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Abstract

The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges of 1438 had greatly diminished papal influence on French church affairs, and especially on appointments to ecclesiastical office. Since then, the popes had systematically tried to obtain the abrogation of the Sanction, but to no avail. When Louis XI became king in 1461 the situation changed, and for various reasons he decided to abolish the Pragmatic Sanction. In March 1462, an embassy arrived in Rome to formally announce the abrogation to the pope and the cardinals. The embassy was received on 16 March in a public consistory where the pope gave the oration *Per me reges regnant*, praising France, the French royal house, and King Louis. During the following years, conflicts between pope and king led to the factual, though not the formal reactivation of the Pragmatic Sanction, in various ways – all aiming at augmenting the king’s power over French church affairs.
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NOTE TO THE READER

Changes in this version: eight more manuscripts have been collated, and the introduction and the translation have been revised.

In 2007, I undertook a project of publishing the Latin texts with English translations of the orations of Enea Silvio Piccolomini / Pope Pius II. Altogether 76 orations (including papal responses to ambassadorial addresses) are extant today, though more may still be held, presently unrecognized, in libraries and archives.

I am publishing the preliminary edition of both the individual orations and the collected orations in the French digital research archive, HAL Archives.

The reader is advised that I publish – on a yearly basis - new versions of my preliminary editions. It will therefore always be useful to check if a later version than the one the reader may have found previously via the Internet is available in HAL Archives.

I aim at completing - Deo volente - a final edition of all the individual and collected orations in 2020 and will at that time decide upon the form of its ultimate publication.

I shall much appreciate to be notified by readers who discover errors and problems in the text or unrecognized quotations.
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I. INTRODUCTION
1. Context¹

The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges was issued by King Charles VII of France on 7 July 1438. It was based on a number of key decrees of the Council of Basel limiting the power of the popes in general and over the national churches in particular. It required election by cathedral chapters and monastic chapters to ecclesiastical offices, prohibited the pope from bestowing and profiting from French ecclesiastical benefices, and limited appeals to Rome, with the consequence of greatly restricting the financial flows from France to Rome. The Papacy considered the Pragmatic Sanction a mortal danger, deriving from the conciliarist movement, and it worked systematically to obtain its abrogation - and to prevent it from “spreading” to other countries, in particular Germany. Pope Eugenius IV, Pope Nicolaus V, and Pope Calixtus III had each tried to achieve this, but in vain.

In his oration Responsuri² to the French ambassadors at the Congress of Mantua, in December 1459, Pius seems to have considered that some form of compromise might be found concerning ecclesiastical appointments and the appeals from French courts to Rome. But he would not and could not condone that clerics would be judged by secular courts, and not by ecclesiastical courts, and generally he could not accept that the French Parliament would have greater authority in religious matters in France than the pope himself:

_We are not overly concerned with the audition of legal cases, the granting of benefices, or many other things We believe can be remedied. No, what worries Us is that We see the perdition and ruin of souls and the vanishing glory of this noble kingdom. For how can it be tolerated that laymen have been made judges of clerics? … The Roman Bishop, whose parish is the whole world, and whose province is only limited by the Ocean, only has as much jurisdiction in France as the Parliament allows him. He is forbidden to punish a blasphemer, a murderer of near relatives, a heretic – even if he is an ecclesiastic - unless Parliament gives its assent. Many believe that its authority is so great that it precludes even Our censures. Thus the Roman Pontiff, judge of judges, is himself subjected to the judgment of Parliament. If We allow this, We make a monster of the Church, create a hydra with many heads, and completely destroy unity._³

In this area, the pope was fighting to uphold the authority of one of the two supranational institutions in which he passionately believed, the empire and the papacy, against the developing sovereignties of the European nations.

As an inveterate believer in monarchic government, he was also fighting the rise of democracy and warned the King of France of the consequences to his own authority:

_This would be a dangerous thing, venerable brothers, and one which would overturn all hierarchy. For why would subjects obey their kings or other bishops, for that matter, if they

---

¹ Pastor, pp. 92-110; Voigt, IV, 3, pp. 180-209; Combet; Lucius
² Pius II: Oration “Responsuri”
³ Pius II: Oration “Responsuri”, sect. 52
themselves do not obey their own superior? Whoever makes a law directed against another, must consider that he should obey it himself.¹

Already before he became king in 1461, Louis had had contacts with the pope on the matter and had practically promised to abolish the Pragmatic Sanction. In July 1461 he became king after the death of his father, Charles VII, and the question was now: would he keep his promises?

Combet gave this summary of Louis’ interests in the matter:

*Le roi abolit la Pragmatique, mais ce fut surtout Jouffroy,² don’t l’ambition était en jeu (il attendit le chapeu qu’il obtint), qui décida Louis XI. Jouffroy lui représenta que l’abolition aurait pour conséquence d’ôter toute influence aux seigneurs sur les nominations ecclésiastiques. Il insinua … que le pontife instituerait en France un légat chargé de la collation des bénéfices et que l’argent ne sortirait plus du royaume. Le roi deviendrait l’unique dispensateur des bénéfices du royaume, il supprimeraient toute cause de discord, et en donnant toutes les abbayes en commende, il pourrait recompenser à peu de frais ses serviteurs fidèles et en acquérir de nouveaux. Louis XI trouvait donc de très nombreux avantages à la revocation. Il prenait d’abord le contrepieds des actes de Charles VII. En second lieu, il préférerait traiter plutôt avec le pape avec qui il pouvait aisément s’entendre – croyait-il – qu’avec les seigneurs de son royaume, contre lesquels il combattait. Il voulait détruire enfin cet instrument qui favorisait les autonomies locales au detriment de l’unité qu’il rêvait d’établir.*³

On 27 November 1462, Louis, by a royal *ordonnance*, abrogated the Pragmatic Sanction. The pope was informed immediately. Through various intermediaries, Louis may have let the pope understand that, in return, he expected the pope’s support for the French House of Anjou instead of the Spanish House of Aragon as rulers of the Kingdom of Naples, and Pius may have let him understand that he was willing to consider this. But this does not appear to have been a formal condition and Pius, seemingly, did not make a final and formal commitment to such a change of policy.⁴

On 13 March 1462, an embassy from King Louis XI of France arrived in Rome to present the king’s declaration of obedience to the pope, to formally announce the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction, to offer a French contribution to the crusade against the Turks consisting of 70.000 soldiers, and to request the pope’s support for the House of Anjou as rulers of the Kingdom of Naples.⁵

---

¹ Pius II: *Oration “Responsuri”,* sect. 62
² Jouffroy, Jean (ca. 1412 – 1473): Bishop of Arras 1453, Cardinal 1461, Bishop of Albi 1462
³ Combet, pp. 7-8; Cf. Lucius, p. 40
⁴ Lucius, p. 43
⁵ Lucius, pp. 67-69
The French embassy was to be received in a public consistory of March 16. The day before, the pope had a meeting with the Milanese ambassador, Ottone da Carretto, in which he expressed his doubts concerning the military situation in Naples, his fear that Ferrante would succumb to the Angevin forces, and his anguished question whether it would be better to abandon Ferrante’s cause and join the French side. The ambassador assured the pope of the Duke of Milan’s continued, firm support of Ferrante’s cause and of his alliance with the Papacy in this matter, and he managed to strengthen the pope’s resolve to support Ferrante and to keep it firm during the following negotiations with the French ambassadors.¹

The following day, the French embassy was given a splendid reception in a public consistory.²

In his Commentarii, Pius wrote about the event:

Shortly afterwards, Louis sent Richard, Cardinal of Coutances,³ and Jean, Cardinal of Arras,⁴ as ambassadors to the pope. They were accompanied by the Bishop of Angers and the Bishop of Saintes, and some bishops, abbots and great nobles, among whom the most important was the Count of Chaumont,⁵ a man of venerable age and dignified manners. A number of doctors and secretaries were part of the embassy, which was very distinguished and worthy of the king. Travelling with a long row of knights and servants, the embassy spent many days on the road and finally arrived in Rome on 11 March. It was met by the College of Cardinals because of the two cardinals sent by the king. Then a public consistory was held in the Apostolic Palace. The ambassadors were conducted to the palace in a solemn procession. The pope was sitting in majesty on his high throne, the cardinals were sitting as usual on their benches, the order of bishops and notaries was placed, as usual, beneath the pope’s seat; the rest of the quite numerous audience either stood or sat on the ground between the cardinals and the papal tribune. The king’s ambassadors kissed the pope’s feet and handed over the royal letter whereafter they were placed behind the cardinals, close to the pope. Standing there they were requested to speak as they wished to.

Then the Cardinal of Arras held a long oration on the nobility of the French, the glory and the great size of the kingdom, the courage and strength of the Gauls, the eminent virtue of Louis, the Pragmatic Sanction and its introduction into the Kingdom of France, and afterwards he showed the public documents attesting that King Louis had abrogated and quashed the

¹ Lucius, p. 68-69
² Cf. Rainaldus, ad ann. 1462, nos. 8-9, pp. 328-329
³ Richard Olivier de Longueil (1406-1470) : Bishop of Coutances (1453), cardinal 1456. Leader of the French Royal Council under Charles VII (-1461). Named Cardinal of Coutances (cardinalis Constantiensis)
⁴ Jean Jouffroy
⁵ Pierre de Chaumont
Pragmatic Sanction in his whole realm and dominion, and restored true and complete obedience to the Roman and Prime See and to Pope Pius as the Vicar of Jesus Christ: indeed, it was Louis’ intention to be a good son to the pontiff and always to follow his wishes and instructions. The cardinal also mentioned the Turks whose sword threatens the Christians and is a great peril to the Catholic Faith. Louis was concerned about protecting religion. If the Angevin rule was restored in the Kingdom of Sicily, and Genoa came under the French, as was reasonable, he would send 40,000 horse soldiers and 30,000 bowshooters to Greece to fight the Turks. With such troops it would be easy to throw Mehmed out of Europe and to regain Syria with the Holy Sepulchre of Christ. He spoke much in this vein, more grandly and pompously than truthfully, mixing exaggeration with French vanity, and lying with reckless impudence.

When the Cardinal of Arras had reached the – expected and longed for – end of his oration, the pope at length praised the king’s embassy and pious soul. He set forth the origin of the Kingdom of France and the glorious deeds of its kings, and said much about Louis’ virtues and much about the Pragmatic Sanction. His response is inserted into the volume containing his orations. Concerning the exaggerated, fictitious, and empty offer of 70,000 soldiers he said very little so as not to appear to countenance such nonsense. The pontiff was heard with rapt attention by all, as they seemed to revive after having been bored no end by the speech of the Cardinal of Arras. Men dislike listening to bragging, open lies, and vain pomposity. Well-spoken truth finds willing listeners. Therefore the oration of the Cardinal of Arras seemed very long-winded and the pope’s very short.

After the orations, Pius bade the Cardinal of Arras approach and, in that same consistory, he placed the red hat on his head and bade him sit among the cardinals.\(^1\) He also decreed a three-day cessation of judicial and public business as well as prayers of thanksgiving in all the temples, and processions with the relics through all the City. After the consistory, the whole Curia and the people of the City rejoiced: in the evening candles were lit, trumpets were sounding, all the bells were ringing, the young people danced and sang. The men and the old exulted because they had seen the Pragmatic Sanction abolished before they died; they praised the pope in whose time this gift had been given; they praised the king to the skies for his great piety of mind. The whole thing seemed much more glorious and wonderful because it was so unexpected. Indeed, nobody had believed that the sickness of the Pragmatic Sanction could be healed after 24 years, under Pope Pius; all thought that it would have been enough for the Apostolic See if the evil simply did not grow worse.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Jouffroy had been appointed cardinal in the consistory of 18 December 1461, but had not yet received the red hat

\(^2\) Pius II: Commentarii (van Heck), pp. 454-465: Ludovicus paulo post legatos ad pontificem ire jussit Riccardum Constantiensem et Johannem Atrebatensem cardinales, quo securi sunt Andegavensis et Sanctonensis episcopi et abbates aliquot et procurae nobilissimi, quorum princeps fuit Petrus comites Calvimontis, moribus et aetate gravis; fuerunt et doctores et secretarii nonnulli regis inter oratores adnumerati: praeclara legatio et digna regis. Quae magna equitum numero et longo famulorum ordine cum dies multos in itinere absumpsisset tandem III Idus Martii Romam ingressus est occurrente cardinalium collegio propter cardinales, qui missi a rege venerunt. Consistorium deinde publicum habitum in
Later events would show that Pius may not, at the time, have fully appreciated the importance of the Pragmatic Sanction in the French context, and the French king’s determination to be in control of French ecclesiastical affairs generally and especially of ecclesiastical appointments. He may not have understood, either, to what extent Louis would use the Pragmatic Sanction and its principles in his subsequent dealings with the Papacy: when relations between Rome and France were strained, the Pragmatic Sanction would be reactivated, in more or less mitigated forms,¹ and when Louis needed good relations with the Papacy it would be deactivated.

