

ROYAL FAMILIES

Some Notes on the Titles of Coloman of Galicia

K intitulatúre Kolomana Haličského / O titulama Kolomana Haličkoga

In his childhood, Coloman of Galicia was crowned with the papal crown as King of Galicia, but later on, his father, King of Hungary, Andrew II, changed his strategy and directed his efforts to rule Galicia through other pretenders. However, Coloman retained his title and his contemporaries respected his royal authority. Shortly after he had become the Duke of Dalmatia and Croatia, his title evolved to better reflect Coloman's influence and political aspirations in the Hungarian Kingdom. Thus, he became "King and Duke of the entire Sclavonia." The most energetic reaction to this evolution came from the papal see under Gregory IX who addressed Coloman also as "King of Sclavonia" and "King of Slavs." We examine the nature and purpose of each of the stages Coloman's titles go through on the background of contemporary documents and research of modern historians including the ideological script of the Hungarian-Polish Chronicle as an important interpretation tool.

Keywords: Coloman of Galicia, *rex Ruthenorum* (King of Ruthenians), *dux totius Sclavoniae* (Duke of entire Sclavonia), *regnum Galiciae* (the Kingdom of Galicia), King of Galicia, the Hungarian-Polish Chronicle, Gregory IX, the concept of medieval Sclavonia

The titles of Hungarian rulers in the Middle Ages mirror not only their bearers' real entitlements, but also their territorial ambitions and political objectives. By examining the ways in which rulers used their titles, on the one hand, and how such usage was reflected by their contemporaries, on the other, we aim to shed more light on the documentary evidence and chroniclers' records concerning the thirteenth-century Hungarian Kingdom and its relations with adjacent territories. In this respect, Coloman of Galicia, King of Galicia and Duke of *Sclavonia*, attracts particular attention. His titles as well as the corresponding attitudes of the most influential contemporaries undergo remarkable development. Let us investigate the main milestones of this development.

Rex Galitiae

Coloman of Galicia entered the world of high-level politics at the age of six. Hungarian kings had the tendency to get involved in the affairs of Galicia and Volynia from the first half of the twelfth century on. Coloman's father, King Andrew II,

was fascinated by the space of western Russia since his childhood. In 1188–1189 he was appointed by his father Bela III to rule in Galicia as *juveigneur*.¹ In 1205, following the death of Galician prince Roman Mstislavich who left behind two minor children, both Polish and Hungarian rulers intensified their efforts aiming to conquer Galician territory. In the same year, Andrew II was crowned as the Hungarian king. In 1206, he provided protection to the widow and children of Roman Mstislavich at his royal court. Consequently, he complemented his royal titles with the title of the King of Galicia and Volynia,² albeit the *regnum Galiciae* had not officially existed.

In 1214,³ Andrew II asked Pope Innocent III for approval for his son Coloman to be crowned the King of Galicia (Andrew II himself used the title of King of Galicia and Volynia without the pope's approval). The pope accepted the request and agreed with Coloman's coronation *in regem Galiciae*.⁴ Therefore, Coloman obtained the title of *rex Galiciae* by the end of 1214 or beginning 1215, giving rise to the Kingdom of Galicia and Volynia within the Hungarian Kingdom. Nevertheless,

* Nataša Procházková, Alumna of Comenius University Bratislava, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Slovak History.

¹ This French term denotes a royal prince holding an appanage.

² *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis* (deinde CDH), vol. 3, tom. 1. Ed.: Georgius FEJÉR. Budae: Typis typographiae Regiae Vniversitatis Vngaricae, 1829, p. 31, 1206: "Andrea Dei gracia Hungarie, Dalmacie, Croacie, Rame, Servie, Gallicie, Lodomerieque rex in perpetuum."

³ *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia* (deinde VMH), vol. 1. Ed.: Augustin THEINER. Romae: Typis Vaticanis, 1859, nr. 1.

⁴ *Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus continuatus* (deinde CDAC), vol. 6. Ed: Gusztáv WENZEL: Budapest:Magyar Tudományos Akademia, 1874, nr. 227, pp. 374–375.

due to a fierce resistance by local boyars Coloman succeeded to remain on the throne for no longer than a year. The official coronation ceremony celebrated by the archbishop of Esztergom (*Strigonium*) took place at the turn of 1215 and 1216.⁵

Innocent III's successor, Pope Honorius III (1216–1227), also confirmed that the *Regnum Galiciae* belonged to Coloman – he did so right at the beginning of his pontificate in 1217. On the same occasion, he decided that only in case of Bela's and Coloman's death, their entitlements could be transferred to their younger brother Andrew.⁶

Coloman's situation on the Galician throne got worse again during Andrew II's participation in the Fifth Crusade (1217–1218) – to the point that he had to return home. It is highly probable that during these transitory periods Coloman stayed at the Castle of Spiš (Lat. *Scepus*), a place well known to the king of Hungary for its strategic position. Then, in 1219, the allied troops of Lesser Poland and the Hungarian Kingdom managed to reconquer Galicia from the Prince of Novgorod, Mstislav the Bold, and his allies. Coloman was reinstalled on the throne (this time he was already accompanied by his wife, Princess Salomea of Lesser Poland / Małopolska). Thus, Coloman got yet another chance to realise his title of *rex Galitiae*. However, the events soon evolved to his detriment. Hungarians were severely defeated and the victorious Mstislav forced Andrew II to pledge Coloman's resignation from the throne of Galicia in exchange for the release of Coloman and his wife who were captured during the attack. Under such pressure, Andrew II gave up on his second son's rights and promised that his third son, Andrew, would marry Mstislav's daughter, Maria, before succeeding to the Galician throne as the duke. However, soon after coming back to Hungary, Andrew II asked the pope for legal advice. He questioned the pope about to what extent his pledges to the Orthodox prince Mstislav were binding. There, in 1222, Pope Honorius III confirmed Coloman's right to the *regnum*

Galitiae as non-transferable, thus annulling Andrew II's pledge to Mstislav. On the same occasion, he confirmed the validity of Andrew II's other pledge, namely, the marriage between his third-born Andrew and Mstislav's Maria.⁷

The Lord of Spiš

Based on this decision by the pope, following the expulsion from Galicia, Coloman probably finds a shelter in the county of Spiš and at the Spiš castle, where he initiates a major rebuilding. The growing significance of this castle was due to its suitable position for Hungarian quests to Galicia. The region of Spiš formed an integral part of the Hungarian Crown, so Coloman's local rule was not reflected in his official titles. However, it seems reasonable to assume he was the one to start the tradition of the *dominus terrae Scepusiensis*. Apart from indirect evidence confirming Coloman's donations and other activities in this area, there is a charter of Elizabeth the Cuman of 1279 which explicitly mentions Coloman's rule in Spiš. By this charter Queen Elizabeth donated two villages to the Chapter of Spiš for the salvation of King Coloman's soul "*qui, dum adhuc viveret, terram Scepus possederat usque ad vitam suam pleno iure...*"

The charter was first published by Carolus Wagner⁸ and thereafter also by Joannes Bárdossy,⁹ who added an extensive commentary. Others followed these publications.

Stephen of Anjou, brother of Louis the Great, uses the title of *dux Hungariae et dominus terrae Scepusiensis et de Sarus*, i. e. "the duke of Hungary and the lord of the land of Spiš () and Šariš ()" already in his very first charter¹⁰ (another document, the facsimile of the charter of Stephen of Anjou dated to 5 November 1349 uses the title of "*dux Transilvanus ac dominus terre Scepusiensis*"¹¹). The title has a Slovak medieval equivalent, *hrabí – hrabinka*. *Hrabinka Spišská* is the title used by Hedwig of Těšín (Cieszyn) from the Piast dynasty,¹² the wife of Stephen Zápolya (*se Zápole*). Wladislas II Jagiello,

⁵ KÁLLAY, Ubul.: *Mikor koronázták meg Kálmant Halics felkenz királyát, a papától kuldott koronával?* In: *Századok*, a. 37, 1903, pp. 672–673.

⁶ CDH 5, p. 189.

⁷ CDH 5, pp. 355–357.

⁸ *Annalecta Scepusii sacri et profani*, vol. 1. Ed.: Carolus WAGNER. Viennae: Typis Jooan. Thammae nobil de Trattnern, 1774, p. 299.

⁹ *Supplementum analectorum terrae Scepusiensis*, Ed.: Johannes BÁRDOSY, vol. 1. Leutschoviae: Typis Miachaelis Podhoránszky, 1802, nr. 36, p. 145.

¹⁰ See Magyar Országos Levéltár, Budapest – MOL DF 258977, facsimile cfr. *Historia Scepusii: Dejiny Spiša do roku 1526*, vol. 1. Ed. Martin HOMZA – Stanisław A. SROKA. Bratislava – Kraków: Etc, 2009, p. 374, fig. 40.

¹¹ *Anjou-kori okmánytár*, vol. 5. Ed. et trans. Imre NAGY. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1887, nr. 192, p. 332.

¹² MOL DF 279883 and MOL DF 217790, as well as MOL DF 281671, in editions such as *Slovenské listy a listiny z 15. a 16. storočia*. Ed.: Branislav VARSÍK. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV, 1956 p. 98–99.

Czech king and the future king of the Realm of St. Stephen, grants Stephen Zápolya the title of “eternal *hrabi* of Spiš.”¹³ The translation of the Czech term of *hrabi* refers to earl, duke, or even prince, which corresponds to the later hereditary title of the duke of Spiš for the family of Zápolya (cfr. the title of Stephen Zápolya in Polish terminology¹⁴); later on in Lat. *comes perpetuus*; Ger. *Ewiger Gespan*; Hun. *szepesi örökös gróf / ispán* for the houses of Thurzo and Csáki (slov. *Čáki*). In view of the context the title of the duke of Spiš mostly stayed in the royal family (the Arpads, Angevins, Zápolyas) or belonged to prominent persons and kindreds in the Hungarian Kingdom (comes Bald, the title Drugets, Thurzo, Čáki). Therefore, historians studying Spiš, such as Joannes Bárdossy, prefer to identify rulers of Spiš with the title of “*Scepusiensis Terrae Dux*.”¹⁵

Coloman’s activities in Spiš become clearer also thanks to the new findings of archaeologists and art historians which confirm a construction boom in this area and remarkable analogies between the architecture of Spiš and then Croatia as early as in the 1220s. As far as visual sources are concerned, the seal of the Saxons of Spiš and the first Croatian *kuna*, probably issued by Coloman, also show common traits.

Brotherly conflict

In 1224, Coloman’s younger brother Andrew obtained the Duchy of *Premislia* (Pol. Przemysł) as a dowry from the father of his wife Maria. In 1227, Mstislav decided to grant Andrew the title of *dux Galitiae*. However, Coloman, the crowned King of Galicia, did not take part in the expedition aiming at Andrew’s reinstatement on the ducal throne.¹⁶ Obviously, he did not support his brother’s entitlement. Ultimately, the conflict between Coloman and Andrew culminated in a mysterious military clash initiated by the frustrated Andrew

who attacked Coloman in his Castle of *Roicha*.¹⁷ This dramatic circumstance stimulates imagination as this castle is identified with the Castle Rovište situated in Croatia. To get to the castle, Andrew would have had to travel from Przemysł across the entire Hungarian Kingdom. So far, we have found no definite explanation for this.

A unique way of legitimising the Arpadian dynasty’s entitlement to the Kingdom of Galicia and the associated hierarchy of titles, and also the particular conflict between Coloman and his brother Andrew, are presented by the author of the *Hungarian-Polish Chronicle* (deinde *HPC*).¹⁸ Ladislav, who is presented in the chronicle as the grandson of Saint Stephen, gains eternal right to the Crown of Galicia by becoming the adoptive son of the Ruthenian prince Mstislav (*Mistislav*) and by marrying his daughter (obviously a close analogy to the situation of Duke Andrew). For the time being, his brother Salomon rules in *Sclavonia* (similarly to Coloman). Subsequently, Ladislav gets the Crown of Hungary and Salomon, albeit older, agrees with the coronation of Ladislav. So far, these are the literary characters. The author of the *HPC* transformed the real conflict between the brothers Coloman and Andrew, which escalated in an armed attack on Rovište/*Roicha*, to present a story about Ladislav on the night before the elevation of the relics of Saint Stephen. On this night, Ladislav held Salomon illegally in prison.¹⁹ The author of the *HPC* construed a new story based on this tradition by contaminating the “actual historical events” with the deeds done by several historical figures and thus creating a new reality for hagiographic purposes. The story of Coloman, the eldest son of the Arpadian House’s “protoplast” Attila (*Aquila*) on the background of his relation with the emerging Saint Ladislav, who is, as we read very clearly in the *HPC*, forever entitled to the Galician throne, could have served as a confirmation that these rights belonged to the actual Coloman of Galicia.²⁰

¹³ *Středověké listy ze Slovenska*. Ed.: Václav CHALOUPECKÝ. Bratislava a Praha: Učená společnost Šafaříkova a Československý státní ústav historický, 1937, nr. 193, p. 159.

¹⁴ In an undated letter written after 1662 Stephen is addressed mentioned as *Xsieża*. Cfr. Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich. Zbiór Rękopisów. Miscellanae Scepusiensia, sign. 762, fol. 42.

¹⁵ Johannes BÁRDOSSY: *Moldavensis vel Szepiensis decimae indagatio est proxima terrae Scepusiensis, et huic innexarum, sacro-profanum, jurisdictionum evolutio*. Possonii: Typis ac sumptibus Georgii Aloysii Belnay, 1802, pp. 20–21.

¹⁶ The Hypathian Codex: Part Two: The Galician-Volynian Chronicle (deinde *GVC*). Ed. et trans.: George A. PERFECKY. in: *Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies*, vol. 16, II. Ed.: Omeljan PRITSAK. München 1973, p. 39.

¹⁷ *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae* (deinde *CDCr*), vol. 3–5. Ed.: Tadj SMIČIKLAS. Zagrabiae: Ex officina societatis typographicae, 1905–1907, nr. 323, p. 369.

¹⁸ *Uhorsko-poľská kronika. Nedocenený prameň k dejinám strednej Európy* (deinde *UPK*). Ed.: Martin HOMZA, trans.: Jana BALEGOVÁ. Bratislava: Post Scriptum – Libri Historiae, 2009, pp. 181–183.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 183.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 83–84: “Triple emphasis on the rights of an Arpadian (Ladislav) to the Galician throne is extraordinary at first sight. It shows the author’s eminent interest in this respect. It needs to be highlighted that in the *HPC*, Mstislav is a Galician duke, while

In any case, it can be established that Duke Andrew had reasons to perceive Coloman as his rival. We are now approaching the issue of how Coloman perceived himself.

King of Ruthenians and Duke of Slavonia

Coloman, *rex Galitiae*, left Spiš in 1226. In 1227 his father Andrew II issued a charter in which he refers to Coloman for the first time as the *rex Ruthenorum et dux Dalmatiae atque Croatiae*.²¹ Thereby Andrew confirmed not only Coloman's first donation to the town of Drid but also the exact wording of the title which Coloman styled himself in the donation charter already a year earlier.²² This means that King Andrew II recognised Coloman's title of the *rex Ruthenorum* – King of Ruthenians (Eastern Slavs) – and gave him the title of Duke of Dalmatia and Croatia – *dux Dalmatiae atque Croatiae*.

This semantic shift in Coloman's titles reflects the change of situation. Although Coloman was crowned as King of Galicia (*rex Galitiae*), from 1226 to 1228 he is found in sources as the King of Ruthenians, that is, the king of the people of Eastern Slavic principalities (*rex Ruthenorum*), and the Duke of Croatia and Dalmatia (*dux Croatiae atque Dalmatiae*).²³ In the period from 1229 to 1240, Croatia and Dalmatia in his title are replaced by a curious expression of "entire Slavonia/Slavic land" (*dux totius Sclauoniae*).²⁴ As a matter of fact, Coloman uses this title for the first time in a charter concerning Kecerovský Lipovec (Lat. *Lypolch*) situated neither in Slavonia, nor in Croatia, but in the eastern Slovakia.²⁵ In the first part of his title (*rex Ruthenorum*), the territorial capacity (King of Galicia) semantically transforms into an ethnical and territorially unlimited capacity (King of

Ruthenians). It is obvious that Coloman failed to effectively rule the people of Galicia, however, he maintained his royal rank and his contemporaries recognised him as a ruler with royal powers. Historiography has not noted any other attempt by Coloman to regain a real power in Galicia, despite the fact that in the 1230s he already had a strong position in the Hungarian Kingdom pursuing an expansive foreign policy in Bosnia. Also, Duke Andrew of Galicia, who died in 1234, no longer hindered Coloman's way to Galicia. Coloman seemed disconnected from Galician affairs. However, on the symbolic occasion of King Bela's coronation ceremony in 1235, Coloman demonstrated his superiority to another aspirant to the throne of Galicia – Danilo of Galicia. The *Chronicon Pictum* depicts in the new king's accompaniment Coloman as carrying the king's sword, while Danilo of Galicia as leading the new king's horse.²⁶

The question is how Coloman understood his royal title and what is the meaning of the changed attribute next to the royal rank from 1226. The transformation of the royal title from territorial to ethnical basis²⁷ is confirmed by his contemporaries including King Andrew II, King Bela IV, Pope Honorius III, and Pope Gregory IX.

High ambitions and variable evolution are characteristic for the latter part of Coloman's title. Beginning in 1229, Coloman styles himself in his charters as the *rex Ruthenorum et dux totius Sclauoniae*. In the narrowest sense of the term, Slavonia expanded on the territory between the Drava and Sava rivers in Croatia; however, Coloman's duchy included the entire Croatia and Dalmatia and he obviously wanted more, as Bosnia attracted his intense attention, too. The notion of *tota Sclauonia* clearly indicated broader territorial ambitions either in the sense of the Franciscan

Galicia is a kingdom. Ladislav is its eternal ruler. This is where we come across the only crowned king of Galicia before 1241 – Coloman of Galicia. It was him (Coloman), more than any other Arpadian (before and after), who needed to establish such historical and sacred rights. However, it is worth noting that Coloman derived these rights not from some random Arpad, but he did so directly from Saint Ladislav, another saint of the House of Arpad. According to the chronicler, Saint Ladislav is "dedicated to God" – Deo dedicatus. [translated by Nataša Procházková].

²¹ CDCr 3, nr. 249, p. 278: "...filius noster Colomanus Dei gratia Ruthenorum rex, et liberalitate nostri Dux Dalmatie atque Croatiae..."

²² CDCr 3, nr. 231 pp. 258–259: "...nos Collomanus Dei gratia rex Ruthenorum et largitate gloriosi patris nostri Andree Ungarorum regis dux Dalmacie atque Croacie..."

²³ CDCr 3, nr. 266, p. 299; Ibidem, nr. 304, pp. 346–347; Ibidem, nr. 323, p. 369.

²⁴ *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae* (deinde CDSI), vol. 1. Ed.: Richard MARSINA. Bratislavae: Obzor, 1971, nr. 359, p. 256; cfr. CDCr, nr. 304, pp. 346–347; Ibidem, nr. 331, p. 384, nr. 367, p. 424, etc.

²⁵ CDSI 1, nr. 359, p. 256.

²⁶ MARCI *Chronicon de gestis Hungarorum. Ab origine gentis ad annum 1330 producta*. Ed.: Franc TOLDY. Pestini: Typis Gust. Emich, 1867, p. 223. *Obrázková kronika*. In: *Kroniky stredovekého Slovenska*. Ed. et trans. Július ŠOPKO. Budmerice: Rak, 1995, pp. 60–61.

²⁷ On the contrary, Danilo of Galicia was most probably crowned as *rex Russiae* in 1253. More on this subject, DĄBROWSKI, Dariusz: *Daniel Romanowicz król Rusi (ok. 1201–1264)*. *Biografia polityczna*. Kraków: Avalon, 2012.

thirteenth-century concept of *Sclavonia* – i. e., the Slavic land, denoting the territory inhabited by Southern Slavs, or the territory of Western and Southern Slavs within the Hungarian Kingdom including the region of Spiš in eastern Slovakia and adjacent regions.²⁸

In his own charters, Coloman uses his titles relatively consistently. Interestingly enough, after 1232 his chancellor, the provost of Zagreb, *magister* Filo, starts omitting the royal attribute *Ruthenorum* in favour of a shorter title, *rex et dux totius Sclauoniae* (the king and duke of entire Slavonia/Slavic land).²⁹ For Coloman, who was active in several regions of the Hungarian Kingdom, in the northeast, south, and northwest in particular, the delimitation to Eastern Slavs only would have been too restrictive. Instead, the title of *rex et dux totius Sclauoniae* was less specific so as to generalize Coloman's claims and to allow for its bold far-reaching interpretations. Again, reflection of the ambiguous nature of the term Slavonia is found in the *HPC*, the author of which scholars associate with the court of Coloman of Galicia. In his view, *Sclauonia* was the original name of the country that Aquila (*Atila/Arpad*) later named Hungary.³⁰ Croatian historiography associated the title of *dux totius Sclauoniae* with Coloman's ambition to include Bosnia in the "entire Slavic land."³¹ However, it should be noted here that after Coloman's withdrawal from Bosnia, his office reintroduced a longer and more specific form of his royal title – *rex Ruthenorum*, while the term of "entire Slavonia" was maintained.³²

The perspective of contemporaries

Coloman's powerful contemporaries such as King Andrew II and Pope Gregory IX usually called him or referred to him simply as King Coloman (*Collomanus rex*),³³ while his brother, King Bela IV, obviously supported the titles that Coloman used

himself.³⁴ In this context, the papal office ostensibly failed to use the expression *dux totius Sclauoniae* in the latter part of Coloman's title. In the late 1220s, Gregory IX addressed Coloman as *rex Ruthenorum et dux Sclauoniae*.³⁵ In 1233, however, Gregory IX asked Coloman to provide the protection of his court to Princess Viola of Opole and her sons and to Coloman's mother-in-law, Princess Grimyslava of Sandomer (Pol. Sandomierz). On these occasions, the pope sees Coloman as *rex Sclauoniae*. In the letter to the bishop of Cumans from 1238, Gregory IX refers to Coloman as "the illustrious king and duke of Slavs" (*rex et dux Sclavorum illustris*). In addition, in the letter to the Benedictine abbot in Oradea (Varadin) (1238) concerning the financial compensation for the bishop of Bosnia Coloman is referred to as *rex illustris dux Sclavorum*.³⁶ Even in the crucial moment in the middle of 1240, when Gregory IX gives Coloman and the bishop of Zagreb, Stephen II Babonic, the authorisation to exclude the Bishopric of Zagreb from the competence of the Bishopric of Kalocsa and create a new church administration unit with a majority of Slavic population, the pope uses the title *rex et dux Sclavorum* ("King and Duke of the Slavs").³⁷

To put it briefly, there are occasions when the pope calls Coloman "the king of Slavonia/Slavic land." As we have mentioned above, it is highly risky to delimit exactly what the term of Slavonia meant in the contemporary context. The pope dealt with this problem in his own way and replaced the title of *rex Slavoniae* with a more specific term – *rex Sclavorum* ("the king of Slavs"). Again, we come across the shift of meaning from a territorial to a national and supra-territorial capacity. This pattern of transformation recurs in Coloman's titles.

The reasons why the pope addressed Coloman as the king of Slavs is not quite clear. There are two trails to follow if we want to find the origin of this title. One of them leads us to Svätopluk I the Great

²⁸ VEREŠOVÁ, Nora. Koncepcie geografického termínu Sclavinia v historických prameňoch 6.–14. storočia (PhD thesis). Bratislava: Filozofická fakulta UK, 2011, 426 p.

²⁹ CDCr 3, nr. 331, p. 384; Ibidem, nr. 358, p. 414; Ibidem, nr. 367, pp. 422–423, Ibidem 4, nr. 218, p. 252; etc.

³⁰ UPK, pp. 127–131.

³¹ Lujo MARGETIĆ: Neka pitanja ranije bosanske pravne povijesti. In: *Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta u Zagrebu*, a. 56, 2006, nr. 6, pp. 1742–1759.

³² CDCr 4, nr. 95, pp. 102 – 104; Ibidem, nr. 113, pp. 123–125.

³³ VMH 1, nr. 160, pp. 89–90.

³⁴ CDCr 4, nr. 44, p. 48; Ibidem, nr. 83, p. 89; CDSI, vol. 2, vol. 2. Ed.: Richard MARSINA. Bratislavae: Obzor, 1987, nr. 76, pp. 54–55, etc.

³⁵ CDH 3, p. 112.

³⁶ CDCr 4, nr. 50, p. 57.

³⁷ Ibidem, nr. 106, p. 114: "*Gregorius (IX) episcopus servus servorum dei carissimo in Christo filio Colomanno illustri regi et duci Sclavorum, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.*"

(Zuentepulc / Sventibald, etc.) who was addressed as the *rex Sclavorum* by Pope Stephen V in a letter *Quia te zelo* in 885.³⁸ Another historical ruler whom the pope addressed as the king of Slavs was Mihailo of Duklja (Lat. *Civitate Dioclitana*) in 1077.³⁹ In this respect it is remarkable that according to the *HPC*, the king of *Sclavonia* and Croatia should have resided in Split (*Spalatensis*).⁴⁰ Geographically, it is very close to the ancient archbishopric centre of Duklja. This is also where the *Chronicle of the Priest of Duklja* (deinde *CPD*) was written.⁴¹ Its author knows Svätopluk as the first crowned king of Slavs. Although the dating of the *CPD* is not clear, ranging from the twelfth to the fourteenth century, it is obvious that the author used older texts in his chronicle in order to satisfy contemporary political demands, similarly to the *HPC*.

Milutić explains the variety of titles given by the pope to Coloman by the former's efforts to tame Coloman's desire for Bosnia. In his analysis, he argues that the pope understood the concept of *tota Sclavonia* in Coloman's ducal title as denoting the territory of Southern Slavs including Bosnia, which was in conflict with the pope's preference of Ban Ninoslav as the Duke of Bosnia.⁴² In spite of this, the pattern of the transformation of

Coloman's titles from a territorial to an ethnical basis, *rex Galitiae* to *rex Ruthenorum* and *rex / dux Sclavoniae* to *rex / dux Sclavorum*, remains unexplained. We tend to agree with other scholars that this shift cannot be considered coincidental and calls for further research.

Conclusion

The evolution of Coloman's titles raises many questions. These various titles reflect Coloman's path of a medieval ruler who was looking for new ways of strengthening and expanding his powers. Coloman's decision-making is clearly independent, like that of a king. He revives the Slavic tradition of the Hungarian Kingdom but also brings up new ideas concerning the realm. Some of his original inputs were followed up by the future rulers and intellectuals of *Sclavonia*, Croatia and Dalmatia (Mauro Orbini, Vinko Pribojević and others), while others fell into oblivion after his violent death on the battlefield. It is quite thought-provoking to imagine how Coloman's successor would have dealt with the legacy of his titles. Unfortunately for our curiosity, Coloman died without a legitimate heir.

³⁸ *CDSI* 1, nr. 35, p. 25.

³⁹ *CDCr*, vol. 1. Ed.: Marko KOSTRENIĆ – Jakov STIPISIĆ et Miljen ŠAMŠALOVIČ. Zagreb: JAZU, 1967, nr. 123, p. 158.

⁴⁰ *UPK*, pp. 130 et 131.

⁴¹ LJETOPIS POPA DUKLJANINA: *Latinski tekst sa hrvatskim prijevodom i "Hrvatska kronika"*. Ed. Vladimir Mošin, trans. Stjepan MENCINGER – Vjekoslav ŠTEFANIĆ. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1950, pp. 11–36. Also – JOVANOVIĆ, Neven: Marulićev prijevod Hrvatske kronike i ovo izdanje. In: Marko MARULIĆ: *Latinska manja djela*, vol. 2. Split: Književni krug, 2011.

⁴² *Neka pitanja*, p. 1753.

