁰ It therefore seems that in this case the term “Alemanus” did not carry geographical but rather ethnic (linguistic) meaning, as Sopron and its surroundings belonged to the distinctly German-speaking regions of old Hungary. After all, a certain John who worked in the position of a notary in a Bohemian chancery and should therefore, using the above logic, represent the category of provincially defined “Czechs”, was also labelled a “German” in the source.⁴¹ In addition, the accountant generally did not dare characterize persons who were considered to be in the elite class of Hungarian (and Croatian) barons due to their clerical ranks as foreigners. The Archbishop of Esztergom and Cardinal, Ippolito d'Este, a close relative of Queen Beatrice (his mother was Eleonora of Aragon, daughter of King Ferdinand of Naples), as well as Bishop Vincenzo de Andreis of Otočac in Dalmatia, fell into the category of “native” people in the analysed register.⁴²

Caution is therefore warranted, especially in less obvious cases. Some people — from noble courtiers to ordinary servants — were only registered on the pages of the account book under their first names. The account scribe generally used standardized, Latin-conforming variants of first names (Iohannes, Georgius, etc.). However, when he considered it expedient, he resorted to attempts to graphically capture the true sound and the universally comprehensible phonetic form of first names in a given context, e.g. Jan, Janek, Januš, Hanzl (Jan, Janko, Janus, Hanzel) or Jíra, Jiřík, Jurko (Gyra, Geryk, Gywrko). He applied this approach not only to ordinary servants, where it would generally be expected, but also to the registration of nobles, including the highest levels of the social ladder (e.g. he registered the Timișoara *ispán* and one of the most influential Hungarian aristocrats Joseph Somi under the Hungarian

larly, the oldest documented envoy of Lithuanian rulers to the Buda court was Michael Gliński, captured only in 1501. Cf. BANIONIS 1998, p. 178. The person referred to in the source as John Sewelczky therefore also remains de facto unidentifiable. Purely hypothetically, he may have been Alexander's courtier and military leader named John Swierczowski. Works consulted in this regard: PIETKIEWICZ 1997 (especially registers on pp. 109–125); SKIBNIEWSKA 2015 (especially courtier catalogues on pp. 281–436); OCHMAŃSKI 1972 (especially the section of prelates and canons on pp. 30–51).

³⁹ Originally Procopinus. KOZÁK 2019, p. 200.

⁴⁰ Originally Fridericus Almanus, as well as Fridericus, or Frycz de Sopronio. See KOZÁK 2019, pp. 194, 203, 266. Identified by NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1802.

⁴¹ KOZÁK 2019, pp. 173, 196, 198, 273.

⁴² H. Kuffart paid systematic attention to Cardinal Ippolit (in the source he appears anonymously as *cardinalis* or *dominus archiepiscopus Strigoniensis*), or to the rare accounts associated with the operation of his court. See KUFFART 2014 (cf. especially pp. 204–206). The Bishop of Otočac is also mentioned anonymously in the source (“episcopo Othochach”). For identification, cf. EUBEL 1914, p. 209.

diminutive of his name “Józsa”).⁴³ Although it is tempting to combine “Slavic-sounding” first names with a specific geographical definition of the origin of the people in question, such a method can be very misleading. The royal cook John, written as “Jan” and not “Iohannes” in Latin, was “Bohemus” just like his fellow countryman, a royal trumpeter.⁴⁴ But can (almost) the same be responsibly said about the stableman Vojtek (written as “Woythko” and not “Adalbertus”), or about a royal trumpeter named George Trubka (“Trupka Gyerygh”)?⁴⁵ Probably not. Also, the assumption that people from certain regions were entrusted as envoys with tasks in these regions is not always based on solid foundations. A certain Matthias (Matyáš) of Těšín / Cieszyn (de Thesyn)⁴⁶ was sent to the Bohemian lands, and the steps of Martin “Polonus” in the royal service were directed to Poland.⁴⁷ Nicholas / Miklós (spelled “Myklos”) went in the same direction by the will of the king, and his mother tongue may have been (judging by the phonetic imprint of his first name) Hungarian.⁴⁸

Despite all the “buts”, it is precisely the moments when the scribes of the Hungarian royal treasury captured contemporary opinion about the geographical origin of persons surrounding the monarch (or in his service) that can be described as the strongest points in terms of considerations of “foreigners” working within the territory of Hungary in the mid-1490s. The relatively great number of Czechs (*Bohemi*) and — albeit significantly smaller — of Poles (*Poloni*) cannot be surprising, as King Vladislaus came to Hungary from the Kingdom of Bohemia, but he came from a Polish milieu. In addition, as already mentioned, it is necessary to take into account the synergistic radiation of the Jagiellonian dynastic space in the analysed period, which accelerated the mobility between the courts of the individual Jagiellonian monarchs; people from the Bohemian lands were also renowned in certain specific professions, especially when it came to mercenaries or experts in mining issues. Although the social background and geographical origin in the source of registered mercenary commanders (there was always an anonymous group of ordinary fighters behind their names) usually remain hidden in the darkness of history, Czech *magistri rotharum peditum* as particularly valued warriors whose services were paid for in gold,⁴⁹ are usually characterized by at least the noun *Bohemi*. At the very least, we can say that the colours of King Vladislaus in troubled Hungary were defended by commanders of “Czech” mercenary units, Alex (or Aleš), Budincký, John Flaška, Christopher, Jakuš, Konatovský, John Rakendorfer, Šimek, Slovák, Tobias, John Uher

⁴³ Written as “de Som”, but most often just as “Josa”, or more respectfully as “dominus Josa”. KOZÁK 2019, pp. 70, 79, 89, 93, 109, 124, 125, 126, 129, 134, 136, 138, 143, 144, 146, 149, 150, 156, 184, 191, 195, 205, 214, 219, 222, 227, 235, 242, 243, 249, 258, 265, 274, 277, 281.

⁴⁴ KOZÁK 2019, pp. 190, 206.

⁴⁵ KOZÁK 2019, pp. 202, 252, 287.

⁴⁶ KOZÁK 2019, p. 280.

⁴⁷ KOZÁK 2019, pp. 164, 165.

⁴⁸ KOZÁK 2019, p. 162.

⁴⁹ The phenomenon of Czech mercenaries: TRESP 2004.

and a certain Wndrachel, or perhaps Vondráček.⁵⁰ A *Bohemus* named Matěj, whom Tibor Neumann has tentatively identified as Matthias of Tuchoř and Řešetákov, held an important position as *ispán* of the chamber in Baia Mare, where he supervised the condition of the local mining facilities, among other duties. He was probably an expert who was taken at his word, as King Vladislaus did not hesitate to entrust him with the prospecting of the mountainous landscape around Visegrád, where he was to look for new deposits of gold and silver.⁵¹

In the following lines, we will focus on persons of non-Hungarian origin who completed the court of King Vladislaus Jagiellon. In addition to the labels mentioned in the source (Bohemi, Poloni, Alemani, etc.), we will also try to identify persons without these characteristics, as well as persons from the neighbouring (incorporated) countries of the Bohemian Crown (Moravia, Silesia and Lusatia), or generally all “foreigners” for whom the Kingdom of Hungary was a temporary or permanent home at the end of the Middle Ages. In the case of persons surrounding the monarch, the situation is somewhat facilitated by the fact that they were predominantly nobles. It is therefore at least theoretically possible to place their names in specific genealogical contexts. However, it is obvious that this was not always possible, especially when some of the courtiers appear in the surviving accounting register only under their first names. Moreover, the community of career courtiers (*aulici regii*) was dominated by representatives of the lower nobility, and the diverse world of yeoman and esquire families still represents a field of research largely uncharted. Again and again (yet a little differently), a relevant methodological question comes to the fore: who was a “Czech” courtier in Buda — a “foreigner” or a “native”? Or, to put it differently — did King Vladislaus Jagiellon have two courts after 1490, namely the court of Vladislaus as King of Hungary and (next to it) the court of Vladislaus as King of Bohemia, or was it a single continuous court designed to enforce sovereign power in both of Vladislaus’ Crowns, i.e. in Hungary and in the Bohemian lands?

At first glance, the analysis of the accounting source seems to support the thesis that after 1490, two courts of King Vladislaus Jagiellon actually existed side by side. So, on one side there were (in Buda) the somewhat exotic *aulici Bohemi*, and on the other a community of other courtiers, or “native” Hungarian courtiers, including courtiers orig-

⁵⁰ Originally “Alexy”, “Bwdynchky”, “Flasko”, “Cristoff” or “Cristofforus”, “Jakws”, “Conatowczyk”, “Rakondorfer” or “Rakwendorffer”, “Symegh”, “Slowak”, “Thobias” or “Thobyasse”, “Vhar”, “Whar”, or “Wharyan”. See KOZÁK 2019, pp. 122, 123, 130, 134, 137, 139, 143. T. Neumann’s reasoning that Jan Rakendorfer may have been Silesian (from the village of Rachów) is unlikely with regard to the characteristic “Bohemus” (NEUMANN 2019, footnote 870).