Some historians view the affair of the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction as a high stake diplomatic game or duel between Europe’s two most skillful political negotiators, Pope Pius II and King Louis XI. Without making formal promises, the pope supposedly – through Jean Jouffroy - made

¹ Kendall, p. 129: By a series of decrees in 1463-1464 the King virtually restored the Pragmatic Sanction of his father, but established the monarchy, rather than the French ecclesiastical hierarchy, as the master of the Church in France. Pius announced that the French were a parcel of fools governed by a fool and threatened to excommunicate Louis XI. Cf. Also Blanchard: Avec le pape, la lutte est âpre. ... les péripéties de la Pragmatique Sanction – son abrogation, puis son retour sous des forms plus ou moins détournées – soulignent un manque de doctrine
Louis believed that he was ready to abandon King Ferrante and support the House of Anjou in Southern Italy, thus obtaining the French declaration of obedience to the papacy and the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction, without formal conditions attached. And after the abrogation had been announced in Rome, the pope would continue his complicated game by offering Louis a ceasefire – which would take so long time to come into effect that King Ferrante, aided by Milan and the pope – would be able to achieve effective military control of the Kingdom.¹

On the other hand, Louis’ reason for abrogating the sanction was not to restore papal power over the French church, but to subject it to French royal power, as later events clearly showed.

In view of these later events, it may be asked if the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction was truly a victory of papal diplomacy, or if it was, whether it was worth it. The historian, Christian Lucius, concludes that it was:

> Die Obedienz des Landes, das der Herd der antirömischen Bewegung gewesen war, bedeutete einen grossen moralischen Erfolg des Papsttums und einen Schweren Schlag für die konziliare Opposition, die sich an andern Stellen noch regte. Denn mochte auch bei dem politischen Gegensatz, der ja nicht lange zu verbergen war, die Grundlage der dem Papste zugeständenen Rechte noch so brüchig, der materielle Gewinn endschliesslich noch so gering sein: aus der Position, die das Papsttum zurückgewonnen hatte, war es ohne weiteres nicht wieder zu verdrängen, und eine Erfolg blieb es unter allen Umständen, dass die ideellen Ansprüche der römischen Kurie einmal wenigstens anerkannt worden waren. Aber nicht nur als Papst, auch als italienischer Territorialfürst durfte Pius auf das Erreichte stolz sein. In dem kritischen Augenblick, wo die Augen aller italienischen Politiker auf ihn gerichtet waren, hatte er nicht versagt, ja er hatte durch dies diplomatische Meisterstück der politischen Welt bewiesen, dass er sich aus eigner Kraft auf seinen Posten behaupten konnte.²

In this light, it is understandable that the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction would be remembered as a major achievement of Pius II, mentioned even in his epitaph.³

---

¹ Pastor, pp. 105-106; Lucius, pp. 72-75
² Lucius, p. 76
³ Zimolo, pp. 70, 87, 111-112
2. Themes

2.1 Praise of the Franks and the French royal house

The pope’s praise of the Franks and the royal house of France was generous and without reservations:

... You have given the Church a great, safe, and exceptional force of protection in the illustrious House of the Franks, and You have chosen this particular family and granted it heroic virtues to defend the Roman Church and Christian religion against all attacks of evildoers. Indeed, just as in the Old Testament You loved the Hebrew Kingdom more than the others, thus in the New Law You especially love the family of the Franks. For that family guards the rights and the privileges of the blessed Peter and Paul with special devotion and sets the apostolic dignity above all. [Sect. 6]

He even “acknowledged” the descent of the Franks from the Trojans which was the noblest pedigree a royal house or a nation could have – emulating the Romans. His source concerning this pedigree was one of his favourite – medieval historians, Otto von Freising. In his youth, Piccolomini had made fun of such pedigrees, but later – as in the case of the French – he used them unabashedly, even if his own sense of history was so well-developed that he might not really have believed them. In the oration Per me reges regant, he actually adds a reference to Plato according to whom – in Seneca’s version: all kings come from slaves, and all slaves from kings, thus somehow undermining the very idea of the noble pedigree.

2.2 Praise of King Louis

Pius’ is unstinting in his praise of Louis:

Glorious is indeed the fame of the kings named Louis and to be honoured forever. In our own Louis it has not decreased, but rather increased. Following in the footsteps of his ancestors, he shows himself to be the like of the kings named Clovis, Pepin, Charles, Philip, as well as his namesakes as king of France. He is the seventh among the eminent kings named Louis, true offspring of the Franks, true blood of Charlemagne, and true successor and heir to the kings named Louis. He is not broken by adversity nor gets puffed up by success. [Sect. 15]

1 Louis XI (1423 – 1483): King of France from 1461 to his death
Pius devotes some time to explain the difficulties between Charles VII and his son, Louis XI, putting the best face on it, and blaming – naturally – the bad counsellors of the father.

2.3. **Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, 1438**

In his oration, the pope did not deal specifically with why the Pragmatic Sanction was unacceptable to the Apostolic See. This he had done already in his oration Responsurí, held at the Congress of Mantua. But he very clearly tells the audience how great a danger the Pragmatic Sanction had posed to the Papacy and his relief at its suppression:

> ... without any helper and depending on his own counsel, his own mind, and his own steadfastness, he banned from his kingdom a plague that many did not consider a sickness, but health, which had great defenders, and which – under the guise of something good – threatened to destroy the Church. We feared that it would grow: now it is dead! We feared that it would spread to other kingdoms and infect other nations: now it has been destroyed [in that country] where it was born! We feared the ruin of the Church: now we are saved! Oh, good God, great is the evil extinguished today, and great are the dangers from which we have been freed! [Sect. 4]

Very soon the pope would bitterly regret his fulsome praise of Louis, as the king kept using and reshaping the principles contained in the Pragmatic Sanction according to the changing political and ecclesiastical situation in the realm and his own overall policy of strengthening royal power over French church affairs.

2.4. **Neapolitan War**

In spite of the very close family ties between the House of Anjou and the Valois dynasty, neither Charles VII nor Louis XI materially supported the Angevins in their war for the Kingdom of Naples, undertaken by Jean d’Anjou on behalf of his father, King René, in late 1459.

---

1 Charles VII had Marie, princess of Anjou, as his wife, the formidable Yolande of Aragon, nominal queen of Sicily, as his mother-in-law, King René as his brother in law, and Charles of Anjou as his cousin, and Louis XI had evidently inherited this whole set of family ties.

2 Kendall, p. 119: *On becoming king, he [Louis] found it expedient to support the Angevin invasion of the Kingdom of Naples – he could not afford to ruffle too many princely sensibilities, and the chivalric House of Anjou, though endowed with a permanently empty purse and a talent for political failure, was popular in France. In the winter and spring of 1462 he had sought to persuade Sforza to abandon King Ferrante of Naples and espouse the Angevin cause, even threatening
But even if they were sparing with money and soldiers, they exerted intense diplomatic pressure on both the Duke Francesco Sforza of Milan and Pope Pius II, partners in supporting the Spanish House as rulers of the Kingdom of Naples.

At the Congress of Mantua in 1459, the ambassadors of Charles VII had demanded that the pope support the Angevin cause in the Kingdom of Naples, but the pope had resisted the pressures. Soon after his accession, King Louis renewed the French diplomatic pressures, but in autumn 1461 the Milanese ambassadors estimated that Louis would not really promote the Neapolitan cause of his Angevin relations, and this assessment was communicated to the pope.

Nonetheless, when Louis’ ambassadors came to Rome in 1462 to formally announce the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction – as well as to present the king’s declaration of obedience to the pope – they once again took up the Neapolitan matter and requested that the pope recognize the French House of Anjou as the legitimate rulers of the kingdom.

In his response, the oration *Per me reges regnant*, the pope just mentioned the French claims, telling the ambassadors that *the matter would be discussed separately and at another time* [sect. 4].

When the festivities were over, the French ambassadors returned to the matter of the Kingdom of Naples, but the pope kept firm, staunchly reiterating his offer of either a proper judicial process to determine who had the right to the Kingdom, René d’Anjou or Ferrante of Aragon, or a mediation by parties friendly to both contenders, and a ceasefire to provide time for such solutions.

The French ambassadors responded with dire threats, but they were bluffing since Louis would not really send an army to Italy to help the Angevins. As Pius was well aware of this, he allowed himself to call the bluff when – according to the *Commentarii* – he asked the ambassadors *why they insisted

---

*Sforza’s ambassadors with war. The Duke of Milan was not to be moved, however, and the King had no intention of carrying his display of hostility beyond diplomatic language. He probably foresaw that René’s son, Duke John, would be driven from the Kingdom of Naples, an event that came about in the spring of 1463. The lack of significant support from King Louis in terms of money and troops would be a major reason for Jean d’Anjou to join the revolt of the princes against King Louis in 1464, and the condition for his reconciliation with the king would be effective financial and military support for a future invasion of the Kingdom. In spite of Louis’ promise of such aid, René would not get it, cf. Kendall, pp. 131 and 344. As early as March 1462, Louis actually let the ambassador of Milan understand that he was prepared to accept the defeat of the Angevins in the Kingdom of Naples, cf. Kendall p. 409, meaning that his continuous pressure for the pope to desert Ferrante was part of a greater political play that did not really concern the Kingdom of Naples*

1 Pius II: *Oration “Responsuri”*
2 Lucius, p. 38
3 Lucius, p. 58, believes that the pope may have ventilated his doubts in front of the Milanese ambassador, the day before the solemn reception of the ambassadors, in order to pressure the Duke of Milan into intensifying his support of King Ferrante with a view to improving the military situation of the allied before a cease-fire, offered to the French, could take effect. Cf. also Lucius, pp. 70-74.
that the pope’s few auxiliary troops should be withdrawn from the Kingdom of Naples if it was so easy for him, as the cardinal said, to send 70,000 soldiers through Italy against the Turks in Greece and Asia Minor? If such troops were mobilized and sent across the Alps, all would bow to the king: he would regain Genoa and speedily get possession of the Kingdom of Naples.¹ His Holiness’ biting sarcasm would not have been lost on the ambassadors.

It is difficult to determine if King Louis truly wanted the Anjou to have the Kingdom of Naples. It would of course strengthen the French position in Italy (especially if the French could also come to possess the Duchy of Milan – to which the House of Orleans had a legitimate claim - and Genoa as well), but it would, at the same time, mean a problematic strengthening of the Angevins, a great princely house in France whose loyalty towards the king was definitely not certain, as later events would soon be showing.

At any rate, in spite of continued French public diplomatic pressure on the Duke of Milan and the pope, Louis in reality accepted their refusal to desert King Ferrante in Naples, and he even let the Milanese ambassador understand – in one of his carefully calculated asides – that the Kingdom of Naples was no longer a real issue.²

2.5. War against the Turks

Like his father, Charles VII, King Louis XI had not the faintest interest in a crusade against the Turks. Joel Blanchard says: “Louis XI n’a jamais vraiment voulu s’impliquer dans une croisade, mais il en fait une arme.”³

The two French kings had much more pressing problems at home and were quite happy that the buffer states, and especially Venice, would spend their resources on wars against the Turks – instead of against France.

¹ Pius II: Commentarii (van Heck), p. 457: Sed cur tantopere parva praesulis auxilia avocari de Regno petantur, si armatorum septuaginta milia facile regi est, ut Atrebatensis asseruit, per Italiam contra Turcos in Greciam atque Asiam mittere? Instruantur he copie atque Alpes transire incipient, et omnes cedimus ei. Tum Genua regi patebit et nulla de Regni possessione mora fiet
² Kendall, p. 408
³ Blanchard
The French offer of 70,000 soldiers to the crusade was so exorbitantly generous that the pope would not really comment on it, but wrote in his Commentarii: Concerning the exaggerated, fictitious and empty offer of 70,000 soldiers he said very little so as not to appear to countenance such nonsense.¹

For Louis, the issue of French participation in the crusade was simply a diplomatic device, used to lure – hopefully - gullible popes into making tangible concessions in return. Though quite enthusiastic for the crusade, Pius, however, was nothing but gullible, and he did not believe that Louis would join the crusade if he could avoid it.