Slovak and Southern Slavic Threads in the Genealogy of the Piast and Rurikid Dynasties in the Thirteenth Century

Slovenské a južnoslovanské motívy v genealógiách Rurikovcov a Piastovcov
v 13. storočí / Slovački i južnoslavenski motivi u genealogiji Rurikovića i Pjastovića
u 13. stoljeću

Some of the Piast and Rurikid marriages are linked in various ways with the history of Slovakia and the Southern Slavs. The best researched among them are the marriage of Coloman, son of Andrew II, with Salomea, daughter of Leszek the White, which strengthened the treaty of Spiš, and the matrimony of Leo, the son of Daniel Romanovich, Prince of Galicia and Vladimiria, with Constance, daughter of Bela IV, concluded in Zvolen. However, there is a group of less known marriages, or, as is often the case, marriages which raise controversy among researchers. As the first of them, let us mention the marriage of Casimir I of Opole with Viola, considered by some scholars to have been Bulgarian, by others Russian, or even a representative of the Arpadian dynasty. In my opinion, it is conceivable that the princess came from Dalmatia. This supposition is even more reliable and better documented than the previous ones. Then the article examines the marriage instigated by Daniel Romanovich, which linked Anastasia Alexandrovna, widow of Boleslas I, Prince of Mazovia, to a Hungarian nobleman Demetrius, who may have been identical with Demetrius the Older from the Aba family. Finally, it is worth mentioning the marriage of Mary, the daughter of Roman Danilovich and Gertrude Babenberg, with Joachim Gutkeled, son of Stephen, ban of Nitra and later the ban of Slavonia and the governor of Steier.

Keywords: Piast and Rurikid dynasties, dynastic marriages, thirteenth century, medieval Kingdom of Hungary, Galicia, Dalmacia, Croatia, Slovakia

It is very well known that in the thirteenth century, the relations between the Kingdom of Hungary and the individual Polish and Russian principalities, in particular those located in the south-western regions of the enormous areas under the rule of the Rurikids, were quite vibrant. Naturally, due to the subject framework of our conference, we will not pursue all relations of the whole Arpadian monarchy with its eastern and northern neighbours, but only within its Slovak and Southern-Slavic provinces. Moreover, so as not to overburden the content and to preserve its cohesiveness, we have

limited ourselves to present the connections occurring in the triangle outlined above.

Let us start with a reminder that the matrimonial alliances between the Arpadian, Piast and Rurik dynasties were made during the whole span – it can be said – of their interconnected existence.

We take note of the thirteenth-century marriages of the following members of the Polish and Hungarian ruling houses: Coloman, son of Andrew II, with Salomea, daughter of Leszek the White, and then also with the Russian princess Grimyslava (Nr. 1),¹ Boleslas the Chaste with Cunigunde

* Dariusz Dąbrowski, Kazimierz Wielki University in Bydgoszcz, Faculty of Humanities, Institute of History.

¹ From genealogical point of view, see in particular WERTNER, Mór: *Az Árpádok családi története*. Nagy-Becskerek: Pleitz Fer. Pál könyvnyomdája, 1892, pp. 448–452; BALZER, Oswald: *Genealogia Piastów*. Kraków: Avalon, 2005, pp. 480–488; JASIŃSKI, Kazimierz: Rodowód Piastów małopolskich i kujawskich. In: *Biblioteka Genealogiczna*, vol. 3. Ed.: Marek GÓRNY. Poznań – Wrocław: Wydawnictwo historyczne, 2001, pp. 39–43. As from the biographical or political perspective, see WŁODARSKI, Bronisław: Salomea królowa halicka (Karta z dziejów wprowadzenia zakonu klarysek do Polski). In: *Nasza Przeszłość*, a. 5, 1957, pp. 61–83; PROCHÁZKOVÁ, Nataša: Postavenie haličského kráľa a slavónskeho kniežaťa Kolomana z rodu Arpádovcov v uhorskej vnútornej a zahraničnej politike v prvej polovici 13. storočia. In: *Medea. Studia mediaevalia et antiqua*, a. 2, 1998 (http://www.geocities.com/zbornik_medea/medeall/halic.html); EADEM: Koloman Haličský na Spiši pred rokom 1241. In: *Terra Scepusiensis. Stan badań nad dziejami Spiszu*. Ed.: Ryszard GŁADKIEWICZ – Martin HOMZA. Levoča – Wrocław: Kláštorisko n. o. – Centrum Badań Śląskoznawczych i Bohemistycznych Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2003, pp. 243–249.

(Kinga), daughter of Bela IV (Nr. 2);² Boleslas the Pious with Jolenta (Helena), daughter of Bela IV (Nr. 3);³ Fenenna, daughter of Ziemomysł, Prince of Inowrocław (that is, the niece of Leszek the Black and Wladislaus Łokietek/the Elbow-high), with Andrew III (Nr. 4);⁴ This list should also include the marriage of the prince of Opole, Casimir I, with Viola (Nr. 5);⁵ of an ancestry arising some controversy among scholars; and the marriage of Leszek the Black with Grifina (Agrippina), the daughter of Rostislav Mikhailovich, a member

of the Rurikid house residing in Hungary, and Anna, daughter of Bela IV (Nr. 6).⁶

During the same century the following Russian-Hungarian dynastic matrimonial connections occurred: the betrothal of Daniel Romanovich with a daughter of Andrew II, presumably Maria, wedded later to Bulgarian tsar Ivan Asen II (Nr. 7);⁷ the marriage of Maria, daughter of Mstislav Mstislavich the Brave (Udaly), with Andrew, son of Andrew II (Nr. 8);⁸ the marriage of Rostislav Mikhailovich with Anna, daughter of Bela IV (Nr. 9);⁹ the marriage of

² Competent information on this marriage is contained in the works WERTNER, Mór: *Az Árpádok családi története*, pp. 485–488; BALZER, Oswald: *Genealogia Piastów*, pp. 488–496; JASIŃSKI, Kazimierz: *Rodowód Piastów małopolskich i kujawskich*, pp. 43–49.

³ For information on this marriage, see: WERTNER, Mór: *Az Árpádok családi története*, pp. 489–491; BALZER, Oswald: *Genealogia Piastów małopolskich i kujawskich*, pp. 403–410; JASIŃSKI, Kazimierz: *Genealogia Piastów wielkopolskich. Potomstwo Władysława Odonica*. In: *Kronika miasta Poznania. Nasi Piastowie*. Poznań, 1995, nr. 2, pp. 41–43.

⁴ For most exhaustive information on this marriage, see: WERTNER, Mór: *Az Árpádok családi története*, pp. 566–574; BALZER, Oswald: *Genealogia Piastów*, pp. 615–621; JASIŃSKI, Kazimierz: *Rodowód Piastów małopolskich i kujawskich*, pp. 137–139.

⁵ Selected issues concerning this marriage are taken up further on, with source references and appropriate literature.

⁶ On this marriage, see: BALZER, Oswald: *Genealogia Piastów*, pp. 577–583; JASIŃSKI, Kazimierz: *Rodowód Piastów małopolskich i kujawskich*, pp. 95–104.

⁷ Currently the broadest information about this relation is contained in: DĄBROWSKI, Dariusz: *Rodowód Romanowiczów książąt halicko-wołyńskich*. In: *Biblioteka Genealogiczna*, vol. 6. Ed.: Marek GÓRNY. Poznań – Wrocław: Wydawnictwo historyczne, 2002, pp. 62–67; IDEM: *Genealogia Mściśławowiczów. Pierwsze pokolenia (do początku XIV wieku)*. Kraków: Avalon, 2008, pp. 311–313. On subsequent fate of the daughter of Andrew II, see: BOŽILOV, Ivan: *Familijata na Asenevci (1186–1460) genealogija i prosopografija*. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata akademija na naukite, 1994, pp. 78, 84, 87. See also WERTNER, Mór: *Az Árpádok családi története*, pp. 436–438.

⁸ See e.g.: WERTNER, Mór: *Az Árpádok családi története*, pp. 452–456; DĄBROWSKI, Dariusz: *Genealogia Mściśławowiczów*, pp. 566–570.

⁹ Some of the issues related to the marriage of Rostislav Mikhailovich with Anna, rather well-known in the literature, generate controversies. One of them concerns its timing. According to different researchers the marriage took place in 1242, 1243, or 1244. See, for instance: WERTNER, Mór: *Boris und Rostislav, Beitrag zur Geschichte der russisch-polnisch-ungarischen Beziehungen*, part 2: *Rostislav von Halics und seine Familie*. In: *Vierteljahrsschrift für Heraldik, Sphragistik und Genealogie*, a. 17, 1889, pp. 181; IDEM: *Az Árpádok családi története*, pp. 463–475 (1243); ZOTOV, Vladimirovič Rafail: *O černigovskich knjaz'jach po ljubeckomu sinodiku i o Černigskom knjažestvoje v tatarskoe vremja*. Sankt Peterburg: Izdat. Archeogr. Komm., 1892, p. 284 (1243); HRUŠEVSKIJ, Michail: *Chronolohija podij Halyc'ko-Volyns'koi litopyisy*. In: *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeni Ševčenko*, a. 41, 1901, nr. 3, p. 31 (1243–1244, most likely in 1243); NICOLAS DE BAUMGARTEN: *Généalogies et mariages occidentaux des Rurikides Russes du Xe au XIIIe siècle*. In: *Orientalia Christiana*, vol. 9/1. Roma: Pont. institutum orientalium studiorum, 1928, nr. 35, tab. XII (1244); FLOROVSKIJ, Antonij Vasuľevič: *Čechi i Vostočnye Slavjane: Očerki po istorii češko-russkich otnošenij (X–XVIII vv.)*, vol. 1. Praha: Orbis, 1935, p. 216 (1243); DWORZACZEK, Włodzimierz: *Genealogia*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1959, tab. 85 (1243); PAŠUTO, T. Vladimír: *Vnešnjaja politika Drevnej Rusi*. Moskva: Nauka, 1968, p. 299 (end of 1242); DIMNIK, Martin: *Mikhail, Prince of Chernigov and Grand Prince of Kiev 1224–1246*. In: *Studies and Texts. Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, vol. 52. Ed.: IDEM, 1981, p. 122, nota 93 (the author claims that the marriage between Rostislav and Anna had to take place soon after the arrival of the prince of Chernigov at the court of Bela IV, that is, shortly after March 1242. In one of his later works, Dimnik specified the time *post quem* of this event, indicating that Bela IV gave his daughter in marriage to Rostislav following the return from Dalmatia, that is, after May 1242); IDEM: *The Dynasty of Chernigov 1146–1246*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 364–365; *Europäische Stammtafeln. Stammtafeln zur Geschichte Europäischen Staaten. Neue Folge*, vol. 2. Ed.: SCHWENNICKER, Detlev. Marburg: Stargardt, 1984, tab. 131, 155 (1243); DONSKOJ, Dimitri: *Spravočnik po genealogii Rjurikovčevj, nr. 1 (sередина IX–načalo XIV v.)*. Renn: Rennes Univ. de Haute Bretagne, 1991, p. 163, nr. 468 (1244); *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. század)*. Ed.: Gyula KRISTÓ. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1994, p. 65 (tab. Árpádok 5–1243); VOJTOVYČ, Leontij: *Udil'ni knjazivstvo Rjurykovyčiv i Hedyminovyčiv u XII–XVI st.*, L'viv: Nacional'na Akad. Nauk Ukraïny, Inst. Ukraïnoznavstva im. I. Krypjakovyča, 1996, tab. 9 (ca. 1244). The author upholds this view in his latest genealogical works: *Knjaziv'ski dynastii Schidnoi Evropy (kinca' IX–počatok XVI st.): sklad, suspil'na i polityčna rol'*. *Istoryko-genealohične doslidžennja*. L'viv: Inst. Ukraïnoznavstva im. I. Krypjakovyča NAN Ukraïny, 2000, p. 184; IDEM: *Knjaža doba na Rusi: Portrety elity*. Bila Cerkva: Pšonkivs'kyj, 2006, p. 419 (in 1244); JASIŃSKI, Kazimierz: *Rodowód Piastów małopolskich i kujawskich*, p. 100 (1243); FONT, Márta: *Árpád-házi királyok és Rurikida fejedelmek*. Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2005, pp. 245, 262 (1243); HARDI, Đjura: *Rostislav Michajlovič "Dominus de Machou"*. In: *Studia Balcanica Bohemo-Slovaca*, a. 6, 2006, p. 66 (1242 or 1243); DĄBROWSKI, Dariusz: *Stosunki polityczne między królem Węgier Bela IV, niektórymi książętami polskimi i Romanowiczami w latach 1242–1250 (ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem kwestii matrymonialnych)*. In: *Polska w kregu polityki, kultury i gospodarki europejskiej. Księga pamiątkowa z okazji 70-lecia urodzin prof. Maksymiliana Grzegorza*. Ed.: Zbigniew ZYGLEWSKI. Bydgoszcz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kazimierza Wielkiego, 2007, p. 46 and nota 4 (soon after March 1242, although it cannot be excluded that even at the beginning of 1244). Here I would like to revise my hitherto held opinion on the *post quem* timing of Rostislav's marriage. It turns out that the prince could not come to Hungary straight after March 1242 because the Galician campaign, in which

Leo/Lev Danilovich with Constance, daughter of Bela IV (Nr. 10).¹⁰

Here it would be worth remembering two other marriages, not fully of dynastic character, namely: Anastasia, daughter of Alexander Vsevolodovich with a Hungarian nobleman, as described in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, Demeter (Nr. 11);¹¹ Maria, daughter of Roman Danilovich and Gertrude Babenberg, with Joachim, son of Stephen, count of Nitra and then ban of Slavonia and governor of Steiermark (Nr. 12).¹²

However, not all of the above-mentioned unions will be considered: firstly, because they were not related in any particular way with Slovak or Southern Slavic provinces of the Arpadian monarchy; secondly, they have been researched sufficiently well and they do not raise any major controversies; and, thirdly, as in the particular case of the marriage of Maria, daughter of Roman and Gertrude, with Joachim Gutkeled, they associate in a purely formal manner with the Rurikid and Arpadian connections, whereas in reality they concern Hungarian-Austrian relations.¹³ Thus, the matrimonies or near matrimonies indicated by numbers 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 12 are excluded from our area of interest.

Now, having established the scope of topics covered in the paper let us move on to their presentation.

I shall commence with some minor observations concerning the union of Salomea, daughter of Leszek the White, with Coloman, basically well-known among researchers (Nr. 1). Firstly, I would like to bring forward the latest opinion about the genealogy of the Piast bride wedded to an Arpadian. Following Balzer, it has been generally accepted that she was the daughter of the prince of Łuck/Lutsk, Ingvar Yaroslavich.¹⁴ Yet, according to the findings of the author of this paper, Grimyslava, the wife of Leszek the White, belonged to another branch of the Ruriks. Her parents were probably Yaroslav Vladimirovich, the three-time ruler of Novgorod, and the daughter of voivode Švarn, a magnate of Czech or, less likely, Jass descent.¹⁵ From the point of view of our subject matter this detail is of no great consequence but it is worth mentioning since it is probably not known to our Croat, Serb, Slovak, and Hungarian colleagues. Secondly, it seems that the date of concluding the Hungarian-Lesser Poland alliance, generally referred to as the agreement of Spiš (*Zips*), is not as certain as it has been assumed. At that particular moment the alliance was just matrimonially strengthened by the betrothal of Salomea with Coloman. Until now it has been generally assumed that this arrangement was made around 1214,¹⁶ or, according to the finding of Bronisław Włodarski – it was accepted that it was

he took part and which could be dated only on the basis of the date of the return of the Batu Khan Mongols from Hungary and the Balkans, had taken place later than I have assumed so far. This is not the place to elaborate on this issue but the Batu army had to cross the Galician-Volhynian Rus and disperse Rostislav's units not earlier than during the late summer-autumn of 1242. Only then Rostislav ran away to Hungary. Thus, late summer-autumn 1242 would be the *post quem* date of his marriage to Anna. Finally, I would like to add that as much as Rostislav himself is concerned, his activity and his family played an important role in the South Slavic history, and in spite of the large body of literature, they are still worth studying from the point of view of our genealogical interest in the marriage of this ruler with the daughter of Bela IV, which goes beyond the scope of our subject matter.

¹⁰ Since further on I discuss certain information related to this union, I refer the readers to relevant works in the appropriate places of this paper.

¹¹ See nota 44–51.

¹² Until now, as far as I know, most information about this relation is provided by Hermann Meier (Gertrud Herzogin von Österreich und Steiermark. In: *Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereins für Steiermark*, a. 23, 1927, fasc. 1–4, pp. 20–21) and DĄBROWSKI, Dariusz: *Rodowód Romanowiczów*, pp. 230–231.

¹³ In my view, the aforementioned marriage still requires a good deal of research.

¹⁴ See, for example: BALZER, Oswald: *Genealogia Piastów*, pp. 462–465; Nicolas de BAUMGARTEN: *Généalogies et mariages*, tab. 14; DWORZACZEK, Włodzimierz: *Genealogia*, tab. 27; WYROZUMSKI, Jerzy: Grzymisława. In: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, tom. 9, Wrocław – Kraków – Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akad. Nauk, 1960, pp. 122–123; IDEM: Leszek Biały. In: *Ibidem*, tom. 17, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk: Zakład Narod. Im. Ossolińskich, 1972, s. 157; WŁODARSKI, Bronisław: *Polska i Ruś*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1966, pp. 44, 98; *Europäische Stammtafeln*, vol. 2. Ed.: Detlev SCHWENNICK, tab. 136; ŠČAVELEVA, Ivanovna Natal'ja: Russkie knjagini v Pol'se. In: *Vnešnjaia politika Drevnej Rusi*. Ed.: Vladimir Terent'evič PAŠUTO. Moskva: Nauka, 1968, pp. 119–120; DONSKOJ, Dimitri: *Spravočnik*, p. 172; TĘGOWSKI, Jan: Kontakty rodzinne dynastów polskich i ruskich w średniowieczu. In: *Między sobą. Szkice historyczne polsko-ukraińskie pod redakcją Teresy Chynczewskiej – Hennel i Natalii Jakowenko*. Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2000, pp. 22–24; JASIŃSKI, Kazimierz: *Rodowód Piastów małopolskich i kujawskich*, pp. 27–29; VOJTOVČ, Leontij: *Knjaža doba*, p. 496.

¹⁵ I dealt with this issue in another paper: DĄBROWSKI, Dariusz: Dwa ruskie małżeństwa Leszka Białego. Karta z dziejów Rusi halicko-wołyńskiej i stosunków polsko-ruskich w początkach XIII wieku. In: *Roczniki Historyczne*, a. 72, 2006, pp. 67–93. See also IDEM: *Genealogia Mściławowiczów*, pp. 334–337, 616–621, 687–689.

¹⁶ See, e. g.: BALZER, Oswald: *Genealogia Piastów*, pp. 482–483; Hruševskij, Michail: Chronolohija podij Halyc'ko-Volyns'koi litopysy, pp. 337, 380; IDEM: *Istoriija Ukraïny-Rusy*, p. 31; PAŠUTO, Vladimir T.: *Očerki po istorii Galicko-Volyns'koi*

concluded in autumn of that year.¹⁷ But compilation and comparative analysis of information contained in the group of Northern Russian sources (*Novgorod the Great* and *Rus' Zaleska chronicles*) narrating about the participation of Prince Mstislav Mstislavovich, so-called Bold, in this episode of the struggle for Galician throne, indicates that the agreement of Spiš was executed not earlier than in December 1214 or at the very beginning of the following year, or else – but this seems much less likely – at the time close to the date *ad quem* of July/beginning of August 1214.¹⁸

Let us now move to the second of the selected unions. That is – we would like to recall – the

marriage of a prince of Opole, Casimir I Mieszko-vich, with Viola (Nr. 5), which according to few complementary premises was concluded between 1212 and 1220, but certainly closer to the date *ad quem*.¹⁹ The only mention about this princess' filiation was given by the fifteenth-century Polish historiographer Jan Długosz. Under the year 1251 he added an intriguing piece of information while reporting on the death of Viola, the duchess of Opole: “*genere et nacione Bulgara*”.²⁰ In scant documents issued by that person or pertaining to her,²¹ in other historiographic records preceding Długosz,²² in her obituary note in Czarnowaz monastery,²³ and in the sphragistic material²⁴ we

Rusi. Moskva: AN SSSR, 1950, p. 200; STÖKL, Günther: Das Fürstentum Galizien-Wolhynien. In: *Handbuch der Geschichte Russlands*, vol. 1 (*bis* 1613). Ed.: Manfred HELLMANN. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1981, pp. 510–511; PERFECKY, A. George: Hungary and the Hungarians in the Galician-Volynian Chronicle. In: *Hungarian Studies*, a. 3, 1987, nr. 1–2, p. 22; FENNEL, Džon: *Krizis srednevekovoj Rusi*. Moskva: Progress, 1989, p. 75; KRYP'JAKEVYČ, Ivan: *Halyc'ko-Volyns'ke knjazivstvo. Druhe vydannja iz zminamy i dopovnenjamy*. L'viv: Nacional'na Akademija Nauk Ukraïny, Instytut Ukraïnoznavstva im. I. Kryp'jakevyča, 1999, p. 116; KOTLIAR, Mykola: *Danylo Halyc'kyj*. Kyïv: Kyïv Ynst. Ystorii Ukraïny NANU, 2001, p. 28; IDEM: *Istoriya dyplomatii Pivdenno-zachidnoi Rusi*. Kyïv: Nacionalna Akad. Nauk Ukrainy – Inst. Istorii Ukrainy, 2002, p. 106; VOJTROVYČ, Viktorovich Leontij: Korol' Danylo Romanovyč: polityk i polkovodec' In: *Doba korolja Danyla v nauci, mystectvi, literature*. Ed.: Myrosław OTKOVYČ. L'viv: Hromads'ka Orhanizacija Mystec'kyj Fond imeni Korolja Danila, 2008, p. 48.

¹⁷ WŁODARSKI, Bronisław: *Polityka ruska Leszka Białego*. Lwów: Nakł. Tow. Naukowego, 1925, p. 52; IDEM: *Polska i Ruś*, p. 58; MACHNOVEC, Leonid: *Litopys rus'kyj za Ipats'kym spyskom*. Kyïv: Vydavnytvo Dnipro, 1989, p. 374; HARDI, Đjura: *Naslednici Kijeva izmedju kraljevske krune i tatarskog jarma. Studija o državno-pravnom položaju galičke i galičko-volinske kneževine do 1264. godine*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu, Katedra za istoriju, 2002, p. 134; FONT, Márta: *Árpád-házi királyok*, p. 225; HOLLÝ, Karol: *Kňažná Salomea a uhorskopolské vzťahy v rokoch 1214–1241*. In: *Historický časopis*, a. 53, 2005, nr. 1, p. 7; NAGIRNYI, Vitalij: *Polityka zagraniczna księstw ziemi halickiej i wołyńskiej w latach 1198 (1199)–1264*, Kraków: Polska Akad. Umiejętności, 2011, p. 171. Oleksandr Holovko, who, without providing the grounds for his views, assumed that the Congress of Spiš took place in 1214 (HOLOVKO, Olexandr: *Korona Danyla Halyc'koho. Volyn' i Halyčyna v deržavno – polityčnomu rozvytku Central'no-Schidnoi Evropy rann'oho ta klasyčnogo serednoviččja*. Kyïv: Stylos, 2006, p. 276).

¹⁸ This problem was discussed in detail in my paper (Vstuplenie Mstislava Mstislaviča v bor'bu za Galič. In: *Srednevekovaja Rus'*, a. 10, 2012, Jndrik, pp. 173–179, 188–189).

¹⁹ JASIŃSKI, Kazimierz: *Rodowód Piastów śląskich: Piastowie wrocławscy, legnicko-brzescy, świdniccy, ziębiccy, głogowscy, żagańscy, oleśniccy, opolscy, cieszyńscy i oświęcimscy*. Kraków: Avalon, 2007, p. 502.

²⁰ *Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*, vol. 7. Ed.: Sophia BUDKOWA. Varsaviae: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1975, p. 76: [Under 1251 year] “*Viola genere et nacione Bulgara, ducissa de Oppol moritur.*” This note – as it was emphasised by the editors of the work and noticed by scholars – Długosz himself added to the text proper.

²¹ See: *Schlesisches Urkundenbuch*, vol. 1, tom. 2, Ed.: Heinrich APPELT. Graz – Wien – Köln: Hermann Böhlau, 1968, nr. 291 (aforementioned official of the aforementioned nameless duchess), nr. 319 (The document from 1230 issued by Viola herself); *Ibidem*, vol. 2, Ed.: Winfried IRGANG. Wien – Köln – Graz: Böhlau, 1977, nr. 1 (“*ducissa de Opol*” mentioned in the list of witnesses), nr. 50 (protective bull of George IX from 3. December 1233 for: “*V(iole) vidue ducisse de Opol*”, nr. 52 (bull by George IX from 23. December 1233 r. to Polish hierarchs on the care for Viola, described in the identical way as in the preceding document), nr. 80 (In the list of witnesses of a document of Prince Henry I from 1234 for a monastery in Czarnowaz from 1234 mentioned as: “*dilecta nuru nostra relicta ducis Casimiri*”), nr. 105 (Viola's own document from 1235, where she appears as: “*Vi(ola) [...] relicta domini ducis Cazymiri*”), nr. 120 (in the list of witnesses of the document of the Opole castellan Zbrostaw from 1236, as: “*V(iole) illustris ducisse de Opol*”), nr. 156 (Viola's own document from 1238, where she appears as: “*Viola dei gratia ducissa de Kalisz et de Ruda*”), nr. 166 (in the donation of her son Mieszko, from 1239, for the All Saints' hospital in Wrocław, made on the agreement and advice of: “*dilectae matris nostrae dominae Viola*”), nr. 243 (her own document from 1243, where she appears as: “*V(iola) dei gratia ducissa de Kalis*”, nr. 244 (in the list of witnesses of the document of the prince of Opole, Mieszko Casimirovich/Kazimierzowic, from 1243, as: “*domina matre nostra Viola*”), nr. 295 (in the will of her son, Mieszko, nameless). See also nota 35. Finally, it is worth mentioning that a part of the quoted records fully confirm that the name of Casimir's wife was Viola (concerning the doubt in this matter, see nota 25).

²² I know of only one historiographic record preceding Długosz. It is the obituary note recorded by Upper Silesian Annals (*Rocznik górnośląski*). In: *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. 3. Ed.: August BIEŁOWSKI. Lwów: W Komisie księgarni gubrynowicza i Schmidta, 1878 [reprint Warszawa 1961], p. 715: “*1251 Fridericus in excommunicatione obiit. Et Viola domina de Opil obiit*”.

²³ *Necrolog des Kloster Czarnowanz*. Ed.: Wilhelm WATTENBACH. In: *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Geschichte und Alterthums Schlesiens*, a. 1, 1856, p. 228: “[7 Sept.] *Woyla Ducissa Oppoliensis*”.

²⁴ The imprint of Viola's seal is one of only three such thirteenth-century monuments belonging to Silesian duchesses which have been preserved (apart from Viola's imprint, we have also the imprints of the seal of Jadwiga/Hedwig, wife of Henryk I Brodaty (Henry I the Bearded), and of Anna, wife of Henryk II Pobożny (Henry II the Pious)). According to Marian

do not find any confirmation of the aforementioned Długosz's information. But under the year 1236 he gave some cognizance which caused quite a bit of confusion regarding Viola's biographic data. Namely, in the passage dealing with the death of Casimir I of Opole, while listing his progeny, he indicated that his offspring came into the world "ex Wenczeslawa ducissa [...]"²⁵

The mysterious question of Viola's descent caused more serious deliberation only, it seems, in Polish literature.²⁶ Four different concepts were formed concerning the filiation of Casimir of Opole's wife. In 1934 Stanisław Kętrzyński presented – incidentally in fact – an opinion that the duchess came from the circle of Latin houses, of Venetian or French lineage, settled in the eastern parts of the Latin empire, or else in small statehoods which emerged in the Balkans after the Fourth Crusade. The author based his conclusions on an onomastic criterion. He regarded Viola's appellation as belonging to Latin circle and noticed that Casimir had evidently married her as a result of "some unknown to us pilgrimage (...) to the Holy Land".²⁷ Towards the end of the sixth decade of the twentieth century Władysław Dzięwulski presented the reasoning which was to confirm the credibility of Długosz's note on Viola's Bulgarian descent. In his opinion the duchess was the daughter of the Bulgarian tsar Kaloyan (Ivan II, John II the Good, Caloiohannes) or one of his relatives,

and she received a name of Latin origin on the occasion of bestowed by Pope Innocent III consecration ceremony of Basil (7 November 1204), Latin archbishop of Bulgaria, and the coronation of Kaloyan, which took place on the following day. The Bulgarian princess could be given her name in honour of Cardinal Leo Brancaloni, originating from northern Italy, from which emanated the cult of St. Viola (Verona). The marriage of Casimir with Viola could take place during the return of the troops of Andrew II from the crusade through Bulgaria, the fact well confirmed by sources. An additional validation of the Opole duchess' descent is the occurrence of notables with the names Nicholas, son of Vasil/Basil, Laskarius and Vasil (Vasileus) in the entourage of hers and Casimir I as well as Mieszko II Casimirovich²⁸.

