ABSTRACT: The author analyzes the education and training of the Hungarian and Bohemian king Ladislaus the Posthumous at the court of the Roman-German king Frederick III Habsburg in 1440-1452. He examines not only a thin collection of the accounts of Ladislaus’ training and his teachers, but also the work by Enea Silvio Piccolomini on the education of children that was written directly for Ladislaus the Posthumous in 1450. Besides this theoretical education, the author also deals with the practical side of Ladislaus’ training by way of an example of the imperial coronation journey to Rome in 1451-1452, in which Ladislaus took part.
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We typically know very little about the childhood and education of medieval monarchs. The case of Hungarian-and from 1453 Bohemian as well-King Ladislaus the Posthumous, is not very different. Although some sources have survived that will be discussed later, we are still entering into a very obscure period of the king’s life. The aim of the this study is to attempt to answer a number of problematic questions. Did the king have a proper upbringing and education at the court of his guardian, Frederick III of the Habsburg dynasty? What did such an education look like, and who were his teachers and tutors? Did the king employ any methods in his future life as a ruler that he acquired during his education? We will also attempt to define Frederick III’s role in Ladislaus’s upbringing and the overall educational process.

Basic Information on the Period

Before we can examine the upbringing and education of Ladislaus the Posthumous, we must first briefly discuss the era that preceded his education at the court of Frederick III of the Habsburg dynasty, because otherwise we could not understand the reason for Ladislaus’s residence at the court of his distant relative (Ladislaus was of the Albertine line of the Habsburgs, and Friedrich III was from the Leopoldine line).

It is important to mention the difficult situation Ladislaus, who was born 22 February 1440 at the castle at Komárno, was in. This difficulty stems from the fact that he had no familial support. His father, Albert V (as a king, he was known as Albert II) died several months before Ladislaus’s birth (he passed away on 27 October...
1439). It is important to note his father’s position at his death: Albert II was a Roman-German, Hungarian, and Bohemian king. In this way, Ladislaus became the heir of a several royal thrones the moment he was born, his territory including the Austrian duchy, Moravian margraviate, Upper and Lower Lusatia, Silesian principalities, and other areas. Since Ladislaus was born after his father had already died, he received the designation of „Posthumous” by chroniclers and historiographers.1

On 23 October 1439, four days prior his death, Albert V issued a testament that was to become crucial for future development. If should have a son, he appointed his wife, Elizabeth of Luxembourg, and the senior of the Habsburg dynasty as guardians. The guardians were to be aided in governing his lands by a council of trustees, to which three individuals from Hungary, three from Bohemia, two from Austria, and one from Prague were to be elected. Bratislava was chosen as the heir’s permanent residence, because from there he could have all the individual centres of his lands within reach.2

Ladislaus was left ith only his mother, Elizabeth of Luxembourg (daughter of Emperor Sigismund of Luxembourg and Barbara of Cilli), who immediately began fighting for the preservation of the rights of the royal infant. His mother had three-month-old Ladislaus crowned King of Hungary on 15 May 1440 in Székesfehérvár. The majority of the Hungarian nobility, however, sided with Polish King Vladislav III Jagiellon, who had himself crowned King of Hungary in Székesfehérvár on 17 July 1440. A war broke out between the two camps, the so-called Habsburg Party (supporters of Ladislaus the Posthumous) and the so-called National Party (supporters of Vladislav III Jagiellon). The desperate mother ultimately agreed to hand Ladislaus and his older sister, Elizabeth, as well as the Hungarian crown over to Roman-German King Frederick III of the Habsburg dynasty, who urged her to release her son to him. In the end, Elizabeth, who permanently feared for the safety of her children, acquiesced to Frederick’s proposal at a meeting in Wiener Neustadt.3

On 22 November 1440 in Wiener Neustadt, Frederick III pledged that he would not

---


take any action concerning Elizabeth’s daughter Elizabeth or her son Ladislaus without the queen’s consent. He vowed to take care of them and raise them. If the queen should find a suitable castle in Hungary where Ladislaus would be safe, he will return the children to her. The desperateness of Elizabeth’s situation, which was not a meeting of two equal parties with equal negotiating capital is evidenced by the following document. Frederick III decided to reap as much as he could from the situation at hand, and limit Elizabeth’s room for negotiation even further. On 26 November 1440, Elizabeth was forced to pledge to Frederick III that when she finds a suitable castle for her son, Ladislaus, where he would be safe, she will hand over this castle to Frederick III, and he shall keep watch over the young king there. All of this was to occur under Elizabeth’s sole condition that she would be able to visit Ladislaus there without limitation. One cannot really call this friendly support of Habsburg familial solidarity on the part of Frederick; these were harsh terms that were advantageous only for one party only: for Frederick III.

If readers have the impression that Ladislaus had been taken hostage by his relative, then their impression is not far from the truth. Though it was not an imprisonment in the true sense of the word (since Ladislaus was afforded proper care and upbringing), Frederick III could use the young king as a sure bet or reserve in negotiations with representatives of lands that should be under Ladislaus’s rule. The return on help he provided to Elizabeth was a hundredfold, not only as collateral in property, jewels, and royal crowns, but also, basically, in Elizabeth’s children themselves. If we were to examine the situation through a modern lens, Frederick III made an investment and the return on his investment grew exponentially over the years.

Did Elizabeth make a mistake in handing her children over to Frederick III? It may seem so, from today’s perspective. On the other hand, her situation was so entirely desperate that she sought help from wherever she could, and for almost any price. Additionally, there was no way she could have known how the situation would develop. She herself likely saw handing over her children solely as a temporary affair; she could not have predicted that it would turn out differently.