Pius, however, did think that France would be morally obliged to join the crusade if the Duke of Burgundy, as he had promised after the Fall of Constantinople, at the Fête du Faisan in 1453, would participate. But to the pope’s grief, Louis in the end directly forbade his uncle the duke to join the crusade which would therefore collapse miserably, ending with the pope’s death in Ancona in August 1464.

3. Date, place, audience, and format

Authors give various dates for the consistory in which the oration was delivered: Voigt has the 15th of March,² Lucius, Pastor, Paparelli, and Helmrath the 16th,³ and Combet the 17th.⁴ The 16th would appear to be the most likely. The place was the Apostolic Palace in Rome.

The audience were the participants in a public consistory, calculated to impress the representatives of the powers, the curia, and the Roman population with the importance of the event.

The format was a grand papal oration from the throne.

4. Text

The text is extant both in an Early Version and in a Final Version,⁵ the two versions being almost identical.

---

¹ Cf. above
² Voigt, III, p. 197
³ Lucius, p. 69; Pastor, p. 105; Paparelli, p. 69; Helmrath, p. 141
⁴ Combet, p. 16
⁵ In the lists below, the manuscripts used for the present edition have been marked with the siglum
4.1. Early Version

The Early Version is contained in a number of humanist collective manuscripts of which the following have been used:

- **Bruxelles / Bibliothèque Royale**
  Ms. 15564-67, ff. 44r-53v *(R)*

- **London / British Library**
  Egerton 1089, pp. 501-502 *(M)*

- **Roma / Archivio Segreto Vaticano**
  Arm. XXXII 1, ff. 6r-17r *(H)*
  Borghese 1, 121-122, ff. 1r-26v
  Fondo Pio 22, ff. 355r-365v

- **Roma / Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana**
  Fondo Buoncompagni F 7, ff.
  Vat. Lat. 5667, ff. 40r-49v *(L)*

- **Roma / Biblioteca Casanatense**
  4310, ff. 124r-132r

- **Roma / Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Vittorio Emmanuele**
  Vittorio Emmanuele 492, ff. 186v–195r *(T)*

- **Wien / Österreichische Nationalbibliothek**
  Ser. Nova, 12709 (=Fidei 9364), ff. 96v - 99v *(W)*

**Filiation of collated mss. containing the Early Version:**

On the basis of the presently collated manuscripts, the following – tentative - filiation of these manuscripts is established as the one which accounts for most of the variants found, but it will have to be developed and supported by collation of further manuscripts. It appears unlikely, however,

---

1 Incomplete: comprises only sect. 1-4
2 From Kristeller (Digital). Filiation approximative
3 From Kristeller (Digital). Filiation approximative
4 The letters with asterisk represent the corresponding Greek letters and indicate a “hypothesized” manuscript
that collation of more manuscripts will give better knowledge of the Early Version of the text, as manifested in the common variants of the presently collated manuscripts, cf. ms. A* below:

- A* (H/L/M/R/T/W)
  - B* (H/L/M/R/T)
    - G* (H/L/T)
  - D* (L/T)
    - L
    - T
  - H
    - M
    - R
  - W

4.2. Final Version

4.2.1. Manuscripts

The Final Version is extant in the seven manuscripts containing the “official” collection of Pius’ orations from 1462:

- **Lucca / Biblioteca Capitolare Feliniana**
  544, ff. 139r-144v (G)

- **Mantova / Biblioteca Communale**
  100 (A-IV-6), ff. 274r-284v

- **Milano, Bibl. Ambrosiana**
  l. 97 inf., ff. 176v-182v

- **Roma / Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana**
  Chis. J.VI.211, ff. 182r-188r (D)
  Chis. J.VIII.284, ff. 138v-143v (A)
  Chis. J.VIII.286, ff. 289r-298r (C)
  Vat. Lat. 1788, ff. 195r-201r (B)

\[1\] Stamped numbering of folios in the lower right corner of the recto folios
4.2.2. Editions

The Final Version was published by Mansi, on the basis of the Luccensis 544 (G):

- Pius II: *Orationes politicae et ecclesiasticae*. Ed. Giovanni Domenico Mansi. 3 vols. Lucca: Benedini, 1755-1759 / II, pp. 103-114

4.3. Present edition

Text:

The present edition of the *Per me reges regnant* is based on the 11 manuscripts listed above with the siglum, with the Chisianus J.VIII.284 as the lead manuscript.

Presentation:

The Latin text and English translation are presented synoptically, with the Latin text on the left side and the English text on the right side.

Identified quotations are given in italics.

Pagination:

Pagination is from the Luccensis 544 (G) (red).

Textual apparatus:

In the main text, the reading from the lead manuscript is preferred unless other readings are clearly better. Variants are placed in the textual apparatus, with the exception of standard orthographical variants, see below.

The variants common to the manuscripts H, L, M, R, T, W, i.e. the Early Version, are given in fat types. Variants occurring in both D and G are colour coded in red.
Orthography and punctuation:

Standard variations from contemporary lexical practice are not indicated in the textual apparatus. For such variants, the reader is referred to those orthographical profiles of the manuscripts which are given in the bibliography volume of the collected edition.¹

The punctuation is the editor’s own.

Translation:

The translation is intended to be a close rendition of the meaning of the Latin text, but not to directly transpose Latin grammatical forms which would result in a stilted and convoluted text, or expressions which would seem unnatural or senseless to modern readers.²

Unless otherwise stated, translations of quotations from classical authors are from the Loeb Classical Library (Digital). Translations of quotations from the Bible are from the Douay-Reims translation of the Vulgate into English. In the case of quotations from the synoptic gospels, normally only the reference to Matthew is given.
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II. TEXT AND TRANSLATION
Responsio Pii II. Pontificis Maximi data Romae oratoribus\textsuperscript{1} regis Franciae\textsuperscript{2}

[1] \{139r\} \textit{Per me reges regnant et legum conditores justa decernunt}. Salomonis in parabolis haec verba leguntur, sed non sunt Salomonis\textsuperscript{3} nec sunt\textsuperscript{4} hominis ex\textsuperscript{5} peccato geniti. Sapientia Dei, filius Dei\textsuperscript{6}, splendor paternae gloriae, idest ipsum Dei verbum, per quod facta sunt omnia, introducitur loquens. Ait enim paulo post eadem\textsuperscript{7} sapientia: \textit{Dominus possedit me in\textsuperscript{8} initio viarum suarum, antequam quidquam faceret\textsuperscript{9} a principio, ab aeterno ordinata sum}. Haec est\textsuperscript{10} ergo, quae loquitur increata Dei sapientia, id est ipse Deus, Dei filius, qui cum patre et spiritu sancto unus est Deus. Sed quid sibi vult, cum ait: \textit{Per me reges regnant, et legum conditores justa decernunt}? Profecto perinde est ac si dicat\textsuperscript{11}: non sunt reges, qui sapiantiam spernunt; non sunt\textsuperscript{12} reges, qui filium Dei non audiunt; non sunt reges, qui non auscultant evangelio\textsuperscript{13}. Nec reges fuerunt, qui\textsuperscript{14} ante salvatoris adventum praecepta sapientiae neglexerunt\textsuperscript{15}, nec Mosaicam legem, aut sanctos Dei prophetas audire voluerunt\textsuperscript{16}.

\textsuperscript{1} Ludovici \textit{add.} C
\textsuperscript{2} Pii Secundi Pontificis Maximi responsio data oratoribus Ludovici regis Franciae de extinctione Pragmaticae \textit{D, G}; Responsio Pii papae II. data oratoribus serenissimi regis Franciae in consistorio publico cum illi per os cardinalis Atrbatensis viri disertissimi obedientiam prestitissent et pragmaticam sanctionem abrogassent die xvi. Martii MCCCCCLXII. \textit{H, L, T}; Responsio Pii Papae II data oratoribus serenissimi regis Franciae in consistorio publico cum illi per os cardinalis Atrbatensis obedientiam prestitissent et pragmaticam sanctionem abrogassent. Die XVI. Martii 1462 \textit{M}; Responsum Pii II. Pontificis Maximi datum Romae oratoribus Ludovici regis Franciae lege foeliciter \textit{R}; Responsio domini Pii papae secundi data oratoribus serenissimi regis Franciae in consistorio publico cum illi per os cardinalis Atrbatensis viri disertissimi obedientiam prestitissent et pragmaticam sanctionem abrogassent die xvi. Marcii anno domini Mo CCCCCLXII \textit{W}
\textsuperscript{3} sed non sunt Salomonis \textit{omit.} G
\textsuperscript{4} \textit{omit.} C
\textsuperscript{5} in \textit{H, L, M, R, T, W}
\textsuperscript{6} filius Dei : Dei filius \textit{M}
\textsuperscript{7} ipsa \textit{W}
\textsuperscript{8} ab \textit{W}
\textsuperscript{9} fieret \textit{G}
\textsuperscript{10} \textit{omit.} \textit{H, L, M, R, T}
\textsuperscript{11} \textit{diceret.} \textit{H, L, M, R, T}
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{sim} \textit{R}
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{evangelia} \textit{W}
\textsuperscript{14} \textit{omit.} \textit{R}
\textsuperscript{15} sapientiae neglexerunt : neglexerunt sapientiae \textit{W}
\textsuperscript{16} noluerunt \textit{G, L, T}
Response of Pius II, Supreme Pontiff, given in Rome to the ambassadors of the King of France

1. Introduction: the wise king

[1] “By me kings reign, and lawgivers decree just things.” These words of Solomon are found in the Book of Parables, but they are not of Solomon himself nor of any man born of sin. They were said by the Wisdom of God, the Son of God, the splendour of the Father’s glory, Himself the Word of God by which all things were made. For a little later, Wisdom itself says: The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before he made any thing from the beginning. I was set up from eternity. This is what was by said by the uncreated Wisdom of God, which is God Himself, Son of God, One God together with the Father and the Holy Spirit. But what does it mean: By me kings reign, and lawgivers decree just things. It means that those who despise Wisdom are not kings. Those who do not heed the Son of God are not kings. Those who do not hear the Gospel are not kings. And those who, before the Saviour’s coming, neglected the precepts of Wisdom or did not heed the Mosaic law and the holy prophets of God were not kings.

---

1 Proverbs, 8, 15
2 John, 1, 3
3 Proverbs, 8, 22-23
4 Proverbs, 8, 15
[2] You who sit on an ivory throne, clad in purple, with a jewel-encrusted crown on your head, a scepter in your hand, glistening with gold, who dictate the law to your people, who command legions, and who are proud of the name of king, do you wish to know if you are worthy of such great state and if you merit to be called king? Remember the Delphic Oracle, saying: “Know yourself.”

Look at your acts and know your inner self. If Wisdom, ruler and mistress of the world, mother and queen of virtues, has made its abode with you and lives with you, and delights in being with you, if your lips speak what is right, if your mouth meditates truth,2 if you hear the Son of God, if you obey the Gospel, if you support law3 and justice, and if you prefer the common good to your own, then you are undoubtedly king and worthy of this glorious and great name. But if you act otherwise, then you are4 a tyrant, not a king.

---

1 One of the Delphic maxims, inscribed in the forecourt of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi, according to the Greek periegetic (travelogue) writer Pausanias (10.24.1)
2 Proverbs, 8, 7
3 “judicium”
4 “personam induisti”
2. Abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges

[3] But, brethren, what shall We say of King Louis\(^1\) of France? What do you say, sons? Do we judge Louis to be worthy of the name of king? Are his actions those of a king? Does Louis have a royal mind? Do you think that the embassy we have just heard is worthy of a pious and great king? Do you consider that the Wisdom of God lives with him who has sent such a distinguished embassy in a matter so important, so useful, so necessary, and so holy? Before your eyes, you see two cardinals acting on behalf of this great king: you know how great are their honourable dignity and authority. By them stand the other ambassadors, men of eminent learning, nobility, and virtue. When have we seen or heard, in this place, an embassy like this one? And what do the royal ambassadors bring? What do they request? What do they say? All their words are modest, filled with obedience, faith, and reverence. They bring much, they demand little. Their great king offers himself and all his to the First See, with all obedience, as well as help to defend the Faith. It is indeed a magnificent gift, worthy of the House of France. And he places that savage and evil beast called the Pragmatic Sanction as a captive before our eyes, nay, as killed and completely destroyed. Why is that important? It is important because this beast has devoured many souls and would have devoured many more unless it had been killed at the hands of Louis. Great is the spirit and great is the virtue of the king who killed this monster.