Wincenty Swoboda wrote a paper in which he made a critical assessment of these views. The researcher pointed out that the information on Viola's Bulgarian origin provided by Długosz may not be at all credible since it could have been done under the influence of the chronicler's knowledge about the titles of Rostislav Mikhailovich and the fact that his daughter Grifina was wedded to Leszek the Black. Apart from that, there were no political premises and favourable circumstances for a marriage of Casimir I of Opole with a representative of the Bulgarian ruling house – Andrew II was not accompanied in his crusade by

Gumowski, this is "actually the seal of majesty" of the type which does not appear in Germany but occurs in France, as it is also the case with the seal of Jadwiga/Hedwig (GUMOWSKI, Marian: *Pieczęcie śląskie do końca XIV wieku*. In: *Historja Śląska od najdawniejszych czasów do roku 1400*, vol. 3. Ed.: Władysław SEMKOWICZ. Kraków: Nakł. Polskiej akademji umiejętności, 1936, pp. 294–296). On the rim of the Viola's seal there is an inscription: "+ SIGILLVM·VIOLE·DUCISSE IN OPOLE". It shows a woman (duchess) sitting on a throne and two figures of young men on her sides (most probably Viola's sons: Mieszko and Wladislaus). See images of seal in: GUMOWSKI, Marian: *Pieczęcie śląskie do końca XIV wieku*, tab. 115, nr. 79; HORWAT, Jerzy: *Piastowie górnośląscy*. Bytom: Muzeum Górnośląskie, 2007, p. 27; while for the inscription on the rim, see for instance the comment on the document in: *Schlesisches Urkundenbuch*, vol. 2. Ed.: Winfried IRGANG, p. 53. Unfortunately, I am not qualified to comment on the typology of the Dalmatian, Bulgarian and Hungarian seals of the times, so as to compare them with the one used by the Opole duchess. But I can ascertain that during the period of our interest the Russian sigillography was altogether different (see in this matter: JANIN, L. Valentin: *Aktovye pečati Drevnej Rusi X–XV vv.*, vol. 1: *Pečati X–načala XIII v.*; *Ibidem*, vol. 2: *Novgorodskie pečati XIII–XV vv.*. Moskva: Nauka, 1970; JANIN, L. Valentin – GAJDUKOV, G. Petr: *Aktovye pečati Drevnej Rusi X–XV vv.*, vol. 3. *Pečati, zaregistrovannye v 1970–1996 gg.* Moskva: Nauka, 1998.

²⁵ *Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu Cronicae*, vol. 6. Ed.: Sophia BUĐKOWA et al. Varsaviae: Pánstw. Wydawn. Nauk, 1973, p. 276. Incidentally, Długosz gave wrong date of duchess' demise. Now I will not start a discussion as to the reasons for which the name Więcesława appeared in the quoted passage. I would like just to indicate that in literature it is generally accepted that Casimir had only one wife, the mother of his children. The duchess herself used solely the name Viola in her documents. This is how she was named in an obituary note.

²⁶ According to my knowledge, the German authors, following Długosz, accepted Viola's Bulgarian descent (see GROTEFEND, Hermann: *Stammtafeln der schlesischen Fürsten bis zum Jahre 1740*. Breslau: Max, 1889, tab. 6, p. 46, nr. 1; WUTKE, Konrad: *Stamm – und Übersichtstafeln der Schesischen Fürsten. Auf Grund von H. Grotefends Stammtafeln der schlesischen Fürsten bis zum Jahre 1740* (2. Aufl. 1889). Breslau: p. 1., 1911, tab. 6.

²⁷ KĘTRZYŃSKI, Stanisław: Ze studjów genealogicznych, part 2, Śmierć Władysława Łokietka. In: *Miesięcznik Heraldyczny*, a. 13, 1934, nr. 5, p. 67, nota 17.

²⁸ DZIEWULSKI, Władysław: Bułgarka księżną opolską. In: *Sobótka. Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny*, a. 24, 1969, fasc. 2, pp. 159–169. It contains also other arguments and references to sources and literature. See also IDEM: Odpowiedź na uwagi krytyczne Wincentego Swobody. In: *Studia i Materiały do Dziejów Wielkopolski i Pomorza*, a. 28, 1981, fasc. 2, pp. 181–182.

these Silesian princes, but by another Piast, Wladislaus Odonic, and additionally, one could not detect any good reason which would induce the rulers of Bulgaria to enter into kinship relations with an evidently unimportant lord of an exotic, from their point of view, Opole. Moreover, the names of the notables from the milieu of the above-mentioned Silesian princes, as well as the appellation (or appellations) of the duchess herself, do not constitute arguments for her Bulgarian lineage; they rather suggest links with Rus'. Thus, Swoboda, by questioning the basis of Dziewulski's reasoning, came to a conclusion that the progenitors of Casimir I Mieszkovich's wife should be searched for "within the sphere of Russian-Hungarian political connections of Leszek the White", while she could be: "an unknown Hungarian or West Russian princess, or else a representative of some mighty boyar houses."²⁹

Then quite recently, in 2007, the matter of our interest was discussed by Jerzy Horwat. He did not preclude the possibility of identifying Viola with a representative of the Arpadian dynasty, specifically with the daughter of Emeric, who ruled in period 1196–1204, or possibly with the daughter of Bela III, deceased in 1196, from his third marriage with the daughter of French king Louis VII, Margaret, whom he wedded in 1186. The Silesian author indicated on this occasion that Opole heraldry may have acquired the colours characteristic

of the French ruling house due to Viola's descent on mother's side from Capetian dynasty.³⁰

As it can be seen the presented concepts are, to a large degree, multi-storey hypotheses. This results from the poor condition of source material. Not having much place to present the detailed reasoning concerning Viola's lineage and leaving this task for another occasion, I would like, however, to make a note that there is still another possibility of resolving this riddle. My reasoning goes as follows. Similarly to a number of my predecessors I recognise that it was the ruler of Silesian Opole who took part in the crusade of the Hungarian king Andrew II to the Holy Land.³¹ It is known very well that the crusader units took off from Split on their maritime route to their goal. Thus, Casimir's sojourn in Dalmatia would be confirmed. It is interesting that one known document originating in this area was issued in September 1208 by Viola, a nun of the congregation *tituli Sanctae Mariae*, the former abbess of St. Demeter monastery in Zadar.³² I do not know anything more about this person as I have not found any other source information about her.³³ Obviously, she was not the same person as her namesake who became the duchess of Opole some ten years later. Nevertheless, we have a hundred percent confirmation of usage of the appellation Viola by some aristocratic Dalmatian house. I do not

²⁹ SWOBODA, Wincenty: Księżna kaliska Bułgarka? Przyczynek do rozbioru krytycznego Annalium Długosza. In: *Studia i Materiały do Dziejów Wielkopolski i Pomorza*, a. 13, 1980, fasc. 2, pp. 61–78; IDEM: Bułgarzy i Bułgaria w oczach Polaków XII–XVII w. In: *Balkanica Posnaniensia*, a. 2, 1985, pp. 244–245; IDEM: Replika [Władysławowi Dziewulskiemu]. In: *Studia i Materiały do Dziejów Wielkopolski i Pomorza*, a. 14, 1981, fasc. 2, pp. 183–184.

³⁰ HORWAT, Jerzy: *Piastowie górnośląscy*, pp. 24–30. In the quoted work we find very reliably reported history of deliberations on Viola's descent. The hypothesis of her descent from the Hungarian royal family is only a supposition without any basis in source materials. On this occasion we would like to remind that Wincenty Swoboda – as it seems, rightly – raised the matter of incongruity of a union between a daughter of a Bulgarian tsar and a minor Silesian prince. The disproportion between this prince and a Hungarian princess royal would be even greater. Apart from that, Viola's kingly lineage would be surely noted in the admittedly few records referring to her. I pass over the fact that literature does not record an existence of Emeric's or Bela III's daughter who could be wedded to Casimir of Opole. I would like to add here that the considerations on the influence of the French heraldic tradition on colour arrangement of Opole coat-of-arms was presented by Horwat, following KAGANIEC, Małgorzata: *Heraldyka Piastów śląskich 1146–1707*. Katowice: Muzeum Śląskie, 1992, pp. 77–78. Here it will be necessary to refer to the remarks by Sylwiusz Mikucki, who observed that during the period of our interest the unchanging heraldic colours were not yet settled neither in Silesia nor in the countries of Western Europe. There, this process took place around 1230 and led to the establishment of heraldic colours towards the end of the thirteenth century (MIKUCKI, Sylwiusz: *Heraldyka Piastów śląskich do schyłku XIV w.* In: *Historja Śląska od najdawniejszych czasów do roku 1400*, vol. 3. Ed.: Władysław Aleksander SEMKOWICZ. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1936, p. 533. In this situation the conclusions of Kaganiec and Horwat become groundless.

³¹ Mikołaj Gładysz lately examined the opinion concerning the identification of a Piast partaking in the Fifth Crusade on the side of the Hungarians. By analysing the available source material he came to a conclusion that it may only pertain to Casimir I of Opole (*Zapomniani krzyżowcy. Polska wobec ruchu krucjatowego w XII–XIII wieku*. Warszawa: DiG, 2002, pp. 156–169).

³² *Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus continuatus*. Ed.: Gusztáv WENZEL, vol. 6. Pest: Eggenberger Ferdinánd Akademiai, 1867, nr. 204 (electronic edition: *Collectiones digitales diplomaticae Hungariae*, Budapest: Arcanum, 2005. See also: *Regesta documentorum Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae saeculi XIII*. Ed.: Ivan SAKCINSKI-KUKULJEVIĆ. Zagrabia: Typis officinae societatis typographicae, 1896, nr. 74; *Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, vol. 3: *Diplomata annorum 1201–1235*. Ed.: Tadija SMIČIKLAS. Zagreb: Tisak Dionicke tiskare, 1905, nr. 69.

³³ In search for information about Viola I checked the following source publications: *Regesta documentorum Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae saeculi XIII*. Ed.: Ivan SAKCINSKI-KUKULJEVIĆ; *Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, vol. 2. Ed.: Tadija SMIČIKLAS. Zagreb: Tisak Dionicke tiskare, 1904.

doubt that it had to be an important house since its representative became an abbess of a congregation of nuns. A matrimonial union between a minor Piast prince and a member of some local, largely autonomous and prosperous aristocracy, brought about under the patronage of Andrew II, can be assumed as fully acceptable. Moreover, in my opinion it fits surprisingly well with the next premise concerning Dalmatian descent of Casimir's I wife. Namely, on December 5, 1233 Pope Gregory IX took the duchess of Opole under his care – the widow, her sons, the land and the property.³⁴ On December 23 of the same year, he wrote a letter to the king of *Sclavonia*, Coloman, asking him to assure the protection of the aforementioned woman.³⁵ This fact suggests the existence of a link between Coloman, the ruler of Dalmatian and Balkan provinces of the Arpadian monarchy, and the widow of Casimir I. Was it not, by any chance, a dependency resulting from Viola's descent from a region under the reign of the above-mentioned son of Andrew II? Let us further note that at the same time Gregory IX appointed Coloman as the protector of Grimyslava of Sandomierz,³⁶ which was without doubt related to specific relations existing between them. Indeed, the Hungarian prince royal was the son-in-law of the widow of Leszek the White.

I would also like to point out that Viola's association with Bulgarian tsars' family, as very splendid, would be most probably noticed by the Silesian or other Polish sources. Yet, we do not have any such records.

In any case, at the current state of research I am inclined to say that the supposition of Viola's Dalmatian descent is at least as valid as the others.

As to the marriage of Leo/Lev Danilovich with Constance, daughter of Bela IV (Nr. 10), which I believe is well known to researchers from all the countries participating in the conference, I would like to turn attention to the matter of its timing. By analysing the source records known to me, I assumed in a work published in 2002 that the marriage of Leo with Constance had to be concluded between the middle of 1246 and the middle of the following year. I upheld that view several times in later period.³⁷ Meanwhile, in 2008, there appeared a paper by Pavol Maliniak, who, following the itinerary of Bela IV and at the same time referring to an article by Toru Senga (not used by myself), came to a conclusion consistent with the view of Marta Font, that the marriage of Leo with Constance and related Russian-Hungarian alliance was most likely brought about in August 1247.³⁸ While agreeing with the Slovak researcher's opinion on the role of studies concerning the itinerary of Bela IV in establishing the date of concluding the covenant of Zvolen, I would like to point out that he did not consider my reasoning in the matter of our interest. Yet – as I believe – it would cause verification of his views. Maliniak rightly observed that the preserved documents confirm two sojourns of the Hungarian monarch in Zvolen at the time when undoubtedly Leo and Constance were married. First of those stays took place between August 2 and September 11, 1247.³⁹ The Slovak researcher very appropriately noticed the necessity of accepting the date *ad quem* of establishing the Russian-Hungarian alliance enforced by the marriage had to fall before the death of Conrad I of Mazovia (August 31, 1247), which is indicated by the order of records contained in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*.

³⁴ *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis* (deinde CDH), vol. 3, tom. 2. Ed.: Georgius FEJÉR. Budae: Typis typographiae Regiae Vniversitatis Vngaricae, 1829, p. 373.

³⁵ CDH 3/2, pp. 373–374. This bull was used in the discussion on Viola's descent already by Wincenty Swoboda. The author knew it, however, only from registers published by Potthast.

³⁶ *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, vol. 1. Ed.: Augustin THEINER. Romae: Typis Vaticanis, 1859, nr. 104.

³⁷ DĄBROWSKI, Dariusz: Stosunki polityczne między królem Węgier Belą IV, niektórymi książętami polskimi i Romanowiczami w latach 1242–1250 (ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem kwestii matrymonialnych). In: *Polska w kręgu polityki, kultury i gospodarki europejskiej. Księga pamiątkowa z okazji 70-lecia urodzin prof. Maksymiliana Grzegorza*. Ed.: Zbigniew ZYGLEWSKI. Bydgoszcz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kazimierza Wielkiego, 2007, p. 53; IDEM: *Genealogia Mściławowiczów*, p. 356.

³⁸ MALINIAK, Pavol: K sobášnej politike Bela IV. Dynastická svadba vo Zvolene a jej reflexie v historiografii. In: *Historický časopis*, a. 56, 2008, nr. 1, pp. 127–133. As I have already mentioned, the author was referring to the article of SENGA, Toru: IV. Béla külpolitikája és IV. Ince pápához intézett „Tatár-levele”. In: *Századok*, a. 121, 1987, fasc. 4, pp. 588–594. See also: FONT, Márta: *Árpád-házi királyok*, pp. 250, 263. [Editor's note: However, according to Martin Homza, Pavol Maliniak does not acknowledge in his article that he has used mostly the works by BAČOVÁ, Jana: *Uhorsko-poľsko-ruské vzťahy v kontexte vojny o babenberské dedičstvo*. Diplomová práca (Diploma Thesis). Comenius University Bratislava. Department of Slovak history, 2007, pp. 30–40, based on her earlier seminar papers, later developed in EADEM: *Legitimacy – Superiority – Subordination: The Image of Danil Romanovich in the Context of Foreign Affairs in the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*. MA Thesis. Budapest: Department of Medieval Studies, Central European University, 2010].

³⁹ *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Slovaciae*, vol. 2. Ed.: Richard MARSINA. Bratislavae: Obzor, 1987, nr. 224 (11 IX 1246), nr. 225 (27 IX 1246), nr. 263 (3 VIII 1247), nr. 267 (12 VIII 1247), nr. 269 (11 IX 1247).

However, there are still two other arguments concerning the dates of the discussed events which were not considered by Maliniak. Contrary to his conviction, the narration of *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* unequivocally informs on Cyril turning back from his voyage to Nicaea due to persuasion of Bela IV, and not after the return from Asia Minor, following the ordination. At that time the hierarchy of Rus' had not yet achieved the goal of his voyage. After coming back from Hungary, he participated in the council with his princes, the sons of Roman, and then together with Daniel and Leo he moved to Zvolen.⁴⁰ The first absence of Cyril from Galician-Volhynian Rus' was very short, it lasted maybe a month. I would comfortably place it in June or July 1246, since he obviously could not embark on a trip to Nicaea (today Iznik) earlier than after the return of Daniel from Orda. This reasoning confirms the possibility of finalising the Russian-Hungarian negotiations already between July and September of that year.

The second line of reasoning seems in turn in order to undermine the hypothesis on the marriage of Leo with Constance taking place between August 2 and September 11, 1247. It pertains to the fact that in the correspondence related to the negotiations between the Romanoviches and Innocent IV we find three papal bulls, issued correspondingly on August 27 (two) and September 12, 1247 (one), which were addressed to "*Danieli Ruscie et W[asy]lconi] fratri eius, Regibus et Nato eiusdem Danielis*".⁴¹ The selection of addressees clearly indicates that in the opinion of the Holy See the three representatives of the dynasty were holding autonomous positions in the state. This does not need to be explained in case of Daniel and Vasilko. However, an anonymous Danilovich remains there. In my opinion, it could not be anybody else but Leo, since he was the oldest of the living brothers and the only one whose political activity during that time is being confirmed.⁴²

Moreover, a marriage of this Danilovich with a Hungarian princess royal would constitute, from the point of view of Innocent IV, an excellent reason for distinguishing him as the addressee of the third bull. It would probably fully correspond to the real situation in the Romanoviches' state, because – which is quite credible – Leo, after wedding Constance, should have been given a separate domain. I do not think that the information on Hungarian-Rus' matrimonial arrangement could have reached Lyon sooner than in a month. Thus, since Innocent IV sent the letters to three Russian addressees already on August 27, 1247, it could not be assumed that Danilovich married the daughter of Bela IV between August 2 and September 11 of the same year.

The harmonisation of the presented arguments inclines me to stick to my dating of concluding the agreement of Zvolen with a complementing addition of its actual occurrence to the period between 11 and 27 September 1246, when Bela IV was certainly sojourning in this place.⁴³

Finally, we are left with the last union to discuss, namely, the marriage of Anastasia Alexandrovna with the Hungarian boyar Demeter (Nr. 11). We know about him only from a separate record of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*. It is worth quoting it verbatim so as to grasp the context of the discussed events. The above-mentioned old Russian source states under 6759 (actually 1247) as follows: "*potom že syn ego [Konrad's I] umre Bolesav. Mazoveš'skyi knjaz' i vdast' Mazoveš'. bratu svoemu Somovitovi poslušav knjazja. Danila. bje bo bratučada ego za nim. doči Aleksandrova. imenem' Nastas'ja. jaže posjaže potom za bojarina Ugor'skogo. imenem Dmitra. v ta že ljeta sede Samovit vo Mazoši.*"⁴⁴ As it can be seen perfectly well, we have here a clearly indicated princess descent on paternal side, her kinship with Daniel Romanovich, the fact of marrying the prince of Mazovia, Boleslas I Conradovich, and then

⁴⁰ Ipat'evskaja letopis. In: *Pol'noe Sobranie Russkich Letopisej*, vol. 2. Ed.: Aleksej D. KOŠELEV. Moskva: Izdat. Vostočnoj Literaturny u.a., 2001, col. 809.

⁴¹ *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantia (1075–1953)*, vol. 1: 1075–1700. Ed.: Athanasius G. WELYKYJ, Romae: PP. Basiliani, 1951 (= *Analecta OSBM. Series 2, Sectio 3*), nr. 20, 21, 25.

⁴² Already in 1240 Leo was chosen by his father as a candidate for marrying one of the daughters of Bela IV. For this purpose they travelled together to Hungary (*Ipat'evskaja letopis'*, col. 787). Then, in 1244, certainly as a very young man, he commanded the units sent against Rostislav Michajłowicz (*Ibidem*, col. 797), and the following year participated in person in the battle of Jarosław (*Ibidem*, col. 802, 804–805). It ought to be added that Heraklius, who was older than Leo, had probably died before 1240, while the younger Danilowiches started to appear in the sources a good while later – Roman from 1251/1252, Szwarno from 1254, and Mstislav (II), from 1271. See: DĄBROWSKI, Dariusz: *Rodowód Romanowiczów*, pp. 99–139, 153–154, 166–180. Thus, in 1246 only Leo could be taken into account as the potential spouse for the daughter of Bela IV, which was in fact a fulfilment of the matrimonial plans which Daniel had in his regard in 1240.

⁴³ My opinion in the matter is therefore almost identical with the findings of Toru Senga (IV. Béla külpolitikája, pp. 588–594).

⁴⁴ *Ipat'evskaja letopis'*, col. 810.

a Hungarian official Demeter. The analysed passage reveals also the causative role of Daniel, who probably decided about the fate of his widowed relative and found a new husband for her. We remember that at that time the Galician-Volhynian prince had a settled relationship with Hungarian king Bela IV, without whose consent a marriage of a Hungarian magnate with Rus' duchess would be rather impossible.

It is not very difficult to establish, unfortunately only an approximate date *post quem* of Anastasia's second wedding. Boleslas Conradovich died after April 17 (or else February 25) 1248 and before April 7 1249.⁴⁵ Apart from the name of the second husband and the description of his position, we do not know anything more about the marriage. The assumption that Demeter was a representative of the official elite of the Arpadian monarchy is only a guess, although a logical one and with a high degree of probability. Such a view has been present in Polish, Russian and Ukrainian literature for a long time. Arkadij Longinov, for instance – in reference to Ignaz Fessler – stated that Anastasia's husband was a famous commander who distinguished himself in the battle of Slaná/Sajó and in fights against Mongols in Dalmatia, "*Demether Lepolth*" from "Aba"⁴⁶ family. This opinion was also accepted by Hieronim Grala, who pointed out that in the identification of Longinov the name of the magnate can be of some help: "[the name] often used by adherents of Eastern Church, that is, mainly Slavs within the lands of the Hungarian crown."⁴⁷ Oswald Balzer took a much more cautious view in this matter. He indicated that it was difficult to decide which of the Hungarian noblemen bearing the name of Demeter had become the spouse of Anastasia, as there had been so many Demeters at that time. According to the Lviv researcher it would be a far-stretched assumption that the widow of a prince be given in marriage to some minor official. Bearing that in mind, Balzer was trying to find Anastasia's husband amongst Demeters who were confirmed in the post of court judge (*iudex curie*) in the years 1233, 1234, 1243, 1244, 1246 and 1263.⁴⁸

Now the author of this paper, following Balzer's reasoning, embarked upon an attempt to identify Demeter. Well, I am sorry to announce that the result of the effort cannot be considered as final. In any case, an analysis of diplomatic Hungarian sources leads to a conclusion that, presumably, Anastasia's husband was a certain Demeter the Older from Aba family, the teacher and pantler of Coloman, who was in Rus' at that time, a participant of the expedition of Andrew II to the Holy Land, then ban of Vásvár (*comitatus cantiferei*), Andrew's "*senescalus*" and "*magister dapiferorum*", the pantler of Coloman as the ruler of Slavonia, then, at the latest since 1233, the king's court judge and the count of Bakony. Acting meritoriously during the great Mongol invasion in the years 1243–1244, he appeared as "*iudex curie et comes musuniensis*", as well as the ban of Bodrog. What is interesting and important for our identification queries, there are premises allowing us to assume that Demeter was married twice. Namely, we have a document issued in 1263 by the chapter of Bakony concerning the meeting of three sons of Demeter, "*comes*" from Aba house. The encounter dealt with the matter of inheritance of "Nehche"⁴⁹ lands by Alexander (certainly already grown-up during the Mongol invasion) and Demeter, on one side, and Peter, on the other. Without a doubt, the property in question was Našice (currently in Croatia), which Coloman granted to Demeter in 1240,⁵⁰ while the dispute among the heirs suggests that they could have had different mothers.⁵¹

In case the presented identification would prove correct, we would be dealing with a situation in which the female representative of the Rurikid dynasty would be a spouse of a magnate connected through his career with the ruler of Sclavonia, owning property within contemporary Croatia and belonging to a house which played a significant role in the history of Slovakia. It would be difficult to find a better bracket for contemplating Piasts' and Ruriks' links with South Slavic and Slovak provinces of the Arpadian monarchy.

⁴⁵ BALZER, Oswald: *Genealogia Piastów*, pp. 499–501; JASIŃSKI, Kazimierz: *Rodowód Piastów małopolskich i kujawskich*, pp. 51–53.

⁴⁶ LONGINOV, Arkadi Vasiljevich: *Rodstvennyja svjazi russkich knjazej s ugorskim korolevskim domom*. In: *Trudy Vilenskago predvaritel'nago komiteta po ustrojstvu v Vil'ne IX Archeologičeskago sezda*. Vil'no: Predvaritelnyi komitet, 1893, p. 323.

⁴⁷ GRALA, Hieronim: *Rurykowicze na Bałkanach w XII i XIII wieku*. In: *Balkanica Posnaniensia*, a. 4, 1989, p. 140.

⁴⁸ BALZER, Oswald: *Genealogia Piastów*, pp. 505–506. Similarly cautious approach although presented with less detail was taken by Nicolas DE BAUMGARTEN: *Généalogies et mariages*, tab. 13 and VOJTOVYČ, Leontij: *Knjaža doba na Rusi*, p. 503.

⁴⁹ CDH 4/3, pp. 177–179.

⁵⁰ CDH 4/1, pp. 203–206.

⁵¹ DĄBROWSKI, Dariusz: *Genealogia Mściślawowiczów*, pp. 389–399.

I would like to end these, indeed very sketchy, deliberations with a certain methodological observation. In view of a breakdown of the scientific links between the individual countries of, generally speaking, Central-Eastern Europe and the Balkans over many recent years, it is worthwhile to attempt to create a platform for renewing and developing these contacts at every possible occasion. This paper constitute such, needless to say, very modest attempt, since it involves the themes of interest to Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian historians, which – in my opinion – could be properly

resolved only through the engagement of Bulgarian, Croatian, Serbian, and Hungarian researchers. In this case our Slovak colleagues are the natural connectors. Obviously, a similar process may go in the opposite direction, or, else, in many other territorial configurations. The necessity of cooperation and collective resolution of research problems is particularly well illustrated by these exempla – the studies on the marriages of Casimir I of Opole with Viola as well as Anastasia Alexandrovna with the Hungarian magnate Demeter.*

* Translated by Władysław BIBROWSKI.

Stephen of Anjou, the Lord of Spiš and Šariš, the Duke of Transylvania and Slavonia-Croatia-Dalmatia

Štefan z Anjou, pán Spiša a Šariša, sedmohradský, slavónsko-chorvátsko-dalmátsky vojvoda / Stjepan Anžuvina, gospodar Spiša i Šariša, sedmogradski (transilvanski) vojvoda i slavonsko-hrvatsko-dalmatinski herceg

Stephen, a younger brother of the Hungarian king Louis I, ruled three territories as a dux: Šariš and Spiš, Transylvania, and Slavonia-Croatia-Dalmatia. Stephen had his own court; he had his own magister thavarnicorum, iudex curiae and magister pincernarum. In 1351 he acted on behalf of his brother while Louis the Great fought in the Kingdom of Naples. Stephen's administration included many activities: rewarding iobagiones castris, granting privileges to towns and endowing Church institutions. Because of the heritage of the Kingdom of Naples Louis wanted Stephen to marry an Angevin princess from Naples, but finally Stephen's marriage served as a fixation of the alliance with the Bavarian Wittelsbach dynasty against the Luxemburg dynasty. Two children, who were for a certain time the only descendants to the Hungarian throne, were born from this marriage.