⁵¹ Originally just “Matheus” or “Mathias”. See KOZÁK 2019, pp. 104, 114, 122, 129, 130, 274, 275. An attempt of identification as Matthias of Tuchoř NEUMANN 2019, footnote 629. P. Trnka registers Matthias of Tuchoř and Řešetákov among royal courtiers for the period 1483/1485–1500, with J. Macek classifying him as a royal “servant” at one time (TRNKA 2010a, p. 124), which would theoretically truly correspond to the idea of a technician and an economically capable, perhaps even low-born, servant.

inally from neighbouring countries of the Bohemian Crown. Both courts were subject to a standard organization, one important official used to be the court marshal (the office of steward / Hofmeister is absent from the source) — called *marsalk* in the Bohemian court and *magister agazonum* in the Hungarian court according to local customs. While the office of Bohemian marshal was held by Wenceslas Čič of Nemyčeves,⁵² the Hungarian marshal at the same time was Peter Dolhai.⁵³ Czech courtiers used their own messengers (*nuntii aulicorum Bohemorum*) to communicate with the monarch, as was the case during their stay in Belgrade,⁵⁴ which is evidenced, among other things, by their involvement in the military campaign against Lawrence Újlaki. For this occasion, they were also independently organized militarily — the source includes two people with the title of hetman of Czech royal courtiers (*capitaneus aulicorum Bohemorum*), squires Nicholas Račín of Račín⁵⁵ and John of Sloupeň.⁵⁶

When it comes to the payment of wages, handing over gifts and benefits in kind (typically luxury cloths) or compensation for damages (damage to property, death of horses, etc.) and debts incurred by courtiers in the service of the monarch — in the “Bohemian” court — Bohemian Chancellor John of Šelmberk and marshal of the “Bohemian” court, Wenceslas Čič of Nemyčeves, engaged directly in the Hungarian metropolis Buda, or generally in Hungary.⁵⁷ This usually took place often, but not exclusively, which is important in the context of our considerations, as the same task was taken upon by one of the Hungarian nobles many times, usually chamberlain Laurence Bradács,⁵⁸ who was in charge of similar tasks at the “Hungarian” court. On the other hand John of Šelmberk appeared in the role of a relator in handling the pleas

⁵² In the account book he appears as “Pan Chych” or most often only as “marsalk” (rarely as “magister agazonum Bohemi”). Wenceslas Čič of Nemyčeves is documented by sources in the office of marshal of the royal court for the years 1491–1504; previously (in 1487–1490), he was burgrave of Prague Castle. See: TRNKA 2010a, p. 140; TRNKA 2008, p. 282.

⁵³ Originally Dolhay. Referred to as *magister agazonum domini regis*, as well as *vicemagister agazonum*. KOZÁK 2019, pp. 118, 123, 135, 136, 198, 209. For a brief biogram, see NEUMANN 2019, footnote 817.

⁵⁴ “Eodem die nuntio aulicorum Bohemorum, qui in Nandor Alba fuerunt...” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 125).

⁵⁵ Originally “Rachin” or “Rachyn”, “capitaneus aulicorum” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 137). As hetman (captain) “over the royal courtiers” Nicholas Račín is mentioned by A. Sedláček in 1494, SEDLÁČEK 1904a (cf. especially p. 18).

⁵⁶ Originally just “Jan”, defined as “capitaneus aulicorum Bohemorum” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 127). John (Ivan) of Sloupeň appears in sources as a military commander in the service of King Vladislaus and “capitaneus aulicorum regalium Bohemorum” in years 1493–1495. Cf. MACŮREK 1958 (see specifically p. 565).

⁵⁷ Cf. KOZÁK 2019, pp. 130, 141, 148, 162–164, 203, 208, 209, 266–268, 271–273, 276–278, 280, 282.

⁵⁸ Briefly by NEUMANN 2019, footnote 753. Cf. KOZÁK 2019, pp. 111, 114, 117, 118, 120, 121, 124–132, 134, 139, 144, 146, 161, 164, 187, 190–192, 195, 197, 201, 204, 269–271, 274, 275, 282, 285 (moments when Laurence Bradács was involved in paying sums in favour of people from the Bohemian

of the Hungarians, as was the case with the Sopron burgher Frederick Weissinger⁵⁹ or the royal herald, for whom a new horse was bought in Székesfehérvár.⁶⁰ As it turns out, the two courts of King Vladislaus were not separated from each other in any way. The interconnectedness of the day-to-day running of the two courts was further enhanced by the fact that the “Czech” courtiers were, in fact, figuratively speaking on the Hungarian payroll. Expenditures in their favour, whatever hands they passed through, went through the Hungarian royal treasury and were under the supreme supervision of the Hungarian royal treasurer, Bishop Sigismund Ernuszt of Pécs. Of course, the income of the Czech courtiers may have flowed (and probably did flow) from sources of the Bohemian Crown.⁶¹ This is also indicated by the intensity of communication with Bohemian mint master Beneš Krabice of Veitmile — paid (not only, but also) from the Hungarian treasury.⁶² At the same time, however, Hungarian accounts show that “Czech” courtiers were regularly paid from the proceeds of taxes, customs duties and other benefits of the Hungarian king.

Instead of two independently functioning “Bohemian” and “Hungarian” courts, we should therefore speak of a single, jointly functioning body, the court of the Hungarian and Bohemian king, whose mission was to enforce sovereign authority in both of Vladislaus’ Crowns. The fact that the “Bohemian” and “Hungarian” parts of Vladislaus’ court had their own independent marshals only shows the common practice in the Middle Ages, whereby various persons or groups of persons followed “their” law even in a “foreign” environment. The *aulici Bohemi* formed a substantial, albeit smaller, part of Vladislaus’ Buda court, at least in the mid-1490s. It was natural that courtiers of Hungarian origin predominated, as after 1490 the king lived mostly in Hungary and thus in their centre. On the other hand, the number of people from the Bohemian Crown in court life in the Hungarian capital was really a lot higher, because Moravians, Silesians and Lusatians must be included among the “Czechs”, i.e. inhabitants of the Kingdom of Bohemia. The natural numerical dominance of the Hungarian element was also lessened by relatively numerous representatives of families from Jagiellonian Poland, some of whom, such as master of the treasury Jarosław Sokołowski of Wrząca Wielka,⁶³ were close to the monarch for a long time and were able to exercise considerable influence on his decisions.

lands or Poland). The notary of the Bohemian chancellery, Wenceslas Hyndrák of Habrov, was also paid through his hands (KOZÁK 2019, p. 127).

⁵⁹ KOZÁK 2019, p. 266.

⁶⁰ KOZÁK 2019, p. 277.

⁶¹ The system of financing the royal court of Vladislaus Jagiellon (before 1490) was most recently addressed by: TRNKA 2010b; TRNKA 2009.

⁶² Originally “Baythmiller”, “Baythmilner”, “Benessius”, “Panbenes”, KOZÁK 2019, pp. 111, 127, 152, 194, 199, 203, 276.

⁶³ Originally exclusively under a large number of graphic variants of the first name Jaroslaw. Royal chamberlain and *tavernicus* Jarosław of Wrząca Wielka (traditionally transliterated in Czech historiography as “of Vrance”), a relative of John Sokołowski “of Vrance” and long-time chamberlain of King

Let us now try to get a clearer idea of the courtiers of non-Hungarian origin (Bohemians and Moravians, Silesians and Lusatians, as well as persons originating from the Kingdom of Poland or German regions of the empire). Given the generally insufficient examination of Vladislaus' court from the period after 1490, it will not be a comprehensive list. Only courtiers (*aulici*) recorded on the pages of the account book from 1494–1495 will be registered. We will also limit ourselves to cases where the affiliation to the “non-Hungarian” component of the monarch's court was indisputable — either these courtiers were labelled as Bohemi, Poloni, etc. directly by officials of the Hungarian royal treasury, or it was possible to identify their family names (and thus their geographical origin). Some courtiers remained anonymous,⁶⁴ or were listed only under first names, without it being possible to responsibly decipher the genealogical context.⁶⁵ For practical reasons, we omit these as well as the staffing of the royal chapel.⁶⁶ We also omit estate stewards from the Bohemian lands, such as high steward William of Pernštejn and Helfštýn, Moravian governor Ctibor Tovačovský of Cimburk, or the Silesian governor, Duke Casimir II of Cieszyn. We focus exclusively on courtiers “as such”.

Vladislaus, appears in a royal document dated February 3, 1499. See TEIGE 1900, pp. 122–123, no. 172. On John Sokołowski cf. comprehensively RUTKOWSKA 2000–2001.

⁶⁴ A nameless *aulicus regius*, for example, travelled from Petrovaradin to Belgrade to hand over a royal letter to the commander of Vladislaus's armed forces, Paul Kinizsi (KOZÁK 2019, p. 117). Two nameless esquires of “Bohemian” origin (*pueri Bohemi regie maiestatis*) travelled to Bohemia accompanied by a courtier of Silesian origin John Kurzbach (KOZÁK 2019, p. 184). Unfortunately, the rarely mentioned Bohemian vice-chancellor (*vicecancellarius Bohemie*) also remained unnamed, see KOZÁK 2019, p. 141.

⁶⁵ It is therefore often impossible to know where they came from. For example, the *aulicus* Derek / Jetřich (originally *Getřyk*) may have come from the Bohemian lands according to the form of his first name, but this is only a hypothesis. KOZÁK 2019, p. 138.

⁶⁶ Vladislaus' chaplains expressly included “Bohemi” and “Poloni”. Cf. KOZÁK 2019, pp. 132, 286, 287.

I. COURTIERS ORIGINATING FROM BOHEMIAN LANDS

1. (George) Běšín of Běšiny, aulicus, Bohemus⁶⁷
2. Černín junior of Chudenice, Bohemus⁶⁸
3. Černý, aulicus⁶⁹
4. Wenceslas Číč of Nemyčeves, magister agazonum Bohemi, marsalk⁷⁰
5. Peter Dubecký of Dubeč, aulicus⁷¹
6. Garda, famulus regis, Bohemus⁷²
7. John Haugvic of Biskupice, aulicus⁷³

⁶⁷ Originally “Besyn” or “Bessyn” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 136, 209). This is probably George Běšín from the West Bohemian yeoman family, who negotiated the monarch’s marriage to Princess Anna of Foix, daughter of Count Gaston of Foix, Count of Candale, who was the niece of the French Queen Anne, along with other king-commissioned nobles in 1500 or 1501. On the role of George Běšín of Běšiny (at the time royal chamberlain) in arranging the marriage of King Vladislaus to Anna of Foix-Candale, cf. most recently GYÖRKÖS 2017 (especially pp. 135–136); GYÖRKÖS 2016, pp. 28–31. However, details of the life, social background and function of George of Běšiny have already been made known by MACEK 1991, pp. 134–135. Nevertheless, for the years 1478–1480, another representative of the same family, namely Wenceslas Běšín of Běšiny, is documented in the position of royal chamberlain and courtier, see TRNKA 2010a, pp. 123, 136. The identification of “Běšín” mentioned in the accounts as knight George, however probable, may not be completely indisputable.