The Upbringing and Education of King Ladislaus

Even before he left Hungary, Ladislaus still held a court of 24 people after his separation from his mother. The staff included, among others, Queen Elizabeth’s chamber maid, Helen Kottanner, and a nursemaid.6 Who exactly remained after his transfer into the guardianship of Frederick III in November 1440 cannot be determined. However, one can assume that there were rather significant substitutions in the staff. It is possible that only the female staff—or parts of it (nursemaid)-remained. Ladislaus’s mother never nursed him, nor did she ever sleep in the same room as him. Nursemaids were in charge of breastfeeding, and typically they were the ones who took care of a child in a royal family, usually until they were four years of age, even though they stopped nursing long before. The bond between a nursemaid and her charge, therefore, was often very strong. It was usually around four years of age when men began to enter into the picture. These men were be in charge of the child’s upbringing. Because of the complexity of the situation, Ladislaus’s mother Elizabeth did not have any influence in the matter of his psychological and physical upbringing. After November 1440, she may have seen him only briefly several times during visits to the court of Frederick III, but no more than this. Additionally, in December 1442, she died under very suspicious circumstances (she was likely poisoned), which meant that Ladislaus became a true orphan.7

In November 1440, Ladislaus found himself, together with his sister Elizabeth, at the court of his relative, King Frederick III in Wiener Neustadt. It was in this city that Ladislaus spent the largest portion of his life. Another residential seat of Frederick’s court was Graz, where Ladislaus also stayed. At the time, both locations belonged to Styria (today Wiener Neustadt belongs to Lower Austria). Frederick’s main seat was Wiener Neustadt, which the king made efforts to expand and develop. Despite the amount of care he devoted to Wiener Neustadt, it never became a significant European residence. It could not compare to Buda during the reign of Ladislaus’s grandfather, Sigismund of Luxemburg, nor to Vienna during the time of Ladislaus’s father, Albert II of Germany. Ladislaus and Frederick would occasionally stay in Vienna (more prominently in 1445–1448), but it was not their preferred residence.8

It is important to take a moment to examine the figure of Frederick III of the Habsburg dynasty, because he played a crucial role in the life and education of Ladi-
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8 KNITTEL, Jan. Český dům Ladislava Pohrobka. Praha 2014 (dissertation defended at the Department of Czech History at the Faculty of Arts at Charles University in Prague 2014), pp. 21, 28-29. For more information on these residences, see the dissertation by BRUCKNER, Eva. Formen der Herrschaftspräsentation und Selbstdarstellung habsburgischer Fürsten im Spätmittelalter. Wien 2009 (defended at the University of Vienna in 2009), pp. 103-105, 202-213.
slaus the Posthumous. This Habsburg ruler was born of the marital relations of Ernest the Iron and Cymburgis of Masovia in 1415 in Innsbruck, Tyrol. He spent his youth mostly in Wiener Neustadt, alongside his brother, Albert VI, who was three years younger than he. Both brothers had a proper upbringing. While the younger brother, Albert VI, inherited the explosive personality of their father, the older Frederick was influenced more by the pious nature of their mother. Frederick’s was mostly of an introverted, contemplative, and measured nature, which was often viewed by others as excessive dispassionateness. It was very difficult to prompt him into energetic action, and deferring matter to a later date became his main diplomatic medium. He was not a man of action, endlessly weighing the pros and cons before he did anything, which often lead to him missing the most opportune moment for action. He was too lazy to work on resolving issues, and only did what was absolutely necessary or what he was forced to do. According to K. F. Krieger, this was Frederick’s strategy of planned inaction.
Frederick’s significant introversion resulted in the fact that he had trouble all throughout his life establishing contact with those around him. He was not, however, the intellectually-oriented, introverted humanitarian that he may seem at first glance. He would remember insults or injustices against him for many years, for which he had the capacity seek cruel revenge even years later. It seems that the outwardly projected calm nature was simply a mask that he used as a political tool so that neither his opponents nor his supporters would ever know his true intentions and motives. When he felt aggrieved in his rights and royal dignity, this otherwise conciliatory man would display irreconcilable severity. One of his prominent characteristics was excessive thrift, almost to the point of stinginess, in which he was completely outside of the norm of the conception of a medieval monarch, who was supposed to be generous to those around him. Frederick was personally modest, and did not have a need for patronage of the arts or courtly entertainment. His contemporaries were annoyed by the fact that he slept late, did not drink alcohol, did not fraternise with anyone, was unable to concentrate on anything, and was often in a bad mood. He was taciturn, often made decisions independently without consulting anyone, and loved solitude and seclusion. His court was not opulent enough, he scrimped on everything he could, and his clerks were never paid on time or in full. Some were of the notion that his personality would have been a more fitting for a monk than a king.14

Frederick reigned over so-called Inner Austria (Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola), and after the death of Ladislaus’s father, Albert II, he became the senior member of the Habsburg dynasty. In 1440, as the guardian of Ladislaus the Posthumous, he took over the regency of Ladislaus’s Austrian hereditary lands (Upper and Lower Austria). He focused his interests on maintaining his influence in the lands that were once under the rule of Albert II of Germany. He knew very well that as long as he was Ladislaus’s guardian, he could maintain his influence on the development of Upper and Lower Austria, Hungary, and the Bohemian lands. For this reason, he had no intention of ever handing over young Ladislaus to anyone, even if they begged or threatened him. From his point of view, the protraction of the interregnum in Ladislaus’s lands was more than he could have ever desired. His ploy was very effective and successful for quite some time.15

It seems that Ladislaus’s life was influenced more by his guardian than he would have liked. The ability to maintain pretence, keep calm, and put forth a non-committal mask—even in extreme situations—seemingly resigned to the given situation, only to then take aggressive action was a tactic Ladislaus later used to his advantage during his reign. He likely learned this from watching Frederick III during his many years of residence at his court. In light of the fact that Ladislaus’s father was already dead, it is possible that Frederick III was, in some sense, a father figure to him, a role model of sorts. Unlike Frederick III, stinginess and thrift were

contrary to Ladislaus’s nature (at least during in the time when he was released from the influence of his guardian, though this could have been a product of his young age).