---

\(^1\) Louis XI (1423 – 1483): King of France from 1461 to his death

\(^2\) Cardinals Jean Jouffroy and Richard Olivier de Longueil. Pius’ positive reference to the two cardinals representing the French king is an important testimony to his acceptance of cardinals as representatives of kings and princes, a practice which had been frowned or upon or forbidden by several of Pius’ predecessors and by the Council of Basel, cf. Cotta-Schönberg: Cardinal
Nec aliud petit quam jura sui sanguinis in regno Siciliae, quae multis verbis cardinalis Atrebatensis explicavit, de quibus seorsum alio tempore loquemur. An dignus amore, an dignus est laude Ludovicus? Et quem diligemus, quem laudabimus, si hunc neglexerimus? Laudatur apud gentiles et magnus habetur Hercules, extinctor Hydrae; majus hic monstrum et periculosius interemit. Laudant Judaei suum Samsonem, ipsius Herculis fere coaetaneum, qui sua nece multis abstulit necem. Multo hic laudabilior, qui sua vita servata multis praebuit vitam. Laudatur Caesar Constantinus, qui congregato apud Nicaeam patrum concilio vipereum Arii virus ab ecclesia eliminavit. Gloriosior Ludovicus, qui per se ipsum roboratam multorum astipulatione periculosam sanctionem delevit. Extollitur maximis praecoonis Sigismundus imperator, qui apud Constantiam, Rhetiae urbeño, adunata magna synodo, quod omnes damnabant et abhorrebant, schisma sustulit. Majus et utilius Ludovici factum, qui nullo adjutore, suo consilio, suo ingenio, sua constantia eam pestem ejecit regno suo, quae a plerisque non pestis sed salus existimabatur, et magnos habebat defensores, et sub specie boni totam videbatur ecclesiam pessumdatura. Timebamus augmentum ejus, et ecce mortua est. Timeamus, ne penetraret ad alia regna, et alias nationes inficeret, et ecce ubi nata est, ibi occisa. Timuimus ecclesiae ruinam, et ecce salvatio! O bone Deus, quantum hoc malum extinctum est; ex quantis hodie periculosus eret! 

---

1 haec H  
2 neglexerimus W  
3 patrum L, M, R, T  
4 ecclesiae L, T; ecclesiis W  
5 M: here the text stops. A margin note says: Manca qui il rimanente nell’originale  
6 coadunata H  
7 synoda L, T  
8 omit. W  
9 qui add. W  
10 omit. D, G  
11 de D, G, H  
12 omit. T  
13 aestimabatur H  
14 tota A, B, D  
15 argumentum C  
16 timebamus W  
17 hodie malum: malum hodie W  
18 et H, W  
19 erecti B, C, H, L, R, T
And the only thing he requests is the rights of his family in the Kingdom of Sicily, as explained in many words by the Cardinal of Arras. We shall speak of this matter separately and at another time. But is Louis not worthy of love? Is he not worthy of praise? Indeed, whom could we love, whom could we praise if not him? The gentiles praise and admire Hercules, who killed the Hydra. But Louis killed a far greater and more dangerous monster. The Jews praise their Samson, who lived almost at the same time as Hercules, because by his own death he prevented the death of many. But Louis is much more praiseworthy than him because he gave life to many by preserving his own. Emperor Constantine is praised because he gathered a council of the fathers in Nicaea and eliminated the Arian poison from the Church. But Louis is even more glorious since he personally abolished a dangerous Sanction that had been strengthened by the approval of many. Emperor Sigismund is praised to Heaven because he gathered a great synod in Konstanz, a city in Rhaetia, and ended a schism condemned and abhorred by many. But the action of Louis is greater and even more beneficial for without any helper and depending on his own counsel, his own mind, and his own steadfastness, he banned from his kingdom a plague that many did not consider a sickness, but health, which had great defenders, and which – under the guise of something good – threatened to destroy the Church. We feared that it would grow: now it is dead! We feared that it would spread to other kingdoms and infect other nations: now it has been destroyed [in the very country] where it was born! We feared the ruin of the Church: now we are saved! Oh, good God, great, indeed, is the evil extinguished today, and great are dangers from which we have been freed!

1 Jean Jouffroy
2 Hercules: (myth.) Roman name for the Greek divine hero Heracles, who was the son of Zeus (Roman equivalent Jupiter) and the mortal Alcmene. In classical mythology, Hercules is famous for his strength and for his numerous far-ranging adventures
3 The Lernaean Hydra or Hydra of Lerna: (myth) more often known simply as the Hydra. An ancient serpentine water monster with reptilian traits in Greek and Roman mythology
4 Samson: one of the last of the judges of the ancient Israelites mentioned in the Hebrew Bible (Book of Judges chapters 13 to 16).
5 I.e. his fellow Jews
6 Constantine I the Great [Flavius Valerius Aurelius Constantinus Augustus] (c. 272 – 337): Roman Emperor from 306 to his death
7 First Council of Nicaea: a council of Christian bishops convened in Nicaea by the Roman Emperor Constantine I in AD 325. This first ecumenical council was the first effort to attain consensus in the church through an assembly representing all of Christendom
8 Arianism: a nontrinitarian belief which asserts that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, but is entirely distinct from and subordinate to God the Father. The Arian concept of Christ is that the Son of God did not always exist, but was created by—and is therefore distinct from—God the Father. The Ecumenical First Council of Nicaea of 325 condemned Arianism as a heresy
9 Sigismund of Luxemburg (1368 – 1437): King of Hungary and Croatia from 1387, King of Bohemia from 1419, and and crowned Holy Roman Emperor in 1433
10 Council of Constance (1414 – 1418): The council ended the Great Western Schism, by deposing or accepting the resignation of three papal claimants and electing Pope Martin V
11 Rhaetia: a province of the Roman Empire, named after the Rhaetian people. It comprised the region occupied in modern times by eastern and central Switzerland, Southern Bavaria and the Upper Swabia, Vorarlberg, the greater part of Tirol, and part of Lombardy
Tua ope salvati sumus, optime Deus. Verum est, domine Jesu Christe, quod dixisti\textsuperscript{1} apostolis tuis: ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem saeculi. Et iterum verum est\textsuperscript{2}, et verum experimur, quod beato Petro promisisti Tu es Petrus, inquiens\textsuperscript{3}, et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam. Servasti verbum tuum; verax es, et non est dolus in ore tuo. Saepe concutitur ecclesia, sed non frangitur; saepe ventis agitatur, sed non mergitur. Saepe nutat\textsuperscript{4}, sed non cadit. Saepe oppugnatur, sed nonquam\textsuperscript{5} expugnatur. Astat dextera tua, neque\textsuperscript{6} sinit\textsuperscript{7} hostes praevalere. Quot saevierunt adversus eam procellae, quot tempestatibus et\textsuperscript{6} persecutionibus in hanc usque diem exposita fuit, et numquam succubuit. Tuo semper munere majestatem suam servavit, quia non\textsuperscript{9} avertisti\textsuperscript{10} oculos tuos ab ea, dedisti ei\textsuperscript{11} salvatores et protectores\textsuperscript{12} multos, et modo per hunc, modo per illum sponsae tuae\textsuperscript{13}, dilectae tuae consuluisti.

Maximum vero et tutum et\textsuperscript{14} singulare praesidium ejus in clarissima\textsuperscript{15} Francorum domo collocasti; et\textsuperscript{16} hanc praecipue familiarium elegisse videris, et\textsuperscript{17} heroicis\textsuperscript{18} ornasse virtutibus, ut esset quae\textsuperscript{19} Romanam ecclesiam et Christianam religionem\textsuperscript{20} adversus omnes malignantium defenderet impetus. Et quippe\textsuperscript{21}, sicut in veteri testamento prae ceteris Hebraeorum regnum amasti, ita et\textsuperscript{22} in\textsuperscript{23} nova lege regiam Francorum familiam praecipua quadam dilectione et caritate prosequeris\textsuperscript{24}, quae beatorum Petri et Pauli jura ac\textsuperscript{25} privilegia speciali tuetur affectu, et curam habet prae ceteris apostolicae dignitatis. Miramini fortasse, fratres ac filii, quod tantopere Francorum genus ac regnum extollimus: minus dicimus quam debemus, nec possunt\textsuperscript{26} aequari factis verba.

\begin{comment}
\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{1}{dixistis L}
\footnote{2}{domine Ihesu Christe add. W}
\footnote{3}{Petrus inquiens : inquiens Petrus W}
\footnote{4}{mutatur H, L, T}
\footnote{5}{non G; nonquam R}
\footnote{6}{nec W}
\footnote{7}{possunt W}
\footnote{8}{omit. G}
\footnote{9}{omit. H, L, R, T}
\footnote{10}{advertisti D, L, R}
\footnote{11}{eis A, B, C, D, G, L, T}
\footnote{12}{salvatores et protectores : protectores et salvatores G}
\footnote{13}{suae H}
\footnote{14}{ac W}
\footnote{15}{preclarissima W}
\footnote{16}{omit. L, T}
\footnote{17}{ac W}
\footnote{18}{honorificis W}
\footnote{19}{omit. T}
\footnote{20}{quae add. T}
\footnote{21}{quidem W}
\footnote{22}{omit. R}
\footnote{23}{omit. T}
\footnote{24}{prosequens W}
\footnote{25}{et H, W}
\footnote{26}{possumus H}
\end{footnotes}
\end{comment}
3. Frankish House as protectors of the Apostolic See

[5] It is by Your help, Best God, that we have been saved. It is true, Lord Jesus Christ, what You said to Your apostles: *I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.* And as we see, it is true what You promised Saint Peter when You said: *thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* You have kept your word. You are truthful, and *guile is not found in your mouth.* The Church is often hit, but it does not break. It is tossed around by winds, but it does not sink. It often falters, but it does not fall. It is often attacked, but it is never overcome. For Your right hand assists it, and it does not allow the enemies to prevail. Until today the Church has been savaged by many storms and exposed to many gales and persecutions, but it never succumbed. You have granted it always to maintain its majesty, for You did *not turn away your eyes* from it, but gave it many protectors and saviours, and You helped your bride, Your beloved, now through one man and now through another.

[6] But you have given the Church a great, safe, and exceptional force of protection in the illustrious House of the Franks, and You have chosen this particular family and granted it heroic virtues to defend the Roman Church and Christian religion against all attacks of evildoers. Indeed, just as in the Old Testament You loved the Hebrew Kingdom more than the others, thus in the New Law You especially love the family of the Franks. For that family guards the rights and the privileges of the blessed Peter and Paul with special devotion and sets the apostolic dignity above all. Maybe you are wondering, brethren and sons, why We so greatly extol the family and Kingdom of the Franks. Actually, We are saying less than We ought to, and Our words cannot match their deeds.

---

1 Matthew, 28, 20
2 Matthew, 16, 18
3 Isaiah, 53, 9; 1. Peter, 2, 22
4 Deuteronomy, 15, 18
4. Noble origins of the Francs

[7] Before Abraham the history books do not tell about many kings, but in the period from Abraham to the coming of Christ there have been many kingdoms.¹ The older ones have all perished. The oldest one is considered to be that of the Assyrians, though both the Egyptians and the Ethiopians claim to be the first, and the Scythians insist that their own is the most ancient. The Assyrians were destroyed by the Medes, and the Medes by the Persians, who yielded to the Macedonians, who in turn yielded to the Romans. The Romans shared the government of the Earth with the Parthians and defeated mighty Carthage. There have been other old kingdoms, but minor ones like those of the Argives, the Sitionians, the Athenians, the Lacedaimonians, the Trojans, the Lydians and many others. Many exceptional men held sceptre in these kingdoms, like Ninus,² Arbaces,³ Cyrus,⁴ Croesus,⁵ Priamus,⁶ Agamemnon,⁷ Cercops,⁸ Agelau,⁹ Alexander,¹⁰ and Arsaces.¹¹ And so did many in Rome and Africa. Some have been forgotten, some are still remembered. But though they are famed, they are not saved. All the men of riches have have perished and found nothing in their hands,¹² for the Wisdom of God was not with them, nor did they reign by Wisdom, but walking after the lusts of their flesh they died in sin.¹³ Of the kings of old only a few were pleasing to God and now reign with him: among the Hebrews, there was the son of Isai,¹⁴ in whom the Lord gloried, because he had found a man according to his own heart.¹⁵ Immense was the glory of David and of his kingdom, the greatest in all Antiquity.