⁶⁸ Originally “Chermyn iunior” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 128). In the period before 1490, P. Trnka has identified two representatives of the Černín family at Vladislaus’s court — Černín senior, whom he has identified as William Černín of Chudenice, and Černín junior, whom he has not been able to identify. It is probable that it is precisely this “young” knight Černín (although he is only captured in the source for the period of 1484–1486) that we encounter on the pages of the account books from 1494–1495. See TRNKA 2010a, p. 138. KOLÁŘ 1893 (especially p. 623) mentions several Williams and other names of baptized members of the family occurring in the same generation.

⁶⁹ Originally “Cerni” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 192, 269). An unknown nobleman of perhaps (?) Moravian (not registered as “Bohemus”) origin. T. Neumann hypothetically reflected on the identity of courtiers “Černý” and “Černín” (NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1785), with P. Trnka registering two representatives of the same family — Černín senior and Černín junior (see footnote 68 of this study). However, given the way the family name is written in the source (“Cerni” or “Chermyn”), this seems unlikely.

⁷⁰ Originally “Pan Chych” or “marsalk” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 128, 129, 130, 141, 147, 148, 162, 163, 164, 197, 203, 205, 206, 208, 209, 267, 268, 269, 271, 272, 274, 277, 278, 280). Cf. footnote 52 of this study.

⁷¹ Originally Petrus “Dwbeczky” or “Dwbezky” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 158, 209). Probably from Bohemia. Esquire John Dubecký of Dubeč († 1508) was the owner of the Frydštejn castle as well as a number of other estates. Cf.: SEDLÁČEK 1895, p. 260; MACEK 2001, p. 389, footnote 138.

⁷² KOZÁK 2019, pp. 126, 133, 140, 156. He cannot be further identified, but he was probably a nobleman from Bohemia, because in February 1494 King Vladislaus dubbed him a knight (Francesco Marsupini supplied 14 cubits of satin for this occasion), cf. KOZÁK 2019, p. 156. T. Neumann has demonstrated that “Garda” appeared among the hetmans (captains) of the mercenary army, which were returning from Silesia after the death of King Matthias Corvinus (NEUMANN 2019, footnote 914).

⁷³ Originally “Hwghwych”, “Hwghwycz”, “Hwgywycz” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 190, 249, 284). One of the leading military commanders in the service of Matthias Corvinus from the Moravian branch

8. Ladislaus Holický (of Šternberk), aulicus⁷⁴
9. Victorin Honbický of Honbice, aulicus⁷⁵
10. Leonard / Linhartek of Har, aulicus, Bohemus⁷⁶
11. Martin Hubka of Staryce, aulicus⁷⁷
12. Jasenský or Jasenický, aulicus, Bohemus⁷⁸
13. Jehnický⁷⁹

of the family was promoted to baron during the reign of King Vladislaus. Cf. at least: KOLÁŘ 1896 (especially p. 960); PILNÁČEK 1930, pp. 389–390, no. 1446.

⁷⁴ Originally “Ladislaus Holyczky” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 209). Relation to the Bohemian Šternberks is merely hypothetical. However, the existence of baron Ladislaus of Šternberk, who belonged to the Holice branch of the family, was proven by SEDLÁČEK 1890, pp. 26–27, when he explicitly stated that Ladislaus of Šternberk was the brother of John Holický of Šternberk. It can also be considered likely that John Holický of Šternberk himself is also mentioned in the accounts in the company of John Meziřícký of Lomnice in the graphic form “Iohannes Holych” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 147).

⁷⁵ Originally “Honghwyczky” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 205). The knights of Honbice were settled in Bohemia and Moravia. In addition to Victorin, the source also mentions (but not as a courtier) John of Honbice (in the form “Hanbycz”, KOZÁK 2019, p. 153). Cf.: SEDLÁČEK 1882, p. 219; PILNÁČEK 1930, p. 35; PILNÁČEK 1991, p. 233; KOLÁŘ 1897 also gathered basic information about the family.

⁷⁶ Originally “Lentharthko” and “de Brunna” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 138, 281, mistakenly considered as two different people). Identified by NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1095–1096 with reference to a document from 1498, with which King Vladislaus exempted Linhart of Har’s (Neumann mistakenly writes “of Hor”) house in Brno from all payments (TEIGE 1900, p. 35, no. 20).

⁷⁷ Originally “Hwppka” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 210). He has been convincingly identified by NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1999 with reference to a document from 1498, with which King Vladislaus renewed his courtier Martin Hubka of Staryc’s coat of arms (TEIGE 1900, pp. 99–100, no. 130).

⁷⁸ A man referred to in the edited source as “Jasenczky”, “Jasenchky” or “Jasnyczky” presents an interesting case in point (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 124, 131, 144). Pavel Trnka, an excellent expert on the court of King Vladislaus Jagiellon from before 1490, has drawn attention to the Polish vice-treasurer “Jaschienský”, who carried out certain financial transactions on behalf of the Bohemian elect in 1471. He has also observed that a certain “Pavel Jasenský” was one of the military commanders accompanying Vladislaus Jagiellon from Kraków to Prague at the end of July of the same year (TRNKA 2008, pp. 124 and 95, footnote 618). In both cases, it was undoubtedly one and the same person, namely a Polish crown vice-treasurer (Polish: *podskarbi*) named Paweł (Paul) Jasiński. Although he died in 1485, he left behind three sons, who can be assumed to have come of age in the mid-1490s. (GÓRSKI 1964–1965; cf. CHŁAPOWSKI et al. 1992, p. 123.). The graphic (and apparently also phonetic) form between the way in which the name of this royal courtier was captured on the pages of the account book and the family name of Paul and his descendants is striking, and it is therefore tempting to consider (genealogical) affinities. Unfortunately, the account scribe explicitly provided “his” man with the geographical label “Bohemus”, i.e. (by family) from Bohemia. In addition, the surnames Jasenský, Jásenský, Jasnický, etc. are still relatively widespread in the Czech language. Therefore, Jasenský and Jasiński cannot be identified as one.

⁷⁹ Originally “Jegynczky” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 190). Perhaps a person from Moravian esquire family Jehnický, or of Jehnice. The Jehnický family is registered by PILNÁČEK 1930, p. 456. The fact that, unlike Jasenský, the person named “Jegynczky” was not labeled “Bohemus” could speak in favour of the theory of his Moravian origin. However, T. Neumann identifies this person as Jasenický.

14. John Karas of Dúlebenka, aulicus, Bohemus⁸⁰
15. John Kurzbach, aulicus⁸¹
16. Sigismund Kurzbach⁸²
17. Jaroslav Světlovský of Landštejn⁸³
18. Bítovský of Lichtenburk, parvulus regius⁸⁴
19. Burian (Albert) Bítovský of Lichtenburk, aulicus, cubicularius, tavernicus⁸⁵
20. Marquard Mazanec of Vesec⁸⁶
21. John Meziřícký of Lomnice⁸⁷
22. Nicholas Pecingar of Bydžín, aulicus⁸⁸

⁸⁰ Originally “Karaz” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 118, 209). Identified by NEUMANN 2019, footnote 818. It could be interesting that he appears in Moravia in 1497 among attestants of Valentine of Leznice and Kladníky (ZA Opava, collection: AŽV, inventory no. 1).

⁸¹ Originally “Curczbo”, “Kwrchboch” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 184). The Kurzbachs were a noble family settled in Silesia. The founder of the modern power and wealth of the family was Sigismund Kurzbach, a chamberlain of King Vladislaus, who managed to get into the ranks of the higher nobility, and in the first half of the 1490s in Silesia became a free lord when he received the fief of Trachenberg (Polish: Żmigród) and Milič (Polish: Milicz) from the monarch. Cf. BLAŽEK 1887, p. 58.

⁸² Originally “Curchboch”, “Kwrchboch” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 121, 126, 131, 248, 252). Cf. footnote 81 of this study. He was documented among royal chamberlains for the years 1471–1488 under the name Sigismund Korbok of Vítkov (Sigismund Kurzbach was to come to Bohemia with Vladislaus Jagiellon from Poland), see TRNKA 2010a, p. 123. Although the accounts from 1494–1495 do not place him among the courtiers explicitly, Sigismund fought on the monarch’s side against the opposition in Hungary and took part in the siege of Ilok. It is possible that the above-mentioned John Kurzbach was his younger relative, perhaps a son. Unfortunately, modern genealogy of the family is not available.

⁸³ Originally “Jerozlaus Zlethkwyczky” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 191). In 1496 he was documented in Hungary, and placed among royal courtiers by NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1759. Since the 1470s, the castle and estate of Starý Světlov in southeastern Moravia (near the village of Podhradí near Luhačovice) were owned by the barons of Landštejn, specifically the brothers Zbyněk, Jaroslav and Ctibor, and later (after the death of the siblings) by Jaroslav Světlovský of Landštejn himself. See e.g. HOSÁK 1938, p. 431.

⁸⁴ The son of Burian Bítovský of Lichtenburg, unknown by name. See footnote 21 of this study.

⁸⁵ See footnote 21 of this study.

⁸⁶ Originally “Markwark Mazanowcz” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 198), sent by the monarch in a delegation to Prague. He has been identified by T. Neumann (NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1867) with reference to the register of the Bohemian chamber court (ČELAKOVSKÝ 1890, p. 542). His affiliation with the court milieu of King Vladislaus is uncertain.

⁸⁷ Cf. footnote 20 of this study. John Meziřícký of Lomnice pursued a career in the service of kings Matthias Corvinus and Vladislaus Jagiellon. In Moravia he held the office of subchamberlain 1485–1490, high chamberlain of the Olomouc provincial court (*cúda*) 1491–1495, and in 1496–1515 he was governor (*capitaneus terrae*) of Moravia. See: SEDLÁČEK 1901 (primarily p. 240); BOČEK 1850, unpagged.

⁸⁸ Originally “Peczynger”, “Pechinger”, “Pechynger” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 144, 191, 203, 270). He was identified by T. Neumann (NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1195) — for example, in 1499 King Vladislaus borrowed 500 *groschen* from him (TEIGE 1900, p. 107, no. 148).