Ladislaus’s early childhood ended the moment he was transferred from the care of the female staff into the hands of men, though the exact point in time that this happened cannot be determined. One can assume that it was relatively early on. It took place at the moment when the people around him determined that he was physically and mentally capable of handling training and education. This was the moment that his care was handed over to his tutors. The principle at the time was that the sooner he began his education, the better. The future monarch needed to learn how to present himself in a courtly environment and orient himself in its hierarchical structure. There were also other children around the young prince that were similar in age. These included the offspring of important aristocratic dynasties that were to represent the future king’s court. The young king learned how to rule, and they learned how to heed and serve him. The children’s instruction was often carried out in groups, during which the future monarch would receive greater care and attention. The cohort of 11 young nobles surrounding Ladislaus was documented in March 1452, when they, together with Ladislaus, attended the coronation of Emperor Frederick III in Rome (they were labelled the *Kunig Laczlav Dienen*).

Further detailed descriptions of the typical childhood „workday“ of Ladislaus the Posthumous have not survived. To get a general sense, however, we can look to curriculums from the early 16th-century Pfalz region. The conditions of Ladislaus’s education probably were not all that different from those over half a century later. Children of the nobility were to rise before 6:00 a.m. during the summer months, and in the winter before 7:00 a.m. They were then washed, dressed, and coiffed. This was followed by morning prayers and an hour of lessons. The programme continued with breakfast, attendance of holy mass, and listening to the sermon. Lunch followed, after which they had two-hour lessons with short breaks for refreshment. After this exhausting programme, the young nobles would have leisure time to do as he pleased. The next item on the programme was dinner, which was followed by a 15-minute lesson on Latin or another favourite subject. Before bed, the young aristocrat would have one more beverage. In the summer, they would go to bed at 9:00 p.m. and in the winter at 8:00 p.m.

---


17 *Analecta monimentorum*, 2, pp. 568-569. KNITTEL, Český dvůr Ladislava Pohrobka, p. 22-23 attempts to identify them in some cases.

For his lessons in Latin grammar, Ladislaus the Posthumous received a handwritten Latin textbook as a gift from the monastery in Melk. The illuminated parchment codex was created some time around 1446 in the monastery in Melk by the Benedictine monk, Simon.19

The key role in Ladislaus the Posthumous’s education was held by his tutor and steward, Kaspar Wendel of Krotendorf. He was a man who enjoyed a great deal of confidence from Frederick III. Despite this fact, before he was established in his position as steward to Ladislaus the Posthumous, he had to vow that, in his capacity as steward, he would never take any action against the interests of Frederick III (a promise that he did not keep, as will be shown later). Kaspar came from a poor background, though he went on to study at the university in Vienna, and then took a position at an Austrian office, after which he entered royal services, where he functioned as an advisor to Frederick III. It was assumed that he would build a great career at the court of Frederick III, which would one day earn him an episcopal seat. Kaspar was in charge of all of Ladislaus’s servants. It was also his duty to oversee the quality of his education, as well as the wardrobe and diet of the young king. Another task included familiarising Ladislaus with the various ceremonies and rituals of the royal court. The steward entrusted the actual instruction of specialised subjects and languages to professional scholars: instructors from the ranks of the clergy.20

Not all historians are thrilled with the figure of Kaspar Wendel. A. G. Supan, for example, calls him a perfidious man whose actions always served to support his own ambitions.21

Another individual who participated in the Ladislaus the Posthumous’s education was Jan Hinderbach, who drafted a treatise on physical exercises (mainly with a ball) for Ladislaus. Other exercise included horseback riding, running, jumping, swimming, archery, and shooting a slingshot.22

Frederick III hired a Czech teacher for Ladislaus, a post that was filled by Jan Holubář of Náchod. The fact that Ladislaus was learning Czech even prior to his


21 SUPAN, Die vier letzten Lebensjahre, p. 18.

release from the guardianship of Frederick III is confirmed by the fact that Jan Holubář is listed in September 1452 as a part of Ladislaus's retinue during his visit to opposition estates and in February 1453 in Vienna. Jan Holubář served at Ladislaus's court even after the young monarch was released from his guardianship as an informer, personal guard, and tournament skills instructor.23

It was probably in relation to Ladislaus the Posthumous's residence in Bohemia (in 1453–1454) that Jan Holubář created an illuminated Latin-German-Czech dictionary for King Ladislaus. The dictionary first lists phrases in Latin in the first column, with the second column listing its equivalent in German, and finally, the third lists its translation into Czech. The following are two specific example: *Forum* – *Markt* – *Trh* or *Rex* – *Kunig* – *Kral*.24

Kaspar Wendel had a close relationship with the Italian humanitatarian and chronicler, Enea Silvio Piccolomini, who, upon request, drafted the Latin treatise and/or handbook, *De institutione liberorum* [On the Education of Children] in 1450 for Ladislaus the Posthumous and, most importantly, for his tutors and teachers.25

It is not entirely clear how much Enea Silvio’s treatise was actually put into practice for Ladislaus the Posthumous’s education. Enea Silvio drafted the text in February 1450 in Wiener Neustadt. In light of the fact that, in December 1451, young Ladislaus left with King Frederick III for his coronation tour to Rome during which a formal form of education was impossible, there were then only 22 months left in which the principles laid out by Enea Silvio could be put into practice.


25 The text of the treatise *De institutione liberorum* is printed, see FRA II/67, pp. 103-158, no. 40. It has been published in Czech translation, see SYLVIUS, Eneaš. *E compile di et di tutelari pro Ladislavo di Este, che si diede Allerseggio a darseggiare il suo posto.

The text also contains a later note about the death of King Ladislaus the Posthumous. Currently, the original manuscript is archived at the Palatine Library at the Vatican, under sign. BAV Pal. lat. 1787.
It was a relatively unique undertaking that did not have very many predecessors during that time. In his work, Enea Silvio refers directly to Ladislaus the Posthumous, to whom he issues advice and instructions on how he should live, how to behave, and how he should study and educate himself. Originally, the work was to be made up of four sections, in which each section was designated for a specific phase of life. In other words, for a boy, a youth, a man, and an elder. However, only the first section for a boy, was written. Enea Silvio never got around to the remaining sections.