Keywords: fourteenth century, dynastical politics, House of Anjou, Spiš, Slavonia-Croatia-Dalmatia

Stephen was born on 20 August, 1332¹ as the youngest son of Hungarian king Charles I and his wife Elizabeth, daughter of Polish king Wladislas.² For the first time he appears in a charter from the year 1343 in connection with Ladislav, *plebanus de Insula Christiana* and *clericus Pragensis diocesis*, who was his *instructor*.³ He is most probably the same Ladislav *de Wilyelmow* who is mentioned in 1347 as Stephen's *informer*.⁴ Stephen appears more frequently in charters in 1346, when his brother, King Louis I appealed for the pope's support of himself and his brother for the throne of the Kingdom of Naples after the violent death of their brother Andrew. In January Louis called Stephen simply as a duke. It is interesting that later, on 18 March, Elizabeth, Stephen's mother also

wrote to the pope in the same case and called Stephen as the duke of the whole Slavonia, while his brother Louis used only a general title of duke in a letter from the following day (March 19).⁵ Stephen appeared in the plans to gain the Kingdom of Naples still in 1349, when his marriage with Mary, sister of Queen Johanna of Naples,⁶ was planned.

From the forties we have a group of the pope's bulls addressed to Stephen. Pope Clement VI sent on 29 September 1345 letters with identical content to Louis, Stephen and their mother Elizabeth: he expressed his condolences for the death of Andrew, King of Sicily. In this case Stephen was not addressed as a duke yet.⁷ However, the pope addressed him on 28 December 1345 already as the duke of Transylvania.⁸ The pope used the same

* Ladislav Dombi, Allumnus of Comenius University in Bratislava, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Slovak History.

¹ *Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV*. In: *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum* (deinde *SSrerHung*), vol. 1. Ed.: Emericus SZENTPÉTERY. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1937, p. 501.

² *SSrerHung* 1, p. 50.

³ *Monumenta Vaticana: Acta Clementis VI Pontificis Romani 1342–1352* (deinde *Monumenta Vaticana*), vol. 1. Ed.: Ladislaus KLICMAN. Praga: Typis Gregerianis, 1903, nr. 198, p. 108.

⁴ *Ibidem*, nr. 841, p. 494.

⁵ *Árpád-kori és Anjou-kori levelek*. Ed. and trans.: László MAKKAI – László MEZEY. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó, 1960, pp. 256–259, 260–262.

⁶ *Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum meridionalium, 1347–1358*, vol. 3. Ed.: Sime LJUBIĆ. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1872, CCVI, pp. 135–137.

⁷ *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek az Anjou-korból* (deinde *MDE*), vol. 2. Ed.: Gusztáv WENZEL. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1875, pp. 100–101.

⁸ *Ibidem*, nr. 118, pp. 127–128. The pope in his letters to Louis, Stephen and Elizabeth with identical content recommended Francis, bishop of Triest, who was sent as apostolical *nuncius*.

title in the following period, on 9 January 1346⁹, 1 May 1348,¹⁰ and 21 January 1349.¹¹

Since the plan to gain the Kingdom of Naples did not bring any success, Louis used his brother for his policy in the Central-European region. He wanted an alliance with the Wittelsbach dynasty against Emperor Charles IV of Luxemburg. Stephen married Margaret, the daughter of the former emperor Louis IV, called the Bavarian.¹² In his letter of 1352, Louis I called her Anna, though.¹³ This marriage made it impossible for Stephen to contend for the Polish throne because the Polish nobility refused him. In this way we can interpret a mention in *Chronica Dubnicensi* which recounts that the Polish nobility accepted Louis as the successor to King Casimir, but on condition that neither his brother nor any other German would have any say in any matter.¹⁴

His first official acts as a duke are from the year 1349. First, on 31 August, Valentinus, the *comes* of Spiš and the castellan of the Spiš castle, who was also *magister tavarnicarum* and *iudex curiae* of Stephen, *ducis Hungariae*, sent a letter to the chapter of Spiš about *congregatio generalis eiusdem domini ducis Stephani...c. S in Suburbio castris Scepus*.¹⁵ Stephen's first acknowledged act in the duke's office dates from 21 October 1349, when he resided in

Buda and titled himself as *dux Hungariae et dominus terrae Scepusiensis et de Sarus*. This charter informs us about his court: it mentions a member of his court, *iuvenis* Mych, son of Andrew, grandson of Gregory. Stephen demanded the chapter of Spiš to delineate the property of Mych.¹⁶

In another charter of his preserved from the same year (5 November), Stephen titled himself as *dux Transsilvaniae et dominus terrae Scepusiensis et de Sarus*. This is the only known case, in which he used the title of duke for two regions at the same time. This document concerns the return of property to Paul, son of Andrew, called *cantor de Kumlows*, which had been confiscated earlier because he had been suspect of murdering his brother Chel.¹⁷

During most of the year 1350 Stephen resided in Buda and used the title *totius Sclavoniae, Croatiae et Dalmatiae dux*. On 20 February Ban Paul Ugal mentions *congregatio generalis universis nobilibus et aliis communibus hominibus dicti regno Sclavoniae de mandato Stephani ducis*.¹⁸ Stephen's first charter in this year dates to 7 April, when he confirmed the liberties of Trg.¹⁹ On 26 June he took part in solving a dispute between Lawrence, son of Lawrence, grandson of Phyle *de Wolkou*, and inhabitants of *Wolkouar*.²⁰ On 25 May he wrote to the chapter of Bács (*capitulum Bachyensis*) that Michael

⁹ Ibidem, nr. 124, pp. 132–133. In the same case.

¹⁰ Ibidem, nr. 260, pp. 293–294. The pope wrote to Louis, Stephen, Elizabeth, secular and Church officials concerning the case of imprisoned Anjou dukes, who were accused of the murder of Andrew.

¹¹ Ibidem, nr. 271, 331. The pope informed Louis, Stephen, Elizabeth and the church officials that cardinal Guido was sent to Hungary as apostolical legate.

¹² DŁUGOSZ, Jan: *Roczniki, czyli kroniki sławnego królestwa Polskiego Księga*, vol. 9. Ed.: Krystyna PIERODSKA et al. Trans.: Julia MRUKÓWNA. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1975, p. 279.

¹³ *Anjou-kori okmánytár* (deinde AO), vol. 5. Ed. et trans.: Imre NAGY. Budapest: Magyar Tudományok Akadémia, 1887, nr. 359, pp. 576–578. According to Antal PÓR it was Louis' mistake, because Emperor Louis IV had two daughters, Anna and Margaret. Anna was at that time widow of John, duke of Lower Bavaria. PÓR, Antal: *Az Anjouk és Wittelsbachok: Nagy Lajos második szövetkezése IV. Károly császár ellen*. Budapest: Athenaeum irodalmi és nyomdai R-T, 1907, p. 26.

According to PÓR, Stephen was 7 or 8 years younger than Margaret. They were relatives in the third step, because mother of Charles I and mother of Louis IV were daughters of Rudolf of Habsburg. PÓR, Antal: *István úr árvája*. In: *Századok*, a. 35, 1901, pp. 97–99.

According to Wertner, Margaret was born around 1324 and the marriage was realized in 1350. WERTNER, Mór: *Az Anjouk genealogiája különös tekintettel a magyarországi ágra* (Második közlemény). In: *Turul*, a. 6, 1888, nr. 2, p. 70.

¹⁴ *Kronika uhorských kráľov zvaná Dubnická*. Ed. and trans.: Július SOPKO. Budmerice: Rak, 2004, p. 106.

Still on 4 April 1350 in Buda the Polish king Casimir made an agreement with Louis and Stephen. They accepted his dominance over Rus, while after his death the Hungarian Kingdom could buy it for 100 000 florins and Louis, Stephen or their sons would become his successors in the Polish Kingdom. DĄBROWSKI, Jan: *Kazimierz Wielki: Twórca Korony Kólestwa Polskiego*. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1964, p. 32.

Giovanni Villani dates the death of Polish king Casimir to the year 1345–1345, "afterwards Louis went to Poland and established Stephen as Polish king". Confr. *A három Villani krónikája: Croniche di Giovanni, Mattheo e Filippo Villani*. Ed. and trans.: Miklós RÁCZ. Budapest: Atheneum, 1909, p. 152.

¹⁵ MOL DF 274644.

¹⁶ MOL DF 258977.

¹⁷ AO 5, nr. 192 p. 332.

¹⁸ *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae* (deinde CDCr), vol. 12. Ed.: Tadija SMIČIKLAS. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1913, nr. 441, pp. 581–582.

¹⁹ Ibidem, nr. 449, pp. 591–592.

²⁰ Ibidem, nr. 462, pp. 607–608. Phyle – Füle and his descendants came from the Mikolay branch of Miskolci kindred. KARÁCSONYI, János: *A magyar nemzetségek a XIV. század közepéig*. In: *Arcanum DVD könyvtár IV. Családtörténet heraldika honismeret* [DVD-ROM]. Budapest: Arcanum, 2003, p. 825.

de Sancto Michaelis complained about the fortune of his daughter Catherine. She married Peter, son of Peter *de Zenche*. Her dowry was used for liberating Nicholas, brother of Peter. However, after Peter's death his brothers Nicholas, Paul and Demeter refused to give her four *loci curiales* from a possession in Križevac county.²¹ On 10 October Stephen donated the estates of Demeter, son of Nicholas, who had died without descendants, to the castellan in Oklič (*Aklych*) – Thomas, son of Ladislav, grandson of Simon of Saint James (*de Zenthjakab*), who served the duke from Stephen's childhood. This donation concerned also Thomas' cousin John, son of Ladislav, grandson of Elias, and included the following possessions: *Rastigh*, *Ezeek*, *Kopeel*, *Laaz*, *Polyna*, *Tharnowcz* and *Kwchy-an* in Vrbas county (*in comitatu Orbaz*).²²

From this year we have also the acts which protected various persons: first, the widow of Stephen, son of Bartholomew *de Marcellw*, and her sons Nicholas and Peter (29 April),²³ and then the inhabitants of Zagreb (9 July).²⁴

In 1350 Stephen issued various charters in Slavonia, Croatia and Dalmatia, (which are not related to the territory implied in his titles). These acts can be divided into two groups. The first group includes the following ones. On 19 April he returned possessions Keer and Ataad in Somogy county to James, son of Berkus; Dionysius, son of Emeric and James, son of Myke.²⁵ On 2 May and on 27 June he sent letters to the chapter of Bratislava.²⁶ On 17 May he returned possessions to the noblemen from Zala county: Paul, son of Omodeus *de Abraam*, and to Nicholas, son of Andrew *de Rendes*.²⁷ On 20 July he took under his protection the Cistercian monastery in Burs *in comitatu Castriferri* (Vas county).²⁸ On 24 July the

representatives of Bodrog county turned to him: *vicecomes* Thomas, son of Peter *de Abulma*, and two *iudices nobilium*, George, son of Briccius, and John, son of Ivan, asked for his intervention in the issue of the burning of possessions in their county. Interestingly, they address him as *dux Croachie tocius regni Slavoniae* in this letter.²⁹ On 12 August Stephen wrote to Rudolf, the count of Moson, Vas and Sopron (*comes Mosoniensis, Supruniensis* and *Castriferri*), in the case of preserving the liberties of the city of Sopron.³⁰ The letter of the chapter of Győr (*capitulum Jauriensis*) of 14 August informs the palatine that Stephen took part in solving a dispute about the possession of Beus between the Várkonyi and the Héderváry families.³¹ On 27 August Stephen informs the count of Zala that he takes Dionysius and Lawrence, sons of *Desev de Vathka* (Dezider) under his protection.³² On 4 September he reminded Stephen and Craterius, the burghers citizensof Buda and *comites camerarum regalium Budensis et Strigonensis*, not to collect *lucrum camerae* from *iobagiones* of the nuns of the Rabbit Island. He did so on the basis of the charter of King Louis of 1344, who had admonished not only the officers of the two *camera* but also *iudices nobilium* of the counties of Fejer, Pest, Pilis and Esztergom in the same matter.³³

In the case of the issues concerning the counties of Zala and Bodrog, the argument for his intervention could be their geographical proximity to Slavonia. *Keer* and *Ataad* belonged to the territory of the former Arpadian *praedium* of Segesd, which was held by Duke Coloman in the thirteenth century,³⁴ and we can suppose that this territory continued to be the possession of a duke in the fourteenth century. However, when we add to the counties of Zala and Somogy the counties

²¹ MOL DL 91415.

²² CDCr 11, nr. 487 pp. 632–633. This document mentions that it was the first year of his *ducatus*.

Thomas and John came from the family Laki-Kaczor. HOLUB, József: A Laki Kaczor család (1526-ig). In: *Turul*, a. 34, 1916, p. 104.

²³ *Ibidem*, nr. 456, pp. 599–600. Family Marczaltői came from Omodeus Níger from Gut-Keled kindred. Bartholomew was the son of Omodeus' son Ampod. WERTNER, Mór: Nemzeti kutatások (Első közlemény). In: *Turul*, a. 17, 1899, nr. 3, pp. 118–120. Karácsonyi calls them Marczaltövy. KARÁCSONYI, János: *A magyar nemzetségek*, pp. 489–493.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, nr. 465, p. 610.

²⁵ AO 5, nr. 218, p. 368.

²⁶ MOL DF 226960, DF 273803.

²⁷ CDCr 9, nr. 459, pp. 601–602. Nicholas came from Gatal kindred. KARÁCSONYI, János: *A magyar nemzetségek*, p. 457.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, nr. 463, pp. 608–609.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, nr. 468, p. 612.

³⁰ MOL DF 201775. Rudolf Wolfurti. ENGEL, Pál: Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301–1457. In: *Arcanum DVD könyvtár IV. Családtörténet heraldika honismeret [DVD-ROM]*. Budapest: Arcanum, 2003.

³¹ *Codex diplomaticus patrius* (deinde CDP), vol. 5. Ed.: Imre NAGY et al. Győr: Sauerwein Géza, 1873, nr. 103, pp. 123–124.

³² CDCr 11, nr. 471, pp. 614–615.

³³ MOLDL 4165.

³⁴ KRISTÓ, Gyula: *A vármegyék kialakulása Magyarországon*. Budapest: Magvető Könyvkiadó, 1988, p. 256.

of Vas (*Castriferri*), Moson, Sopron, the chapters of Győr and Bratislava (*Posoniensis*), we could assume that Stephen ruled, besides Slavonia, Croatia and Dalmatia, also the whole western part of the Hungarian Kingdom, like Tomasina Morosini did at the end of the thirteenth century, *ducissa tocius Sclauonie et gubernatrix citra Danubialium parcium usque mare*.³⁵

This hypothesis is supported with the other group of Stephen's charters which includes three documents. One of them relates to the territory outside of the Hungarian Kingdom. On 10 August Stephen donated to the tradesmen from the area on the river Rhine the same liberties as King Charles had given to the merchants from Prague.³⁶ The other two charters are the following. On 26 June he requested the community of Spiš county to find out whether James, son of Detricus, and Zonk, son of Hannus, owned the whole possession of *Ulchyne*.³⁷ Another document is a donation of a possession in Tekov/Bars county issued on 22 October. This is the only known charter of this year issued in another place as Buda – in Bratislava (*Posonium*).³⁸ All these documents mention that the king was abroad, *in partibus transmarinis*, and he gave the impetus to issue the last two acts. The absence of a mention of the king in the first group of the listed charters supports our supposition about Stephen's independent acting in the western part of the kingdom. Another hypothesis is that Louis let him rule that part of the kingdom because of the crusade that Louis led to gain the Kingdom of Naples. Stephen had to hold Slavonia, Croatia and Dalmatia for his secure comeback and the western parts as a defence against an attack.

Stephen also had a certain role in the diplomatic relations with Venice. In a letter of 19 April 1350, Louis instructed Andrea Dandolo to turn to

Ban Paul, who acted on behalf of Duke Stephen, in the matter of the damages on the castles Ostroviza and Knin/*Tininio* caused by Dandolo's people.³⁹ On 28 May Venice sent letters to Queen Elizabeth and to Stephen in the abovementioned matter and in order to keep the peace.⁴⁰

The last mention of Stephen as a Slavonian, Croatian and Dalmatian duke appears in the donation charter of King Louis of 30 October 1350. Louis gave two castles, Strigovo/Oztrigo and Čakovec to Stephen Lackfi and his family as a reward for his duties in the fight against Naples, and mentioned that Stephen and their mother Elizabeth gave their consent.⁴¹

The first two documents where he titled himself as *dux Transylvanus* date from 28 December 1350, but he still resided in Buda. It is a paradox that the charters do not concern any issue related to Transylvania, but the payment of fees in Esztergom county (*comitatu strigoniensis*).⁴² This is not the only strange phenomenon of this year. Stephen issued the following charter on 26 January in Felvinc: he ordered Blaise, count of Arad, and his *vicecomes* to send before his *praesentia* only the cases which he would command them to send to him and the disputes concerning possessions.⁴³ However, Arad county is usually not described as a part of Transylvania in the Middle Ages.⁴⁴ On 28 March he confirmed the donation of the two abovementioned castles to Stephen Lackfi.⁴⁵ It was a day after his mother Queen Elizabeth had done so.⁴⁶ Stephen mentions in the dating formula that it is the first year of his *ducatus*. On 18 October he admonished Nicholas, son of Briccius, count of Braşov, and his *vicecomes* not to continue the custom of their predecessors and take away a quarter of the tithe. On behalf of the whole *decanatus* of Braşov, Nicholas, *decanus* and *plebanus*

³⁵ *Árpád-kori új okmánytár 10. kötet* (deinde AUO). Ed.: Gusztáv WENZEL. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia történelmi bizottsága, 1873, nr. 123, pp. 186–187.

³⁶ MDE 2, nr. 318, pp. 390–392.

³⁷ AO 5, nr. 232, pp. 387–388. Detricus and Zonuk were brothers. James was *iudex curiae* in years 1372 and 1373–1380. They came from the family Stekfalvi (Szepesi). ENGEL, Pál: *Magyarország világi* and ENGEL, Pál: *Középkori magyar genealógia*. In Arcanum DVD könyvtár IV. Családtörténet heraldika honismeret [DVD-ROM]. Budapest: Arcanum, 2003.

³⁸ MOL DF 249099.

³⁹ MDE 2, nr. 309, pp. 381.

⁴⁰ Ibidem, nr. 313, pp. 384–385. Then they both sent their messengers to Venice, and got an answer on 24 August. MDE II/320 pp. 393–394.

⁴¹ CDCr 11, nr. 477, pp. 619–624.

⁴² MOL DF 236300, MOL DF 23601.

⁴³ MOL DL 91422. Felvinc (hun) – Unirea, Vințu de Sus, Felviņ, Vinț belonged to Sedes Aurata – Aranyosszék, Scaunul Arieşului. SZABÓ, M. Attila: *Erdély, bánóság és partium történelmi és közigazgatási helységnevtára* [CD-ROM]. Budapest: Arcanum, 2006.

⁴⁴ KRISTÓ, Gyula – MAKK, Ferenc: *Az Árpádok*. S. I.: Szukits, 2000, pp. 316–317.

⁴⁵ CDCr 12. Ed.: Tadija SMIČIKLAS. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1914, nr. 10, pp. 13–14.

⁴⁶ Ibidem, nr. 9, pp. 11–12.

de Braschaw and *plebanus Christian de Widenbach* turned to him.⁴⁷ Stephen also exempted the inhabitants of Dej from paying the toll and gave them the right to be judged only by their own judge.⁴⁸

Like in a document from the previous year, Stephen and his mother appear again in a donation charter to Kolus issued by King Louis on 24 April as the persons who agree with his donation. While in the donation to Lackfi Stephen's official title is used, here King Louis addresses him just as *dominus Stephanus*.⁴⁹

Exactly a year after he had used the title of *dux Transylvanus*, a change occurs. In the document of 28 January 1352, he titled himself as the duke of Spiš and Šariš (*dux terrae Scepusiensis et de Sarus*) for the first time. He admonishes the inhabitants of *Sarus* (Šariš) and *Scibinium* (Sabinov) not to disturb the forest of John, son of Nicholas, called Apród, the king's chancellor, and his brother Blaise.⁵⁰ This document shows that his activity focused mainly on property questions. During his *ducatus* the dispute between the family Peren/Peréni and Lawrence Vitéz about possessions in Šariš county began.⁵¹

On 31 August Matthew and Dominic, sons of Jekul, complained to Stephen that the town of Gelnica (*Gylnech*) collected the taxes from their *iobagiones tributes*.⁵² The tension between these two parties was growing because on 8 December Stephen wrote to the convent in Jasov that Dominic had informed him that the inhabitants of Gelnica had caught and imprisoned his brother Matthew.⁵³

Similarly as two years earlier in Slavonia-Croatia, Stephen continued to protect noblemen: on 24 April he took orphans John and Paul, sons of

James, grandsons of John *de Lamnocha*, under his protection.⁵⁴

From the year 1352, in connection with his activities, we know the names of four leaders of towns in Šariš. Three of them are mentioned in one charter, namely *iudices* Henchlinus in Šariš, Nicholas in Prešov and Marcus in Sabinov: Stephen orders the castellan of Spiš, Nicholas *de Kubly*, who was also the duke's *magister tavarnicus*, *iudex curiae* and *magister ianitorum*, to protect the right to judge criminals which these towns received from King Charles.⁵⁵ The fourth leader mentioned in the documents is *iudex* Conrad from Bardejov. In this case King Louis, who was in Bardejov, bypassed his brother Stephen and on 8 March gave them the right of annual market, lasting for 8 days from 1 September. Conrad, however, had these rights confirmed by Duke Stephen on 17 May.⁵⁶

Up to this time there were only two cases when Stephen issued charters in another place than Buda. In this year, in the course of five months, from August to December, he issued three charters in three different places: on 31 August at the Spiš castle (*in Castrum Scepusiensi*), on 25 October in *Suburbio Scepusiensi* and on 8 December in the town of Košice (*in civitate Cassoviensi*).

We suppose that he had lost his influence in Transylvania by this year. However, he may still have had some impact when, on 19 February, he confirmed the possessions of Nicholas, former Transylvanian voivode.⁵⁷ However, then on 27 June his mother Queen Elizabeth reminded the count of Braşov about Stephen's order concerning the abovementioned case of the tithes, mentioning Stephen as *dux illo tempore illorum partium*.⁵⁸

⁴⁷ *Documenta Romaniae historica C. Transilvania (deinde DRH)*, vol. 10. Ed.: Ştefan PASCU. Bucureşti: Editura academiei Republicii socialiste Romania, 1977, nr. 69, p. 66. Nicholas came from the family Batory, which belonged to the Rakamaz branch of the Gut-Keled kindred, ENGEL, Pál: *Magyarország világi*; IDEM: *Középkori magyar*. Braschaw/Brassaw – Comitatul Braşov, Kronerstädter Komitat, Brassó vármegye. SZABÓ, M. Attila: *Erdély, bánság*.

⁴⁸ MOL DF 277848. Dej (rom) – Dés / Deés / Desch / Burglos / Burgschloss / Desium / Dyonisiopolis. It took place in Szolnok Inferior (Belső-Szolnok) SZABÓ, M. Attila: *Erdély, bánság*.

⁴⁹ DRH 10, nr. 26, pp. 24–25.

⁵⁰ MOL DF 228465.

⁵¹ *Supplementum Analectorum Terrae Scepusiensis (deinde Supplementum)*, vol. 2. Ed.: Michael SCHMAUK. Szepesvárálja: Typographia episcopalis, 1889, nr. LXXII, pp. 109–110.

⁵² MOL DL 83266.

⁵³ MOL DL 83267. Jekul / Jakul – Hekkul was an inhabitant of Gelnica (*Gylnech*), who reached nobility and became the predecessor of the Jekelfalussy family. KOMÁROMY, András: A Jekelfalussy család ősei. In: *Turul*, a. 11, 1893, nr. 4, pp. 201–203.

⁵⁴ AO 5, nr. 358, p. 575. They came from the Berzevici kindred. NAGY, Iván: *Magyarország családai Második kötet*. In: *Arcanum DVD könyvtár IV. Családtörténet heraldika honismeret [DVD-ROM]*. Budapest: Arcanum, 2003, pp. 37–44.

⁵⁵ *Diplomatarium comitatus Sarosiensis*. Ed.: Carolus WAGNER. Posonium et Cassovia: Joannis Michaelis Canderer, 1780, pp. 450–451. 15 January 1352.

⁵⁶ MOL DF 212854.

⁵⁷ DRH 10, nr. 101, p. 108. Nicholas Sirokai (Jobbágyi) was a member of the king's court in the year 1336 and in the year 1338 he was royal *procurator* and *rector ianitorum*. ENGEL, Pál: *Magyarország világi*.

He came from the branch of the Aba kindred called Szalánci (Slanecki). KARÁCSONYI, János: *A magyar nemzetségek*, p. 31.

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, nr. 130, pp. 138–139.

He continued to act as the duke of Spiš and Šariš possibly until the beginning of the year 1353. On 7 January the *vicecomes* of Šariš, John, son of Nicholas, wrote that he acted on behalf of the duke.⁵⁹ On 12 March 1353 Stephen appears again as *totius Slavoniae, Croatiae et Dalmatiae dux*, but this time he resided already in Zagreb.⁶⁰ The continuity of this *ducatus* from the year 1350 was disrupted, because he again used the wording first year of his *ducatus* in the dating formula.⁶¹ We can divide his activities into several spheres. The first sphere: the towns. He confirmed the liberties of Krapina on 12 March⁶² and Zelina on 23 May. In the case of Zelina we know about *villicus* Demeter and two *iobagiones*: Philip, son of Lawrence, and Mykch, son of Benedict.⁶³ On 6 December he gave to Koprivnica (*Kapronca*) the same rights which Zagreb had. He also named a *notarius* Ambrose: the inhabitants had to pay him and his successors in office the sixteenth part of the tithe.⁶⁴

The second sphere: the Church. On 28 May he confirmed the privileges donated to the Church of Zagreb by Stephen V.⁶⁵

The third sphere: the noblemen. A soldier (*miles*) of his court, John, son of James *de genere Aba*, and his cousins Nicholas, son John, Peter, son of Nicholas, Lawrence, son of Peter, and other noblemen from Vočina (*Athyna*) got the right to punish criminals in their named possession (on 8 March).⁶⁶

Thomas, son of Ladislav, and his cousin John called Thar, who received a donation from Stephen in 1350, got the donated estates exchanged for Sveti Petar (*Zenthpeter*) in Križevci county on 11 April. Thomas was the castellan of Medvedgrad at that time.⁶⁷ A month later, on 14 May, he was also called as *comes* of Garešnice (*Gresencze*) and a *iuvenis* of the duke's court.⁶⁸

On 16 September Stephen ordered the chapter in Požega (*Posega*) to solve the violent behaviour of

Dominic, son of Radyn, and his procurator Moyus, son of Alexander. This is the only document from this year which Stephen issued in Buda.⁶⁹

On 27 November Duke Stephen confirmed the privilege of Ban Nicholas from the year 1346 for Nicholas, son of Myke, concerning his exemption from the service to the castle of Križevac. Stephen also exempted his brother Gregory.⁷⁰

The last cases are general congregations (*congregationes generales*). On 8 May a general congregation began in Zagreb; however, it was initiated by the ban, as he calls it as *nostra*, but he further states that it was "*de mandato excellentis principis, domini Staphani dei gracia totcius Sclauonie, Croatiae et Dalmatie ducis universis nobilibus et aliis cuiusuis conditionis et statutus hominibus inter Drauam et Zauam existentibus*".⁷¹ We know two conclusions of this congregation: one of them is mentioned in a ban's charter,⁷² and the other one appears in the documents of both the ban and the duke. This was the case of possession Kaniška in Križevac county. First, on 19 May, Ban Nicholas informed the chapter of Zagreb about the decision to give this possession to Lachou, son of Ladislav.⁷³ Three days later the duke wrote about the whole process in more detail: Ladislav, son of Michael, who also tried to gain the abovementioned possession, submitted false charter ascribed to King Ladislav. As a result, Ladislav, his wife Rusa, his brothers Bazarab and Briccio, and cousins John and Blaise, sons of Valter, lost their possessions.⁷⁴

On 3 June in Zagreb began another "*congregatio generalis excellentis principis domini Stephani ducis, dominin ostri et exeius dileccione nostra universis nobilibus ceterisque status et condicionis hominibus inter Zawam et Gozd existentibus*". The only report of this congregation comes from the ban, who confirmed the privilege of King Charles to Stephen, son of Mykch.⁷⁵

⁵⁹ *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis* (deinde CDH), vol. 9/2. Ed.: Georgius FEJÉR. Buda: Typis typogr.