23. Nicholas Račín of Račín, aulicus, capitaneus aulicorum⁸⁹
24. John of Rechenberg, aulicus, Slesak⁹⁰
25. Reibnitz, aulicus⁹¹
26. Roubík of Hlavatce, aulicus⁹²
27. Paul Rychvaldský of Kateřinice, aulicus⁹³
28. George Sádlo, aulicus⁹⁴
29. Sekeřický of Sekeřice, aulicus, famulus regis⁹⁵

⁸⁹ He came from a yeoman / knight family, which was written after the village of Račín near Toužim in northwestern Bohemia. Cf. footnote 55 of this study.

⁹⁰ Originally “Rahembergh”, “Rachemberger”, “Rachenberger”, and also “Iwan Slesak” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 131, 195, 268, 269). A member of one of the wealthiest noble families in Lower Silesia, who managed to establish himself at the court of Hungarian-Bohemian kings Vladislaus and Louis, and Polish-Lithuanian ruler Sigismund I the Old, as well as in the circles of Ferdinand I of Habsburg. Cf.: KOZÁK 2009; ANDRZEJEWSKI 2007, pp. 77–78, *passim*.

⁹¹ Originally “Reybnycz” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 209). A member of a widely branched Silesian noble family unknown by name. For basic genealogical data, see e.g. *Neues allgemeines Adels-Lexicon* 1867, pp. 406–408.

⁹² Originally “Rwbyk” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 209, has erroneously identified him as “Rubik”). Determined by T. Neumann (NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1996) with reference to Otto’s encyclopedia. The Roubíks of Hlavatce were a yeoman family originally settled in southern Bohemia, and they also owned estates in Moravia at the turn of the 15th century. Brothers Nicholas, Ctibor, Albert and Ulric Roubík lived at the end of the 15th century. Cf. SEDLÁČEK 1904b.

⁹³ Originally “Ryqualczky” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 190, 210). Rychvald castle in Central Moravia demonstrably disappeared in the first half of the 15th century (PLAČEK 1996, pp. 308–309). Rychvald in the Duchy of Těšín / Cieszyn, today in the Karviná district (Czech Republic), was a stable part of the Těšín / Cieszyn ducal chamber, see GOJNICZEK 2014, pp. 126–127. This is undoubtedly a representative of the Moravian esquire family Rychvaldský of Kateřinice, whose members’ names were written after the village of Kateřinice or Rychaltice (also written as Rychvaldice) near Příbor. See: PILNÁČEK 1991, pp. 270–271, no. 361; PILNÁČEK 1930, p. 319, no. 1116. Although Pilnáček did not know Paul Rychvaldský for the period around 1500, his genealogical overview is incomplete; he has also documented the use of the first name Paul in older generations of the family (around the mid-15th century).

⁹⁴ Originally “Gersyk Zadlo” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 145). Probably a representative of the lower nobility settled within the borders of the Bohemian Kingdom. A noble origin is indicated by the fact that, according to the accounting record, he actively participated in a knights’ tournament organized by the monarch (he received 4 golden *ad haustiludendum*). After all, a certain John Sádlo was the recipient of the pledges of King Sigismund of Luxembourg (TEIGE 1900, pp. 245–246); in 1478, Caspar Sádlo of Knoblochsdorf testified on a deed of duke Henry the Elder of Münsterberg (*ibidem*, p. 25); in 1500, the Bohemian yeoman Henry Sádlo of Kladrubce addressed his letter to the burghers of Kouřim (SCHULZ 1900, p., 412, no. 10).

⁹⁵ Originally “Zekerchky”, “Zekerychky” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 144, 157). Probably a representative of the petty nobility written after the Bohemian village Sekeřice or Sekyřice. For the family, cf. SEDLÁČEK 1882, pp. 37, 70, 73, 190, 205, 244, 248. T. Neumann has identified him as John of Sekeřice (NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1199), but such identification remains uncertain.

30. Nicholas Seydlitz, aulicus⁹⁶
 31. George Schoff (Schaffgotsch) of Helfenburk, aulicus⁹⁷
 32. John of Sloupeň, capitaneus aulicorum Bohemorum⁹⁸
 33. John Srb, aulicus, vicepincerna, pincerna, Bohemus⁹⁹
 34. Conrad Stoš of Kounice (and Smidary), aulicus¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ Originally “Nichel Zeydlych” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 146). A representative of a widely branched Silesian noble family, with some branches also settled in Lusatia and Bohemia. However, as Nicholas was not labelled as “Bohemus”, it can be concluded that he was probably “Silesian”. For basic genealogical data, see e.g. *Neues allgemeines Adels-Lexicon* 1868, pp. 448–450.

⁹⁷ Originally “Swff” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 190). P. Trnka mentions George “Šof” of Helfenburk among royal chamberlains (approximately) for the years 1478–1490, see TRNKA 2010a, p. 123. He was undoubtedly a representative of the Schoff family settled in Silesia (later the family name was contaminated by the popular first name “Gotsche”, or Gotthard, becoming Schaffgotsch), one branch of which also settled in Bohemia at the end of the Middle Ages. Unfortunately, existing — mostly outdated — genealogical overviews do not include a person named George Schoff (Schaffgotsch), see KRAUSEN 1715 (see genealogy on p. 106 and genealogical table no. N. VIII. at the end of the volume), or WURZBACH 1875, pp. 67–85. Helfenburk castle (also “Hrádek”) in northern Bohemia was demonstrably in the possession of the Ilburks of Ilburk family at the time (in the years 1475–1531). See SEDLÁČEK 1923, p. 102. The Helfenburk castle in southern Bohemia also did not belong to the Schaffgotsch family. SEDLÁČEK 1890, pp. 99–100. Vladislaus’ courtier George Schoff therefore had to be in another (Silesian?) location.

⁹⁸ Originally just “Jan”, defined as “capitaneus aulicorum Bohemorum” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 127). John (Ivan) of Sloupeň appears in the sources as a military commander in the service of King Vladislaus Jagiellon and “capitaneus aulicorum regalium Bohemorum” in the years 1493–1495. See MACŮREK 1958 (see specifically p. 565).

⁹⁹ Originally Iohannes “Srb” or “Zerb”, a royal courtier and cupbearer (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 117, 124, 127, 129, 137, 173, 189, 190, 192, 207, 209, 271). Accounts show that he lived in Petrovaradin, Bač or in the town Valpovo in the service of the king. As for his (provincially) Bohemian origin (“Bohemus”), it is worth mentioning that in 1488, an esquire named John (Hanuš) Srb of Dobšice is recorded in Bohemia. See SEDLÁČEK 1895, p. 406. On the other hand a certain courtier, “Zerbach”, who was supposed to be *pincerna regius*, also appears in the accounting records. The question is, therefore, whether they are not in fact one and the same person. However, the considerations developed in the indicated direction are not facilitated by the fact that in Bohemia in the second half of the 15th century we see several esquire families written as of Srbeč, of Srbce, of Srbče, etc. (there were multiple villages in the country called Srby, Srbice, Srbsko etc.). Less than a century later the sources mention the family Srbický of Zálezl. Cf.: SEDLÁČEK 1882, pp. 112, 113, 154; SEDLÁČEK 1884, pp. 38, 118; SEDLÁČEK 1891, p. 161. The identification of “Srb/Zerb” as “Zerbach”, the similarity of the offices held speaking in its favour, does not have to be entirely indisputable.

¹⁰⁰ Originally “Sthos” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 209). A representative of the widely branched Stoš (Stosch) family, which was settled mainly in Silesia and on the Moravian-Silesian border, later also in Moravia and Bohemia. He is probably a representative of the Branice branch of the family (today Branice in Poland, district Głubczyce, near Krnov) who, after the military campaign of King Matthias Corvinus’ troops in the mid-1470s, went to the court of King Vladislaus, and whose name was later written according to East Bohemian Smidary (cf. ZA Opava, collection: AS, inventory no. 63). In 1497 he was already dead (see *ibidem*, inventory no. 78 and 79). Cf. also TUREK, JISL 1953.

35. (Henry) Sudek of Dlúhá, Bohemus¹⁰¹
36. Susper, Bohemus¹⁰²
37. Šarovec of Šarov, Bohemus¹⁰³
38. John of Šelmberk, cancellarius Bohemie¹⁰⁴
39. Tým, aulicus¹⁰⁵
40. Valecký of Mírov, aulicus¹⁰⁶
41. Vlček, aulicus¹⁰⁷

¹⁰¹ Originally “Zwdek” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 139). The king ordered him to pay compensation for a dead horse; his affiliation to the court may not be unquestionable (he is not registered as *aulicus*, but he was apparently in the monarch’s service). T. Neumann has hypothetically concluded that he could be a representative of the South Bohemian esquire family Sudek of Dlúhá (Dlouhá) (NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1117); A. Sedláček mentions a burgrave from Velešín Peter, whose son was John, father of Henry Sudek verifiable for the years 1484–1496. See SEDLÁČEK 1906.

¹⁰² Originally “Susper” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 132). It has not been possible to classify him further, nor is his affiliation to the court unquestionable. All we know is that according to the surviving accounts, the king paid him servant wages (*sallarium*).

¹⁰³ Originally “Sarwchky” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 130). At the end of the Middle Ages, the knightly family Šarovec of Šarov was settled both in Moravia and in Eastern Bohemia. The noun “Bohemus” rules out that it could be a Moravian line (which was hypothetically assumed by NEUMANN 2019, footnote 981). Sigismund Šarovec of Šarov, holder of the Rabštejnek castle and the Slatiňany estate in the Chrudim region (SEDLÁČEK 1882, pp. 145 a 148), and Daniel Šarovec of Šarov and Ledce near Hradec Králové, were active in Eastern Bohemia at the time (SEDLÁČEK 1883, p. 71). POKLUDA 1993 (cf. especially pp. 193–194, where there is also clear genealogy) has discussed the genealogy of the Moravian branch and documented its connection to the Bohemian branch.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. footnote 24 of this study.