It is impossible to provide a detailed analysis of the expansive text here. However, we shall point out the majority of the main concepts. In this, we will see that Enea’s treatise did not refer solely to advice on education, but to life in general (proper behaviour, questions of morality, diet, etc.). Silvio imparts upon young Ladislaus that a monarch should be wise, because if he were not, he would destroy both himself and his subjects. He was to adopt the virtues of his forefathers as his own. An uneducated king was nothing more than a crowned ass. Because Hungary was weakened by disaster, and Bohemia was ravaged, there was no other alternative than for them to rise again to their former glory under Ladislaus’s reign. Furthermore, Silvio states that he has high expectations for Ladislaus, and that he believes that they will be fulfilled. Silvio is glad that Ladislaus does not involve himself in immorality, and does not relish in the company of unruly peers. He also appreciates that he listens eagerly to morality tales, and works to become a better person. It is good that Ladislaus heeds the admonitions of his teachers. Enea Silvio obtained information about Ladislaus’s educational progress from his friend, Kaspar Wendel. Enea goes on to state that he drafted the treatise upon the request of Kaspar Wendel for young Ladislaus’s edification and education.26

Silvio learned from Kaspar Wendel that Ladislaus was a very eager learner. This was good, since nothing can be achieved without education and practice. He knows that he has good teachers, and if he heeds their instructions, he will become a great man and an excellent king. He should pay attention to proper manners, not contort his mouth, not smack while eating, not succumb to drunkenness, not be servile, he should not hold his face up high, but also should also not cast his eyes downward.27

The future king should scorn stinginess, but should not have a desire for money, with which no wise man has ever had a bond. He should behave modestly toward women, love children and his relatives, honour his elders, obey the law, suppress his anger, control his desire, take pity upon the oppressed and the poor, reward the deserving, punish criminals, and not exaggerate his successes with excessive excitement and celebration.28

Physical exercise was also important for the young king. He should not be prohibited from playing games that are not indecent. In this passage, Enea Silvio states that the matter of physical exercise, particularly with a ball, was covered directly by the treatise written for Ladislaus by Jan Hinderbach. Enea approves of the manual, and
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26 FRA II/67, pp. 103-106; SYLVIUS, Pojednání o vychování dítětí, pp. 6-7.
28 FRA II/67, p. 157; SYLVIUS, Pojednání o vychování dítětí, p. 41.
recommends that Ladislaus follow its principles. It is also important to practice military exercises (archery, shooting a slingshot, spear throwing, horseback riding).  

Enea Silvio also expresses his opinions on the young king’s diet. It should be modest. He should not eat hard-to-digest dishes, and should not become accustomed to sumptuous foods. He lists Ladisalus’s guardian, Frederick III, as a positive model, who eats and drinks in moderation. He breakfasts modestly, lunches modestly, and pays absolutely no heed to the gossip of drunkards. Young boys like Ladislaus should not drink wine at all, or only if it is watered down. Ladislaus should avoid drunkenness. Drinking should be only for quenching thirst.

The text contains numerous appeals to Ladislaus’s morality. The king would never be able to be labelled as happy if he does not live honourably, and spiritual values must always take precedence over material property. Ruling is a great burden, because the king does not have the luxury of worrying only about himself, but must take care of his subjects as well, whom he must govern justly. Enea warns Ladislaus about the variability of human fate, because nothing on this earth is ever constant. People are wealthy for a while, then soon poor, they rule over others for a bit, then themselves become subjects, they enjoy good health for a time, and soon are stricken with illness. No one can know what tomorrow will bring. As will be seen later, these words became extremely characteristic of Ladislaus the Posthumous’s fate. Fate played cruel games with the king.

Ladislaus should have the same positive relationship to all people across his territories. He cannot prefer his subjects in Austria at the expense of his subjects in Bohemia and Hungary. He should treat everyone the same.

One relatively important passage from Enea Silvio’s treatise is the one in which he expresses his opinions on group instruction. Ladislaus should choose such boys for his childhood peers that have respectable morals, do not have any vices, and do not express themselves vulgarly. Since all people are susceptible to peer pressure, it would not be good if Ladislaus imitated ill-mannered peers in such things. He should also be wary of flatterers, who are multiplying everywhere like the plague. His companions should be truthful, honest, modest, humble, should not be deceptive or unjust, and should not love wine and alcohol. Of these childhood peers, several should know how to speak Hungarian, several Czech, several German, and all should speak Latin. All of the listed languages should be alternated in conversation. This is an easy and fun way for Ladislaus to learn the languages that he will need so that he can communicate personally with the subjects in various lands in the future. There is no better way for Ladislaus to earn the support of his subjects than the mastery of their language and being able to understand complaints expressed in their vernacular. In many cases, there are certain delicate matters that cannot be discussed through interpreters. In this matter, Ladislaus should follow the example of his forefathers, one positive, one negative. His grandfather, Sigismund of Luxembourg, profited greatly from his familiarity with many languages, while his father,
Albert II of Germany’s unfamiliarity with them was a great detriment.\(^{33}\)

Ladislaus should learn to be a good speaker with an emphasis on wisdom and expression. He should not, however, speak at too great a length. Knowing when to keep silent instead of speaking is a great art. What was not said in keeping silent can easily be said later, but once something is pronounced, it can never be taken back. His voice should not fade or strengthen “in the manner of a woman,” and should not waver, but he should also not yell. In a conflict, valid arguments should prevail over dogged insistence on one’s own stance. A king should never lie. The more noble a person is that is lying, the more shameful is his behaviour.\(^{34}\)

Ladislaus should not look up to individuals who care only about their hair, imbibe in baths, feast all day long, ponder illicit gains, and whose sole goal is their own pleasure. Ladislaus should avoid such people. Very few people are able to resist this lifestyle.\(^{35}\) We should add that Ladislaus’s life after 1452 (after being released from his guardianship), however, took on the characteristics of all of the things Enea warned against.