---

¹ In the following section Pius follows Otto von Freising: Chronica, and in particular IV, 31-32
² Ninus: according to Hellenistic historians, the eponymous founder of Nineveh, ancient capital of Assyria
³ Arbaces: according to Ctesias, one of the generals of Sardanapalus, king of Assyria and founder of the Median empire about 830 BC
⁴ Cyrus II the Great (c. 600 or 576 – 530 BC): founder of the Achaemenid Persian Empire
⁵ Croesus (595 BC – c. 547 BC): King of Lydia from 560 to 547 BC until his defeat by the Persians
⁶ Priamus: (Greek myth.) In Homer, king of Troy during the Trojan War
⁷ Agamemnon: (Greek myth.): King of Mycenae or Argos, thought to be different names for the same area. Brother of Menalaus. When Helen, the wife of Menelaus, was abducted by Paris of Troy, Agamemnon commanded the united Greek armed forces in the ensuing Trojan War
⁸ Two legendary kings of Athens were called Cercops
⁹ It is uncertain which Agelau Pius is referring to
¹⁰ Alexander III the Great (356 – 323 BC): King of the Greek kingdom of Macedonia. Created one of the largest empires of the ancient world, stretching from Greece to Egypt and into present-day Pakistan
¹¹ Arsaces I: founder of the Arsacid Parthian dynasty. Dates are unknown
¹² Psalms,75, 6: Dormierunt somnum suum, et nihil invenerunt omnes viri divitarum in manibus suis
¹³ Galatians, 5, 16: ambulantes post desideria carnis; Jude, 1, 16: secundum desideria sua ambulantes
¹⁴ King David
¹⁵ 1. Samuel, 13, 14
[8] At si comparemus Hebraeos invicem ac Francos¹ post regnum² utrimque susceptum, non pudebit Francorum nomen antefere eo tantum excepto quod³ de sanguine David natus est salvator mundi, rex regum, et dominus dominantium, Christus Dei filius, cujus imperium super humerum ejus, qui de se ipso ait: data est mihi omnis potestas in caelo et in terra. Non est, quod in hac parte Francorum gloria priscis Hebraeis aequari possit. At si cetera consideremus, longe superior erit, sive originem gentis animo volvimus⁴, sive regni amplitudinem, seu virtutem, et rerum gestarum magnitudinem pensitamus. Inspiciamus utriusque gentis originem. Hebraei ex pastoribus ad regnum⁵ venere, Franci ex Troja profecti stirpem prae se tulerunt antequam regnarent, atque inde ortum habent, unde Romanorum principes Julius et Augustus sese natos esse gloriabantur. Exusto enim Illo⁶ et Priami regno deleto, Trojanorum manus in Scythiam migravit, quae ultra Danubium ad Tanaim vergit. Juvenes erant regia stirpe creati, qui multitudinem secum duxere, nec Franci primo, sed Sicambri appellati sunt. Et diu, sicut ceterae gentes, Romano imperio servierunt.⁷

---
¹ invicem ac Francos : et Francos invicem W
² utriusque vel add. W
³ In W the following section until the words Meroveum a quo in sect. 11] is placed in sect. 14, q.v.
⁴ volumus H
⁵ ad regnum omit. C
⁶ Ilion W
⁷ omit. T
But if we compare the Hebrews and the Franks after they became rulers, we shall not be ashamed to prefer the name of the Franks, except for one thing: from the blood of David was born the Saviour of the world, \(^1\) king of kings, and lord of lords; \(^2\) Christ the Son of God, whose government is upon his shoulder, \(^3\) and who says about himself: All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. \(^4\)

In this respect, the glory of the Franks cannot equal that of the old Hebrews. But in everything else, it is far greater whether we consider the origin of the people, the size of the realm, their virtue, and the greatness of their deeds. Let us look at the origin of both peoples. The Hebrews were shepherds before they became kings. The Franks came from Troy \(^5\) and descended from a royal line before they became rulers themselves. \(^6\) Their origin is the same as that of the Roman princes Julius \(^7\) and Augustus \(^8\) who were proud to be born [of the Trojan line]. For when Troy had been burnt and the kingdom of Priamus had been destroyed, a group of Trojans migrated to Scythia, beyond Donau and Tanais. It was young men from the royal line who brought a crowd of people with them, and first they were not called Franks, but Sicambrians. \(^9\) For a long time afterwards they were subservient to the Roman Empire, like the other peoples.

---

\(^1\) Cf. the genealogy of Christ in Matthew, 1, 16  
\(^2\) 1. Timothy, 6, 15; Apocalypse, 19, 16  
\(^3\) Isaiah, 9, 6  
\(^4\) Matthew, 28, 18  
\(^5\) As Virgil had done for the Romans, a legend of Trojan origins was created for the Franks, at the latest in the 7th century, thus providing for them the same noble origins as had the Romans, cf. Werner, p. 25  
\(^6\) Piccolomini’s source for the Trojan origins of the Franks and their early history is Otto von Freising: Chronaca, I, 25 and IV, 32. The main source of Otto von Freising’s description of the origins of the Franks is the Liber Historiae Francorum (or Gesta Regnum Francorum) from 727.  
\(^7\) Julius Caesar, Gaius (100–44 BC): Roman general and statesman  
\(^8\) Augustus (Gaius Octavius) (63 BC – 14 AD): Adoptive son of Julius Caesar. Founder of the Roman Empire and its first Emperor, ruling from 27 BC until his death  
\(^9\) The Sicambri, also known as the Sugambri or Sicambrians, were a Germanic people who during Roman times lived on the right bank of the Rhine river, in what is now Germany, near the border with the Netherlands. By the 3rd century the region, in which they and their neighbours had lived, had become part of the territory of the Franks, which was a new name that possibly represented a new alliance of older tribes, possibly including the Sicambri. Many Sicambri had however been moved into the Roman Empire by this time. An anonymous work of 727, the Liber Historiae Francorum, states that following the fall of Troy, 12,000 Trojans led by chiefs Priamus and Antenor moved to the Tanais (Don) river, settled in Pannonia near the Sea of Azov and founded a city called Sicambia. In just 2 generations from the fall of Troy (by modern scholars dated in the late Bronze Age 1550-1200 BC) they arrived in the late 4th century AD at the Rhine. A variation of this story can also be read in Fredegar, and similar tales continue to crop up repeatedly throughout obscure, mediaeval European literature. Modern scholars, of course, reject it as an unhistorical legend
At imperante Valenti\textsuperscript{nino} \textsuperscript{1}, cum barbari rempublicam \textsuperscript{2} inasissent, vocati\textsuperscript{3} in auxilium Sicambri egregiam operam navarunt, victoriamque pepererunt, propter quam rem libertatem \textsuperscript{4} in decennium donati sunt\textsuperscript{5}, et Franci primum\textsuperscript{7} appellati, ex virtute nomen\textsuperscript{8} aędzi\textsuperscript{9}. Hebraeis nomen indidit Heber, non quemadmodum Francis ipsa virtus. Elapso tempore\textsuperscript{10} cum tributum repeteretur, negatum est. Duo tunc erant Francorum duces priscae nobilitatis ac virtutis\textsuperscript{11}, juvenes Priamus et Antenor. Ventum est ad proelium, vulneratus\textsuperscript{12} Priamus occubuit; victi Franci\textsuperscript{13} multis in\textsuperscript{14} bello desideratis\textsuperscript{15} in Germaniam profugerunt, \textit{(141r)} et in Thuringia sedes posuere, Marcome\textsuperscript{16} Priami et\textsuperscript{17} Sunone\textsuperscript{18} Antenoris jam defuncti filis principatum obtinentibus, quibus mortuis, Faramundus Marcomedis\textsuperscript{19} filius communi consensu gentis imperium accepit, et primus omnium rex\textsuperscript{20} Francorum est appellatus\textsuperscript{21}, cujus regnum circa Moganum\textsuperscript{22} fuit, qui fluvius\textsuperscript{23} e regione Maguntiae\textsuperscript{24} Rhenum influit\textsuperscript{25}, et nunc Franconia in his locis habetur. Haec est Francorum origo, nobilissima proiecto et altis subnixa\textsuperscript{26} radicibus. \textit{Omnes reges}, inquit Plato, \textit{ex servis orti, et omnes servi ex regibus.} Franci, quamvis Romanis aliquandiu subjecti fuerunt, ex regno tamen ad regnum pervenere et quidem nobilissimum ac\textsuperscript{27} maximum.

\begin{itemize}
\item[1] Valenti\textsuperscript{nino} H, L, T
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\item[9] triumphi \textit{add.} W
\item[10] decennii W
\item[11] virtute W
\item[12] vulneratus W
\item[13] victis Francis : victis Francis H
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But during the rule of Valentinianus,\(^1\) when barbarians had invaded the [Roman] State, the Sicambrians were summoned to help and did splendidly. Because they were victorious, they were given their freedom for ten years and were for the first time called Franks\(^2\), a name reflecting their valour. The Hebrews had their name from [a man], Heber,\(^3\) and unlike the Franks they were not named after some virtue. When the 10 year period was over, the Franks were requested to pay their taxes again, but refused to do so. At that time the Franks had two young leaders, of old nobility and valour, Priamus and Antenor.\(^4\) It came to a battle, and Priamus was wounded and died. The Franks lost many men in the war and fled to Germany. There they settled in Thuringia. Marcomedes, son of Priamus, and Suno,\(^5\) son of the already deceased Antenor, became their princes. When they died, Faramund,\(^6\) son of Marcomedes, by common consent became ruler of the people. He was the first to be called King of the Franks. His kingdom was situated around the river Main that runs from the region of Mainz and flows into the Rhine. That region is now called Franconia.

This is the origin of the Franks. It is indeed a most noble origin with ancient roots. Plato\(^7\) says *that all kings come from slaves, and all slaves from kings.*\(^8\) But though the Franks were for a period under the Romans, they came from kings and became kings again - indeed of a most noble and great kingdom.

---

\(^1\) Valentinianus I [Flavius Valentinianus Augustus] (321 – 375): Roman emperor from 364 to his death

\(^2\) I.e. free

\(^3\) Heber or Eber: ancestor of the Israelites, according to the “Table of Nations” in Genesis 10-11 and 1 Chronicles 1

\(^4\) Legendary Frankish princes

\(^5\) Legendary Frankish princes

\(^6\) Pharamond or Faramund: (c. 370-427) legendary early king of the Franks, first referred to in the anonymous 8th century Carolingian text *Liber Historiae Francorum*

\(^7\) Plato (428/427 or 424/423 BC – 348/347 BC): Greek philosopher. Student of Socrates

\(^8\) Cf. Plato: *Theatetus*, 174E. Referred to by Seneca: Epistolae morales, 44, 4: *Platon ait neminem regem non ex servis oriundum, neminem servum non ex regibus*

1 ea H
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And what about the Frankish Kingdom as compared with the Hebrew Kingdom? The Hebrews ruled only in Syria, and they did not even possess it all. Their kingdom was Judea and the region of Palestine, and they were often plundered by the neighbouring peoples. The Kingdom of the Franks stretched from the Italian Alps to the Ocean, and from the Pyrenean Mountains to Pannonia. For a long time, it held Italy as part of their Roman Empire. And how many other kingdoms were not held by the kings of the Frankish House? Let us pass over the Western kingdoms. Jerusalem, capital and column of the Hebrew people, had French kings for many years and obeyed the family of the French. This one reason is sufficient to put the Hebrews in the second place. What shall we say about Cyprus which has been ruled by the French until today. As was Antioch for a long time, and Tyrus, and Sido, and Achaia, and Thessalia. Even Constantinople and the Greek Empire was for a long time in the hands of the French. Today the Kingdom of France is just as great as the whole of Syria, but much more strong and noble, though Solomon’s wealth, chariots, knights, and mass of buildings are praised beyond measure.
Sed ad viros transeam, ex quibus vera laus elicitur. Laudantur ex Hebrais regibus aliqui, multi vituperantur. Contra in Francia multorum egregia facinora referuntur, pauci reprehenduntur. Saul, qui primus apud Hebraeos regnavit, ipso Dei testimonio reprobus est. Salomonis optimum regni principium, finis pessimus legitur. Filius ejus Roboam adolescentum stulto consilio credidit, et decem tribus a se alienavit. Reges aliqui sive in Juda sive in Israel perniciosi fuerunt, nec excelsa abstulerunt, nec reipublicae alioquin bene consularunt, praeter admodum paucos, qui viam David ambulaverunt. In Francorum genere paene innumerabiles reperti sunt viri excellentes et Deo grati. Namque, ut omittamus Clodium Faramundi filium, qui primus regni fines ex Germania propagavit in Galliam; et Meroveum, a quo Franci Merovingi dicti sunt, et alios quamplures, qui legem Christianam ignoraverunt, quis satis Clodoveum laudaverit, primi Hilderic filium, qui non solum Sygrium Romanum, sed Alamanos, Gothos, et Aquitanos a beato Dionysio baptizatus bello superavit? [Cont.]