¹⁰⁵ Originally “Thym”, “Tym” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 132, 146, has probably erroneously identified as “Tim”). Perhaps T. Neumann (NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1005) has identified him more correctly with reference to disputes over honour, which were resolved by a chamber court in Bohemia at the beginning of the 16th century, namely in 1503 between esquires Tým of Poška and Nicholas Chotek of Hočkov (ČELAKOVSKÝ 1894, p. 37, no. 1266), and in 1518 between Catherine Maizl and Tým of Poška, at the time burgrave of Rabštejn (ČELAKOVSKÝ 1901, p. 326, no. 2566). However, caution is warranted, as “Tým” was never identified by the noun “Bohemus” in the source.

¹⁰⁶ Originally “Walczky”, “Waleczky”, “Walyczky” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 155, 190, 195, 265, 270). Moravian yeomen Valecky of Mírov (after the village of Valeč near Moravský Krumlov) were one of the branches of the Rájecký of Mírov family, cf. SEDLÁČEK 1904c. In the years 1480–1500, Marquard and Sigismund Valecký of Mírov came repeatedly separately and together, see: HOSÁK 1938, pp. 126, 137, 146, 147, 238; PILNÁČEK 1930, pp. 467–468, no. 2015.

¹⁰⁷ Originally “Welchek” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 210). This could theoretically be warrior Wenceslas Vlček of Čenov or his relatives (cf. SEDLÁČEK 1907), as NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1995, assumes. However, the absence of the characteristic “Bohemus”, as well as the fact that the family name Vlček was in fact borne by several knightly families settled in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia, encourages caution. Courtier Vlček, about whom we only know for sure that on the occasion of the assembly in Levoča he received part of a Wrocław broadcloth from his king, he may have quite well been one of the Vlček of Dobrá Zemice knights, who built interesting property complexes during the reign of Vladislaus Jagiellon on the Moravian-Silesian border (see PILNÁČEK 1936).

42. Zedlitz, aulicus¹⁰⁸
43. Zima / Zíma, aulicus¹⁰⁹
44. of Žerotín, parvulus regius, aprodianus regius¹¹⁰
45. Žibenský / Žibeňský, Bohemus¹¹¹

II. COURTIERS OF POLISH ORIGIN

1. (Peter) Balicki, aulicus¹¹²
2. Kezelicki or Ciesielski, aulicus, Polonus¹¹³

¹⁰⁸ Originally “Czedlycz”, “Czyglych” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 203, 269), incorrectly mistaken by T. Neumann for Seydlitz. An unknown representative of a widely branched noble family settled in Silesia and Lusatia. On the family, cf. basic genealogical data in *Neues allgemeines Adels-Lexicon* 1870, pp. 624–626.

¹⁰⁹ Originally “Zyma” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 209). It was not possible to identify him further, but perhaps he was a nobleman (originally a lower nobleman) from Moravia or (Upper) Silesia.

¹¹⁰ Originally “Seretinczky”, “Szyrothynchky”, “Zyrothynchky” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 145, 198, 282). This anonymous member of the Moravian aristocratic Žerotín family, whom the accounting scribe labeled as *puer* or *parvulus* / *aprodianus regius*, must be searched for among the sons of John the Elder of Žerotín and Fulnek († 1499), who managed over the years to establish himself in the service of all three rival Bohemian kings, namely George of Poděbrady, Matthias Corvinus and Vladislaus Jagiellon. With the exception of Baron Peter of Žerotín and Šumperk (1462–1530), who was too old for a page boy, John junior (1473–1531) and especially Victorin (1476–1529), George (1478–1507), Bartholomew (1482–1521) or Bernard (1484–1532) come into consideration. On the family relations of John the Elder of Žerotín, cf. KOZÁK 2005; and also the thorough genealogical overview of STIBOR 2007 (here specifically pp. 101–105).

¹¹¹ Originally “Zybenchky” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 271). His affiliation to the court is not indisputable, however, he negotiated certain matters in Bohemia on behalf of the king. He cannot not be further identified.

¹¹² Originally “Belyczky” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 209). T. Neumann (NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1996) considers that this could be a family written as “of Bělice”. However, it seems more probable that it is Peter Balicki, who accompanied Vladislaus Jagiellon with ten armed riders in 1471 on his way from Kraków to Prague, see GAWĘDA, PERZANOWSKI, STRZELECKA 1960, pp. 78, 95. The fact that the officials of the Hungarian royal treasury did not label him “Polonus” is not a sufficient argument here, because for some reason most of the courtiers of (demonstrably) Polish origin were not labelled as such. “Balický” was considered as royal chamberlain at the court even after 1471, and already P. Trnka assumed that they could be the same person (TRNKA 2010a, p. 122). After all, a representative of the Polish Balicki family also held the title of chamberlain at the court of Vladislaus’ younger brother, Prince (and later Polish-Lithuanian ruler) Sigismund during his stay in Buda and in the Bohemian lands. Cf. KOZÁK 2014, pp. 18, 22, 27, 31–33, 37, 39, 41, 43, 46, 47, 50, 55, 56, 60, 62, 64–66, 68–72, 76, 79–82, 84, 87, 93, 95, 96, 99, 101, 118, 141, 143, 150, 155, 157, 159, 160, 163, 170, 181, 186, 190, 206, 213, 214, 221, 223, 242, 248, 256, 259, 260, 263–265, 270, 272, 282, 289, 291, 304, 320, 332, 333, 341, 367, 369, 388, 391, 393, 398, 399, 404, 443, 446, 448, 482, 483, 487, 499, 514, 518, 519, 520, 531, 544, 545, 558, 569, 588, 595, 599, 603, 608, 610, 612, 617, 622, 627, 637, 639.

¹¹³ Originally “Kesselychky”, “Kezelyczky”, “Kezelychky” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 133, 146, 155, 173, 192, 209). T. Neumann points out that John Kezelicki was an inhabitant in Hungary — in 1495 he held estates in the county of Turda and was perhaps related to Matthias Kezelicki or Cseszelicki (in Polish,

3. Mark Minocki, aulicus, pincerna¹¹⁴
4. Sarnowski or Żarnowski, aulicus, Polonus¹¹⁵
5. Jarosław Sokołowski of Wrząca Wielka, aulicus, tavernicus¹¹⁶
6. Ladislaus Żeleński, aulicus¹¹⁷

III. COURTIERS FROM GERMAN REGIONS OF THE EMPIRE

1. George Neideck (Neudegg)¹¹⁸
2. Sigismund Seilester, aulicus, Alemanus¹¹⁹
3. Tschengel (?), aulicus, Alemanus¹²⁰

It is obvious that the present set of considerations offer more questions than satisfactory answers, which is consistent with the unhappy state of knowledge of the staff of the court of King Vladislaus Jagiellon in the period after his takeover of the government in Hungary. However, several partial conclusions can be formulated. Above

the family name was originally Ciesielski), who first stood in the service of King Matthias Corvinus, and after his death he was near King Vladislaus, who sent him to Moscow as his ambassador in 1501 (NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1024).

¹¹⁴ Originally “Maynoczky”, “Minoczky”, “Mynuczky” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 158, 188, 210). P. Trnka points out that the nobleman Mark Minocki from Lesser Poland (Minovský or Mminovský in Czech) arrived in Prague in 1471 as a member of Vladislaus Jagiellon’s entourage. Trnka has found evidence of Minocki serving as Vladislaus’ royal chamberlain until 1506 in sources. Cf.: TRNKA 2010a, p. 122; GAWĘDA, PERZANOWSKI, STRZELECKA 1960, pp. 96, 205.

¹¹⁵ Originally “Sarnoczky”, “Sernowczyk” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 126, 130). It is not entirely clear which Polish noble family this is. It could be both the Sarnowski family of the Jastrzębiec coat of arms (so P. Kozák) and the Żarnowski family, who used the Rogala coat of arms, as T. Neumann assumes (NEUMANN 2019, footnote 911). Cf. e.g. BOBROWICZ 1841, pp. 121–123, 281.

¹¹⁶ Originally “Gerezlaus”, “Gerezlawus”, “Geryzlaus”, “Iaroslaus”, “Jarozlaus”, “Jeroslaus”, “Jerozlaus”, “Jeruslaus” (KOZÁK 2019, pp. 120, 135, 136, 186, 188, 192, 199, 200, 209, 272, 278). See footnote 63 of this study.

¹¹⁷ Originally Ladislaus “Zelenczky” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 145). In 1472, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania Casimir IV sent his son, Bohemian King Vladislaus, financial assistance, as well as a unit of 500 mercenaries led by a certain “Jan Želenský”, as stated by TRNKA 2008, pp. 15, 124, 130, 131, 132. Perhaps Ladislaus Żeleński was related to John Żeleński.

¹¹⁸ Originally “Naydeker” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 141). The Buda court, one of the important centers of transalpine humanism since the time of King Matthias, attracted a number of noble intellectuals, many of whom sought employment in the service of the monarch. George Neideck (Neudegg), a graduate of law at the university in Bologna, who was originally an Austrian nobleman and later *cancellarius Austriae* of Emperor Maximilian I, linked the beginning of his rich career in the mid-1490s with King Vladislaus’ entourage. Cf. FÓGEL 1913, p. 159 or JENŐ 1880, pp. 79–83. Variation of family name Neudegg, see NEUMANN 2019, footnote 1147.

¹¹⁹ Originally “Saylester” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 201). He has not been identified.

¹²⁰ Originally “Chengel” (KOZÁK 2019, p. 200). He has not been identified.

all, it turns out that after 1490, royal courtiers originally from the Bohemian lands formed a group that could not be overlooked in the Hungarian metropolis of Buda. 45 people from Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia and Lusatia have been identified, while in reality the representation of noblemen (from the ranks of the higher and lower nobility) from the lands of the Crown of St. Wenceslas was even slightly higher, as some courtiers remained anonymous or hidden under their first names. If we add the “Poles” and people with roots in the German regions of the empire, we will perhaps reach a number of more than sixty noblemen who (together) formed the culture of the Buda court of King Vladislaus Jagiellon. This fact alone significantly relativizes the traditional idea of an isolated monarch, which lives in Czech historiography to this day, who — surrounded by “Hungarians” — distanced himself from the “Czech” reality. Of course, a detailed prosopographic analysis of Vladislaus’ court in the years 1490–1516 is noticeably missing. However, an analysis of the situation from the mid-1490s suggests that rather than a Hungarian court (with a not very important, symbolic “Czech” appendix), it was an institution fully representing the Hungarian and Bohemian areas of Vladislaus’ domain. It would therefore be more appropriate to speak of the court of the Hungarian and Bohemian king, or more simply — with regard to the predominant place of residence — the Buda court. In the context of the search for “foreign” elements and “foreigners”, we must repeat that the Buda court (like any other major royal court) remained in essence a place of mixing the “foreign” with the “domestic”, and that the boundaries between these worlds remained unclear even to contemporaries. The structure of “foreign” (in the past as well as the methodology of a professional historian) is therefore a category that is largely subjective.