In terms of education, the study of philosophy was very important, which as to commence at approximately seven years of age. Other essential subjects include grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric. It is also important to exercise one’s own memory. Enea Silvio had obtained information that Ladislaus dedicated himself so studiously to grammar that he did not need to be corrected by his instructor. It is important to continue in the given trend. Each day, Ladislaus should learn either poetic verse or passages from works by brilliant writers from memory. The treatise’s author lists which specific poets, historians, satirists, and orators Ladislaus should study. He mentions that it is extremely important that a monarch be well-versed in history, because he can use certain individuals as examples of what he should do, while others serve as examples of what to avoid. If it was up to Enea, he would not have given Ladislaus Bohemian or Hungarian history as reading, because they were written by uneducated people and contained countless lies. It is also essential to dedicate oneself to a Christian education, the basics of which Ladislaus already knew. The more noble a person, the more humble he should be in the eyes of God. One must honour priests, and, as king, Ladislaus must not allow them to be oppressed or allow any acts of injustice against them.\(^{36}\)

According to Enea Silvio, writing is an extremely neglected subject in aristocratic families. Some people even believed that taking the time to work on writing in royal households was ridiculous. Ladislaus should look up to his guardian, Frederick III, in this matter, whose writing was beyond reproach. While Enea recognises that a monarch does not need to write very often, he should still know how. The results of his handwriting endeavours should not be stains, but pearls.\(^{37}\) Ladislaus should also learn to count, because being well-versed in numbers is essential to a king.\(^{38}\) Al-

\(^{33}\) FRA II/67, pp. 120-121; SYLVIIUS, Pojednání o vychování dítětí, p. 17.
\(^{34}\) FRA II/67, p. 122; SYLVIIUS, Pojednání o vychování dítětí, p. 19.
\(^{35}\) FRA II/67, pp. 136-137; SYLVIIUS, Pojednání o vychování dítětí, p. 27.
\(^{36}\) FRA II/67, pp. 117-120, 125, 142-144; SYLVIIUS, Pojednání o vychování dítětí, pp. 15-17, 20, 30-32.
\(^{37}\) FRA II/67, pp. 144-145; SYLVIIUS, Pojednání o vychování dítětí, p. 32.
\(^{38}\) FRA II/67, p. 154; SYLVIIUS, Pojednání o vychování dítětí, p. 39.
though Enea had his doubts about music education, he still was inclined to believe that it too should be a part of Ladislaus the Posthumous’s education. Ladislaus should even have at least a general knowledge of the concepts of astronomy.\textsuperscript{39}

Although it is entirely possible that Ladislaus the Posthumous’s education did not follow the abovementioned advice and recommendations, it is still important to review them here. Why? They are a depiction of the curriculum of the time, and was no doubt familiar to Enea Silvio Piccolomini’s, the steward and caretaker of young Ladislaus, Kaspar Wendel, as well as the people around him.

\textit{The Visitors of Young Ladislaus}

We can learn certain information about the life of Ladislaus the Posthumous at the court of Frederick III by examining the records of visits of the ambassadors from „his lands“ in Austria an Styria. Some reports are more significant and more informative, while others include only passing mention of the young king. When messengers of Queen Elizabeth of Luxembourg arrived in May 1442, included in their report (according to the \textit{Staré letopisy české [Old Bohemian Chronicles]} was the fact that, in late February 1442, King Frederick III had all of Elizabeth’s children taken to different places than they had originally been living. Ladislaus was sent to a castle on the Italian-Austrian border (\textit{mladého krále poslal na pomezí vlaské země rakušské na jeden hrad [he sent the young king to a castle in the Italian lands of Austria]}), and his sisters to Wiener Neustadt.\textsuperscript{40}

Details about one visit to Ladislaus the Posthumous can be gleaned from a letter from Enea Silvio Piccolomini to the Bishop of Passau dated 28 October 1445. When Hungarian ambassadors came to visit Frederick III in Vienna in 1445, the king rode out on horseback to meet them. Ladislaus the Posthumous was not in Vienna at the time, but had been sent by Frederick III to Laxenburg (a favourite residence of the Habsburgs near Vienna).\textsuperscript{41} When Nicholas of Ilok was asked if he will visit young Ladislaus the Posthumous in Laxenburg, he replied that he did not know who his king would be, and therefore will not go to greet Ladislaus until he knows that he is his lord. However, the Archbishop of Esztergom, Dionyz of Sec, did go to Laxenburg to visit the five-year-old boy. The archbishop brought Ladislaus the Posthumous gifts, and kissed him. According to Enea Silvio, he then told him that he suffered for him greatly, and that he was looking forward to seeing him again in his homeland, in Hungary.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{39} FRA II/67, pp. 154-156; SYLVIUS, Pojednání o vychování dítěk, pp. 39-40.
\textsuperscript{40} Staří letopisové češti od roku 1378 do 1527 čili pokračování v kronikách Příbíka Pulkavy a Beneše z Hořovic z rukopisu starých vydané (ed. František Palacky). In \textit{Dílo Františka Palackého}, sv. 2 (k vydání připravil Jaroslav Charvát). Praha : L. Mazáč, 1941, p. 119. The passage is contained in other \textit{Staré letopisy české} as well, see \textit{Staré letopisy české z vratislavského rukopisu}. Ed. František Šimek. Praha : Historický spolek a Společnost Husova musea, 1937, p. 96. For more information from the literature, see PALACKÝ, Dějiny národu českého, 4, p. 37; DURST, Königin Elisabeth von Ungarn, 1907–1908, p. 10. In the case of the sisters, it seems that this information was incorrect, because at that time only one sister, Elizabeth, lived in Austria.
\textsuperscript{41} For more information on Laxenburg, see BRUCKNER, Formen der Herrschaftsrepräsentation, pp. 104-105.
\textsuperscript{42} Fontes rerum Austriacarum. Oesterreichische Geschichts-Quellen. Zweite Abtheilung. Diplomataria et
In his Česká kronika [Bohemian Chronicle], Enea Silvio Piccolomini described another visit to young Ladislaus. We must approach his version of the events with caution, because it seems that the details did not play out exactly as he describes. Despite this fact, I believe that the general outline of the narration is based in truth. Furthermore, Enea Silvio emphasises in his text that he was personally present for the entire event in Wiener Neustadt (meaning that the information is not hearsay, but that he had experienced it firsthand). Enea Silvio writes that many Bohemians travelled to Austria to the court of Frederick III in order to see young Ladislaus with their own eyes. One of these was Jan Jiskra of Brandýs, who fought successfully for Ladislaus’s rights in Hungary. When Jiskra came before the six-year-old Ladislaus the Posthumous (if the information about his age is true, the entire event took place in 1446) he apparently began to weep and kissed Ladislaus’s hand in front of many witnesses. Jiskra then described to Ladislaus everything that he had done so far for his father and for him in Hungary. He described how he sacrificed himself physically for them, and as showed the scars on his body as proof. He went on to declare that there is no force on earth that could dissuade him from service to Ladislaus. He would serve him until his death. He remarked how unfortunate it was that Ladislaus could not yet understand these things because of his young age. At the conclusion of his speech, Jiskra was supposed to have raised the question of a reward for his loyalty and efforts. Ladislaus then began to look around the room until he notice a chamberlain standing nearby. He went up to him, and took the money pouch he had hanging around his neck that served to give money to the poor. Without saying a word to the chamberlain, he removed all of the money that was in the pouch. He then took these six coins, and presented them to Jiskra. According to Enea Silvio, everyone was taken aback by the boy’s deed, and, based on this action, they concluded that he will be a long-sighted and generous ruler. Jiska was supposed to have had the money set into a gold chain that he wore around his neck as a memory to the king’s act of grace.43