Regiae Vniuersitatis Vngariae, 1833, pp. 297–298.

⁶⁰ CDCr 12, nr. 109, p. 152.

⁶¹ Ibidem, nr. 113, pp. 155–156.

⁶² Ibidem, nr. 109, p. 152.

⁶³ Ibidem, nr. 124, p. 170.

⁶⁴ Ibidem, nr. 161, pp. 215–216.

⁶⁵ Ibidem, nr. 127, pp. 174–175.

⁶⁶ Ibidem, nr. 129, pp. 176–177.

⁶⁷ Ibidem, nr. 113, pp. 155–156.

⁶⁸ Ibidem, nr. 119, pp. 163–164.

⁶⁹ Ibidem, nr. 145, pp. 195–196.

⁷⁰ Ibidem, nr. 158, pp. 212–213.

⁷¹ Ibidem, nr. 120, pp. 164–165.

⁷² He confirmed the possession of Nespesa in *provincia Glaunicha* for Paul and his nephew Fabian. Ibidem.

⁷³ Ibidem, nr. 122, pp. 167–168.

⁷⁴ MOL DF 264725.

⁷⁵ CDCr 12, nr. 133, pp. 182–183.

The following congregation: “*de mandato et precepto Staphani ducis, domini nostri pro requirendis iuribus ducalis maiestatis uniuersis nobilibus ceterisque status, conditionis et preeminencie hominibus in regno Croatie existentibus*”, took place in Tynyny (Knin) and began on 9 September. This gathering solved the payment of the tithes by lower strata people and decided that the bishop of Knin should name *supanum in provincia sua seu districtu*.⁷⁶

From the year 1354 we have fewer documents. There was no general congregation in this year, but three other abovementioned spheres are the same. On 7 January Koprivnica/Kapronca got the right to use the forest. This charter mentions *villicus* Jokul and one inhabitant, Michael, son of Nicholas.⁷⁷ On 20 February Duke Stephen confirmed the liberties of the Hermits of Saint Paul near *Dobycha* (Dubica).⁷⁸

On 10 May Philip, son of Paris, and John, son of this Philip, a *iuenis* of duke's court, got the possession *Obrova* from Stephen.⁷⁹

On 15 May in Ivanič Stephen accepted *iobagiones castris de Moroucha* among the nobility, namely Nicholas, son of Rathk, his cousins Ivan and George, sons of Nicholas, their stepfather Martin, son of Brokon, and Bank, son of Peter. It was a reward for their services *contra regni emulos, morte et sanguinis effusione, membrorumque mutilationibus, ac aliis multimodis periclitationibus ac captiuationibus, que per singula longum esset enarrare*. Their disputes had to be solved only by the duke.⁸⁰

Two charters (issued on 7 April and 13 July) were addressed to Leontius, son of Beke, soldier of his court. He was given the right to have a market at his possession Crehen in Križevac county every Saturday, and the right to punish criminals on all his estates in Križevac and Virovitica (*Vereuche*).⁸¹

The charter of 13 July is the latest known act issued by Stephen, because on 9 August he died *in reuersione de exercitu moto contra Rasciam*.⁸²

After his death Margaret ruled in his *ducatu*. At least up to 27 April 1355 she stayed in Buda.⁸³ Then she moved to Zagreb, but the following document is dated on 30 November only.⁸⁴ She stayed in Zagreb until 14 January 1356.⁸⁵ On 3 April 1356 she was in Vienna and called herself as *ducissa Bauariae*.⁸⁶ Two years later, on 13 August 1358, Louis promised to pay her 40 000 florins on the occasion of her marriage to Gerlach, *comes de Hohenloch*.⁸⁷

Stephen and Margaret had two children. When their mother had left the country, their education was most probably the responsibility of their uncle, King Louis. Son John became the heir not only of the Kingdom of Hungary, but also of Poland, because he figured in the agreement between Louis and the Polish nobility.⁸⁸ But John died not reach the adult age.⁸⁹ After John's death, Stephen's daughter Elizabeth became Louis' heir. That is why Louis wanted to find her a favourable match. The name of her fiancé was changing depending on the actual political situation in Central Europe: at one point her fiancé came from

⁷⁶ CDCr 12, nr. 146, pp. 197–198.

⁷⁷ Ibidem, nr. 163, pp. 218–219. A similar document is dated on 6 January. But here Peter is named as a *villicus* and an inhabitant Wyth, son of Nicholas, is mentioned. CDH 9/2, pp. 327–328.

⁷⁸ CDCR 12, nr. 169, pp. 226–227. The monastery was built between 1270 and 1290. It was burned down in 1393. Its doom was in the year 1464. *Kolostorok és tásaskáptalanok a középkori Magyarországon* [CD-ROM]. Budapest: Arcanum, 2008.

⁷⁹ Ibidem, nr. 179, pp. 236–237.

⁸⁰ Ibidem, nr. 181, pp. 238–240.

⁸¹ MOL DL 94423, MOL DL 94424. He came from the Antimus kindred. ENGEL, Pál: *Középkori magyar*.

⁸² Chronikon Zagrabiense cum texto chronici Varadiensis collatum. In: *SSrer Hung* 1, p. 215. Jaroslav Perniš maintains that he died from an injury after falling off his horse. PERNIŠ, Jaroslav: Uhorskí Anjouovci v zdraví, chorobe a smrti. In: *Genealogicko-heraldický hlas*, a. 13, 2003, nr. 1, p. 8. According to Kristó, the conflict between the Kingdom of Hungary and Serbia broke out in 1353. The crusade was organized in 1354. Hungarian chronicles are silent about this crusade, but from the Austrian ones we learn that Louis led a great army and the Serbian czar Stephen Dushan avoided the clash. Various persons took part in the crusade, from the Esztergom archbishop Nicholas Vasvári to familiars of Duchess Margaret. The battle took place near Belgrade in 1355, where Louis won and the Serbian czar promised to subordinate himself to the pope in Avignon. KRISTÓ, Gyula: *Az Anjou-kor háborúi*. Budapest: Zrínyi Kiadó, 1988, pp. 132–133. Wertner shows the itinerary of the crusade. On 12 June it was in Zimon, on 16 June in Belgrade and on 1 August in Visegrád. WERTNER, Mór: *Magyar hadjáratok a XIV.-ik században*. In: *Századok*, a. 39, 1905, nr. 5, p. 441.

⁸³ CDCr 12, nr. 217, pp. 288–289.

⁸⁴ Ibidem, nr. 236, pp. 313–314.

⁸⁵ Ibidem, nr. 241, pp. 321–322.

⁸⁶ Ibidem, nr. 241, pp. 321–322.

⁸⁷ CDH 9/2, pp. 676–677.

⁸⁸ DŁUGOSZ, Jan: *Roczniki, czyli kroniki*, p. 349.

⁸⁹ Louis wrote about his death on 17 November 1360. KLAČIĆ, Vjekoslav: *Hrvatski hercezi i bani za Karla Roberta i Ljudevita I. (1301–1382)*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1901, p. 147.

the Luxemburg house and other time from the Habsburg dynasty. Eventually she married Philip of Tarent who came from the Naples branch of the Angevins. Elizabeth died before 6 April 1380, when her grandmother Elizabeth in her last will and testament ordered to bring her body to the Kingdom of Hungary.⁹⁰

In the end I want to add a few words about Duke Stephen's court. His charters, which I had mentioned above, inform us only about Nicholas *de Kubly* and some *iuvenes* and *milites*. Mainly in 1353, Stephen's documents were prepared by his *prothonotarius* George, son of Michael *de Megeryche*,⁹¹ the castellan and count of Vrbas.⁹²

Other persons of his court appear in some other documents. In 1354 Nicholas *de Kubly* was not his *magister tavarnicorum* and *iudex curiae*. These functions were taken by Dezider/*Deseu*, son of Ivan. His son Ivan was Stephen's *magister pincernarum*.⁹³ Ladislav, son of Ulrich, was mentioned as his *magister in scienciis primitivi*⁹⁴ and a certain Ligerus was a *comes camerarum*.⁹⁵ Besides the abovementioned Ladislav of Vilémov (*de Wilyelmow*), other persons from Czech milieu acted at his court: Peter, son of Bertold *de Brunna* (Brno), was the chancellor of Stephen⁹⁶ and after Stephen's death, also of Margaret.⁹⁷ He was also called as *capellanus* and *familiar*.⁹⁸ John, son of Erenreich *de Znoima* (Znojmo) was the chaplain (*capellanus*).⁹⁹

⁹⁰ PÓR, Antal: István úr, pp. 97–115, 193–208.

⁹¹ CDCr 12, nr. 408, pp. 537–539.

⁹² Ibidem, nr. 161, pp. 215–216.

⁹³ Ibidem, nr. 171, pp. 228–230, Ibidem, nr. 174, pp. 232–233. They came from the family Györkönyi from the Bikács kindred. ENGEL, Pál: *Magyarország világi*. ENGEL, Pál: *Középkori magyar*.

⁹⁴ Monumenta Vaticana II nr. 94, pp. 41.

⁹⁵ CDCr 12/144, pp. 194–195.

⁹⁶ Monumenta Vaticana: Acta Innocentii VI. 1352–1362 (deinde Monumenta Vaticana), vol. 2 Ed.: Joannes Fridericus Novák. Praga: Typis Gregerianis, 1907, nr. 94, p. 41.

⁹⁷ CDCr 12, nr. 201, p. 265, 20 January 1355.

⁹⁸ Monumenta Vaticana 2, nr. 373, pp. 151–152, 21 August 1355.

⁹⁹ Ibidem, nr. 222, p. 94, 22 March 1354.

Der Status von Matschwa in der Zeit Rastislav Michailowitschs

Status Mačvy v období vlády Rastislava /
Status Mačve u razdoblju Rastislavove vladavine

This paper examines the question of whether Mačva (Machva), assigned by the Hungarian king Belo IV between 1247 and 1254 to his son-in-law Rostislav after his unsuccessful attempts to gain Galicia, was organized as a Hungarian banovina (province) in the middle of the thirteenth century. The question is also raised as to what extent the ruler was independent and how his rule was organized. The real question is whether the lord of Machva Rostislav Mihailovich held the title of ban. The author of the paper concludes that Machva did not have the status of banovina in the case of this Russian prince. But it was his dynastic territory, in fact his personal property.

Keywords: Thirteenth Century, Mačva, dynasty politics, dynastic territory

Über die Matschwa¹ als mittelalterliches Gebiet bzw. über ihren Herrscher, den russischen Fürst Rastislav Michailowitsch, Schwiegersohn des ungarischen Königs Bela des IV., gibt es bis heute eine ganze Reihe einzelner Studien, an deren Anfang die noch immer aktuellen Arbeiten der großen Historiker des 19. Jahrhunderts² stehen. Wir begehen mit Sicherheit keinen Fehler, wenn wir sagen, dass es sich um ein Thema handelt, das unerschöpflich eine Reihe europäischer Geschichtsschreibungen miteinander verbindet.³ Indem wir uns entschieden haben, für dieses Treffen etwas über Rastislav Michailowitsch und den Charakter seiner Herrschaft über die Matschwa zu sagen

(eine Frage die wir zwar auch früher erforscht und über die wir geschrieben haben⁴), wurde dies in der Überzeugung getan, dass unser Vortrag einige interessante Berührungspunkte auch mit der slowakischen und der kroatischen Geschichtsschreibung hat und sich somit in die historischen Parallelen dieser zwei Länder einfügen kann.

Als erstes müssen wir feststellen, dass der Name von Rastislav Michailowitsch in den beiden Geschichtsschreibungen gegenwärtig ist. Chronologisch gesehen, seit dem Artikel *Bogomili i patareni* (dt. *Bogumilen und Patarenen*) von Franjo Rački aus dem Jahr 1868, über das klassische Werk *Poviest Bosne* (dt. *Geschichte Bosniens*) von Vjekoslav

* Djura Hardi, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of History.

¹ PEŠTŰ, Frigyes: A macsóí bánok. In: *Századok*, a. 9, 1875, pp. 361–381; WERTNER, Mór: Az árpádkori bánok. In: *Századok*, a. 43, 1909, pp. 480–481; SZENTPÉTERY, Emerich: Das Banat von Machow (Macsó). In: *Ungarische Rundschau*, a. 4, 1915, pp. 872–883; ДИНИЋ, Михаило: Западна Србија у средњем веку. In: ДИНИЋ, Михаило: *Српске земље у средњем веку, историјско-географске студије*. Ed.: СИМА ЂИРКОВИЋ. Београд: Српска књижевна задруга, 1978, pp. 44–54; ИДЕМ: Средњовековни Срем. In: *Српске земље у средњем веку*, pp. 270–284; ИДЕМ: Из прошлости Срема. In: *Српске земље у средњем веку*. pp. 285–288; РОКАУ, Péter – ТАКАЌС, Miklós: Macsó. In: *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. század)*. Ed.: ГУЛА КРИСТО, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1994, (deinde KMTL), pp. 421–422; ЂИРКОВИЋ, СИМА: Земља мачва и град Мачва. In: *Прилози за књижевност, језик, историју, фолклор*, САНУ, Књига 74, свеска 1–4, 2008, pp. 3–20.

² РАЛАСКЎ, František: O Ruském knížeti Rostislawowí, otcí královny české Kunhuty, a roku geho. In: *Časopis Českého Museu*, a. 16, nr. 1, 1842, pp. 23–41; ПАЛАУЗОВ, Спиридон Н.: Ростислав Михайлович, князь Маčвы. In: *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения*, vol. 8, 1851, pp. 27–49; WENZEL, Gusztáv: *Rosztizlaw galicziai herceg, IV. Béla királynak veje*. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1887, pp. 3–20; WERTNER, Mór: Boris und Rostislav (Rostislav von Halics und seine Familie). In: *Vierteljahrsschrift für Heraldik, Sphragistik und Genealogie*, a. 22, nr. 2, 1889, pp. 178–194; ИДЕМ: *Az Árpádok családi története*. Nagy Becskerek: Pleitz Fer. Pál Könyvnyomdája, 1892, pp. 463–475; ПРОКОФЬЕВ, Всеволод. Г.: Ростислав Михайлович, русский князь XIII века. In: *Юбил. Сборник Русского Археологического Общества*. Београд, 1936, pp. 131–159.

³ Nach unseren Erkenntnissen ist der Name Rastislav Michailowitsch in der ungarischen, ukrainischen, russischen, serbischen, bulgarischen, bosnischen, tschechischen, österreichischen und polnischen Geschichtsschreibung präsent.

⁴ ХАРДИ, Ђура: Господари и банови Маčве и онострано Срема и Маčве у XIII веку. In: *Споменица Историјског Архива „Срем“*, a. 8, 2009, pp. 65–80; ИДЕМ: О маčванској титулатури Ростислава Михайловича. In: *Извори о историји и култури Војводине*, a. 2, 2010, pp. 57–64; ГАРДИ, Дџура: Чи Ростислав Михайлович був баном Маčви?. In: *ACTES TESTANTIBUS, Ювілейний збірник на пошану Леонтія Войтовича. Україна: культурна спадщина, національна свідомість, державність*. Ed.: Микола Литвин. Львів: Національна академія наук України, Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича, 2011, pp. 197–203.

Klaić, das 1882 erschienen war, bis zu der unlängst veröffentlichten Großsynthese slowakischer und polnischer Wissenschaftler unter dem Titel *Historia Scepusii*, Band 1, mit Textaufbereitung von Martin Homza und Stanisław A. Sroka.⁵ Auf der anderen Seite ist bekannt, dass dieser russische Fürst im Jahre 1247 der Ban von Slawonien war⁶ sowie dass seine Zeit als Herrscher von Galizien beim Friedenstreffen des ungarischen Königs Bela des IV. mit Daniel Romanowitsch, dem Fürsten von Galizien-Wolhynien, das im September 1246 in der Stadt Zvolen (dt. Altsohl) in der heutigen Slowakei stattfand, ein Ende nahm.⁷

Es ist nicht überflüssig daran zu erinnern, dass Rastislaw Michailowitsch der russischen Herrscherdynastie Olegowitsch aus Tschernigow entstammte. Mitte der dreißiger Jahre des 13. Jahrhunderts hatte sich Rastislaw's Vater Michailo Wsewolodowitsch zusammen mit seinem jungen Sohn auf den Kampf um das Fürstentum Galizien gegen den Fürsten Daniel Romanowitsch aus der Dynastie Monomachowitsch aus Wolhynien eingelassen. Rastislaw gelang es nur für eine sehr kurze Zeit (ohne seinen Vater, von 1237 bis 1238) auf dem Thron des Fürstentums zu bleiben. In dieser Auseinandersetzung spielte das angrenzende Königreich Ungarn eine wichtige Rolle. Der ungarische König Andreas II. trug seit 1205 den Titel „*Rex Galiciae Lodomeriaeque*“. Er erhob Anspruch auf die Oberherrschaft in diesen Ländern und die russischen Fürsten betrachtete er als seine Vasallen. Inzwischen hatte Andreas II. versucht, seine jüngeren Söhne als Herrscher über Galizien durchzusetzen, zuerst Koloman als König in Galizien (1214–1221) und danach auch Herzog Andreas (1222–1233), jedoch ohne dauerhaften Erfolg. Rastislaw fand letztendlich im Jahre 1242, während er vor den Mongolen floh, Zuflucht bei Andreas, dem Nachkommen Bela IV., der ihn bald mit seiner Lieblingstochter Anna verheiratete. Dank seines Status als königlicher

Schwiegersohn lachte Rastislaw das Glück und er wurde letztendlich der ungarische Prätendent auf Galizien. Doch seine Pläne scheiterten in der Schlacht bei Jaroslaw im Jahre 1245. Im folgenden Jahr schloss Bela IV. bei dem erwähnten Treffen in Zvolen Frieden mit Rastislaw's Gegner und Onkel Daniel. Bei dieser Gelegenheit wurde die Ehe zwischen Daniels Sohn Lew und Konstanz, der zweiten Tochter des ungarischen Königs, beschlossen. Somit verlor Rastislaw alle Aussicht auf eine Rückerlangung Galiziens.⁸

Zum Trost übertrug Bela IV. die Herrschaft über die Matschwa auf seinen Schwiegersohn, oder besser gesagt auf die Familie seiner Tochter Anna. Von diesem Zeitpunkt bis zu seinem Tod im Jahre 1264 war Rastislaw's Regierungstätigkeit an das Mitteleuropa und den Balkan gebunden. Die Matschwa lag an der südlichen Grenze Ungarns zum Serbischen Staat (heute der westliche Teil Zentralserbiens), am Rand Panoniens, südlich des Flusses Sava (dt. *Save*) und östlich des Flusses Drina. Wegen dem Mangel an Quellen mussten die Historiker mehrmals feststellen, dass die genauen Gebietsgrenzen, vor allem diejenigen in Richtung des inneren Balkans, nicht einfach zu bestimmen sind.⁹ Das Gebiet wurde nach der gleichnamigen Festung Matschwa benannt, die allerdings zum ersten Mal im Zusammenhang mit Rastislaw als ihrem Herrscher erwähnt wird. Basierend auf Forschungsergebnissen von Sima Ćirković, der sich auf ungarische diplomatischen Quellen aus der ersten Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts stützt, können wir sagen, dass die Festung Matschwa an dem Fluss Sava lag, allem Anschein nach in der Region des mittelalterlichen Syrmien, natürlich auf dem gegenüberliegenden rechten Flussufer (Stari Noćaj). Sie besaß einen offenen Raum in der Mitte sowie einen Anlegehafen, der die Flussüberquerung ermöglichte, wenn man aus Panonien in den inneren Balkan fahren wollte.¹⁰ Neben Matschwa erstreckte sich Rastislaw's, bzw. die Herrschaft

⁵ RAČKI, Franjo: Bogomili i patareni. In: *Rad JAZU*, knjiga VII, Zagreb, 1869, p. 167; KLAJČ, Vjekoslav: *Poviest Bosne do propasti Kraljevstva*. Zagreb: Tisak Dioničke tiskare, 1882, pp. 84–85; *Historia Scepusii*, vol. 1. Ed.: Martin HOMZA – Stanisław A. SROKA. Bratislava – Kraków: Katedra slovenských dejin UK FiF – Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2009, passim.

⁶ *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis* (deinde CDH). Ed.: Georgius FEJÉR. Buda: 1829–1844, nr. 4, p. 254; WERTNER, Mór: *Az árpádkori bánok*, p. 401.

⁷ SENGÁ, Toru: IV. Béla külpolitikája és IV. Ince pápához intézett „tatár-levele“. In: *Századok*, a. 121, 1987, nr. 1–2, pp. 592–594.

⁸ ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ, Михайло: *Історія України-Руси*. том II, III. Київ: Наукова Думка, 1992–1993, passim; ПАШУТО, Владимир Т.: *Очерки по истории Галицко-Волынской Руси*. Москва: Издательство Академии Нук СССР, 1950; КОТЛЯР, Микола. Ф.: *Данило Галицький, біографічний нарис*. Київ: Видавничий Дім „Альтернативи“, 1979; ФОНТ, Márta: *II András orosz politikája és hadjáratai*. In: *Századok*, a. 126, 1992, nr. 1–2, pp. 107–144; ВОЙТОВИЧ, Леонтий: *Княжа доба на Русі: портрети еліти*. Біла Церква: Видавець Олександр Пшонківський, 2006, pp. 408, 418–420, 492–494, 497–501.

⁹ SZENTPÉTERY, Emerich: *Das Banat von Machow*, p. 874; РОКАХ, Péter – TAKÁCS, Miklós: *Macsó*, pp. 421–422; БИРКОВИЧ, Сима: *Земља Мачва и град Мачва*, pp. 3–20.

¹⁰ БИРКОВИЧ, Сима: „Црна Гора“ и проблем српско-угарског граничног подручја. In: *Ваљево. Постанак и уснон градског средишта*. Ваљево: Народни музеј Ваљево и Одељење за историју Филозофског факултета у Београду, 1994, pp. 62, 74; ИДЕМ: *Земља мачва и град Мачва*, pp. 18–20.

seiner Familie, im Westen auch auf Teile Bosniens (höchstwahrscheinlich auf Usor und Sol) um sich in den fünfziger Jahren des 13. Jahrhunderts auch auf Kosten des geschwächten Bulgariens nach Osten auszuweiten.¹¹

In der Geschichtsschreibung wird jedoch oft angeführt, dass Rastislaw Michailowitsch der Ban von Matschwa war, oder dass er von Bela IV. das Banat von Matschwa erwarb, obwohl diese Behauptung durch keine Quelle bekräftigt wird. Die Frage wird unmittelbar verkompliziert durch den weit verbreiteten Glauben, dass zu Regierungszeiten Bela IV., nach dem mongolischen Einfall in Europa, an den südlichen Grenzen des Königreichs Ungarn allmählich eine ganze Reihe Banate errichtet wurde (in Usor, Sol, Kutschewo, Branitschewo, Sewerin...). Es handelte sich um Militärverwaltungseinheiten an deren Spitze sich die königlichen Würdenträger befanden. Ihre Aufgabe war, diese Territorien fester an das Königreich Ungarn zu binden, das Verteidigen der ungarischen Grenze sowie das Ermöglichen des Eindringens in die benachbarten Balkanländer. Unter den neugegründeten Banaten befand sich angeblich auch Matschwa, die Bela seinem Schwiegersohn Rastislaw zuteilwerden ließ. Einen auffallenden Widerspruch finden wir in der Tatsache, dass es einerseits den Historikern nicht entging, dass Rastislaw dem Titel nach kein Ban war, und es andererseits üblich war, dass man über die Matschwa seit der Mitte

des 13. Jahrhunderts wie über ein Banat sprach und sie mit seinem Namen verbunden wird.¹²

In keinem Dokument aus dem 13. Jahrhundert taucht Rastislaw Michailowitsch als Ban der Matschwa auf.¹³ Sein offizieller Titel, wenn es um dieses Gebiet ging, lautete *Dominus de Machou*, wie er in der Bulle von Bela IV. in der Auflistung staatlicher Großwürdenträger (*series dignitatum*), vom 28. Juli 1254, bezeichnet wurde.¹⁴ Nach Rastislaws Tod wird auch seine Witwe, Fürstin Anna, vom Papst (1264) mit dem gleichen Titel *domina* bzw. *ducissa* (*ducissa Gallitie, ac de Bosna et de Mazo domina*) angedredet.¹⁵ Den Herzogtitel für die Gebiete Matschwa und Bosnien (*dux de Machow et de Bosna*) sollte auch Rastislaws jüngerer Sohn und Erbe Belas Rostislawitsch 1271 übernehmen.¹⁶

Was Matschwa die anbetrifft, haben noch Mór Wertner in seiner systematischen Arbeit *Az árpádkori bánok* und nach ihm auch Mihailo Dinić festgestellt, dass in der Zeit der Arpaden die Anwesenheit der Bane als königliche Würdenträger in dieser Region nur für die Zeit von 1272 bis 1279 nachzuweisen ist.¹⁷ Dem entgegen, wurde Matschwa, oder das jenseitige Syrmien (*Sirmia ulterior*), wie der andere, ältere Name für die Region lautete, während der meisten Zeit des 13. Jahrhunderts¹⁸ von den nächsten Verwandten der ungarischen Königsdynastie verwaltet.¹⁹

Zu seiner Zeit hatte der ungarische König Bela III. das jenseitige Syrmien von Byzanz erobert,

¹¹ ДИМИТРОВ, Христо: *Българско-унгарски отношения през средновековието*. София: Академично издателство „Проф. Марин Дринов“, 1998, p. 166; KRISTÓ, Gyula: *Az Árpád-kor háborúi*. Budapest: Zrínyi Katonai Kiadó, 1986, pp. 137–138; ЂИРКОВИЋ, Сима: *Историја средњовековне босанске државе*. Београд: Српска књижевна задруга, 1964, p. 73.

¹² Vergleiche hierzu: PEŠTY, Frigyes: *A macsó bánok*, p. 361; KLAJČ, Vjekoslav: *Povjest Bosne*, pp. 84–85; HUBER, Alfons: *Geschichte Österreichs*. Erster Band, Gotha: Fridrich Andreas Perthes, 1885, p. 473; WERTNER: *Boris und Rostislaw*, p. 182; IDEM: *Az Árpádok családi története*, p. 466; HÓMAN, Bálint – SZEKŰ, Gyula: *Magyar történe*. I. kötet. Ed.: Bálint HÓMAN. Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, 1939, pp. 565–566; ЈИРЕЧЕК, Константин: *Историја Срба*. прва књига, до 1537. године (друго, исправљено и допуњено издање, превео Јован Радонић). Београд: Слово љубве, 1978, p. 177; ДИНИЋ, Михаило: *Западна Србија у средњем веку*, pp. 44–54; РАДОНИЋ, Јован: *Споразум у Тати 1426. и српско-угарски односи од XIII–XVI века*. In: *Глас СКА*, 1941, CLXXVII, p. 127; *Историја српског народа*, прва књига. Ed.: Сима ЂИРКОВИЋ. Београд: Српска књижевна задруга, 2000, p. 352; СПРЕМИЋ, Момчило: *Деспот Ђурађ Бранковић и Мачванска бановина*. In: СПРЕМИЋ, Момчило: *Прекинути успон, српске земље у позном средњем веку*. Београд: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, 2005, p. 92.