SOURCES, STUDIES, MONOGRAPHS AND OTHER MATERIALS
USED IN THE TEXT

MANUSCRIPT SOURCES AND UNPUBLISHED WORKS

- SOkA Kutná Hora [= Státní okresní archiv Kutná Hora], collection: Horní a mincovní fond Kutná Hora
 OSZK [= Országos Széchényi könyvtár, Különgyűjtemények], sign. Cod. Lat. 411
 ZA Opava [= Zemský archiv v Opavě], collection: AŽV [= Archiv Žerotínsko-vrbenský]
 ZA Opava [= Zemský archiv v Opavě], collection: AS [= Slezský stavovský archiv, Opava]
 TRNKA 2008 = Pavel Trnka, *Finanční situace českého krále Vladislava Jagellonského v letech 1471–1490*, an unpublished diploma thesis defended at the Institute of Czech History, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague, Prague 2008

PRINTED SOURCES AND LITERATURE

- ANDRZEJEWSKI 2007 = Tomasz Andrzejewski, *Rechenbergowie w życiu społeczno-gospodarczym księstwa głogowskiego w XVI–XVII wieku*, Uniwersytet Zielonogórski, Zielona Góra 2007
 Antonio Bonfini 2018 = Antonio Bonfini (1427–1502) *umanista e storico dell'Ungheria e i Bonfini da Patrignone*, ed. Manuela Martellini, Edizioni Palumbi, Teramo 2018
 BACZKOWSKI 1995 = Krzysztof Baczkowski, *Walka o Węgry w latach 1490–1492. Z dziejów rywalizacji habsbursko-jagiellońskiej w basenie środkowego Dunaju*, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków 1995
 BACZKOWSKI 1997 = Krzysztof Baczkowski, *Europa wobec problemu tureckiego w latach 1493–1495*, "Studia Historyczne", XL, 1997, pp. 313–340
 BACZKOWSKI 2003 = Krzysztof Baczkowski, *Państwa jagiellońskie u schyłku średniowiecza*, in: *Schylek średniowiecznej Europy*, ed. Henryk Samsonowicz, Bellona, Warszawa 2003, pp. 205–223
 BACZKOWSKI 2014 = Krzysztof Baczkowski, *Habsburgowie i Jagiellonowie w walce o Węgry w latach 1490–1492*, Napoleon V, Oświęcim 2014
 BALOGH 1966 = Jolán Balogh, *A művészet Mátyás király udvarában I–II*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1966
 BANIONIS 1998 = Egidijus Banionis, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės pasiuntinybių tarnyba XV–XVI amžiais*, Diemedžio Leidykla, Vilnius 1998
 BLAŽEK 1887 = Conrad Blažek, *J. Siebmacher's grosses und allgemeines Wappenbuch. Sechster Bande achte Abtheilung. Der Abgestorbene Adel der Preussischen Provinz Schlesien. Erster Theil*, Bauer & Raspe, Nürnberg 1887
 BOBROWICZ 1841 = Jan Nepomucen Bobrowicz, *Herbarz Polski Kaspra Niesieckiego S. J.*, vol. VIII, nakładem Breitkopfa i Haertela, Lipsk 1841
 BOČEK 1850 = Antonín Boček, *Přehled knížat a markrabat i jiných nejvyšších důstojníků zemských v Markrabství Moravském*, Jednota národní s. Cyrilla a Methuda, Brno 1850
 BOTLIK, ILLIK 2018 = Richárd Botlik, Péter Illik, *A mohácsi csata (1526) másképpen. A nagy temető?*, Unicus kiadó, Budapest 2018
 ČELAKOVSKÝ 1890 = *Registra soudu komorního*, ed. Jaromír Čelakovský, Praha 1890 (Archiv český čili Staré písemné památky české i moravské X, tiskem dra Ed. Grégra), pp. 441–560

- ČELAKOVSKÝ 1894 = *Registra soudu komorního*, ed. Jaromír Čelakovský, Praha 1894 (Archiv český čili Staré písemné památky české i moravské X, tiskem dra Ed. Grégra), pp. 1–545
- ČELAKOVSKÝ 1901 = *Registra soudu komorního*, ed. Jaromír Čelakovský, Praha 1901 (Archiv český čili Staré písemné památky české i moravské X, tiskem dra Ed. Grégra), pp. 1–475
- ČORNEJ, BARTLOVÁ 2007 = Petr Čornej, Milena Bartlová, *Velké dějiny zemí Koruny české*, vol. VI: 1437–1526, Paseka, Praha–Litomyšl 2007
- DIVÉKY 1913 = Adorján Divéky, *Az 1494. évi löcsei fejedelmi kongresszus*, Reiss József T. Könyvnyomó intézete, Lőcse 1913
- ENGEL 1809 = *Fragmentum libri rationarii super erogationibus aulae Regis Hungariae Ludovici II. de anno 1526*, ed. Johann Christian von Engel, Viennae 1809 (*Monumenta Ungrica*)
- EUBEL 1914 = Conradus Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi sive summorum pontificum, S.R.E. cardinalium, ecclesiarum antistitum series ab anno 1431 usque ad annum 1503 perducta*, II Messaggero di S. Antonio, Monasterii 1914
- FEDeles 2012a = Tamás Fedeles, *A király és a lázadó herceg. Az Újlaki Lőrinc és szövetségesei elleni királyi hadjárat (1494–1495)*, Szegedi Középkorás Műhely, Szeged 2012
- FEDeles 2012b = Tamás Fedeles, *Opsada Iloka 1494*, “*Scrinia Slavonica. Godišnjak Podružnice za povijest Slavonije, Srijema i Baranje Hrvatskog instituta za povijest*”, XII, 2012, pp. 7–19
- FEDeles 2017 = Tamás Fedeles, *Miklós király és Lőrinc herceg. Az utolsó két Újlaki vázlatos pályaképe*, in: *Személyiség és történelem — a történelmi személyiség. A történeti életrajz módszertani kérdései*, ed. József Vonyó, Magyar Történelmi Társulat, Pécs–Budapest 2017, pp. 135–168
- FINE 1987 = John V.A. Fine Jr., *The Late Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Conquest*, University of Michigan Press, Michigan 1987
- FINKEL 1914 = Ludwik Finkel, *Zjazd Jagiellonów w Lewoczy r. 1494*, Jakubowski, Lwów 1914
- FÓGEL 1913 = József Főgel, *II. Ulászló udvartartása (1490–1516)*, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Budapest 1913
- FRAKNÓI 1877 = *II. Lajos király számadási könyve (1525 január 12–július 16)*, ed. Vilmos Fraknoi, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Budapest 1877 (Magyar történelmi tár, XXII)
- FUKALA 2001 = Radek Fukala, *Trnka z Ratibořan Jan*, in: *Biografický slovník Slezska a severní Moravy*, New series, vol. II (XIV), Ostravská univerzita, Ostrava 2001, pp. 131–133
- GAWĘDA, PERZANOWSKI, STRZELECKA 1960 = *Rachunki królewskie z lat 1471–1472 i 1476–1478*, eds. Stanisław Gawęda, Zbigniew Perzanowski, Anna Strzelecka, Polska Akademia Nauk, Wrocław–Kraków 1960
- GAŚSIOROWSKI 1972 = Antoni Gaśiorowski, *Leszczyński Rafał*, in: *Polski słownik biograficzny*, vol. XVII, Polska Akademia Nauk, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk 1972, pp. 129–130
- GOJNICZEK 2014 = Waclaw Gojniczek, *Urzędy książęce i ziemskie w ustroju księstwa cieszyńskiego (1477–1653)*, “Śląsk” Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Katowice 2014
- GÓRSKI 1964–1965 = Karol Górski, *Jasiński Paweł*, in: *Polski słownik biograficzny*, vol. XI, Polska Akademia Nauk, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1964–1965, p. 32