The Completion of the Standard Training and Education

The standard form of Ladislaus the Posthumous’s education ended in 1451, when Ladislaus accompanied his guardian, Frederick III, on his imperial tour to Rome.\textsuperscript{44} While Ladislaus had had more of a theoretical education thus far, the journey to what is today’s Italy and the several-month stay in this country was a true school of life. Not only did he attend many ceremonies and ceremonial entrances into towns, he also was personally present in Rome at the wedding of his guardian, Frederick III, with the young Eleanor of Portugal on 16 March 1452. Three days later, on 19 March 1452, Ladislaus personally attended Frederick’s coronation as emperor.\textsuperscript{45}

During the ceremonial visit of Pope Nicholas V, which took place after Frederick’s coronation as emperor, Ladislaus the Posthumous surprised the large audience with a speech about which Frederick had no prior knowledge. In his speech, Ladislaus spoke very favourably about the pope (with the aim of gaining his favour). He reminded them all of the fact that his forefathers were particularly significant supporters of the papal throne. It is clear that Ladislaus’s speech was prepared and set up beforehand by his tutor, Kaspar Wendel, and the talented lad presented it to great success.\textsuperscript{46}

Additional information on Ladislaus the Posthumous’s stay in Rome has survived. Parts can be found in an anonymous letter sent 4 April 1452 from Rome by someone close to Ladislaus (perhaps from Ladislaus’s confessor).\textsuperscript{47} From the letter, we learn that, acting on orders from Frederick III, Ladislaus paid a visit to Pope Nicholas V on 14 March 1452. Ladislaus received a friendly welcome from the pope. The unknown author of the letter from 4 April 1452 was personally present at the visit, as were Kaspar Wendel and a number of other individuals. According to our informant, the pope was pleased by the interview with the young Ladislaus. The pope blessed Ladislaus, and showed him the palaces and gardens of his residence. After his return from the pope’s residence to the house where Ladislaus was staying, he was visited by several cardinals. On 1 April 1452, the author of the anonymous letter brought Ladislaus back to the pope, who demonstrated a great act of grace.

\textsuperscript{44} GUTKAS, Der Mailberger Bund, pp. 78-79. For information about Frederick III’s tour for the imperial crown and his residence in Italian territories, see the printed dissertation MARTENS, Johannes. Die letzte Kaiserkrönung in Rom 1452. Leipzig : Max Hoffmann, 1900 (information on the commencement of the journey to Rome can be found on p. 36); further QUIRIN, Heinz. König Friedrich III. in Siena (1452). In Aus Reichstagen des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts. Göttingen 1958, pp. 24-79; KRIEGER, Habsburger, ve středověku, pp. 177-180; KOLLER, Kaiser Friedrich III., pp. 115-126.


\textsuperscript{47} For the edition of the anonymous document from 4 April 1452, see Materialien zur österreichischen Geschichte. Aus Archiven und Bibliotheken. Ed. Joseph Chmel. II. Band, I. Abteilung. Wien 1838, pp. 6-7. For more information, see also CHMEL, Habsburgische Excurse IV., pp. 280-281. During the period when the letter was written, the emperor was not in Rome; he had left for Naples.
toward Ladislaus by granting him and his sister indulgences. Our informant goes on to say in his letter that the young king was in excellent health while in Rome. Because of his great piousness, he visited St Peter’s Basilica, and his curiosity lead him to visit the old Roman palaces. Ladislaus often left the house where he was staying with a large retinue to tour the city.

According to Enea Silvio Piccolomini, young Ladislaus was very confident during his visitations with the pope, as if he were already an independent ruler. He told the pope that, while the cardinals are at his court all the time, he will not be there all the time, and so that is why he should be given preference over them for audiences. Apparently, the pope liked his statement very much.48

Ladislaus’s stay in Italy was not just an idyllic interlude, as the preceding text may make it seem. During this time, Ladislaus the Posthumous made several attempts to escape from the clutches of his uncle.

Emperor Frederick III left Rome for Naples with his wife, Eleanor, on 24 March 1452 to negotiate with Alphonso of Portugal. Originally, Frederick wanted to take Ladislaus with him, but, in the end, he decided that, because of the exhausting journey, the harsher climate of the south, and possible conflicts between Ladislaus as king of Hungary and Alphonso of Portugal, he would leave him in Rome. In addition to Ladislaus, the religious staff of Frederick’s retinue also remained in Rome. The issue of Ladislaus’s position, or rather his extraction from the guardianship of Emperor Frederick III, became a topic of interest for parts of the religious circles in Rome. In the emperor’s absence, Ladislaus made an attempt to flee from Frederick’s grasp so that he could take control of the government of his hereditary lands. Several cardinals we supposed to have provided indirect aid for his escape.