¹³ Die angeblichen Bezeichnungen von Rastislaw als Ban von Matschwa bei Frigyes Pesty basieren nicht auf Quellen, sondern auf älterer Literatur, wie vom Autor selbst betont wurde. PEŠTY, Frigyes: *A macsó bánok*, pp. 366–68. Diese Erwähnungen werden auch von Mór Wertner in seiner Archontologie der ungarischen Banate nicht angenommen: WERTNER, Mór: *Az árpádori bánok*, p. 480; Ebenfalls: ZSOLDOS, Attila: *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1000–1301*. Budapest: História-MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2011, pp. 50–51; ХАРДИ, Ђура: *Господари и банови Мачве и оностраниг Срема*, pp. 70–72.

¹⁴ F, vol. 4/2, p. 218.

¹⁵ *Vetera Monumenta historica Hungarum sacram illustrantia* (deinde VMH), tom. 1. Ed.: Augustino THEINER. Romae: 1859, pp. 273, 276; F, vol. 4/3, pp. 210, 236.

¹⁶ Ibidem 1, p. 303.

¹⁷ WERTNER, Mór: *Az árpádori bánok*, p. 480; ДИНИЋ, Михаило: *Сремски бан*. In: *Гласник Историског друштва у Новом Саду*, nr. 4, 1931, p. 272.

¹⁸ ДИНИЋ, Михаило: *Средњовековни Срем*, pp. 270–284; IDEM: *Из прошлости Срема*, pp. 285–288; РОКАУ, Péter – TAKÁCS, Miklós: *Macsó*, pp. 421–422.

¹⁹ ЂИРКОВИЋ, Сима: *Земља Мачва и град Мачва*, pp. 6–7; ХАРДИ, Ђура: *Господари и банови оностраниг Срема и Мачве*, pp. 65–80.

das nach dem Tode des Kaisers Manuel I. Komnenos unaufhaltsam immer schwächer wurde. Im Jahr 1186 ging das Gebiet als Mitgift an Byzanz zurück, als der ungarische König seine Tochter Margarete (Maria) mit dem byzantinischen Kaiser Isaak II. vermählte. Als jedoch Byzanz 1204 aus der Region verschwunden war, gelangte sie nach dem Krieg mit Bulgaren wieder in ungarischen Besitz. In den zwanziger Jahren des 13. Jahrhunderts kehrte Margarete aus dem Königreich Thessaloniki in ihr Heimatland zurück (wahrscheinlich im Jahr 1223) und das *jenseitige Syrmien* wurde ihr, zusammen mit den angrenzenden ungarischen Komitaten, von ihrem Bruder Andreas II. zugeteilt.²⁰ Nach Margarete wurde das jenseitige Syrmien von ihren Söhnen William von Saint Omer (mit dem Titel *dux Sirmii* um 1233–1238), geboren in Margaretes dritter Ehe mit einem lateinischen Baron, und seinem älteren Halbbruder, Zarewitsch Kalojan Engel (mit dem Titel *Dominus Syrmie* um 1238–1242), verwaltet.²¹

Als der königliche Schwiegersohn Rastislaw Michailowitsch 1246 Galizien *de facto* verlor, musste für ihn von Bela IV., wie schon längst von Gustav Wenzel und Mór Wertner bemerkt wurde, ein würdiger Ersatz für das russische Fürstentum gefunden werden.²² Anfänglich taucht Rastislaw am 2. Juni 1247 nur als slawonischer Ban auf, aber das war nur eine vorläufige Lösung, denn am 3. April 1248 treffen wir auf dieser Position Stephan, vom Geschlecht Gutkeled, an.²³ Ersatz war bald gefunden in der Region des jenseitigen Syrmien – die künftige Matschwa. Obwohl der genaue Zeitpunkt nicht ermittelt werden kann, steht fest, dass Rastislaw die Herrschaft über die Matschwa vor dem 28. Juli 1254 (*terminus ante quem*)²⁴ und nach dem 2. Juni 1247 (*terminus post quem*) erlangte, als er zum letzten Mal als Ban von Slawonien erwähnt wird.²⁵ Die Region befand sich in seinem Besitz bis zu seinem Tode im Jahr 1264 und danach im Besitz seiner Ehegattin und seiner Söhne,

bis zum Aussterben der Familie in der männlichen Linie im Jahr 1272.²⁶

In unseren früheren Arbeiten haben wir die Vermutung aufgestellt, dass Rastislaw noch in den vierziger Jahren, bzw. am frühesten 1247, in den Besitz der Matschwa kam. Es ist nämlich schwer zu glauben, dass er und seine Familie bis zum Jahr 1254 ohne entsprechenden herzoglichen Besitz im Königreich Ungarn waren. Das würde einfach ihrem Status als Mitglieder der königlichen Familie nicht entsprechen. Insbesondere da ihnen im Fall Galiziens, wegen der Wichtigkeit des Bundes mit der Familie Romanowitsch für das Königreich Ungarn, doch Unrecht angetan wurde. Wenn auch nicht in solchem Maße wegen dem Schwiegersohn, sondern eher wegen seiner Tochter Anna, suchte Bela unserer Vermutung nach, nach einer Lösung, um ihre potentielle Unzufriedenheit so schnell wie möglich zu besänftigen und für sie einen würdigen Ersatz für Galizien zu finden.²⁷ Der Ersatz wurde, nach Meinung von Wenzel und Wertner, in Form der Matschwa gefunden.

Was die dynastischen Kompensationen anbetrifft, könnten wir vielleicht an dieser Stelle eine Parallele zwischen Rastislaw und Herzog Koloman (Sohn von Andreas II.) ziehen. Der Ausgang ihrer Herrschaft in Galizien ist ähnlich. Die beiden waren zu dieser Zeit potentielle ungarische Thronfolger und Herrscher über Galizien, jedoch erfuhren sie am Ende eine Niederlage. Herzog Koloman, als König von Galizien, war nach der Befreiung aus russischer Gefangenschaft (wahrscheinlich Ende 1221 oder in der ersten Hälfte des Jahres 1222), in der er sich zusammen mit seiner Frau Salomea von Kraków (dt. Krakau) befunden hatte, gezwungen, seine Ansprüche in Hinblick auf Galizien aufzugeben. Nachdem er Galizien verlor, gab sich Koloman mit der Herrschaft über die Zips zufrieden (1221–1241), um seit 1226 ebenfalls Herzog von Slawonien zu sein, in dem zuvor sein älterer Bruder, der Thronfolger Bela,

²⁰ WERTNER, Mór: Margit császárné fiai. In: Századok, a. 37, 1903, pp. 593–611; ЖИРЕЧЕК, Константин: Историја Срба, pp. 152–155; ФЕРЈАНЧИЋ, Божидар: Проблем византијског наслеђа у северозападној Србији. In: Ваљево. Постанак и успон градског средишта. Ваљево: Народни музеј Ваљево и Одељење за историју Филозофског факултета у Београду, 1994, pp. 49–58; ЂИРКОВИЋ, Сима: Земља Мачва и град Мачва, pp. 4–5.

²¹ WERTNER, Mór: Margit császárné fiai, pp. 602–611; IDEM: Az Árpádok családi története, pp. 406–412; ДИНИЋ, Михаило: Јован Ангел „Dominus Syrmie“. In: Гласник Историског друштва у Новом Саду, Књига IV, p. 30; РОКАИ, Петар: „Gyletus dux Sirmii“. In: Зборник Матице Српске за историју (weiter ZМСИ), a. 27, 1983, pp. 121–127; РОКАИ, Петар: О једном наслову Калојана Анђела. In: Зборник радова Византолошког института, a. 19, 1980, pp. 167–171.

²² WENZEL, Gusztáv: Rosztizlaw galicziai herceg, p. 14; WERTNER, Mór: Az Árpádok családi története, p. 466.

²³ ZSOLDOS, Attila: Magyarország világi archontológiája, p. 45. Vergleiche: WERTNER, Mór: Az árpádkori bánok, pp. 400–402.

²⁴ CDH 4/2, p. 218.

²⁵ Ibidem 4/1, p. 454.

²⁶ ХАРДИ, Ђура: Господари и банови Мачве оностраног Срема и Мачве, pp. 70–74.

²⁷ IDEM: О мачванској титулатури Ростислава, pp. 60–61; IDEM: Чи Ростислав Михайлович був баном Мачви?, pp. 197–203.

regiert hatte.²⁸ Man könnte sagen, dass diese Regionen ein tröstlicher, wenn nicht sogar ein vorteilhafter, Ersatz für Galizien waren. Neben der herzoglichen Herrschaft über diese Territorien behielt Koloman auch den königlichen Titel, der an Galizien gebunden war. Nach Meinung von Gyula Kristó, hatte dieser Umstand Einfluss darauf, dass zu Zeiten Kolomans auch Slawonien als Königreich bezeichnet wurde.²⁹ Was die Zips angeht, nehmen einzelne Historiker wie Márta Font und Attila Zsoldos an, dass dieses Komitat unter Kolomans Herrschaft stand, noch während er König in Galizien war (um 1216). Da sie nämlich an einer wichtigen strategischen Position zu Galizien und Kraków lag, war die Zips (wahrscheinlich mit dem Komitat Abaujwar) als Hinterland Stütze für Kolomans Herrschaft im unsicheren Galizien.³⁰

Während seiner Regierungszeit in Galizien (1214–1221), weilte, unserer Meinung nach, der unmündige ungarische König eine längere Zeit auf russischem Boden, allerdings nur in der Zeit zwischen 1219 und 1221, als er auch vom galizischen Fürsten Mstislav Mstislawitsch dem Kühnen gefangen gehalten wurde.³¹ Es ist sehr gut möglich, dass in der Zwischenzeit gerade die Zipser Burg das (Ersatz-)Regierungszentrum und Mittelpunkt des galizischen Königreichs war.

Im Unterschied zu Koloman, der 1241 seinen Wunden erlag, die ihm mit mongolischer Waffe beigebracht worden waren, bekam Rastislaw nach der Vertreibung aus der Rus jedoch nicht das besser eingerichtete und reichere Slawonien, sondern die Matschwa bzw. das jenseitige Syrmien. Aber dieses Gebiet, das müssen wir betonen, hatte schon in der Zeit davor den Status eines eigenen dynastischen Territoriums, es war ein Fürstentum unter der Regierung der engsten dynastischen Angehörigen.

Wie schon erwähnt, gehörte das Territorium der Schwester des Königs, der ehemaligen byzantinischen Kaiserin Margarete aus der Arpaden-Dynastie, und ihren Söhnen. Margaretes Zweig der Arpaden verschwand, d.h. starb aus, im Jahre 1242. Gleich nach dem Rückzug der Mongolen hatte der pragmatische Bela IV. mit der Erneuerung seines zertrümmerten Landes und Stärkung seiner königlichen Macht angefangen. Für seinen Vater Andreas II. spielten auf dem Feld der dynastischen Politik, die in einem gewissen Maße durch das Verhältnis zwischen der Aristokratie und der königlichen Herrschaft bestimmt war, Slawonien, Siebenbürgen und Galizien eine sehr wichtige Rolle in der Verteilung der inneren staatlichen Macht im Königreich Ungarn selbst.³² In diesem Moment hatte also Bela, wenigstens vorläufig, keine Absicht auf Siebenbürgen und Slawonien zu verzichten, sodass das Gebiet der Matschwa an Rastislaw zugeteilt wurde. In der Zeit zwischen 1242 und 1254 konnte Bela IV. tatsächlich das Banat der Matschwa innehaben. Auffallend aber sind vor allem der Zusammenhang und die Kontinuität mit der Anwesenheit königlicher Verwandter in diesem Gebiet. Der vorherige Gebietsverwalter nämlich, Zarewitsch Jovan Andjeo (dt. Johannes Engelos), und Fürst Rastislaw Michailowitsch haben den identischen Titel *Dominus* geführt. Die Region behielt auch nach dem Einfall der Mongolen einen speziellen Status.

Es wurde schon früher festgestellt, dass der Titel *Dominus*, mit dem man Rastislaws Herrschaft über die Matschwa bezeichnete, dem ungarischen Titel *úr* (Wenzel), oder dem slawischen Titel *господар* (deutsch: *Herr*)³³ entsprach. Nach Meinung von Georg Ostrogorski gab es im Königreich Ungarn im Laufe des 12. Jahrhunderts den Titel *Urum* (ungarisch *uram* – *mein Herr*), mit

²⁸ WERTNER, MÓR: *Az Árpádok családi története*, pp. 448–452; ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ, Михайло: *Історія України-Руси*, 3, pp. 31–41; KRISTÓ, Gyula: *A feudális széttagolódás Magyarországon*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1979, pp. 92–93; FONT, Márta: *II. András orosz politikája*, pp. 124–129; ALMÁSI, Tibor: Kálmán, Magyar herceg. In: *KMTL*, p. 316; HOLLÝ, Karol: *Kňazná Salomea a uhorsko-poľské vzťahy v rokoch 1214–1241*. In: *Historický časopis*, a. 53, 2005, pp. 12–20; HOMZA, Martin: *Včasnostrdovekové dejiny Spiša*. In: *Historia Scopusii* 1, p. 148; ПРОСНАЗКОВА, Nataša: Koloman Haličský (?–1241). In: *Ibidem*, pp. 318–320.

²⁹ KRISTÓ, Gyula: *A feudális széttagolódás*, p. 93; KLAČIĆ, Vjekoslav: *Slavonija od X do XIII stoljeća*. Zagreb: Tisak Dioničke tiskare, 1882, pp. 54–58.

³⁰ FONT, Márta: *II. András orosz politikája*, pp. 126–127; ZSOLDOS, Attila: *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik, A királynéi intézmény az Árpádok korában*. Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2005, p. 157.

³¹ Vergleiche: ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ, Михайло: *Історія України-Руси*, 3, pp. 32–41; FONT, Márta: *II. András orosz politikája*, p. 127; HOLLÝ, Karol: *Kňazná Salomea*, pp. 15–17; ХАРДИ, Ђура: *Наследници Кијева између краљевске круне и татарског јарма*. Нови Сад: Филозофски факултет у Новом Саду, Одсек за историју, 2002, pp. 137–145.

³² FONT, Márta: *II. András orosz politikája*, p. 136; KRISTÓ, Gyula: *A feudális széttagolódás*, pp. 44–53.

³³ WENZEL, Gusztáv: *Rosztizlaw galicizai herceg*, pp. 14–15; WERTNER, MÓR: *Az Árpádok családi története*, pp. 467–468; МИХАЛЬЧИВ, РАДЕ: *Господар (господарь)*. In: *Лексикон српског средњег века*. Ed.: СИМА ЂИРКОВИЋ – РАДЕ МИХАЛЬЧИВ. Београд: Know-ledge, 1999, pp. 120–121.

dem man den Thronerben bezeichnete und der gleichwertig mit dem byzantinischen Titel *Despot* war. Die beiden Titel erschienen zum ersten Mal gemeinsam als Bezeichnung für den künftigen König Bela III., als der Arpade im Jahre 1163 nach Byzanz beordert und dort zum *Despoten*, d.h. zum Thronfolger des Kaisers Manuel Komnenos erklärt wurde. Schon im 13. Jahrhundert verlor der Titel *Urum*, ähnlich wie viele andere Titel, seine ursprüngliche Bedeutung und wurde nicht mehr dem Thronerben, sondern nahen Verwandten des Königs erteilt. Ostrogorskis Meinung nach trug Rastislaw Michailowitsch als Herrscher über die Matschwa eben diesen alten ungarischen Titel *Urum*, bzw. *Dominus*.³⁴ Den identischen Titel hatte vor ihm auch sein Vorgänger Kalojan Angelos. Mit der Zeit verlor der Titel seinen Wert und wurde auch den Großadligen erteilt. Es ist zum Beispiel bekannt, dass der bosnische Woiwode Hrvoje Vukčić 1404 in einer kyrillischen slawischen Handschrift als *урум*³⁵ bezeichnet wurde.

Inzwischen wurde, nach dem Aussterben von Rastislaws Nachkommen, der mächtige Ugrin Csák, der dem Großadel angehörte, zudem dass er *magister tavernicorum regalium* war, in der Bulle von Ladislaus IV. vom 13. März 1279 auch als „*Banus et Dominus de Macho, et de Bozna*“ bezeichnet.³⁶ Ugrin blieb jedoch nicht lange im Besitz der Matschwa und einem Teil Bosniens unter unmittelbarer ungarischer Herrschaft. Denn schon im nächsten Jahr wurde die Königinmutter Elisabeth Herzögin über diese Territorien. Es ist leicht zu erkennen, dass Ugrins Titel in Verbindung und in Kontinuität mit dem Titel *Dominus* steht, der zu Rastislaw und seiner Gattin gehörte. Am Ende müssen wir hier noch eine Parallele ziehen.

Am Übergang vom 13. zum 14. Jahrhundert, zu der Zeit in der die Arpaden Dynastie ausstarb und die Anjous ins Königreich Ungarn kamen, trug der kroatische Ban und ungekrönter Herrscher, Ugrins Zeitgenosse Pavle Bribirski,

am Höhepunkt seiner Macht, neben anderer Titel auch den Titel *Dominus in Bosnien*.³⁷ Natürlich nimmt diese Tatsache eine wichtige Stelle in der kroatischen Geschichtsschreibung ein, doch bei dieser Gelegenheit wagen wir die Frage zu stellen, ob die Tradition des von Rastislaw bzw. seiner Witwe getragenen Titels – *de Bosna et de Mazo domina*, mit dem bosnischen Titel der Fürsten von Bribir in Verbindung gebracht werden könnte. Unabhängig davon ist, dass sich das Bosnien unter der Herrschaft der Mitglieder der ungarischen Königsdynastie im territorialen Sinne wahrscheinlich nicht auf das Bosnien bezog, das die Herrschaft von Pavle Bribirski anerkannte.

Für die Geschichtsforschung steht schon lange fest, dass der in der Staatshierarchie des Königreichs Ungarn unter den Arpaden aus dem 13. Jahrhundert benutzte Titel *dominus* identisch mit dem Titel *dux* bzw. Herzog ist.³⁸ Hinsichtlich seines Herrscherranges war Rastislaw auch Fürst (an erster Stelle von Galizien, wenn auch nur vom Titel her), und seine Herrschaft sowie die Herrschaft seiner Nachkommen über die Matschwa musste ihrem Status nach eine fürstliche sein. Letztendlich übte auch Koloman in Galizien, der Zips oder Slawonien herzogliche Herrschaft aus.³⁹ Die Besitzer der Matschwa führten im Laufe des 13. Jahrhunderts abwechselnd die Titel *dominus* und *dux*, zum Beispiel die Söhne der Arpadin Margarete oder Rastislaw und seine Söhne.

Die Matschwa unter Rastislaw Michailowitsch kann sicherlich der Gruppe der Herzogtümer der ungarischen Arpaden-Herrscherdynastie aus dem 13. Jahrhundert zugeordnet werden. Die Herzogtümer hatten, jedes für sich, eine eigene Tradition und besaßen historische Umstände für ihr Entstehen. In diesem Zusammenhang sprachen von dem Land Matschwa (*terra Macho*) im 13. Jahrhundert Gyula Kristó, Attila Zsoldos, Sima Ćirković und andere.⁴⁰ Unser Ziel bei diesem Treffen war nicht über die Struktur und das

³⁴ ОСТРОГОРСКИ, Георгије: Урум-деспот, Почети деспотског достојанства у Византији. In: ОСТРОГОРСКИ, Георгије: *Из византијске историје, историографије и просопографије*. Београд: Просвета, 1970, pp. 211–214. (Original: OSTROGORSKY, Georg: Urum-Despotes, Die Anfänge der Despoteswürde in Byzanz. In: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, a. 44, 1951, pp. 448–460.

³⁵ РАДОЈЧИЋ, Никола: О једном наслову великог војводе босанског Хрвоја Вукчића. In: *Историјски часопис*, nr. 1, 1948, p. 37; ОСТРОГОРСКИ, Георгије: *Урум-деспот*, p. 214.

³⁶ WERTNER, Mór: *Az árpádokori bánok*, p. 481; SZOVÁK, Kornél: Ugrin Csák. In: *KMTL*, p. 697.

³⁷ ANTOJAK, Stjepan: Ban Pavao Bribirski „Croatorum dominus“. In: *Radovi Instituta JAZU u Zadru*, a. 19, 1972, pp. 14–15, 20–21.

³⁸ WENZEL, Gusztáv: *Rosztizlaw galicizai herceg*, p. 14; WERTNER, Mór: *Az Árpádok családi története*, p. 468; KRISTÓ, Gyula: *A feudális széttagolódás*, pp. 32–33; РОКАИ, Петар: „*Gyetus dux Sirmii*“, p. 126. vergleichen und: DU CANGE, Charles Du Fresne: *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, Band 3, Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1954, p. 173.

³⁹ КЛАЌИЋ, Вјекослав: *Славонија од X до XIII столјећа*, pp. 54–58; KRISTÓ, Gyula: *A feudális széttagolódás*, pp. 48, 92–93; ZSOLDOS, Attila: *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik*, p. 174; НОМЗА, Мартин: *Včasnostredoveké dejiny Spiša*, p. 148.

⁴⁰ KRISTÓ, Gyula: *A feudális széttagolódás*, p. 49; ZSOLDOS, Attila: *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik*, p. 174; ТИРКОВИЋ, Сима: *Земља Мачва и град Мачва*, pp. 5–6.

Funktionieren von Rastislaw Herrschaft in der Matschwa zu diskutieren. Wir können jedoch der Annahme zustimmen, dass diese Herrschaft, unter Beachtung der Oberherrschaft des ungarischen Königs, doch Elemente einer herrschaftlichen Selbstständigkeit auswies.⁴¹ Zum Beispiel im Bereich einer relativ selbstständig geführten Außenpolitik. Genauso können wir annehmen, dass der unternehmerische Rastislaw nach Ende der Einfälle zuerst der der Kumanen und dann auch der Mongolen ziemlich viel für die Einrichtung der Matschwa als Region getan hat. Die

gleichnamige Festung wurde höchstwahrscheinlich von ihm als sein Regierungszentrum gebaut.

Zum Schluss möchten wir sagen, dass der Status der Matschwa in der Zeit von Rastislaw Michailowitsch nicht dem Banat entsprach, sondern dass es sich um ein dynastisches Fürstentum handelte, das von den Mitgliedern der königlichen Familie als ihr Besitz verwaltet wurde. Ihrem Status nach besaß die Matschwa auch vor der Ankunft Rastislaws und seines Zweigs des ungarischen Königshauses, dynastische Kontinuität und Wurzeln.

⁴¹ WENZEL, Gusztáv: *Rosztizlaw galicziai herceg*, p. 14.

Die Familie Zapolya und ihre Getreuen in der Zeit vor Mohács

Familiarita rodu Zápoľských v predmoháčskom období /
Obitelj Zapolja i njezini familijari u Mohačkom razdoblju

The Zapolya family, one of the most powerful magnate families in the Hungarian Kingdom, had a large community of people loyal to them throughout the entire country. The following study deals with the structure, hierarchy, organization and relations within the system of the familiaritas of the Zápolya family, especially in the period between 1500 and 1526, when the family was represented by Hedwig of Těšín/Cieszyn, widow of the Hungarian count palatine, Stephen of Zápolya, and their sons, John and George.

Keywords: Zápolya family, Hedwig of Těšín, familiaritas, structure and organization, Hungarian Kingdom, 1500–1526

Nach dem Tode des ungarischen Palatins und Zipser Erbgespanns Stefan Zapolya (lat. *de Zapolya*, kroat. *Zapolja*, slow. *Zápoľský*) im Jahre 1499 wurde die Führung der Familie Zapolya von seiner Witwe, der Teschener Herzogin Hedwig (lat. *ducissa Thesseniensis*) übernommen.¹ In den nächsten zwanzig Jahren bestimmte sie wesentlich das Streben der Familie Zapolya. Sie betätigte sich in den Wirtschaftsangelegenheiten und verwaltete den umfangreichen Besitz der Familie. Sie führte auch eine systematische Heiratspolitik, mit dem Ziel der Familie Zapolya den höchstmöglichen Einfluss in der politischen Szene zu sichern. Im Kirchenbereich sowie im Kunstbereich war sie freigiebige Mäzenin. Ihr Lebens bis zu dem Tod im Jahre 1521 weihte Hedwig dem ambitiösen Plan, die ungarische Königskrone für ihren ältesten Sohn Johannes Zapolya zu erwerben.

Die Aktivitäten in allen oben genannten Bereichen erforderten eine Gemeinschaft der der

Familie loyal dienenden Getreuen, bekannt unter der Bezeichnung *familiaritas*.² Es handelte sich dabei um ein durchaus wohlüberlegtes System der Beziehungen in dem gesamten Gebiet des Königreichs Ungarn. Diese Tatsache wurde zutreffend schon im Werk eines Zeitgenossen Hedwigs, dem Diplomaten Sigmund von Herberstein, erfasst.³ Die Auswahl bestimmter Personen und ihre Eingliederung in die engere oder breitere Gemeinschaft ist keine Angelegenheit des Zufalls, sondern das Ergebnis der Betrachtung mehrerer Kriterien, sowie gewisser gesellschaftlicher, politischer und anderer Interessen der betreffenden Person

Die Ankunft der Herzogin Hedwig im Königreich Ungarn nach der Heirat mit Stefan Zapolya bedeutete zweifellos auch die Ankunft einer größeren Anzahl ihrer Getreuen. Leider stehen uns keine näheren Informationen über ihr Gefolge aus Teschen zur Verfügung. Kurz nach dem Tode von Zapolya fand offensichtlich ein Beratungstreffen statt,

* Veronika Kucharská, Absolventin des Doktorandenstudiums am Lehrstuhl für slowakische Geschichte der Philosophischen Fakultät der Comenius Universität in Bratislava.

¹ Über diese bedeutende Persönlichkeit des spätmittelalterlichen Königreichs Ungarn cfr. SROKA, Stanisław A.: *Jadwiga Zapolya : Piastówna śląska na Węgrzech w dobie panowania Jagiellonów*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Naukowe Societas Vistulana, 2005 und die Dissertationsarbeit: KUCHARSKÁ, Veronika: *Hedviga Tešínska : šlachičná na prelome stredoveku a novoveku*. Bratislava: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Komenského, 2011. Siehe auch das neulich herausgegebene Urkundenbuch der Familie Zapolya mit allen bis jetzt bekannten Urkunden der Hedwig von Teschen – *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára*, vol. 1 : *Levelek és oklevelek (1458–1526)*. Ed.: Tibor NEUMANN. Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, Történettudományi Intézet, 2012.

² Das bisher einzige umfassende Werk über die Getreuen der Familie Zapolya stellt eine Studie von KUBINYI András dar: *A Szapolyaiak és familiárisaik (szervitoraik)*. In: *Tanulmányok Szapolyai Jánosról és a kora újkori Erdélyről. Studia Miskolcensis*, vol. 5. Ed.: József BESSENYI – Zita HORVÁTH – Péter TÓTH. Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetem, 2004, pp. 169–194.