---
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5. Rise of the Carolingians

[11] But let Us pass on to the men, for it is really those who should be praised. Of the Hebrew kings only a few are praised, and many are vilified. In France it is the opposite: many kings are reported to have performed great deeds, and only a few are rebuked for their actions. Saul\(^1\) was the first king of the Hebrews: he was rebuked by God himself. Solomon\(^2\) was excellent in the beginning of his reign, but the end was bad, as we read. His son, Roboam,\(^3\) trusted in the foolish advice of young men and alienated ten of the tribes. The other kings in Juda or Israel were wicked, and neither cared for things on high, nor took good care of their state, except for a very few who followed in the footsteps of David. In the Frankish royal family there have been almost countless excellent men, pleasing to God. We pass over Chlodio,\(^4\) son of Faramund, the first to extend the frontiers of the kingdom from Germany to France, and Merovech,\(^5\) from whom the Franks were called Merovingians,\(^6\) and others who did not know the Christian Law. But who could adequately praise Clovis,\(^7\) son of Childeric I,\(^8\) who was baptized by Saint Denys\(^9\) and defeated not only Syagrius the Roman,\(^10\) but also the Alemanni, the Goths, and the Aquitanians. [Cont.]

---

\(^1\) Saul: first king of a united Kingdom of Israel and Judah. His reign is traditionally placed in the late 11th century BCE

\(^2\) Solomon: King of Israel and the son of David (Book of Kings: 1 Kings 1–11; Book of Chronicles: 1 Chronicles 28–29, 2 Chronicles 1–9). The conventional dates of Solomon’s reign are circa 970 to 931 BC.

\(^3\) Rehoboam: Son of Solomon. Initially king of the United Monarchy of Israel but after the ten northern tribes of Israel rebelled in 932/931 BC to form the independent Kingdom of Israel, he was king of the Kingdom of Judah, or the southern kingdom

\(^4\) Chlodio (c. 392/395 – 445/448): king of the Salian Franks from the Merovingian dynasty

\(^5\) Merovech (d. 453/457): semi-legendary founder of the Merovingian dynasty of the Salian Franks which later became the dominant Frankish tribe

\(^6\) The Merovingians: Salian Frankish dynasty which ruled the Franks for nearly 300 beginning in the middle of the 5th century. Their territory largely corresponded to ancient Gaul as well as the Roman provinces of Raetia, Germania Superior and the southern part of Germany. The Merovingian dynasty was founded by Childeric I (c. 457 – 481), the son of Merovech, but it was his son Clovis I (481 – 511) who united all of Gaul under Merovingian rule. During the final century of Merovingian rule, the kings were increasingly pushed into a ceremonial role. The Merovingian rule ended in 752 when Pope Zacharias legitimated Pepin’s taking over the kingship and deposing Childeric III. See also Pius II: *Oration “Responsuri”*

\(^7\) Clovis I (c. 466 – c. 511): first king of the Franks to unite all of the Frankish tribes under one ruler He is considered the founder of the Merovingian dynasty, which ruled the Franks for the next two centuries

\(^8\) Childeric I (c. 440 – 481/482): Merovingian king of the Salian Franks and father of Clovis I

\(^9\) Error for Saint Remi (c. 437 – January 13, 533): Bishop of Reims and Apostle of the Franks. On 24 December 496 he baptised Clovis I, King of the Franks. This baptism lead to the conversion of the entire Frankish people

\(^10\) Flavius Syagrius (430 – 486 or 487): the last Roman military commander in Gaul, whose defeat by king Clovis I of the Franks is considered the end of Western Roman rule outside of Italy.
Carolus major in domo Franciae primi\textsuperscript{1} Pipini filius trecenta Saracenorum milia, si vero\textsuperscript{2} quadrat historia, apud Aquitaniam unico proelio\textsuperscript{3} trucidavit, et ab immanissima\textsuperscript{4} gente Christianum nomen liberavit. Alter Pipinus hujus filius cum aliquandiu major domus fuisset, et\textsuperscript{5} multa edidisset\textsuperscript{6} praeclara opera, ad regnum tandem evectus\textsuperscript{7} bis Italiam intravit, ut Aistulfi Longobardorum regis insolentiam compesceret ac Stephano papae et Romanae ecclesiae pie consuleret. Perfregit iniquos Aistulfi conatus, pacem Italiae dedit, et beatos apostolos Petrum et Paulum donis amplissimis honoravit.
During a single battle in Aquitania, Charles, Frankish Mayor of the Palace and son of Pepin I, destroyed 300,000 Saracens (if history agrees with truth) and liberated the Christian name from that cruel race. When his son, another Pepin, had been Mayor of the Palace for some time and achieved great things, he became king and twice invaded Italy in order to restrain the insolence of the Lombard King Aistulf and to piously assist Pope Stephanus and the Roman Church. He put an end to Aistulf's plans, gave peace to Italy, and honoured the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul with magnificent donations.

1 The battle of Tours, 732, which stopped Islamic expansion into Europe
2 Charles Martel (c. 688 – 741): Frankish statesman and military leader who, as Duke and Prince of the Franks and Mayor of the Palace, was de facto ruler of Francia from 718 until his death
3 Error for Pepin II. Pepin II [Pepin of Herstal] (c. 635 – 714): Frankish statesman and military leader who de facto ruled Francia as the Mayor of the Palace from 680 until his death
4 Pepin the Short (c. 714 - 768): King of the Franks from 751 to his death. Father of Charlemagne
5 Here Pius significantly downplays the role of the Papacy in Pepin's accession to the royal throne which he had made much of in his oration Responsuri, q.v.
6 Aistulf (d. 756: Duke of Friuli from 744, King of Lombards from 749, and Duke of Spoleto from 751
7 Stephanus III: (c. 720 – 772) Pope from 768 to his death
Pipi regi successit Carolus, cognomento magnus, cujus laudes nulla historia nova non habet, nulla poemata post eum edita nomen ejus obticueret. Laudatissimus est inter omnes Carolus. Solum conabimur facibus, si ejus amplificare laudes tentaverimus. Notum est omnibus sidus, fulget in orienti et in occidenti Caroli stella, qui victis Baioariis, Saxonibus edomitis, Sclavis Pannonibus sub jugum missis, ingressus Italiam Desiderium Longobardorum regem obsidione fatigatum cepit, Romanae ecclesiae suum decus reddidit, Italiam pacavit; Saracenos multis affectit cladibus, et patricius Romanorum, deinde imperator Augustus appellatus est, sub cujus alis tota ferme Europa conquievit. Et non solum ecclesiam Romanam magnis privilegiis decoravit, sed imperium ipsum magnificis operibus honestavit. Propter quas res ei cognomen tributum est, quod ante ipsum tribus tantummodo viris communi omnium scriptorum consensus concessum invenimus, ut magnus vocaretur. Id prius honoris Alexander, Philippus filius, qui usque ad Indiam victor penetravit. Deinde Gnaeus Pompeius, qui omnia regna inter Tanaim et Nilum Romano imperio adjecit. Postea Constantinus, Helenae filius, qui publice Christi ecclesias primus aperuit, consecutus est. [cont.]
[12] Pepin was followed by Charlemagne¹ whose praises can be found in all modern histories and all poems published after his days. Indeed this Charles is the most honoured of them all. We should be trying to assist the sun with lit torches if We attempted to praise him further: his star is known to all. Indeed, Charles’ star shines both in the East and in the West for he defeated the Bavarians, tamed the Saxons, and sent the Slavs and the Pannonians under the yoke. Entering Italy, he besieged the Lombard King Desiderius,² who gave up in the end and was taken prisoner. Charles gave back its splendour to the Roman Church and pacified Italy. He defeated the Saracens in many battles and was named Patrician of the Romans. Later he was called August Emperor.³ Under his wings, almost all of Europe found peace. Charles not only adorned the Roman Church with great privileges, but he also enhanced the honour of the empire itself through great deeds. Therefore he was given the surname of “Great”, which all writers agree had previously only been given to three men. The first to obtain this honour was Alexander,⁴ son of Philip,⁵ whose victorious campaign brought him as far as India. Afterwards came Gnaeus Pompeius⁶ who added all the kingdoms between Tanaïs and the Nile to the Roman Empire. Later came Constantine,⁷ son of Helena,⁸ who was the first to open Christ’s churches to the public. [cont.]

¹ Charlemagne (742/747/748 – 814): also known as Charles the Great. King of the Franks from 768, King of Italy from 774. In 800 crowned by the Pope as the first Emperor in Western Europe since the collapse of the Western Roman Empire three centuries earlier
² Desiderius (d. 786): Last king of the Lombard Kingdom, ruling from 756 to 774. Charlemagne, who married his daughter, conquered his realm
³ Here, too, Pius significantly downplays the role of the Papacy in Charles’ becoming emperor which he had made much of in his oration Responsuri, q.v.
⁴ Alexander III the Great (356 – 323 BC): King of the Greek kingdom of Macedon. Created one of the largest empires of the ancient world, stretching from Greece to Egypt and into present-day Pakistan
⁵ Philip II of Macedonia (382–336 BC): King of the Ancient Greek kingdom of Macedonia from 359 BC until his assassination
⁶ Pompey the Great [Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus] (106 – 48 BC): military and political leader of the late Roman Republic
⁷ Constantine I the Great [Flavius Valerius Aurelius Constantinus Augustus] (c. 272 – 337): Roman Emperor from 306 to his death
⁸ Helena [Flavia Iulia Helena Augusta] c. 250 – c. 330): consort of the Roman emperor Constantius Chlorus and the mother of Emperor Constantine the Great
[12 cont.] Quartus denique ex\(^1\) domo Francorum Carolus dignus est habitus, qui tam praeclaris nominibus\(^2\) aequaretur. Plures fuerunt in hac familia Caroli, digni laude, inter quos\(^3\) is, qui nuper decessit, haud immerito\(^4\) numerandus\(^5\), \{142r\} qui maxima regni sui\(^6\) parte dejectus in pueritia, vir factus\(^7\) divina ope et\(^8\) sua ingenti virtute avitum et paternum regnum recuperavit. Fuerunt et Philipppi et Lotharii et Arnoldi\(^9\) et alii in domo Franciae clarissimi et fortissimi reges, quorum facta recensere longum esset\(^10\), quando\(^11\) ad Ludovicos festinat oratio, quorum gloria in ea gente sublimis habetur.

---
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And finally, the fourth one considered equal to these great men was Charles of the House of the Franks. In that family, several men named Charles were praiseworthy. The recently deceased Charles\(^1\) deserves to be counted among them. In his childhood, he was deprived of most of his kingdom, but when he became a man he regained the kingdom of his ancestors and of his father with the help of God\(^2\) and by virtue of his own strength and courage. In the House of France, there were other famous and strong kings, the Philips, the Lothars, the Arnolds, and others. It would take too long to speak about their deeds, as our oration now hastens towards the kings called Louis whose glory is considered the highest in that people.