- GRGIN 2002 = Borislav Grgin, *The Ottoman influences on Croatia in the second half of the fifteenth century*, "Povijesni prilozi", XXIII, 2002, pp. 87–103
- GYÖRKÖS 2016 = Attila Györkös, *Reneszánsz utazás. Anna királyné 1502-es fogadtatásának ünnepségei Észak-Itáliában és Magyarországon*, Attraktor Kiadó, Máriabesnyő 2016
- GYÖRKÖS 2017 = Attila Györkös, *Le mariage d'Anne de Foix et la diplomatie franco-hongroise au début du XVIe siècle*, in: "M'en anei en Ongria". *Relations franco-hongroises au Moyen Âge*, vol. II, eds. Attila Györkös, Gergely Kiss, Lendület "Hungary in Medieval Europe Research Group", Debrecen 2017, pp. 127–140
- HOSÁK 1938 = Ladislav Hosák, *Historický místopis země Moravskoslezské*, Společnost přátel starožitností československých, Praha 1938
- HOSÁK 1968 = Ladislav Hosák, *Páni z Lichtenburka na Bítově, Cornštejně a Vranově*, "Jižní Morava", IV, 1968, pp. 59–67
- CHŁAPOWSKI et al. 1992 = Krzysztof Chłapowski, Stefan Ciara, Łukasz Kądziała, Tomasz Nowakowski, Edward Opaliński, Grażyna Rutkowska, Teresa Zielińska, *Urzednicy centralni i nadworni Polski XIV–XVIII wieku*, Biblioteka Kórnicka, Kórnik 1992 (*Urzędnicy Dawnej Rzeczypospolitej XII–XVIII Wieku*, X)
- JENŐ 1880 = Ábel Jenő, *Magyarországi humanisták és a Dunai tudós társaság*, Akadémiai Értekezések, Budapest 1880
- KALOUS 2009 = Antonín Kalous, *Matyáš Korvín (1443–1490). Uherský a český král*, Veduta, České Budějovice 2009
- KOLÁŘ 1893 = Martin Kolář, *Černínové z Chudenic*, in: *Ottův slovník naučný*, vol. VI, J. Otto, Praha 1893, pp. 623–627
- KOLÁŘ 1896 = Martin Kolář, *Z Haugvic*, in: *Ottův slovník naučný*, vol. X, J. Otto, Praha 1896, pp. 959–962
- KOLÁŘ 1897 = Martin Kolář, *Z Honbic*, in: *Ottův slovník naučný*, vol. XI, J. Otto, Praha 1897, p. 534
- KOZÁK 2005 = Petr Kozák, *Vzestup rodu Žerotínů. Život a odkaz Jana staršího ze Žerotína a z Fulneka*, "Časopis Matice moravské", CXXIV, 2005, pp. 47–81
- KOZÁK 2009 = Petr Kozák, *Hans Rechenberg († 1537) Slezský válečník, diplomat a stoupenec luterství*, in: *Náboženský život a církevní poměry v zemích Koruny české ve 14.–17. století. Korunní země v dějinách českého státu*, vol. IV, eds. Lenka Bobková, Jana Konvičná, Casablanca, Praha 2009, pp. 572–588
- KOZÁK 2011 = Petr Kozák, *Z dolnoslezské Olešnice do hlavního města Českého království. Pozoruhodný život opavského zemského hejtmana Bernarda Bírky z Násilé († 1483)*, in: *Šlechtic v Horním Slezsku v novověku. Vztah regionu a centra na příkladu osudů a kariér šlechty Horního Slezska (15.–20. století) / Szlachcic na Górnym Śląsku. Relacje między regionem i centrum w losach i karierach szlachty na Górnym Śląsku (XV–XX wiek)*, eds. Jiří Brňovják, Waclaw Gojniczek, Aleš Zářícký, Ostravská univerzita, Uniwersytet Śląski w Katowicach, Katowice–Ostrava 2011, pp. 107–130
- KOZÁK 2014 = Petr Kozák, *Účty dvora prince Zikmunda Jagellonského, vévody hlohovského a opavského, nejvyššího hejtmana Slezska a Lužic, z let (1493) 1500–1507: Kritická edice pramene. Rationes curiae Sigismundi Iagellonici, ducis Glogoviensis et Opaviensis, Silesiae et Lusatiarum summi capitanei, de annis (1493) 1500–1507: Editio critica*, Scriptorium, Praha 2014

- KOZÁK 2017 = Petr Kozák, *Skon Barbory Opavské a Ratibořské, posledního zástupce rodu Přemyslovců na krnovském knížecím stolci*, “Časopis Matice moravské”, CXXXVI, 2017, pp. 269–280
- KOZÁK 2018 = Petr Kozák, *Za obzorem národního paradigmatu: Dvory jagellonských monarchů přelomu 15 a 16 století ve vzájemných vztazích (prolegomena výzkumu)*, “Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica”, XXI, 2018, pp. 91–108
- KOZÁK 2019 = *Účty budinského dvora krále Vladislava II. Jagellonského (1494–1495)*, ed. Petr Kozák, Scriptorium, Praha 2019
- KOZÁK 2020 = Petr Kozák, *Income and Expenditures of the Hungarian Royal Chamber During the First Ruling Years of King Vladislaus Jagiellon: Analysis of an Accounting Register from the Years 1494–1495*, in: *A History of the Credit Market in Central Europe: The Middle Ages and Early Modern Period*, ed. Pavla Slavičková, Routledge, London–New York 2020, pp. 42–51
- KRAUSEN 1715 = Theodor Krausen, *Miscellanae Gentis Schaffgotschianae oder Historisch-Genealogischer Bericht von dem Uralten Geschlechte Derer Herren von Schaff-Gotschen*, Johann Gottfried Webern, s.l. 1715
- KUFFART 2014 = Hajnalka Kuffart, *Introduzione ai libri contabili di Ippolito I d'Este esaminati dal punto di vista ungherese*, “Quaderni Estensi”, VI, 2014, pp. 201–226
- KUŽIĆ 2014 = Křešimir Kužić, *Bitka Hrvata — bitka na Krbavskom polju 1493 godine*, “Historijski zbornik”, LXVII, 2014, pp. 11–63
- MACEK 1991 = Josef Macek, *Tři ženy krále Vladislava*, Mladá fronta, Praha 1991
- MACEK 1992 = Josef Macek, *Jagellonský věk v českých zemích 1471–1526*, part 1: *Hospodářská základna a královská moc*, Academia, Praha 1992
- MACEK 2001 = Josef Macek, *Jagellonský věk v českých zemích 1471–1526*, part 1–2, Academia, Praha 2001
- MACŮREK 1958 = Josef Macůrek, *K otázce české listiny a české kanceláře na dvoře uherském v 2. pol. 15. století (v letech 1486–1490)*, “Historický časopis”, VI, 1958, pp. 560–569
- MAŤA 2004 = Petr Maťa, *Svět české aristokracie (1500–1700)*, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, Praha 2004
- Neues allgemeines Adels-Lexicon* 1867 = *Neues allgemeines Deutsches Adels-Lexicon*, vol. VII, ed. Ernst Heinrich Kneschke, Voigt, Leipzig 1867
- Neues allgemeines Adels-Lexicon* 1868 = *Neues allgemeines Deutsches Adels-Lexicon*, vol. VIII, ed. Ernst Heinrich Kneschke, Voigt, Leipzig 1868
- Neues allgemeines Adels-Lexicon* 1870 = *Neues allgemeines Deutsches Adels-Lexicon*, vol. IX, ed. Ernst Heinrich Kneschke, Voigt, Leipzig 1870
- NEUMANN 2008 = Tibor Neumann, *II. Ulászló koronázása és első rendeletei (Egy ismeretlen országgyűlésről és koronázási dekrétumról)*, “Századok”, CXXIV, 2008, pp. 315–337
- NEUMANN 2009 = Tibor Neumann, *Bátori István politikai szerepe II. Ulászló uralkodása alatt (1490–1493)*, “Szabolcs-szatmár-beregi Szemle”, XLIV, 2009, pp. 83–127
- NEUMANN 2010–2011 = Tibor Neumann, *Békekötés pozsonyban — országgyűlés Budán. A Jagelló–Habsburg kapcsolatok egy fejezete (1490–1492)*, “Századok”, CXLIV, 2010, pp. 335–372; CXLV, 2011, pp. 293–347
- NEUMANN 2014a = Tibor Neumann, *Răscoala secuilor și reforma guvernamentală pentru apărarea granițelor sudice (1492–1493)*, “Banatica”, XXIV, II istorie, Cluj-Napoca 2014, pp. 129–149

- NEUMANN 2014b = Tibor Neumann, *A gróf és a herceg magánháborúja (Szapolyai István és Corvin János harca a lipői hercegségért)*, “Századok”, CXLVIII, 2014, pp. 387–426
- NEUMANN 2016 = Tibor Neumann, *A kassai hadjárat. II. Ulászló zsoldosserege és a lengyelek elleni harc (1490–1491)*, in: *Elfeledett háborúk. Középkori csaták és várostromok (6–16 század)*, eds. László Pósn, László Veszprémy, Zrínyi Kiadó, Budapest 2016, pp. 363–397
- NEUMANN 2017 = Tibor Neumann, *Vojenské výdavky a daň mesta Bratislavy v rokoch 1489–1495*, in: *Ingenii laus. Zborník štúdií venovaný jubiliujúcemu prof. PhDr. Jánovi Lukačovi, CSc.*, eds. Eva Benková, Marek Púčík, Univerzita Komenského, Bratislava 2017, pp. 247–261
- NEUMANN 2019 = *Registrum proventuum regni Hungariae. A Magyar Királyság kincstartójának számadáskönyve (1494–1495)*, ed. Tibor Neumann, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Budapest 2019
- OCHMAŃSKI 1972 = Jerzy Ochmański, *Biskupstwo wileńskie w średniowieczu. Ustrój i uposażenie*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu im. A. Mickiewicza, Poznań 1972
- PALACKÝ 1941 = František Palacký, *Přehled současný nejvyšších důstojníků a úředníků (doplnil Jaroslav Charvát)*, in: *Dílo Františka Palackého*, vol. I: *Práce historické*, ed. Jaroslav Charvát, L. Mazáč, Praha 1941, pp. 319–417
- PIETKIEWICZ 1997 = Krzysztof Pietkiewicz, *Dwór litewski w ks. Aleksandra Jagiellończyka (1492–1506)*, in: *Lietuvos valstybė XII–XVIII a.*, eds. Zigmantas Kiaupa, Arturas Mickevičius, Jolita Sarcevicienė, Lietuvos Istorijos institutas, Vilnius 1997, pp. 75–131
- PILNÁČEK 1930 = Josef Pilnáček, *Staromoravští rodové*, Lidová knihtiskárna Ant. Machát a spol., Vídeň 1930
- PILNÁČEK 1936 = Josef Pilnáček, *Die älteste Genealogie der Grafen Wilczek*, im Verlage der Grafen Wilczek, Wien 1936
- PILNÁČEK 1991 = Josef Pilnáček, *Rody starého Slezska I*, Moravský zemský archiv v Brně, Brno 1991
- PLAČEK 1996 = Miroslav Plaček, *Hrady a zámky na Moravě a ve Slezsku*, Libri, Praha 1996
- POCIECHA 1937 = Władysław Pocięcha, *Chodecki Stanisław*, in: *Polski słownik biograficzny*, vol. III, Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Kraków 1937, pp. 351–352
- POKLUDA 1993 = Zdeněk Pokluda, *Tvrze na Zlínsku*, “Zlínsko od minulosti k současnosti”, XII, 1993, pp. 115–242
- PRAJDA 2017 = Katalin Prajda, *Florentines’ Trade in the Kingdom of Hungary in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Trade Routes, Networks, and Commodities*, “Hungarian Historical Review”, VI, 2017, pp. 36–58
- RAUKAR 1997 = Tomislav Raukar, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje. Prostor, ljudi, ideje*, Školska knjiga, Zagreb 1997
- RUTKOWSKA 2000–2001 = Grażyna Rutkowska, *Sokołowski Jąłbrzyk Jan z Wrzący Wielkiej*, in: *Polski słownik biograficzny*, vol. XL, Polska Akademia Nauk, Warszawa–Kraków 2000–2001, pp. 128–131
- SEDLÁČEK 1882 = August Sedláček, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze Království českého*, vol. I: *Chrudimsko*, Knihotiskárna Františka Šimáčka, Praha 1882
- SEDLÁČEK 1883 = August Sedláček, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze Království českého*, vol. II: *Hradecko*, Knihotiskárna Františka Šimáčka, Praha 1883
- SEDLÁČEK 1884 = August Sedláček, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze království českého*, vol. III: *Budějovsko*, Knihotiskárna Františka Šimáčka, Praha 1884