³ HERBERSTEIN, Sigmund von: *Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii*. Ed.: Hermann BEYER-THOMA – Frank KÄMPFER – Eva MAURER – Andreas FÜLBERTH. München: Osteuropa-Institut, 2007, p. 102: „(...) So was graff Steffan in Zipps (der bey Khünig Mathias in grossem gwallt und ansehen gewest ist / dardurch auch vil Reichthumb uberkhommen) gelassne witiß ain geborne hertzogin von Teschn / aines grossen gemüets / die understüende sich mit den ansechlichisten hungern in den merern Spanschaftten zuhandlen mit jargelt (das sy jargelisch nennen) diensden und in oill annder weg an sich zuziehen / der mainung das sy jren Sun hansen die obgemelt jres Khünigs tochter zu gemachl der hoffnung darmit auch das Khünigreich (weil der Khünig allt unnd khrangkh was) zu bekhomen (...)“.

zu dem die Familiengetreuen von Hedwig einberufen wurden. Sie ersuchte z. B. Valentinus Korom von Blatnica, sich zu ihr zu begeben, wobei sie auch die Ankunft von Michael Hangatsch, dem Zipser Propst Georg und weiteren, im Gebiet der heutigen Slowakei wirkenden Getreuen erwähnte.⁴ Michael Hangatsch war ungarischer Vizepalatin, Kastellan von Szádvár und Zempliner Vizegespan zusammen mit Georg von Csanád, Kastellan von Tokaj.⁵

Die Elite der Getreuen repräsentierten die Berater. Als Kriterium für die Einteilung in diese Gruppe wurde von uns die in den Quellen benutzte Bezeichnung *consiliarius* bzw. *secretarius* angewendet. Eine solche Position erforderte außerordentliche Fähigkeiten, Bildung und ausgezeichnete Orientierung in politischen und diplomatischen Angelegenheiten, denn sie waren bevollmächtigt, ihren Herren bei wichtigen Verhandlungen zu vertreten. Die Berater waren oftmals selbst Mitglieder des höheren Adels, bildeten den engsten Kreis um ihren Herren, waren dessen Vertraute und hatten somit großen Einfluss auf seine Entscheidungen.

Für die Familie Zapolya waren die in den Jahren 1505–1506 verlaufenen Verhandlungen, die zum Ziel hatten, eine erfolgreiche Heirat zwischen dem jüngeren Sohn Hedwigs Georg Zapolya und Elisabeth, der Tochter von Johannes Corvinus und Beatrix von Frangepan (lat. de *Frangepanibus*,

slow. und kroat. *Frankopan*) zu schließen, von höchster Priorität.⁶ Daher war es selbstverständlich und notwendig, dass sich an diesen Verhandlungen die fähigsten Getreuen beteiligten. Unter einer der Vertragsversionen sind Unterschriften mehrerer Berater der Familie Zapolya zu finden.⁷

Die Dienste von Michael Imrefi für die Familie Zapolya sind bisher nur bei den oben erwähnten Heiratsverhandlungen in den Jahren 1505–1506 zu belegen. In den Jahren 1514 und 1522 wird Imrefi als königlicher Oberstallmeister erwähnt.⁸ In der Wappenurkunde, die ihm 1523 von König Ludwig II. erteilt wurde, wird er als sein Berater erwähnt.⁹ Seine Ehefrau war Christine aus dem Geschlecht Podmanicky (Tochter von Ladislaus Podmanicky), deren Schwester Margarete Ehefrau von Georg von Mesztesyó war.¹⁰ Im Mai und Juli 1505 deputierte Hedwig Georg von Mesztesyó zusammen mit ihren weiteren Beratern Paul von Dombó (Dombai), Adam Horvat, Johannes von Tornaľa und Georg Gersenyé¹¹ mit Vollmachten ausgestattet zur Beatrix von Frangepan um über weitere Einzelheiten der Heirat ihrer Kinder zu verhandeln.¹² Georg von Mesztesyó und Paul von Dombo werden im Jahre 1507 als Assessoren am königlichen Gerichtshof angeführt.¹³ Paul von Dombo beteiligte sich auch an der Vorbereitung des *Tripartitums*.¹⁴ Enge Beziehungen führten

⁴ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 290, 17. 01. 1500: „Egregio Valentino Korom de Blathmycza (...) Sciatis, quod dominus Michael Hangachy et dominus prepositus cum ceteris familiaribus nostris in partibus superioribus (...) die crastina procul dubio istic apud nos constituentur (...) committimus vobis, quatenus et vos quoque absque omni occasione ad dominicam diem proxime venturum istic constitui debeatis (...)“; KUBINYI: *A Szapolyaiak és familiárisaik*, p. 181.

⁵ Magyar Országos Levéltár Budapest, Diplomataikai Levéltár (deinde MOL DL) 46338, 23. 03. 1496: „(...) Michael de Hangacz vicepalatinus Regni Hungarie et Georgius de Chanadino castellanus castris Thokay vicecomites (...) comitatus Zempleniensis (...)“; DL 90207, 14. 12. 1491: „(...) Michael Hangach castellanus castris Zaard (...)“.

⁶ Näheres zu diesem Heiratsprojekt: SROKA, Stanisław A.: Sobášna politika Hedvigy Zápoľskej. In: *Z minulosti Spiša*, vol. 13. Ed.: Ivan CHALUPECKÝ. Levoča: Spišský dejepisný spolok, 2005, pp. 55–61; IDEM: *Jadwiga Zapolya*, pp. 45–63.

⁷ MOL DL 37829: „(...) ex parte vero predictorum domine Hedwigis ducisse ac Johannis et Georgii filiorum eiusdem egregii Stefanus Marias de Markosfalwa, Georgius Zerechen, Clemens Rosen de Mythyth, Michael Sobly, Johannes Thornay, Magister Adam de Horwath, Paulus Dombay et Michael Imryfy similiter familiares et consilarii eorundem (...)“.

⁸ *Diplomatarium Comitatus Sarosiensis, quod ex tabulariis et codicibus manuscriptis*. Ed.: Carolus WAGNER. Posonii et Cassovia: Sumpt. Joannis Michaelis Landerer, 1780, p. 400: „(...) Michaelis Emrefy Magister stabuli Regie Maiestatis (...)“; MOL DL 91062, 24. 07. 1522: „(...) egregius Michael Imbryfy de Zerdahel agazonum magister noster (...)“.

⁹ MOL DL 93845, 11. 11. 1523: „(...) fideli nostro Egregio Michaeli Imrefy de Zerdahel Agazonum nostrorum vicemagistro consiliarioque nostro (...)“.

¹⁰ MOL DL 65988, 04. 05. 1501: „(...) Cristina egregii Michaelis Emrefy de Zerdahel et Margaretha, Georgii Zerechen de Mezthegnyew consortes filie videlicet egregii condam Ladislai Podmanyczky de Podmanyn (...)“; ENGEL, Pál: *Magyar középkori adattár. Középkori magyar genealógia* (CD-ROM). Budapest: Történettudományi Intézet, 2001, Sub voce Szerecsen.

¹¹ KUBINYI: *A Szapolyaiak és familiárisaik*, p. 175.

¹² NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 303, 03. 05. 1505: „(...) Misimus erga vestram illustrem dominationem hos egregios Stephanum Maryasy de Markosfalwa, Georgium Zerechen de Mezthegnyew, Paulum de Dombo et Iohannem de Thornalya familiares et consilarios nostros (...)“; Ibidem, nr. 310, 15. 07. 1505: „(...) Misimus (...) hos egregios Georgium Zerechen de Mezthegnyew, Paulum de Dombo, Magistrum Adam de Horwath et Georgium de Gerstenye familiares et consilarios nostros (...)“; Ibidem auch nr. 308, 309.

¹³ KOVACHICH, Martinus Georgius: *Supplementum ad vestigia comitorum apud Hungaros*, vol. 2. Budae: Typ. ac sumpt. Typographiae Regiae Universitatis Pestanae, 1800, pp. 343–344: „(...) item Michael de Zob, Georgio Zerechen de Mezthegnyew (...) Paulo de Dombo (...) Consiliariis ac Sedis nostrae Iudicariae Juratis Assessoribus (...)“.

¹⁴ WERBŐCZY, Stephen: *The Customary Law of the Renowned Kingdom of Hungary: A Work in Three Parts (The “Tripartitum”)*. Ed. et trans.: János M. BAK – Péter BANYÓ – Martyn RADY. Budapest: Central European University, Department of Medieval Studies, 2005, pp. 8–9: „(...) Michael de Zob ac Paulum de Dombo iurato assessores dictae sedis nostrae iudicariae (...)“.

später zur Heirat zwischen Dombos Sohn und der Tochter von Verböci.¹⁵ Magister Adam Horvat war langjähriger Notar, wirkte am Gericht der „*persönlichen Anwesenheit des Königs*“¹⁶ und in der Kanzlei des Palatins Stefan Zapolya.¹⁷ Seine Unterschriften sind unter vielen Urkunden aus den Jahren 1480–1497 zu sehen. Bei den Zapolyas fungierte er auch als Kastellan der Burg Szádvár.¹⁸

Zu den engsten Getreuen der Familie Zapolya gehörte auch Johannes von Tornaľa. Er war langjähriger Vizegespan der Gemerer Gespannschaft zusammen mit Peter von Drienčany.¹⁹ Im Jahre 1513 erweiterte der König Vladislav II. auf Wunsch von Johannes Zapolya das Wappen des Geschlechts von Tornaľa um das Symbol des sich im Wappen der Zapolyas befindenden Einhorn.²⁰ Im Jahre 1514, als sein Sohn während des Dózsa-Aufstandes hingerichtet wurde, wurde Johannes von Tornaľa als Hofmeister von Johannes Zapolya erwähnt.²¹ Im Auftrag Hedwigs von Teschen beteiligte sich Johannes von Tornaľa an dem schon erwähnten Heiratsprojekt in den Jahren 1505–1506. Jakob, der Bruder von Johannes, wirkte im Jahre 1511 in Debrecen als Offizial von Johannes Zapolya²², nach dem Jahre 1526 wurde er Schatzmeister von Zapolya.²³

Michael von Szob (Szobi) war Honter Gespan²⁴ und zusammen mit Georg von Mesztegnyő und Paul von Dombo Assessor am königlichen Gerichtshof. Er beteiligte sich auch an der Vorbereitung des *Tripartitums* und war einer der engsten Mitarbeiter Verböcis. Die politische Rolle von Stefan Verböci wurde weitgehend bestimmt von der

Zusammenarbeit mit Michael von Szob. Verböci wirkte eine Zeit als Notar in seinen Diensten. Es gibt Vermutungen, dass er der uneheliche Sohn von ihm sein könnte, was die enge lebenslange Zusammenarbeit und auch den Übergang seines ganzen Besitztums nach seinem Tode auf Verböci andeuten würde. Am Anfang des Jahres 1526 kulminierten die Bestrebungen Palatin Verböci seines Amtes zu entheben und in Abwesenheit wurde er zusammen mit Michael von Szob vom ungarischen Landtag wegen Verrats verurteilt. Beide waren gezwungen zu fliehen und einige Zeit versteckten sie sich auf ihren Besitztümern.²⁵

Diesen Ereignissen ging ein Streit um die Besitzungen des Magnaten Lorenz von Ilok (lat. *de Wylak*, kroat. *Iločki*, slow. *Ilocký*) voran, mit dessen Tod im Jahre 1524 das Geschlecht von Ilok in männlicher Linie ausgestorben war. Nach seinem Tod gingen alle Besitztümer der Familie auf die Krone über. Gegen diese Entscheidung stellten sich die Brüder Johannes und Georg Zapolya, die ihre Besitzansprüche auf einen alten, unter ihrem Vater Stefan Zapolya und Laurentius von Ilok geschlossenen Vertrag zurückführten.²⁶ Dieselben Ansprüche wurden zugleich auch vom Obertruchsessmeister Ladislaus More von Csula, der fast unmittelbar nach Ilockys Tod seine Witwe Magdalene geheiratet hatte, erhoben.²⁷ In einem neuen Prozess auf dem Landtag von Hatvan (1525) entschied Palatin Verböci als Vorsitzender überraschend nicht zugunsten seines langjährigen Herren Johannes Zapolya, sondern, nach Instruktionen vom Königshof, für More.²⁸ Es handelte

¹⁵ NAGY, Iván: *Magyarország családai czimerekkel és nemzékrendi táblakkal*, vol. 3. Pest: Friebeisz – Ráth Mór, 1859, p. 348.

¹⁶ Z. B.: MOL DL 26939, 31. 01. 1496: „(...) egregio Magistro Adamae de Lizka personalis presentiae Regiae ac istarum partium Transylvanarum prothonotario (...)“; KUBINYI: *A Szapolyaiak és familiárisaik*, p. 181.

¹⁷ MOL DL 71068, 05. 11. 1498: „(...) item egregiis Magistris Adam de Horvath nostro palatinali (...) prothonotarios (...)“.

¹⁸ MOL DL 30063, 27. 8. 1500: „(...) Magister Adam de Horvath castellanus castris Zaard (...)“.

¹⁹ MOL DL 61084, 05. 7. 1501; DL 61100, 07. 06. 1518: „(...) Johannes de Thornalya ac Petrus de Drenchen vicecomites (...) comitatus Gewmeriensis (...)“.

²⁰ SKALSKÁ, Monika: *Jelšava a Jelšavské panstvo v stredoveku*. Martin: Matica slovenská, 2009, pp. 271–272.

²¹ *Monumenta rusticorum in Hungaria rebellium anno MDXIV*. Ed.: Antonius FEKETE NAGY – Viktor KENÉZ – Ladislaus SOLYMOŠI – Geisa ÉRSZEGI. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1979, pp. 103–104: „(...) crucifixus fuit filius domini Iohannis Thornally magistri curie domini nostri graciousissimi (...)“.

²² NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára 1*, nr. 462, 07. 09. 1517: „(...) Egregio Jacobo de Thornalya officiali nostro in Debrecen (...)“.

²³ SKALSKÁ: *Jelšava a Jelšavské panstvo v stredoveku*, pp. 276–277.

²⁴ MOL DL 46930, 26. 2. 1510: „(...) Egregius Michael filius Petri de Zob comes comitatus Honthensis (...)“.

²⁵ KUBINYI, András: István Werbőczy als Politiker in der Zeit vor Mohács (1526). In: *The Man of Many Devices, who Wandered full Many Ways (...)* Festschrift in Honor of János M. Bak. Ed.: Balázs NAGY – Marcell SEBŐK. Budapest: Central European University Press, 1999, pp. 558–582.

²⁶ MOL DL 64614, 09. 06. 1525: „(...) eiusdem contractus inter illustrem condam Laurentium de Wylak ducem Bozne ab una nec non Spectabilem et Magnificum condam Stephanum de predicta Zapolya comitem perpetuum prenotate Terre Scepusiensis genitorem ipsorum Johannis et Georgii comitum ab altera partibus (...)“.

²⁷ MOL DL 66060, 14. 06. 1525.

²⁸ Verlauf des Landtages in *Epistolae Procerum Regni Hungarie*, vol. 1. Ed.: Georgius PRAY. Posonii: G. A. Belnay, 1806, pp. 395–420; Tagebuch des Landtagsartigen Versammlung des Adels zu Hatvan 1525. In: *Sammlung kleiner noch ungedrückter Stücke*. Ed.: Martin Georg KOVACHICH. Ofen: Gedruckt mit Königlichen Universitäts Schriften, 1805, pp. 97–110; weiter zum Prozess: FRANKÓI, Vilmos: *Werbőczy István életrajza*. Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1899, pp. 224–226; KUBINYI: István

sich um eine ernste Angelegenheit in der Zeit unmittelbar vor Mohács, die ohne Zweifel die angespannte Beziehung zwischen dem König und den Zapolyas noch verschlechterte. Der Konflikt wird vom Zeitgenossen Georg von Syrmien beschrieben und die Tatsache, dass der Besitz nicht den Zapolyas zugesagt wurde, hält er sogar für eine der Ursachen, die zum Tode König Ludwigs II. führen sollten.²⁹

Klemens Rozen (Rožeň) von Rožňové Mitice (heute Trenčianske Mitice) wird als Vizegespan der Trentschiner Gespanschaft erwähnt.³⁰ Im Jahre 1499 war er anwesend beim Verfassen des letzten Willens von Stefan Zapolya.³¹ Im Jahre 1505 beteiligte er sich an den oben genannten Heiratsverhandlungen.³²

Drei Berater der Herzogin Hedwig – die Herren de Rosa, Laurentius und Hynko werden in der Chronik von Konrad Sperfogel bei der Beschreibung ihrer Begräbnisprozession durch die Stadt Levoča (dt. *Leutschau*) aufgeführt.³³ Beim Erstgenannten handelt es sich vermutlich um ein Mitglied des Geschlechts Rozen – Michael, Klemens oder Ladislaus, es ist aber nicht sicher um welchen, denn alle drei waren zu dieser Zeit noch am Leben. Michael war jedoch Abt in der nahen Zisterzienserabtei in Spišský Štiavnik (dt. *Schawnik*).³⁴ Bei dem an zweiter Stelle Genannten

handelt es sich höchstwahrscheinlich um Lorenz Salzer von Záblatie (heute ein Teil von Trenčín).³⁵ Er war langjähriger Vizegespan der Trentschiner Gespanschaft, fast ununterbrochen in den Jahren 1501–1526 und zugleich auch Hauptmann der Burg Bojnice.³⁶ Der einzige zu belegende Hynko war Hynek von Blížešov, im Jahre 1511 erwähnt als Hauptmann der Burg Orava (dt. *Arwa*).³⁷ Als Kastellan von Orava erscheint er auch in Hedwigs Urkunde aus dem Jahre 1519.³⁸

Eine sehr enge Beziehung zur Familie Zapolya hatte der Getreue Stefan Mariasi (Mariási) von Markušovce (dt. *Marksdorf*). Zur Wende des 15. zum 16. Jahrhundert wurde Mariasi zum bedeutendsten Mitglied der Herren von Markušovce. Das hatte er besonders seiner Verbindung zu den Zapolyas zu verdanken, denn kurz nachdem er in ihre Dienste getreten war, machte er rasch Karriere und in den nächsten Jahren vergrößerte er wesentlich die Familienbesitzungen. Seit dem Jahre 1492 wirkte er als Kastellan der Burg Šariš (dt. *Scharosch*)³⁹ und verwaltete sie fast bis zu seinem Tod im Jahre 1516.⁴⁰ Im Jahre 1494 wird er als Hauptmann der Burg Šariš und sogar als Gespan erwähnt⁴¹ und im Januar 1500 wurde er von Hedwig zum Zipser Hauptmann ernannt.⁴² Im Jahre 1502 machte ihn Hedwig auch zum Kastellan der Burg Gelnica (dt. *Gelnitz*).⁴³ Mariasi genoss bei Hedwig

Werböczy als Politiker, pp. 558–582; RADY, Martin: Stephen Werböczy and his Tripartitum. In: *The Customary Law of the Renowned Kingdom of Hungary*, p. XLII.

²⁹ SIRMIENSIS, Georgius: *Epistola de perditione Regni Hungarorum. Monumenta Hungariae: Historica: Scriptorum*, vol. 1. Ed.: GUSZTÁV WENZEL. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1857, pp. 78–81 und 406–409; ein weiterer Zeitgenosse: THURN SCHWAMBIUS, Johannes: Extract aus der Beschreibung des Mitternhauss, im Neusohl gelegen, durch Hansen Thurnschwamb, der Herrn Fugger gewesen Factorem daselbst, samt anderm, was sich in der Kron Hungern zugetragen, geschrieben im Ein Thausend Fünfhundert frey und sechzigsten Jahr. In: Johann Christian von ENGEL: *Geschichte des Ungrischen Reiches und seiner Nebenländer* 1. Halle: Johann Jacob Gebauer, 1797, pp. 196–197.

³⁰ MOL DF 274533, 16. 3. 1495: „(...) Clemens Rozen vicecomes comitatus Threnchiniensi (...)“.

³¹ *Analecta Scepusii sacri et profani*, vol. 1. Ed.: Carolus WAGNER. Viennae: Typis Joannis Thomae nobil. de Trattner, 1773, p. 151.

³² Heiratsverträge MOL DL 37829.

³³ Štátny archív v Levoči, Kronika Konrada Sperfogla (Levočská kronika 1516–1536), sign. A 7, A 12, fol. 43–44: „(...) tres consiliarii eius (...) dominus de Rosa, dominus Laurentius et dominus Heyncko nobiles (...)“; *Kroniky stredovekého Slovenska: Stredoveké Slovensko očami kráľovských a mestských kronikárov*. Ed. et trans.: Július Sopko. Budmerice: Vydavateľstvo RAK, 1995, pp. 229–230.

³⁴ Näheres über ihn am Ende des Artikels.

³⁵ So auch die Vermutung von KUBINYI: *A Szapolyaiak és familiárisaik*, p. 182.

³⁶ MOL DL 21033, 13. 04. 1501: „(...) Laurentius Zablath vicecomes comitatus Threnchiniensi; DL 24791, 05. 3. 1526: *Laurentius de Zablath vicecomes comitatus Thrynchhiniensi et capitaneus castris Baymociensi (...)*“; DL 75790, 31. 01. 1518: „(...) egregius Laurentius Trencheny de Zablath capitaneus castris dicti Georgii de Zapolya Baymoc vocati (...)“.

³⁷ *Slovenské listy a listiny z 15. a 16. storočia*. Ed.: Branislav VARSÍK. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV, 1956, p. 54.

³⁸ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 500, 04. 10. 1519: „(...) Scribimus (...) Hynkoni castellano castris nostri Arwa (...)“.

³⁹ *Ibidem*, nr. 220, 13. 07. 1492: „(...) egregius Stephanus de Maryazy castellanus castris nostri Saros (...)“.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, nr. 427, 07. 03. 1516: „(...) quod quia egregius Stephanus Maryasy de Markosfalwa castrum nostrum Saros vocatum, quod hactenus de nostro beneplacito tenuit et possedit, de nostra commissione et voluntate manibus egregiorum Christofero Warkoch et Michaelis de Challockewz dedit et assignavit (...)“.

⁴¹ MOL DL 74960, 17. 07. 1494: „(...) Stephanus Mariasi de Marcusfalwa capitaneus castris Saros et comes comitatus de Saros (...)“.

⁴² NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 291, 24. 01. 1500: „(...) egregium Stephanum Maryasy, castellanum castris nostri Saros in capitaneum illarum partium ad hoc tempus delegimus et deputamus (...)“.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, nr. 295, 28. 06. 1502: „(...) egregius Paulus Darhocz, castellanus castris nostri Gelnecz idem castrum nostrum Gelnecz (...) ad manus Egregii Stephani Maryasy Capitanei nostri Scepusiensium dedit et assignavit (...)“.

hohes Ansehen, deshalb beauftragte sie ihn auch mit der Erziehung ihres ältesten Sohnes Johannes, den er bei seinen Reisen und Aufenthalten auf den Königshof in Buda begleitete.⁴⁴ Die enge Beziehung zwischen ihm und der Familie Zapolya wurde auch auf seinem Grabmal in der Kirche von Markušovce verewigt.⁴⁵ Am Portal dieser Kirche befindet sich das Wappen der Herzogin Hedwig.⁴⁶

In Hedwigs Diensten wirkten auch zwei Sekretäre – Benedikt und Michael Panonius, Doktor der Künste und der Medizin⁴⁷ und allem Anschein nach der Leibarzt von Hedwig.⁴⁸ Nach ihrem Tod im Jahre 1521 dienten beide weiter als Sekretäre ihrer Söhne Johannes und Georg.⁴⁹

Am Verlauf der Heiratsverhandlungen beteiligten sich auch weitere Getreue, die zwar nicht direkt als Berater bezeichnet werden, aufgrund der ihnen anvertrauten Aufgaben können sie aber in den Kreis der höchstgestellten Getreuen eingegliedert werden. Gregor von Kovácshida⁵⁰, Emerich von Ládón (Ládonyi)⁵¹ und Benedikt Bakos⁵² sind in den Jahren 1505–1506 mehrmals

auf den Hof von Beatrix von Frangepan deputiert worden. Bakos wird im Jahre 1515 als Vizekastellan der Burg Šariš erwähnt⁵³, Emerich von Ládón wirkte in den Jahren 1518–1519 als Kastellan der Burg Csesznek und im Jahre 1523 wird er sogar als Hofmeister von Zapolya erwähnt.⁵⁴

Ein weiterer Deputierter im Jahre 1505 war Nikolaus von Turiec (dt. *Turz*)⁵⁵, Sohn des Chronisten und Protonotars Johannes von Turiec.⁵⁶ Im Jahre 1498 wirkte Nikolaus als Königskanzler.⁵⁷ Nach der Ernennung von Johannes Zapolya zum Woiwoden von Siebenbürgen (1511) bekleidete Nikolaus das Amt des Vizewoiwoden.⁵⁸ In den Jahren 1518–1522 war er Turzer Gespan und 1518 zudem Kastellan der Burg Sklabiňa.⁵⁹ Als Kastellan der Burg Sklabiňa fungierte bei den Zapolyas auch Rafael Majteni, der früher unter Johannes Corvinus als Kastellan der Burg Bojnice diente.⁶⁰ Zu den Getreuen der Zapolyas in Gemer gehörten auch die Mitglieder des Geschlechts von Putnok. Georg von Putnok war Vizegespan der Gemerer Gespannschaft und wirkte als Kastellan der Burg Murán.⁶¹

⁴⁴ *Historia Scepusii: Dejiny Spiša do roku 1526*, vol. 1. Ed.: Martin HOMZA – Stanisław A. SROKA. Bratislava a Krakow: Katedra slovenských dejín FiFUK a Instytut Historii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2009, p. 527; NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára 1*, nr. 297, 15. 10. 1502: „(...) Stephanum Maryassy capitaneum nostrum Scepusiensem, quem e Buda cum filio nostro illustri qualibet hora huc expectamus (...)“.

⁴⁵ *Analecta Scepusii Sacri et Profani 2*. Ed.: Carolus WAGNER. Viennae: Typis Joan. Thomae nobil. De Trattnern, 1774, p. 353: „(...) Stephanus hac tumba positus Mariassi jaceo: hoc generi statuens monumentum perpetuum, ut sit posteris ossa tegendi. Gratus eram patriae, atque domui Zapolyianae; ast jam mortale reddens telluri corpus, animam Magne quaeso suscipe Pater, et Coeli optata parte reponere MDXVI. Sepultus XXX. April (...)“.

⁴⁶ BÁRCZAY, Oszkár: A markusfalvi templom címeres emléktáblái. In: *Turul*, a. 15, 1897, pp. 92–94.

⁴⁷ *Monumenta ecclesiastica tempora innovatae in Hungaria religionis (1520–1529)* 1. Ed.: Vincze BUNYITAY – Raymund RAPAICS – János KARÁCSONYI. Budapest: Sectio. Scient. et Litt. Societatis S. Stephani, 1902, p. 4, 15. 03. 1520: „(...) Michaellem Pannonium artium et medicinae doctorem phisicum et Benedictum de Zenthmaria, secretarios illustris Dominae Hedvoigis ducissae Thessiniensis (...) patronae nostrae gratiosissimae (...)“; KUBINYI: *A Szapolyaiak és familiárisaik*, p. 179.

⁴⁸ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára 1*, nr. 429, 14. 03. 1516: „(...) egregius doctor Michael, secretarius et phisicus noster (...)“; *Ibidem*, nr. 435, 16. 05. 1516.

⁴⁹ MOL DL 84753, 31. 5. 1522: „(...) egregiorum Michaelis Pannonii Artium et Medicine doctoris, Benedicti de ZenthMaria secretariorum Spectabilium et Magnificorum dominorum Johannis et Georgii de Zapolya (...)“.

⁵⁰ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára 1*, nr. 301, 20. 04. 1505: „(...) Misimus erga vestram illustrissimam d(ominationem) hunc nobilem Gregorium de Kowachhyda familiarem nostrum (...)“.

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, nr. 314, 19. 11. 1505: „(...) Misimus erga d. vestram hunc nobilem Emericum de Ladon familiarem nostrum (...)“; KUBINYI: *A Szapolyaiak és familiárisaik*, p. 180.

⁵² *Ibidem*, nr. 318, 01. 04. 1506: „(...) Misimus erga d(ominationem) v(estram) i(llum) hunc nobilem Benedictum Bakos familiarem nostrum (...)“.

⁵³ MOL DF 217420, 1515: „(...) Benedictus Bakos vicecastellanus de Saros (...)“.

⁵⁴ MOL DL 62044, 29. 8. 1518: „(...) Emericus de Ladon castellanus castri Cheznek (...)“, DL 24373, 26. 6. 1519. NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára 1*, nr. 572, 14. 05. 1523: „(...) Hinc considerantes servitia egregii Emerici de Ladon, magistri curie nostre (...)“.