Rome was still alive with the memories of powerful emperors of the past, which, to a certain extent, limited the collaborators in Ladislaus’s escape. Concern and fear of the emperor’s wrath if Ladislaus were to flee Rome were very strong. At the time, no one really recognised that Frederick III was actually a rather weak ruler.49

Unfortunately, there is only one source detailing the preparations for Ladislaus’s escape: Enea Silvio Piccolomini.50 Furthermore, it was mainly due to this author that Ladislaus’s attempt at escape was foiled. One cannot escape the impression that Enea Silvio provided a very biased depiction of the event. According to Enea, they waited several nights for a suitable moment when Ladislaus’s guards were not completely alert, so that they could be easily fooled. A priest found out about Ladislaus the Posthumous’s plan to escape from Rome, and informed Pope Nicholas V. That very same night, the pope had Enea Silvio brought to him, told him of the crime that was being planned, and called upon him to arrange everything in
such a manner that it would not damage the emperor. He was to make sure that the young king’s guards were alert. Enea Silvio hurried immediately to the royal chambers, called all the guards, and informed them of the danger of the young king’s escape. The guards swore to Enea that they had nothing to do with Ladislav the Posthumous’s escape. According to Enea, what followed was a sleepless night, in which the guards searched the entire surroundings of the house, looking for traitors. When the traitor saw their activities, he decided to not even attempt Ladislau’s kidnapping. Enea Silvio makes note of yet another attempt at getting the king away from Rome. Under the pretence of organising a hunt, a number of cardinals attempted to take Ladislau, and thus get him out of the city. However, Pope Nicholas V prohibited this undertaking. After the return of Frederick III from Naples on 26 April 1452, the attempts at getting Ladislau out of Rome abated.\textsuperscript{51}

The imperial court left Rome through Sienna to Florence. Here, Emperor Frederick III was met by a delegation of insurgent Austrian and Hungarian states, who gave him an ultimatum for releasing Ladislaus the Posthumous. The representatives of the delegation asserted that Frederick III was holding Ladislaus the Posthumous illegally and unjustly.\textsuperscript{52}

In collaboration with Ladislaus the Posthumous’ steward, Kaspar Wendel, the insurgent delegations attempted to organise Ladislaus’s escape from Florence. The insurgents had contacted Kaspar Wendel before, in Graz, prior to the departure of the entire expedition to the imperial coronation, but their attempt then had failed.\textsuperscript{53} The Hungarian estates had promised Kaspar Wendel a position as bishop in Hungary if he helped Ladislaus escape the emperor’s guardianship. The plan was that Ladislaus was to escape the house in which he was staying in Florence during the night by ladder and flee across the garden away from the premises. The event did not take place because, sleeping in the room with Ladislaus were two noblemen, who were watching him and who had locked all the doors and windows before going to sleep. The insurgent delegations devised yet another way to get Ladislaus away from his guardian. They decided that Ladislaus would appeal to the Florentine municipal council to issue a protection order and for protection. This was, however, wishful thinking, because the councilmen did not want to put themselves in the line of fire in a conflict that they did not fully understand. When


\textsuperscript{52} CHMEL, Habsburgische Excurse IV., p. 287.

the imperial expedition left Florence, Ladislaus accompanied Frederick III all the way to the city gates, where he told him that he will be going no further, and that he wished to stay in the city for a few more days. Frederick refused to allow it. Despite the fact that Ladislaus’s yelled that Frederick is committing acts of violence against him and called to the townspeople for help, they did not react.54

The insurgent emissaries advised Kaspar Wendel to have Ladislaus write a letter from Florence to Pope Nicholas V, asking him for help. Ladislaus’s letter has survived only in the form in which it was recorded in his History of Emperor Frederick III by Enea Silvio Piccolomini. It can be reasonably assumed that the letter, if it had ever existed, was not drafted by Ladislaus the Posthumous, but by his tutor, Kaspar Wendel. The letter states that Ladislaus had heard that the pope is taking action against his supporters in Austria, and he asks that the pope call off these measures, since they are damaging to Ladislaus. The pope was supposed to be an aid to minors, not the emperor. Kaspar ultimately dispatched the letter via couriers from Bologna to Rome. However, it had no effect on Ladislaus’s position.55

Kaspar Wendel took the fall for Ladislaus’s attempt to rid himself of the guardianship of Frederick III in Florence, stating that Ladislaus was blameless, and that he was behind everything. Intercession by his friend, Enea Silvio Piccolomini, saved Kaspar’s life. Originally, the emperor wanted to have Kaspar executed for his treachery, in the end, however, he had him thrown in jail. Later, his former ward, Ladislaus the Posthumous, attempted to have Kaspar exonerated, but his pleas to the emperor failed. Kaspar did not earn back his freedom until after Ladislaus’s death in 1458 (he became a priest in Gars).56

Only the siege of Wiener Neustadt by insurgent Austrian estates (in collaboration with representatives from Bohemia, Moravia, and Hungary) was successful in forcing Frederick III to release Ladislaus from his guardianship. On Monday, 4 September 1452 at nine o’clock in the morning, Ladislaus the Posthumous was


handed over to Count Ulrich of Cilli outside of Wiener Neustadt by the stone cross past of the Viennese gates (the cross was located one kilometre north of the gates). It was a ceremonial handoff. Ladislaus’s twelve-year “captive[tion]” had come to an end. The imperial opposition party was overcome by unconcealed euphoria and jubilation. When Vienna learned of Ladislaus’s release, they had all of the bells in all of the churches resound and lit celebratory fires in triumph. Unfortunately, we do not know how Ladislaus himself felt about the entire matter. We should probably assume that he was at first nonplussed by such a wave of emotions all around him. He was probably full of uncertainty and did not know what was in store for him. After his liberation, the young king was taken to Baden to bathe, so that, in the words of chronicler Enea Silvio Piccolomini, he could wash away everything Styrian (an allusion to Emperor Frederick III).57

Conclusion

Although Ladislaus was born in Hungary, he was by upbringing, education, and use of native language, a German. He was even considered German abroad as well.58

According to Enea Silvio Piccolomini, Ladislaus the Posthumous was not a captive at the court of Frederick III; he was afforded a beneficial education. He was well looked-after and educated. He had enough of everything; if he had had more, it would have compromised his upbringing. Ladislaus had a serious nature, and was restrained and dignified in his conduct.59


58 URBÁNEK, České dějiny. Díl III. Část 2, 1918, p. 757 (on the fact that Ladislaus was considered German abroad: a speech by Enea Silvio Piccolomini at the Frankfurt council in 1454, and a letter by Venetian emissary Pietro Tomasi rom April 1458).