- SEDLÁČEK 1890 = August Sedláček, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze království českého*, vol. VII: *Písecko*, Knihotiskárna Františka Šimáčka, Praha 1890
- SEDLÁČEK 1891 = August Sedláček, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze království českého*, vol. VIII: *Rakovnicko a Slansko*, Knihotiskárna Františka Šimáčka, Praha 1891
- SEDLÁČEK 1895 = August Sedláček, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze království českého*, vol. X: *Boleslavsko*, Knihotiskárna Františka Šimáčka, Praha 1895
- SEDLÁČEK 1901 = August Sedláček, *Meziřícký z Lomnice*, in: *Ottův slovník naučný*, vol. XVII, J. Otto, Praha 1901, pp. 238–240
- SEDLÁČEK 1904a = August Sedláček, *Račín z Račina*, in: *Ottův slovník naučný*, vol. XXI, J. Otto, Praha 1904, pp. 18–19
- SEDLÁČEK 1904b = August Sedláček, *Roubík z Hlavatec*, in: *Ottův slovník naučný*, vol. XXI, J. Otto, Praha 1904, pp. 1019–1020
- SEDLÁČEK 1904c = August Sedláček, *Rájecký z Mirova*, in: *Ottův slovník naučný*, vol. XXI, J. Otto, Praha 1904, pp. 71–72
- SEDLÁČEK 1906 = August Sedláček, *Sudek z Dluhé*, in: *Ottův slovník naučný*, vol. XXIV, J. Otto, Praha 1906, pp. 329–330
- SEDLÁČEK 1907 = August Sedláček, *Vlček z Čenova*, in: *Ottův slovník naučný*, vol. XXVI, J. Otto, Praha 1907, pp. 821–822
- SEDLÁČEK 1923 = August Sedláček, *Hrady, zámky a tvrze království českého*, vol. XIV: *Litoměřicko a Zatecko*, Šolc a Šimáček, Praha 1923
- SCHULZ 1900 = *Listy do Kouřimě zaslané z let 1422–1525*, ed. Václav Schulz, in: *Archiv český čili Staré písemné památky české i moravské XVIII, tiskem dra Ed. Grégra*, Praha 1900, pp. 401–560
- SKIBNIEWSKA 2015 = Józefa Skibniewska, *Dwór królewski Aleksandra Jagiellończyka w latach 1501–1506*, Wydawnictwo KUL, Lublin 2015
- STARÝ 2018 = Marek Starý, „...pojav k svatému manželství jich sestry dceru“. *Marginálie ke genealogii slezských knížat a k osudům Krnovska na přelomu 15 a 16 století*, „Časopis Matice moravské“, CXXXVII, 2018, pp. 57–85
- STIBOR 2007 = Jiří Stibor, *Z Žerotína*, in: *Biografický slovník Slezska a severní Moravy*, New series, X (XXII), Ostravská univerzita, Ostrava 2007, pp. 75–183
- ŠMAHEL 2000 = František Šmahel, *Idea národa v husitských Čechách*, Argo, Praha 2000
- ŠMAHEL 2002 = František Šmahel, *Die Nationen im Mittelalter*, in: *Die Präsenz des Nationalen im (ost)mitteleuropäischen Geschichtsdiskurs*, ed. Robert Maier, Verlag Hansische Buchhandlung, Hannover 2002, pp. 35–43
- TEIGE 1900 = *Registra krále Vladislava II. z let 1498–1502*, ed. Josef Teige, in: *Archiv český čili Staré písemné památky české i moravské XVIII, tiskem dra Ed. Grégra*, Praha 1900, pp. 1–289
- TEKE 2007 = Zsuzsa Teke, *Egy firenzei kereskedő a Jagelló-korban. Raggione Bontempi 1488–1528*, „Századok“, CXLI, 2007, pp. 967–990
- TOMEK 1893 = Václav V. Tomek, *Dějepis města Prahy IX*, W komissí u Františka Řiwnáče, Praha 1893
- TÓTH 2010 = Norbert C. Tóth, *Politikatörténeti források Bátori István első helytartóságához (1522–1523)*, Magyar Országos Levéltár, Budapest 2010
- TÓTH et al. 2016 = Norbert C. Tóth, Richárd Horváth, Tibor Neumann, Tamás Pálosfalvi, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1458–1526 I. Főpapok és bárók*, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Budapest 2016

- TÓTH et al. 2017 = Norbert C. Tóth, Richárd Horváth, Tibor Neumann, Tamás Pálosfalvi, András W. Kovács, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1458–1526 II. Megyék*, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Budapest 2017
- TRESP 2004 = Uwe Tresp, *Söldner aus Böhmen. Im Dienst deutscher Fürsten: Kriegsgeschäft und Heeresorganisation im 15 Jahrhundert*, Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn–München–Wien–Zürich 2004
- TRNKA 2009 = Pavel Trnka, *Výdaje dvora Vladislava Jagellonského v letech 1471–1490*, in: *Dvory a rezidence ve středověku*, vol. III: *Všední a sváteční život na středověkých dvorech*, ed. Dana Dvořáčková-Malá, Historický ústav AV ČR, Praha 2009, pp. 271–292
- TRNKA 2010a = Pavel Trnka, *Složení dvora krále Vladislava Jagellonského v letech 1471–1490*, “*Mediaevalia historica Bohemica*”, XIII, 2010, pp. 111–145
- TRNKA 2010b = Pavel Trnka, *Královské příjmy z kutnohorské mincovny v 70 a 80 letech 15 století*, “*Numismatické listy*”, LXV, 2010, 3, pp. 135–140
- TUREK, JISL 1953 = Adolf Turek, Lumír Jisl, *Ostravsko za česko-uherské války ve světle písemných pramenů i archeologických nálezů*, “*Časopis Slezského muzea*”, III, 1953, pp. 1–24
- URBAN 2003 = Jan Urban, *Lichtenburkové. Vzestupy a pády jednoho panského rodu*, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, Praha 2003
- VYBÍRAL 2008 = Zdeněk Vybíral, *Bitva u Moháče. Krvavá porážka uherského a českého krále Ludvíka Jagellonského v boji s Osmany 29 srpna 1526*, Havran, Praha 2008
- WURZBACH 1875 = Constant von Wurzbach, *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich*, vol. XXIX, k.k. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, Wien 1875

Courtiers, diplomats, servants, merchants... Foreigners in account books of the Hungarian court of King Vladislaus Jagiellon from 1494–1495

Account books kept at the court of the Hungarian monarchs were destroyed during the tragic events following the Battle of Mohács in 1526. The Hungarian royal archives were lost during the evacuation of the Buda residence. When it comes to records of the incomes and expenditures of the monarch and his court, very few fragments of the original varied material have survived, unfortunately. What is traditionally regarded as the most important source in this group is a register of incomes and expenditures of the Hungarian king or kingdom from 1494–1495, the original of which can be found in the Hungarian National Széchényi Library in Budapest. The manuscript contains a list of the Hungarian throne's incomes as well as a list of the royal court's expenditures with a balance sheet compiled by officials of the Hungarian royal treasurer. The aim of the article is to demonstrate the potential of the source with regard to research into the composition of the Hungarian and Bohemian courts under Jagiellon rule. The emphasis is on a group of people who could be described as "foreigners" in the context of the Kingdom of Hungary (or, better still, of Hungary and Croatia) towards the end of the Middle Ages. The 1494–1495 account book is not, in fact, a list of all of King Vladislaus' incomes and expenditures. In practice, it is a record of "only" those of the monarch's incomes and expenditures that were covered by the powers of the Hungarian royal treasurer and supervision of the Hungarian estates.

There is no doubt that the monarch's court always included some individuals of "foreign" origin. This is especially true of more important monarchs, who at the turn of the sixteenth century included representatives of the Jagiellonian dynasty. In addition, the fact that the Jagiellons ruled several monarchies in Central and Eastern Europe naturally strengthened mobility between Jagiellonian courts. After all, individuals of Polish-Lithuanian origin accompanied Vladislaus Jagiellon in his 1471 journey from Kraków to Prague, and some of them subsequently moved with the king to Buda in 1490. Moreover, the Hungarian metropolis became second home to many of Vladislaus' "Bohemian" courtiers. In Buda they all met not only royal courtiers of Hungarian origin (including those from Croatia and peripheral parts of Hungary, like Transylvania or Slavonia), but also a mixture of people from Italy, German regions of the empire as well as Bohemia. That is why the crucial question is: Who was and who was not a "foreigner" at Vladislaus' court? Research carried out by Josef Macek and Pavel Trnka has provided us with an idea of the composition of King Vladislaus' court only for 1471–1490, when he ruled Bohemia. For the period of 1490–1516, when he ruled not only all Bohemian lands, but also Hungary and Croatia, there are no studies of the composition of his court in Czech or Hungarian historiography. Yet despite the limited knowledge of the composition of the court of King Vladislaus Jagiellon after he became King of Hungary, it is possible to formulate several partial conclusions and identify by name 45 individuals from Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia and Lusatia, though in reality the representation of the noblemen (from the higher and lower nobility) from the lands of the Crown of St. Wenceslas must have been larger, as some courtiers remained anonymous.