\(^1\) Charles VII (1403 – 1461): King of France from 1422 to his death. Disinherited in 1420 by his father, in the Peace of Troyes following the Battle of Azincourt, he settled in Bourges from where he gradually regained the French territories occupied by the English. In 1429, by the agency of Jeanne d’Arc, he was crowned King of France in Reims

\(^2\) Pius, significantly, does not mention Jeanne d’Arc
Septem hujus nominis viros fama excellenti fulgentes in hac familia reperimus; nec nos latet fuisse plures, sed eos prosequimur, quorum sunt nomina illustriora. Primus fuit Ludovicus magni Caroli filius, qui tris natos suos reges vidit; quorum natu major Lotharius etiam Romano praeedit imperio. Alter fuit Ludovicus, qui Germaniam regens, Pannonios ac Mysios, qui nunc Rasciani vocantur, et Bulgari suae potestati subjicit, Lotharii germanus. Tertium Ludovicum Lotharii filium ponunt, qui suscepto imperio Saracenos et Graecos Italia pepulit, et reddita ecclesiae pace suavissimus imperator est judicatus. Quartum Ludovicum eum memorant, qui cum Conrado imperatore Germano inita societate ad praedicationem sancti viri Bernardi abbatis Claraevallis, cruce signatus, adversus Turcos ingentes copias in Asiam trajecit, multaque Saracenis intulit damna.
6. Eminent kings named Ludwig/Louis

[13] In this family We find seven men of shining fame carrying that name. We are quite aware, of course, that there were more [kings called Louis], but here We shall only speak of those who were the most eminent. The first was Ludwig,¹ son of Charlemagne, who saw all his three sons as kings: Lothar,² the eldest, ruled the Roman Empire. The second Ludwig,³ the brother of Lothar, governed Germany and subjected the Pannonians, the Moesians, now called the Rascians⁴, and the Bulgarians. The third Louis⁵ was the son of Lothar. Having become emperor, he drove the Saracens and Greeks from Italy and restored peace to the Church. He was generally thought to be a most benign emperor. As the fourth remarkable Louis⁶ they name the one who, inspired by the preaching of Saint Bernard,⁷ Abbot of Clairvaux, entered an alliance with the German Emperor Konrad,⁸ took the cross, brought an immense force to Asia against the Turks, and inflicted great damage upon the Saracens.⁹

¹ Ludwig I der Fromme (778 – 840): King of Aquitaine from 781. He was also King of the Franks and co-Emperor (as Ludwig I) with his father, Charlemagne, of the Holy Roman Empire from 813.
² Lothar I (795 – 855): Holy Roman Emperor (817–855, co-ruling with his father until 840), and King of Bavaria (815–817), Italy (818–855) and Middle Francia (840–855).
³ Ludwig der Deutsche (c. 810 – 876): He received the appellation Germanicus shortly after his death in recognition of the fact that the bulk of his territory had been in the former Germania. Made the King of Bavaria from 817. He ruled in Regensburg, the old capital of the Bavarii. When his father, Ludwig I der Fromme, partitioned the empire toward the end of his reign in 840, he was made King of East Francia.
⁴ I.e. the Serbians
⁵ Ludwig II (825 – 875): King of Italy and Roman Emperor from 844, co-ruling with his father Lothar I until 855, after which he ruled alone.
⁶ Louis VII (1120 – 1180): King of France from 1137 to his death.
⁷ Bernard of Clairvaux (1090 – 1153): French abbot and the primary builder of the reforming Cistercian order. Following the Christian defeat at the Siege of Edessa, the pope commissioned Bernard to preach the Second Crusade.
⁸ Konrad III (1093 – 1152): first King of Germany of the Hohenstaufen dynasty.
⁹ The Second Crusade, 1147-1149
Quintus Ludovicus, signo crucis apud Lugdunum accepto, cum potentissima in orientem classe navigavit¹; Damiatam ab obsidione Soldani² liberavit; Saracenos graviter afflixit; res clarissimas gessit, et quamvis adversa fortuna captus fuerit, redemptus tamen non prius rediit quam Joppem³ et Sidonem et Caesarem maritimas urbes in potestate⁴ Christianorum constitutas, tutissimis⁵ moenibus⁶ et praesidiis communivit. Sextoque demum suae peregrinationis anno domum revisit, non ut quiesceret aut otio marceret⁷, sed ut fortior rediret in hostes.⁸ Neque enim diu moratus, aliam expeditionem adversus Saracenos in Africa morantes instituit, et cum tribus filiis adolescentibus ac Theobaldo rege Navarrae, et apostolico legato comitantibus Massilia⁹ solvens¹⁰, apud Tunisium¹¹ copias exposuit, non procul¹² ab antiqua Carthagine tantisque viribus civitatem obsegit, ut hostes de destructione consulerent. Sed aborta¹⁵ lue¹⁶ in castris acerba, primo¹⁷ Johannem regis filium, deinde legatum, et postremo regem ipsum mundo ablatum caelo reddidit; nec tamen¹⁸ castra deserta sunt virtute Francorum. Supervenit Carolus, quem Siculi primum vocant, cujus opera his conditionibus pax facta est, ut Afri tributum pendentes evangelium Christi apud se libere¹⁹ sinerent praedicari. Tanti fuit momenti virtus²⁰ {142v} quinti Ludovici²¹, cujus etiam mortui valuit auctoritas. [cont.]

---

¹ ac add. W  
² omit. W  
³ Joppen H  
⁴ potestatem W  
⁵ tutissimas H; et add. H, L, R, T  
⁶ moenibus H  
⁷ marcerescet corr. ex marceret H  
⁸ W: here is inserted the text missing above [from sect. 8-11]  
⁹ Massiliam W  
¹⁰ legens W  
¹¹ Tunichium W  
¹² longe W  
¹³ cives W  
¹⁴ cogitarent et add. W  
¹⁵ aborta C, W  
¹⁶ moralitate corr. from lite W  
¹⁷ primum W  
¹⁸ tantum B  
¹⁹ omit. R  
²⁰ quanti add. W  
²¹ omit. W; quinti Ludovici : Ludovici quinti G
[14] The fifth [eminent] Louis\(^1\) took the cross in Lyon and sailed to the East with a strong fleet.\(^2\) He liberated Damietta\(^3\) from the siege of the sultan;\(^4\) he hurt the Saracens sorely and did great deeds. When his fortune faltered, he was taken prisoner, but when ransomed he did not return [to France] before he had strenghtened the coastal cities of Joppe, Sidon, and Caesarea, held by the Christians, with strong walls and garrisons. In the sixth year of the expedition, he finally came back to his country, not to rest and enjoy peace, but to turn back, even stronger, against the enemies. So, he did not stay at home for a long time, but soon mounted another expedition against the Saracens in Africa.\(^5\) Sailing from Marseilles, with his tree young sons, King Theobald\(^6\) of Navarra, and an apostolic legate, he landed his troops at Tunis, not far from old Carthage. He besieged Tunis so vigorously that the enemies began to discuss their surrender. But then a terrible plague broke out in the camp: first it took the king’s son, Jean,\(^7\) from this world and gave him to Heaven, then the legate, and finally the king himself. But such was the strength and courage of the French that they did not leave the camp. Then Charles I\(^8\) of Sicily arrived. He achieved the making of a peace with the conditions that the Africans should pay tribute and allow the Gospel of Christ to be freely preached there. Thus the strength and courage of the fifth [eminent] Louis was so great that his authority outlasted his death. [cont.]

---

1 Louis IX (1214 – 1270): Capetian King of France who reigned from 1226 to his death. Louis IX took an active part in the Seventh and Eighth Crusade (Tunis) in which he died from dysentery. Saint
2 The Seventh Crusade was a crusade led by Louis IX of France from 1248 to 1254. Approximately 800,000 bezants were paid in ransom for King Louis who, along with thousands of his troops, were defeated and captured by the Egyptian army led by the Ayyubid Sultan Turanshah
3 Turanshah (d. 1250): Kurdish ruler of Egypt. A member of Ayyubid Dynasty, he became Sultan of Egypt for a brief period in 1249–50
4 The Eighth Crusade, 1270
5 Theobald II [Thibault] (c. 1239 – 1270): king from 1253 to his death. In July 1270, Theobald embarked with his father-in-law, King Louis IX if France, on the Eighth Crusade to Tunis. Louis died of dysentery at the siege. Theobald died at Trapani in Sicily while returning that same year
6 Jean Tristan (1250 - 1270): French prince. Accompanied his father during the Eighth Crusade to Tunis. At Tunis the army suffered an outbreak of dysentery. Jean Tristan was one of the victims
7 Charles I d’Anjou (1227 – 1285): Son of King Louis VIII of France, brother of Louis IX. Conquered the Kingdom of Sicily from the Hohenstauffen in 1266, having received it as a papal grant in 1262. Expelled from the island of Sicily in the aftermath of the Sicilian Vespers of 1282, he thereafter resided in Naples
[14 cont.] Sextum Ludovicum Caroli secundi\textsuperscript{1} Siciliae regis\textsuperscript{2} filium ponimus, Francorum genere natum, qui relictō saeculo in religione\textsuperscript{3} beati Francisci ita caste, ita pie, ita munde vixit, ut post obitum inter sanctos Christi confessores ex decreto Romani pontificis\textsuperscript{4} Bonifatii VIII.\textsuperscript{5} relatus fuerit. Maximum est hoc Ludovici nomen in domo Francorum.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} omit. W
\item \textsuperscript{2} Siciliae regis : regis Siciliae W
\item \textsuperscript{3} religionem H
\item \textsuperscript{4} presulis W
\item \textsuperscript{5} Eugenii III. H
\end{itemize}
The sixth [eminent] Louis\(^1\) We consider to have been the son of King Charles II\(^2\) of Sicily, of the French line. He left the world and lived in the order of Saint Francis so chastely, so piously, and so purely that after his death he was inscribed among the holy confessors of Christ, by decree of the Roman Pontiff, Bonifatius VIII.\(^3\)

So, great is the name of Louis in the House of France.

1 Saint Louis of Toulouse (1274 – 1297): son of Charles II of Sicily. Louis was made archbishop of Lyon as soon as he reached his majority. Gave up all claims to his royal inheritance and joined the Franciscan order. In 1297, Louis became Bishop of Toulouse. Louis rapidly gained a reputation for serving the poor. Died at the age of 23

2 Charles II, called the Lame (1254 – 1309): King of Naples, King of Albania, Prince of Salerno, Prince of Achaea, Count of Provence and Forcalquier and Count of Anjou

3 Bonifatius VIII [Benedetto Caetani] (c. 1230 – 1303): Pope from 24 December 1294 to his death
Gloriosa Ludovicorum fama et in omne tempus celebranda, quae in Ludovico nostro haudquaquam imminuta est, sed aucta potius, qui suorum progenitorum\textsuperscript{1} vestigiis inhaerens, tales sese conatur exhibere, quales fuere generis auctores Clodoveos\textsuperscript{2}, Pipinos, Carolos, Philippos imitatur, et Ludovicus nomine priores exprimit Ludovicos\textsuperscript{3}: septimus inter eos, qui clariores habentur, vera Francorum soboles, verus magni Caroli sanguis, verus Ludovicorum successor et haeres, qui nec frangitur adversis rebus, nec secundis intumescit. Nostis, quae fuerint hujus regis pueritia\textsuperscript{4} rudimenta, litteras didicit, et moribus imbutus optimis religionis amantissimus fuit, vitiorum hostis, virtutis cultor. In adolescentia multa ei adversa fuerunt\textsuperscript{5}: accusatus ab improbis invitus a patre recessit, quem sibi maligni et iniqui\textsuperscript{6} delatores infestum reddiderant, necesse fuit calumniatoribus cedere, bis bonus adolescens et\textsuperscript{7} in armis clarus et victoriis illustratus, patris conspectum fugere coactus est. Et quamvis multas urbes et multas provincias ex manu hostium recuperavit, et nomen excellens\textsuperscript{8} inter belli duces obtinuerit, plus tamen\textsuperscript{9} invidia potuit, quam sua virtus. Dulcem patris vultum\textsuperscript{10} maledica lingua sibi fecit amarum. Infortunatus\textsuperscript{11} eo tempore juvenis non solum patris curiam\textsuperscript{12} perdidit, sed Dalfinatu\textsuperscript{13} quoque ejectus est, qui more vetusto primogenitus\textsuperscript{14} est\textsuperscript{15} obnoxius. Exul igitur\textsuperscript{16} et extorris, sine imperio, sine dominio, sine terra, paucis comitatus amicos\textsuperscript{17} in Burgundiam migravit ad Philippi ducis, consanguinei sui, florentes\textsuperscript{18} opes, qui juvenem non ut exulem, sed ut dominum accepit et veneratus est, apud quem diu mansit, fuissetque procul dubio genitori reconciliatus, jam enim innocentiam filii pater noverat, nisi reditum\textsuperscript{19} timuisset, qui ejecerant.
7. King Louis XI