59 CHMEL, Habsburgische Excurs IV., pp. 301-302.
Despite the abovementioned methods for the education of Ladislaus the Posthumous that gives the impression of deliberation, some scholars (such as A. G. Supan) are of the opinion that Ladislaus’s education was insufficient. According to Supan, this education had a negative impact on Ladislaus’s overall nature. The author criticises the excessive severity of methods that forbade children every joy, a result of which was that Ladislaus was never openly opinionated. According to him, Ladislaus’s education sowed within him the seeds of prejudice and fanaticism, which is evidenced by his later intolerance of Bohemian Utraquists.60

According to other authors, (I. Čornejová, J. Rak, V. Vlnas), Frederick secured first-rate teachers for Ladislaus, who afforded him a great amount of care. According to these authors, Ladislaus acquired an excellent humanistic-oriented education, which contributed to his love of the sciences and art and his great fondness for reading.61

Let us attempt to answer the research questions raised at in the introduction to this study. I believe that the study has shown that Ladislaus the Posthumous was afforded a quality education that was above par for the time. We have also been able to provide at least a brief overview of Ladislaus’s educational process, and list his teachers and tutors. Additionally, I am convinced that Ladislaus’s residence at Frederick’s court played a crucial role in his education, in which Ladislaus had the opportunity to have a glimpse behind the scenes of politics, court festivities, (even though Frederick did not have many), and daily life at court. The culmination of this „school of life” was Frederick’s imperial tour in 1451–1452, during which Ladislaus met repeatedly with the pope, with cardinals, and with other prominent representatives of the world back then. Ladislaus was able to see the eternal city with his own eyes, and had the opportunity to examine its monuments, palaces, and gardens closely. Additionally, his trip to Italy acquainted him with various intrigues into which he was drawn personally (several unsuccessful attempts at escaping the emperor’s guardianship).

Frederick III’s overall role in Ladislaus the Posthumous’s educational process was key. Not only did Frederick hire his teachers and tutors that he paid himself (hopefully, though in light of his thrift, we can never be sure), but he also offered him a view behind the scenes of large-scale politics, and of all of the corners of the world far and wide. It seems that some of the methods that Frederick used in his reign were adopted by Ladislaus himself. This includes the art of pretence, adopting a mask in which you seem to calmly and orderly submit to an uncomfortable situation, only to later take aggressive and unsuspected action against your opponents. Ladislaus’s view into practical politics that was afforded him at Frederick III’s court (of course, he was not present for various delicate negotiations) was just as important, and, in a certain sense, more important than the education organised by Kaspar Wendel.

60 SUPAN, Die vier letzten Lebensjahre, p. 18.
Frederick III was a father figure to Ladislaus to a certain extent, by which I do not mean to imply that Ladislaus loved Frederick; it can be assumed that he kept his distance. It is possible that, after a certain time, he grew to admire him. As time went on, however, as Ladislaus matured and learned of the various circumstances of Frederick’s relationship with his mother, Elizabeth it is likely that he even began to hate Frederick.

One can surmise from surviving sources, that Ladislaus weathered his education well, was able to submit to it, and was even interested by it, in light of his age. He was a talented and astute student. It seems that he did not suffer from any serious health issues during that time. Despite the twists of fate his life presented (the early death of both his parents), it seems that he was prepared for his future role as king. Whether or not he „played“ it well in the end is a different matter altogether, which will not be discussed here.

SUMMARY

On the Education and Training of King Ladislaus the Posthumous

The author analyzes the education and training of the Hungarian and Bohemian king Ladislaus the Posthumous at the court of the Roman-German king (and from March 1452 Emperor) Frederick III Hasburg in 1440-1452. Ladislaus’ education was negatively affected by the fact that his father Albert V Habsburg had died before Ladislaus’ birth and his mother Elisabeth of Luxembourg followed him in 1442 when the child was less than three years of age. Thus, Ladislaus grew without his parents and virtually in a strange environment at the court of his very thrifty and even tight-fisted guardian Frederick III. The author examines not only a thin collection of the accounts of Ladislaus’ training and his teachers, but also the work by Enea Silvio Piccolomini on education De institutione liberorum (On the Education of Children) that was written directly for Ladislaus the Posthumous in 1450. Although it is not quite clear to what extent Ladislaus’ teachers followed the recommendations of Enea Silvio Piccolomini, the latter’s work shows a contemporary vision of education at royal courts of that time. Apparently, Ladislaus’ education was conducted in the spirit of what Enea Silvio had written, either directly under the influence of his work or independently of it.

Further, the author briefly deals with Ladislaus’ visitors at the court of his Habsburg relative. In addition to his theoretical education, the author also pays attention to the practical side of Ladislaus’ training by way of an example of the imperial coronation journey to Rome in 1451-1452, in which Ladislaus took part. The author comes to the conclusion that practical information, e.g. how the royal court worked, how the court festivities were held, the ceremonial entries of rulers into cities, etc., were as important for Ladislaus’ education as the theoretical training by his teachers. Hardly any future monarch being as young as Ladislaus at his age of twelve had the opportunity to meet at several private audiences popes and cardinals and to
explore ancient monuments of Rome and other Italian cities. Despite all the problems connected with the education of Ladislaus the Posthumous, it can be taken as proved that his both theoretical and practical education was at a high level.
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