[15] Glorious is indeed the fame of the kings named Louis and to be honoured forever. In our own Louis¹ it has not decreased, but rather increased. Following in the footsteps of his ancestors, he shows himself to be the like of the kings named Clovis, Pepin, Charles, and Philip, as well as his namesakes as king of France. He is the seventh among the eminent kings named Louis, true offspring of the Franks, true blood of Charlemagne, and true successor and heir to the kings named Louis. He is not broken by adversity nor gets puffed up by success. You know of his early childhood, how he learnt his letters, was given excellent manners, loved religion, shunned vice, and cultivated virtue. In his adolescence he suffered many setbacks. Having been accused by wicked men, he left his father, whom malicious and evil men had turned against him so that he was forced to leave the field to the slanderers. The good young man, distinguished both in war and victory, was twice forced to flee his father’s presence. And though he recovered many cities and provinces from the hands of the enemies and gained an excellent name among captains of war, his strength and courage could not match jealousy. Evil tongues embittered his father’s sweet face against him, and at that time the unfortunate young man not only lost his place at his father’s court, but he was even expelled from the Dauphinée² which by ancient custom belongs to the firstborn.³ Banished and exiled, without power, without dominion, without land, he went to Burgundy in the company of a few friends, [entrusting] himself to the flourishing fortune of his relative, Duke Philippe,⁴ who received and honoured the young man not as an exile, but as his lord. Louis stayed long with him, and he would undoubtedly have been reconciled with his father – who by now knew that his son was innocent – unless those who had driven him away had not feared his return.⁵

¹ Louis XI (1423 – 1483): King of France from 1461 to his death
³ The Dauphin of Viennois (Dauphin de Viennois): title given to the heir apparent to the throne of France from 1350 to 1791 and 1824 to 1830
⁵ As well they might, cf. the events after Louis’ accession to the throne in 1461
[16] Sed ostendit in obitu\(^1\) pius pater non bene se pium filium ejecisse, qui moriens eum sibi successorem ordinavit. Ludovicus, dum extra gratiam patris ageret, nihil impium cogitavit, nihil durum, sed tamquam Dei judicium patris arbitrium tulit, dicens: haec mihi accidunt, quia non servavi divinam legem, non audivi filium Dei, non parui evangelio, non fuit Dei sapientia mecum. Ac\(^2\) si Deus dederit, ut in regnum [143r] aliquando redeam, alium agam hominem; studebo Deo placere; eique se saepius\(^3\) commendabat, ac beatorum\(^4\) apostolorum Petri et Pauli patrocinia implorabat. Erat sedulo\(^5\) in oratione, elemosynas, quas poterat, elargiebatur, et multa pro suo reditu vota votit. Exauditus est pro sua justitia: mortuo patre cum summa omnium quiete\(^6\) in paterno et avito regno receptus\(^7\) est, clamante populo: *benedictus qui venit in nomine domini*. Et sicut de\(^8\) Alcibiade apud Graecos traditur, non tam ignominiose abiit, quam gloriose reversus est. Sed audiamus, quid agat Ludovicus in paterno solio\(^9\) collocatus: an ludis et\(^10\) choreis indulget? An vino madet? An crapula dissolvitur? An marcet in voluptatibus\(^11\)? Rapinas meditat? An sanguinem\(^12\) sitit? Nihil horum. Id\(^13\) tantum cogitat\(^14\), quomodo Deo gratias agat. Reddit vota, quae votit. Sacrificia offerit divinitati, quae sunt acceptissima: justitiam et\(^15\) innocentiam,\(^16\) pietatem. Expulit, ut fama est, lusores et blasphemos ex curia sua. Luxum non solum in rebus gravibus, sed etiam in vestimentis inhibuit. Ordinat inordinata, nullum tempus inutiliter\(^17\) expendit, audit supplices, et nulli sua jura negat.

\(^1\) *in obitu* *omit. C*  
\(^2\) *at H*  
\(^3\) *se saepius : sepius se W*  
\(^4\) *omit. H, L, T*  
\(^5\) *sedulus W*  
\(^6\) *gratia W*  
\(^7\) *susceptus W*  
\(^8\) *omit. W*  
\(^9\) *in paterno solio* *omit. W*  
\(^10\) *an C*  
\(^12\) *sanguine H, L, R, T*  
\(^13\) *omit. W*  
\(^14\) *tantum cogitat : cogitatum H, L, R, T*  
\(^15\) *omit. G, H, W*  
\(^16\) *et *\(\textit{add. G, H, W}\)*  
\(^17\) *tempus inutiliter : inutiliter tempus W*
[16] But when the pious father died, he showed that he had not done well in driving his pious son away, for on his deathbed he appointed him his successor. While Louis was in disgrace, he did not entertain impious or bitter thoughts. He bore his father’s will as if it was a judgment of God, saying: “This is happening to me because I have not kept the Law of God, I have not heeded the Son of God, I have not obeyed the Gospel, and God’s Wisdom was not with me. But if God grants me to some day return to the kingdom, I shall be another man and strive to please God.” Often he commended himself to God and begged for the protection of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul. He was assiduous in prayer, gave what alms he could, and made many vows for his return. He was heard for his justice: for when his father died, he was received back into the kingdom of his father and his forefathers in complete peace and quiet, while the people shouted: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. And as it is reported about Alcibiades in Greece, the glory of his return was greater than the shame of his departure. But let us hear how Louis is doing now that he sits on his father’s throne: Does he revel in games and dancing? Does he indulge in wine and drunkenness? Does he grow soft with pleasures? Does he plot robbery? Does he thirst for blood? No, he does none of these. He only thinks of how to thank God. He fulfills his vows. He offers pleasing sacrifices to God in the form of justice, innocence, and piety. As rumour has it, he has driven gamesters and blasphemers from his court. And he has forbidden luxury not only in important areas, but also in clothes. He brings order to disorder, spends all his time usefully, hears supplicants, and denies nobody their rights.

1 Hebrews, 5, 7: exauditus est pro sua reverentia
2 Matthew, 21, 9
3 Alcibiades (c. 450 – 404 BC): prominent Athenian statesman, orator, and general
4 “lusores”
O beatum Franciae regnum, cui talis rex praesidet! O felix exilium, quod tale remisit praesidium!

---

2 nunc W
2 utinam add. W
3 praecedisset H
4 Sauli R
5 Hebreis W
6 anteferre C
7 qui add. H, L, R, T, W
8 speciem L, T; speramen est W
9 qui ut: prout R
10 consuleret corr. ex. consulerent H; consulerent L, T
[17] Oh, happy Kingdom of France which is governed by such a king! Oh, happy exile which brought back such strength! May all rulers try to be miserable at some time. It is very important to have seen other palaces of government and to have eaten foreign bread. In Homer, Ulysses is praised as a man who has seen the ways and the cities of many men. And our David would not have had such glory if he had not first suffered exile and Saul’s hate. The deeds of Louis are worthy to be imitated by other kings. This is to be a king; this is to have God’s Wisdom as a companion and to rule through it.

Thus, We should not hesitate to prefer the royal family and the realm of the Franks, where so many noble kings and emperors flourished, to that of the Hebrews. And now it is governed by Louis, a great example of virtue, a remarkable lesson in piety. For in order to piously help his mother, the Roman Church, and the people of France, he has completely destroyed that harmful and pernicious beast called the Pragmatic and cast it from his kingdom.
[18] Quid aitis¹, fratres, quid censetis omnes. Audimus², quid³ tacite inter vos dicitis⁴. Cedat Francia Hebraeis propter Christum salvatorem. Cedat alioquin Hebraeus Franco, cedat et omnis antiquitas⁵. Nam quis Francorum sanguinem satis⁶ pro meritis laudaverit, ex quo⁷ tot pullularunt excellentissimae plantae⁸, tot illustres principes emanarunt⁹, tot animae candidae prodierunt, inter quas Ludovici praesentis regis¹⁰ splendidissimam fore confidimus, cujus gloriosa opera quamvis essent (143v) omnibus nota, hodie tamen extincta¹¹ pragmatica atque sepulta, et restituto apostolicae sedi decore pristino et¹² integra oboedientia reddita, et tam magnificis oblationibus pro tutela fidei nostrae factis, magis ac magis innotuere¹³. Nam quae¹⁴ regio¹⁵ in terris hujus egregii facinoris non rumorem accepit? Quis non audivit quo animo, quo consilio, quo ingenio pragmatica sublata est¹⁶?

Ultra Sauromatas¹⁷ et glacialem Oceanum, ultra anni solisque vias, ubi caelifer Atlas axem humero premit stellis ardentibus aptum,

hujus praecellari facinoris fama penetrabit.

---

¹ dicitis H
² audivimus W
³ quod H, L, R, T, W
⁴ dicatis W
⁵ iniquitas W
⁶ omit. H
⁷ quot C
⁸ et add. H, L, T
⁹ emanaverunt W
¹⁰ praesentis regis : regis presentis W
¹¹ sanctione add. W
¹² ac W
¹³ innotescere H
¹⁴ quis W
¹⁵ omit. W
¹⁶ sublata est : est sublata sanctio W
¹⁷ Sauromatas W
What do you say, brethren, what do you think? We hear what some are whispering among you: France may indeed be inferior to the Hebrews because of Christ Our Lord. But in all other matters, the Hebrews, and indeed all of Antiquity, are inferior to the French. For who can adequately praise the merits of the Frankish blood from which so many excellent plants grew, so many illustrious princes arose, and so many shining souls were born? Among them We are sure that the soul of the present king, Louis, will be one of the most splendid. His glorious earlier were already known to all, but today they simply blaze forth as the Pragmatic Sanction has been annulled and buried, the honour of the Apostolic See has been restored, complete obedience to it has been declared, and magnificent offers of assistance to the protection of Faith have been made. What region on Earth has not received the news of this marvelous deed? And who has not heard with what courage, sagacity, and wisdom the Pragmatic has been annulled? The fame of this splendid deed will surely spread

* beyond the Sarmatians and the icy Ocean,¹

* beyond the path of year and sun, where sky-bearing Atlas wheels on his shoulders the blazing star-studded sphere.²

¹ Juvenal, 2, 1-2: *Ultra Sauromatas fugere hinc libet et glacialem Oceanum*

² Virgil: *Aeneid*, 6, 796-797: *super et Garamantas et Indos proferet imperium; iacet extra sidera tellus, extra anni solisque vias, ubi caelifer Atlas axem umero torquet stellis ardentibus aptum*
These deeds will be written down in the annals of the kings, and they will be kept in the archives of the churches for the memory of posterity. No age will fail to praise Louis. The Apostolic See will remember this great act of piety and show gratefulness not only to him but also to his sons and their sons and all born to them. It will honour his name together with Constantine I, Justinianus,¹ Theodosius,² Charlemagne, and the other pious emperors. This he will be granted by the Church that fights for Christ on Earth.³ But neither will the Church that triumphs in Heavenly Jerusalem⁴ fail to reward Louis for his excellent deeds: if, until the end of life, he remains steadfast in his devotion to his mother,⁵ in the protection of the Faith, in the administration of justice, in the love of God and neighbour, the Church Triumphant will grant him eternal beatitude. Paradise on high will receive his soul, full of joy, radiating and shining with wonderful splendour. It will place his soul on a luminous seat among the blessed choirs of the saints and grant it the vision of Omnipotent God. Together with the angels and blessed spirits, it will contemplate the glory of the Creator and enjoy the supreme and perfect Good. May the Divine Piety grant to Us and to the people entrusted to Us to share this Good. His is the honour and the glory through countless ages. Amen.

¹ Justinianus I the Great (Flavius Petrus Sabbatius Justinianus Augustus) (c. 482 – 565): Byzantine Emperor from 527 to his death
² Theodosius I the Great (Flavius Theodosius Augustus) (347 – 395): Roman Emperor from 379 to his death
³ The Church Militant
⁴ The Church Triumphant
⁵ i.e. the Church