⁵⁵ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára 1*, nr. 311, 10. 09. 1505: „(...) Misimus erga d(ominationem) vestram illustrem hunc magistrum Nicolaum Thwroczy familiarem nostrum (...)“.

⁵⁶ MOL DL 21215, 15. 10. 1503: „(...) pro nobili Nicolao filio condam egregii magistri Johannis de Thwroc (...)“.

⁵⁷ MOL DL 69084, 21. 5. 1498.

⁵⁸ MOL DL 30075, 20. 04. 1512: „(...) Nicolaus Thwroczy vicewaywoda Transilvanus et Siculorum vicecomes (...)“, in den Jahren 1514–1515 FEKETE NAGY – KENÉZ – SOLYMOŠI – ÉRSZEGI (ed.): *Monumenta rusticorum in Hungaria rebellium*, pp. 103–104 und 376–378.

⁵⁹ BORSA, Iván: Turóc vármegye ispánjai és alispánjai 1526-ig. In: *Levéltári Közlemények*, 60, 1989, nr. 2., pp. 199–218.

⁶⁰ MOL DL 73159, 23. 11. 1491: „(...) egregius Raphael de Maythen castellanus castri nostri Baymocz (...)“, MOL DL 63527, 05. 12. 1506: „(...) Egregius Raphael de Maythen castellanus illustris et magnifici domini Johannis de Zapolya comitis perpetui terre Scepusiensis per eundem in castro suo Zklabyna constitutus (...)“.

⁶¹ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára 1*, nr. 212, 11. 11. 1491: „(...) deputavimus egregios Georgium de Pwthnok castellanum castri nostri Mwrán (...)“, auch MOL DL 90207. SKALSKÁ: *Jelšava a Jelšavské panstvo v stredoveku*, pp. 266–269.

In den vertrauten Kreis der Familie Zapolya gehörte auch Emerich Himfi von Döbrente. In einer Urkunde aus dem Jahre 1494 wird er von Stefan Zapolya als *compater* betitelt. Wir können also voraussetzen, dass er Pate eines der Kinder der Zapolyas war.⁶² Himfi war Kastellan der Burg Visegrád und im Jahre 1497 wird er als einer der Behüter der Königskrone angeführt.⁶³ Bei den Zapolyas fungierte er als Kastellan der Burg Turňa.⁶⁴ Nach Himfis Tod wandte sich seine Witwe an Hedwig mit der Bitte um Protektion und Unterstützung und genauso wie ihr Ehemann wurde sie in der Urkunde als *compatrix* betitelt.⁶⁵ Mit Emerichs Tod starb das Geschlecht Himfi in männlicher Linie aus. Seine Tochter Ursula wurde Frau eines weiteren Getreuen der Familie Zapolya, Franziskus von Essegvár (Essegvári), der somit den Besitz der Himfis erwarb.⁶⁶ Franziskus von Essegvár wirkte als langjähriger Kastellan der Burg Pápa. Im Jahre 1517 befreite Hedwig sein Haus in Pápa für die von ihm geleisteten Dienste für vier Jahre von jeglichen Steuern.⁶⁷ In den Jahren 1519–1521 stellte ihm Hedwig mehrere Quittungen über die abgegebenen Erträge der Burgdomänen Pápa, Ugod und Csesznek, der Prämonstratenserabtei Mórchida, der Zisterzienserabtei Zirc und der Benediktinerabtei in Krplivnik aus.⁶⁸

Diese und auch andere Korrespondenz der Witwe Hedwig von Teschen bestätigt ihre aktive

Verwaltung der Familienbesitzungen und gute Übersicht über die Wirtschaftsverhältnisse. Im Jahre 1521, nur einen Monat vor ihrem Tod, stellte Hedwig Nikolaus von Drienčany, dem Kastellan von Turňa, eine Quittung über die 600 Dukaten-Steuern mit der Bemerkung aus, dass sie bisher nur 590 von ihm erhalten hatte und auf weitere zehn noch warte.⁶⁹ Nikolaus diente als Kastellan dieser Burg in den Jahren 1518–1524, zugleich war er auch Gespan der Tornauer Gespanschaft.⁷⁰ Außer den Wirtschaftsangelegenheiten koordinierte Hedwig auch die ihren Sohn Johannes Zapolya zu den Landtagen in Buda begleitenden Getreuen. Im Jahre 1507 befahl sie Franziskus von Podtureň sich auf den Landtag so vorzubereiten wie es Brauch war.⁷¹ In ähnlicher Sache schrieb sie ein paar Jahre später dem Getreuen Thomas von Šebastová.⁷²

Zu den bedeutendsten Getreuen der Familie Zapolya in der Zipser Gespanschaft gehörte Paul Darholtz, der Zipser Hauptmann spätestens seit dem Jahre 1490.⁷³ Am Anfang des Jahres 1500 war er aufgrund einer Erkrankung nicht mehr fähig, diese Funktion auszuüben. Hedwig ernannte deshalb den schon erwähnten Stefan Mariasi zum neuen Hauptmann.⁷⁴ Darholtz war zudem langjähriger Kastellan der Burg Gelnica, vom Jahre 1465 bis 1502, als er auch diese Stelle Mariasi überließ.⁷⁵

Christoph Warkotsch (Vrkoč) kam höchstwahrscheinlich am Ende der achtziger Jahre des 15.

⁶² NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 234, 10. 12. 1494: „(...) Egregio Emerico Hymffy castellano castris Wyssegradensis, compatri nostro nobis grate dilecto (...)“.

⁶³ *Ibidem*, nr. 277, 02. 12. 1497: „(...) egregii Emericus Hymffy de Debrenthe et Ladislaus Kolos de Nema castellani castris Wyssegradensis et pro custodia sacre corone Regni Hungariae per nos deputati (...)“.

⁶⁴ MOL DL 46430, 25.05. 1498: „(...) Emericus Hymffy de Debrenthe castellanus castris Thorna (...)“.

⁶⁵ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 294, 07. 05. 1502: „(...) Generose domine Sophie, egregii condam Emerici Imffy relicte compatrici nostre (...)“.

⁶⁶ Näher zum Geschlecht Himfi: KUPKOVICS, Renáta: *A döbröntei vár kutatása*. Online: http://www.castrumbene.hu/files/c9_03kupovics.pdf.

⁶⁷ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 451, 14. 02. 1517.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*, nr. 482, 13. 01. 1519: „(...) egregius Franciscus Essegwary castellanus castris nostri Papa (...)“; nr. 504, 30. 10. 1519; nr. 507, 01. 02. 1520; nr. 508, 01. 02. 1520; nr. 525, 04. 03. 1521.

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*, nr. 526, 11. 03. 1521: „(...) quod egregius Nicolaus Derencheny, castellanus castris nostri Thorna de nostro presenti subsidio (...) que pertinentie ad florenos sexingentos connumerate et dicte erant, misit nobis florenos quingentos et nonaginta, restant adhuc apud eundem floreni decem, pro quibus respondere tenebitur. De quibus predictis florenis quingentis et nonaginta ipsum Nicolaum Derencheny quittum reddimus (...)“.

⁷⁰ MOL DL 84117, 20. 04. 1519: „(...) egregio Nicolao de Derenchen comiti (...) comitatus de Thorna (...)“.

⁷¹ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 329, 1507: „Egregio Francisco Pothornyany (...) maiestas regia ad futurum festum Beati Georgii martiris unam generalem dietam et congregationem universis regnicolis indixit et (...) illustrem natum nostrum charissimum ad ipsam dietam accersere curavit (...) simul cum omnibus apparatibus vestris more exercituancium vos appromtuare debeatis (...)“.

⁷² *Ibidem*, nr. 463, 19. 09. 1517; *Ibidem*, nr. 466, 30. 09. 1517: „(...) Egregio Thome Sebessy familiari nostro (...) Istis diebus venturis illustris dominus Iohannes waywoda Transsilvanus etc., filius noster Bude constituetur, quare committimus vobis quatenus more vestro Budam mox descendere et festinare debeatis, gentes etiam comitatus Scepusiensis vobiscum descendant, quos ad descendendum citissime exhortetis. De expensis vestris providebit factor noster Scepusiensis etc. (...)“.

⁷³ MOL DL 97806, 08. 12. 1490; WAGNER (ed.): *Diplomatarium Comitatus Sarosiensis*, p. 139: „Capitaneo nostro Egregio Paulo Darholtz“; siehe auch: PRAY (ed.): *Epistolae Procerum Regni Hungariae* 1, pp. 28–29.

⁷⁴ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 291, 24. 01. 1500: „(...) Ex quo impresentiarum nos egregium Paulum Dwrholcz gravi infirmitate detentum fore et ad officium sui capitaneatus ipsum debito modo providere non posse intelleximus (...)“.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, nr. 85, 27. 03. 1465; nr. 295, 28. 06. 1502.

Jahrhunderts im Gefolge der jungen, frisch verheirateten Teschener Herzogin Hedwig aus Schlesien ins Königreich Ungarn.⁷⁶ Er wurde zum Hauptmann der Stadt und Burg Kežmarok (dt. *Kesmark*) und dieses Amt bekleidete er bis zu seinem Tod im Jahre 1520.⁷⁷ Im Jahre 1516 übernahm er die Burg Šariš von Stefan Mariasi.⁷⁸ Nach dem Tode von Christoph Warkotsch übergab Hedwig das Amt des Hauptmann der Stadt und Burg Kežmarok seinem Sohn Kaspar.⁷⁹ Die Gattin von Christoph Warkotsch, Katharina, wurde Hedwigs Vertraute und nach der Heirat ihrer Tochter Barbara Zapolya mit dem polnischen König Sigmund I. im Jahre 1512, begleitete sie sie als ihre Hofdame nach Kraków (dt. *Krakau*). Im selben Jahr jedoch verstarb sie.⁸⁰

Christoph von Smrečany (Smrečanský) fungierte bei den Zapolyas als Kastellan der Zipser Burg⁸¹ und Zipser Vizegespan.⁸² Im Jahre 1511 wird er als Präfekt dieser Burg und der Burgen Regécz, Tállya und Tokaj⁸³ und im Jahre 1513 als Kastellan der Zipser und Tokajer Burg erwähnt.⁸⁴ Zugleich bekleidete er auch Kirchenämter: In den Jahren 1499–1518 war er Kanoniker und Lektor des Zipser Kapitels (über dessen Patronatsrecht die Familie Zapolya verfügte) und päpstlicher Notar.⁸⁵ Zur Wende des

15. aufs 16. Jahrhundert wirkte er als Gemerer Vizegespan und Kastellan der Burg Muráň.⁸⁶

Michael von Žitný ostrov (dt. *Schüttinsel*) übernahm zusammen mit Christoph Warkotsch im Jahre 1516 die Burg Šariš von Stefan Mariasi.⁸⁷ Im Jahre 1517 wirkte er als Zipser Hauptfaktor, von der Herzogin Hedwig wurde er beauftragt, den Zehnten von den Burgdomänen Tokaj und Tállya zu erheben.⁸⁸ Für die Jahre 1518–1519 wird er auch als Kastellan der Zipser Burg erwähnt.⁸⁹ Zu den weiteren Zipser Vizegespanen und Kastellanen in den Jahren 1490–1520 zählen auch Gregor Gebel aus Betlanovce (dt. *Betelsdorf*)⁹⁰, Stefan von Tomor⁹¹ und Matthias Holy von Jablonica.⁹²

In der Trentschiner Gespanschaft bekleidete Ladislaus Rozen, der Bruder von Klemens, das Amt des Vizegespan, erwähnt wird er in den Jahren 1495 und 1509–1510.⁹³ In den Jahren 1497–1499 wirkte als Vizegespan Johannes Zima.⁹⁴ Zwei Mitglieder des Trentschiner Geschlechts Chalupa von Bohunice (dt. *Bohunitz*) fungierten als Kastellane in der Wesprimer Gespanschaft. Georg Chalupa wurde im Jahre 1510 im Willen der Herzogin Hedwigs als Kastellan der Burg Pápa entlassen.⁹⁵ Nähere Umstände sind nicht bekannt, hinter dem Vorfall

⁷⁶ Fragmentum genealogicum familiae Warkotsch de Nobschüts. In: *Analecta Scepussii sacri et profani* 4. Ed.: Carolus WAGNER. Posonii et Cassoviae: Typis Joannis Michaelis Landerer, 1778, pp. 209–219.

⁷⁷ WAGNER (ed.): *Analecta Scepussii* 2, pp. 343–344. „Hic est sepultus strenuus Miles Nobilissimus Dominus Christophorus Warkocz de Nobschucz, Capitaneus Castris et Civitatis Kezmark, qui obiit IX. die Mensis Februarii. Anno Domini MDXX.“

⁷⁸ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 427, 07. 03. 1516.

⁷⁹ *Ibidem*, nr. 513, 18. 04. 1520: „(...) huic egregio Caspari Warkocz, familiari nostro fideli et nobis benemerito capitaneatum illius castris nostri et civitatis nostre Kesmark cum omni plenitudine et auctoritate, prout pie memorie condam genitori suo dedimus et contulimus (...)“.

⁸⁰ WAGNER (ed.): *Analecta Scepussii* 4, pp. 209–219 und *Analecta Scepussii* 2, pp. 343–344: „(...) Honestae Dominae Katharinae, Filiae Thomae Tharcii, olim Domini Christophori Warkocz uxoris sepultura, cujus anima Deo vivat. Obiit Cracoviae feria IV. ante D. Antonii festum, Anno MDXII (...)“.

⁸¹ MOL DL 57039, 19. 10. 1508; NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 348, 16. 01. 1510: „(...) egregio Christofero de Zemerchen castellano castris nostri Scepussii (...)“.

⁸² MOL DL 63887, 19. 9. 1513, zusammen mit Matthias Holy von Jablonica.

⁸³ *Historia critica Regum Hungariae*, vol. 11. Ed.: Stephanus KATONA. Budae: Typis Regiae Universitatis, 1792, p. 623: „(...) Christophorus Szmercheny, castrorum Scepussii, Regecz, Tállya, Tokay praefectus (...)“.

⁸⁴ MOL DL 61096, 04. 07. 1513.

⁸⁵ HRADSKÝ, Josephus: *Initia, progressus ac praesens status Capituli Scepussiensis*. Szepesváralja: Typis Dyonisii Buzás, 1901, p. 376; MOL DF 217517, 04. 04. 1516: „(...) Cristof Smrečzeny lector ecclesie beati Martini (...)“.

⁸⁶ SKALSKÁ: *Jelšava a Jelšavské panstvo*, s. 269–270.

⁸⁷ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 427.

⁸⁸ *Ibidem*, nr. 464, 20. 09. 1517: „(...) egregium Michaellem Challoezy factorem nostrum generalem Scepussiensis ad decimandas huius presentis anni decimas in pertinentiis eorum castrorum nostrorum Thokay et Thalya (...) deputavimus et elegimus (...)“.

⁸⁹ MOL DL 84749, 13. 9. 1518; DL 23268, 11. 11. 1519: „(...) Egregius Michael de Challoezy castellanus castris Scepussiensis (...)“.

⁹⁰ MOL DL 74956, 09. 4. 1492; DL 75105, 24. 8. 1495: „(...) Gregorius Gewbl castris Scepussii castellanus et vicecomes (...)“.

⁹¹ MOL DL 74964, 11. 4. 1496: „(...) Gregorius Gewbel de Bethlemfalwa et Stephanus de Thomor castris Scepussii castellani et vicecomites Spectabilis et Magnifici domini Stephani de Zapolya (...)“.

⁹² MOL DL 63887, 19. 9. 1513: „(...) Cristoferus de Zemerchen et Mathias Holy de Jablonycza vicecomites comitatus Scepussiensis (...)“; MOL DL 23275, 14. 11. 1519; DL 23328, 17. 3. 1520.

⁹³ MOL DL 20272, 09. 03. 1495: „(...) Ladislaus Rozen de Mitha vicecomes comitatus Threnchiniensis (...)“; DL 72746, 20. 8. 1509; DL 21993, 04. 2. 1510.

⁹⁴ MOL DL 20593, 14. 8. 1497: „(...) Johannes Zyma vicecomes comitatus Threnchiniensis (...)“; DL 20887, 31. 10. 1499.

⁹⁵ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 353, 26. 8. 1510: „(...) egregius Georgius Chalupa de Bohonycz, castellanus castris nostri Papa idem castrum nostrum Papa, quod hactenus de voluntate illustris domine genitricis nostre (...) tenuit et possedit (...) expressa voluntate ipsius domine genitricis nostre carissime dedit (...) et assignavit manibus egregii Gothardi de Sythke (...)“.

könnte aber vielleicht auch seine Anwesenheit beim Überfall auf die Benediktinerabtei in Bakonybél im Jahre 1504 stehen, bei dem er mit Paul Chalupa, dem Kastellan von Ugod und weiteren Leuten, der Abtei großen Schaden zugefügt hatten.⁹⁶

Als Kastellan der Burg Trenčín, Hauptresidenz der Herzogin Hedwig seit dem Jahre 1500, wird im Jahre 1516 Gregor von Mútne (Mutňanský)⁹⁷ und als Provisor in den Jahren 1508 und 1513 Johannes Gloch erwähnt.⁹⁸ Aus Hradná in der Trentschiner Gespanschaft stammte Paul Holy, der langjähriger Hauptmann und Dreißigst-Beamte von Trnava (dt. *Tyrnau*).⁹⁹ Er heiratete die Tochter von Hedwigs Berater Lorenz Salzer und wurde zugleich Schwager von Ambrosius Sarkan, mit dem er einige Jahre das Amt des Pressburger Gespans bekleidete.¹⁰⁰ Im Jahre 1510 wurde er von Hedwig auf eigenen Wunsch aus dem Amt des Hauptmann von Trnava entlassen.¹⁰¹ Im Jahre 1516 nahm Hedwig einen gewissen Magister Wolfgang in ihre Dienste, den sie ausschickte, mit dem Stadtrat von Bratislava (dt. *Pressburg*) zu verhandeln.¹⁰²

In der Liptauer Gespanschaft können zu den bedeutenden Getreuen der Zapolyas die Vizegespanen Thomas von Podtureň¹⁰³, Benedikt von

Dechtáre¹⁰⁴ und Johannes Strusky, Hauptmann der Burg Likava, sogar mit dem Titel des Liptauer Gespans, gezählt werden.¹⁰⁵ Vertreter unter den Getreuen hatten auch die Kroaten.¹⁰⁶ Andreas Horvat von Lomnica fungierte als Kastellan der Burg Likava¹⁰⁷, im Jahre 1505 bezeichnete er sich sogar als Liptauer Gespan.¹⁰⁸ Michael Horvat von Lomnica wirkte bis 1505 als Kastellan der Burg Orava.¹⁰⁹ In diesem Jahr machte er sich bei der Übergabe dieser Burg (die er als Pfand von Johannes Corvinus besaß) aus den Händen seiner Witwe Beatrix von Frangepan in den Besitz der Zapolyas verdient.¹¹⁰ Die Übergabe der Burgen Likava und Orava in die Hände der Familie Zapolya war ein Bestandteil der zwischen Hedwig und Beatrix geschlossenen Heiratsverträge.¹¹¹ Als Gegeleistung erteilte Hedwig Michael Horvat die Burgdomäne Plaveč in der Scharoscher Gespanschaft als erbliche Besitzung und seinen Sohn Johannes ernannte sie zum Zipser Propst.¹¹² Außerdem fungierte Michael Horvat auch noch als Administrator der Zipser Propstei¹¹³ und Kastellan der Burg Richnava.¹¹⁴

Im Jahre 1506 nahm Hedwig einen gewissen Peter Horvat, den Getreuen von Stefan von Rozhanovce (Rozgon) als Husaren in ihre Dienste

⁹⁶ Pannonhalmi Bencés Főapátság Levéltára, Pannonhalma, Bences-Capsarium (1000–1526), online: http://vdu.uni-koeln.de:8181/mom/HU/PBFL/PannHOSB/1506_II_14/charter (24. 05. 2011), 14. 2. 1506.

⁹⁷ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 435, 16. 05. 1516: „(...) Misimus ad vos (...) Gregorium Muthnyanszky, castellanum castris nostri Thrinchiniensis (...)“.

⁹⁸ Ibidem, nr. 333, 10. 02. 1508: „(...) egregio Iohanni Gloch provisoris castris nostri Thrinchiniensis (...)“.

⁹⁹ VARSIK (ed.): *Slovenské listy a listiny*, pp. 90–94; ROHÁČ, Juraj: *Arnalista Pavol Holý z Hradnej*. In: *Erbové listiny*. Ed.: Milan Šišmiš. Martin: Slovenská genealogická spoločnosť, 2006, pp. 34–41.

¹⁰⁰ MOL DL 61938, 22. 11. 1501; DL 61952, 16. 06. 1505; DL 50498, 13. 04. 1507.

¹⁰¹ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 350, 13. 02. 1510: „(...) elegeramus itaque ad capitaneatum in medio vestri hunc Paulum Holy, fidelem servitorem nostrum, qui hucusque una vobiscum fidelia nobis semper exhibuit servitia, vosque et negocia vestra coram nobis ex industria sua promovere non cessavit, verum nobis in eo plurimum supplicavit, quatenus officium capitaneatus ab eodem removere dignaremur (...)“.

¹⁰² Ibidem, nr. 434, 15. 05. 1516: „(...) Quoniam Magister Wolfgangus, presentium scilicet ostensor acceptus et connumeratus est in consorcium servitorum nostrorum (...)“.

¹⁰³ MOL DL 64900, 18. 3. 1506: „(...) Thomas de Pothornya vicecomes comitatus Liptoviensis (...)“.

¹⁰⁴ MOL DL 64904, 18. 11. 1517: „(...) Benedictus de Widafelde vicecomes (...) comitatus Liptoviensis (...)“.

¹⁰⁵ MOL DL 25537, 22. 9. 1511: „(...) Joannes Strusky capitaneus arcis Likawa ac post Spectabiles et Magnificos dominorum Joanni et Georgii perpetuos comites terre Scepusiensis etc. comes comitatus Liptoviensis (...)“.

¹⁰⁶ Näher zur Problematik der kroatischen Bevölkerung siehe den Beitrag von Miloš MAREK: „Die Kroaten in der Slowakei im Mittelalter“.

¹⁰⁷ MOL DL 46804, 12. 07. 1507: „(...) Andreas Horwath de Lomnicze (...)“; NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 306, 20. 06. 1505.

¹⁰⁸ *Stredoveké české listiny*. Ed.: Štefan KNIEZSA. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1952, p. 72: „(...) Ja, Andreas Chorwath, hrabye lypthowsky (...)“.

¹⁰⁹ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 305, 28. 05. 1505: „(...) egregius Michael Horwath de Lompnycza, castellanus castris nostri Arva (...)“.

¹¹⁰ Ibidem, nr. 302, 30. 04. 1505.

¹¹¹ MOL DF 267335; SROKA: *Jadwiga Zapolya*, p. 60.

¹¹² MOL DL 107740: „(...) promittimus per presentes, quod ipsum Michaellem Horwath et suos heredes universos in pacifica possessione eiusdem castris Palocha conservabimus (...) etiam nobilem Iohannem filium eiusdem Michaelis Horwath in prepositura ecclesie Beati Martini de Scepus (...) contulimus (...)“; siehe auch nr. 302.

¹¹³ MOL DF 270938, 07. 11. 1513: „Michael Chorwath castris Palocha heres, administrator prepositure Scepusiensis.“

¹¹⁴ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 500, 04. 10. 1519: „(...) Michaeli Horwath castellano castris nostri Rychno (...)“.

auf.¹¹⁵ Ein weiterer Horvat, Adam, war einer von Hedwigs Beratern, wie bereits erwähnt.

Eine besondere Gruppe unter den Getreuen der Familie Zapolya bildeten die Vertreter der Kirche. Im letzten Willen von Stefan Zapolya werden seine zwei Kaplane erwähnt – Michael Bodo und Thomas von Turda, der später Kanoniker des Zipser Kapitels wurde.¹¹⁶ Nachdem die Zapolyas das Patronatsrecht über das Zipser Kapitel erworben hatten, begannen sie ihre Getreuen ins Amt des Propstes ihre Getreue einzusetzen. Erste war 1494 Georg von Mecske (heute Magyarmecske)¹¹⁷, der auch als Sekretär bei Stefan Zapolya fungierte.¹¹⁸ Er wirkte auch als Sekretär und Berater des Königs Vladislav II., mit Pausen bis ins Jahr 1526.¹¹⁹ Das Amt des Propstes bekleidete er bis zum Jahre 1505. Es folgte die Ernennung von Johannes Horvat von Lomnica, Sohn des bereits erwähnten Getreuen Michael Horvat.¹²⁰ Als aber dieser von Thomas Bakoc, dem Erzbischof von Esztergom (dt. Gran), nicht anerkannt wurde, ernannten die Zapolyas Ladislaus von Csobád, den Kanoniker und Lektor des Zipser Kapitels von 1495–1505.¹²¹ Im Jahre 1511, nach dessen Tod, wurde Horvat von Hedwig und ihren Söhnen Johannes und Georg wiederum ernannt, diesmal erfolgreich. Sein Amt bekleidete er bis zum Jahre 1544.¹²²

Michael Rozen (Rožeň), der Sohn von Ladislaus Rozen¹²³, fungierte seit dem Jahre 1510 als Sekretär des Erzbischofs von Esztergom, Thomas Bakocz. Unter dem Ordensnamen Lazarus ist er bekannt als Schöpfer der ältesten erhaltenen Landkarte des Königreichs Ungarn aus dem Jahre 1528, der „Tabula Hungariae“.¹²⁴ Während seiner Zeit als Sekretär begann er mit den kartografischen Arbeiten, aus nicht näher bekannten Gründen vollendete er sie aber nicht und ging nach Trenčín, an den Hof der Herzogin Hedwig.¹²⁵ Sie sollte ihm dann später zur Stelle als Abt der Zisterzienserabtei in Spišský Štiavnik verhelfen, wo er in den Jahren 1518–1542 wirkte.¹²⁶ Wie bereits erwähnt, war er vermutlich auch einer von Hedwigs Beratern.

Zum Schluß erwähnen wir einen Getreuen, der drei Generationen der Familie Zapolya diente. Es handelt sich um den kroatischen Edelmann und Paulinermönch Georg Utišenić.¹²⁷ Nachdem er die Dienste von Johannes Corvinus verlassen hatte, wurde er am Hofe der Herzogin Hedwig von Teschen angenommen. In kurzer Zeit wurde er in den engeren Kreis ihrer Rittern eingegliedert, später ging er in die Dienste ihres Sohnes Johannes Zapolya über. Seine vielversprechende Militärkarriere beendete der Eintritt in den Paulinerorden, wo er im Verlauf der Jahre bedeutende Ämter bekleidete.¹²⁸ Die Umstände und Gründe

¹¹⁵ Ibidem, nr. 320, 11. 05. 1506: „(...) *Intimat nobis d(ominatio) v(estra) m(agnifica), ut quendam familiarem suum, Petrum Horwath ad servitia nostra acceptaremus (...)* Veniat igitur ad servitia nostra quam festinantissime cum sex equis more huzaronum, cui nos ad ipsos equos more huzaronum sallaria deputamus (...)“.

¹¹⁶ Ibidem, nr. 288: „(...) *capellanis meis Michaelae Bodo et Thoma Thorday (...)*“; WAGNER (ed.): *Analecta Scepusii* 1, p. 149 als Chordányi. *Initia, progressus ac presens status Capituli Scepusiensis*, p. 382.

¹¹⁷ WAGNER (ed.): *Analecta Scepusii* 1, pp. 351–353 und *Analecta Scepusii* 3, p. 72.

¹¹⁸ MOL DL 49136, 20. 02. 1495: „(...) *Coram Georgio de Mekche secretario palatinali (...)*“; DL 64496, 11. 5. 1497.

¹¹⁹ *The Customary Law of the renowned Kingdom of Hungary*, p. 8: „(...) *Georgium de Mekche secretarium nostrum (...)*“; MOL DL 85198, 20. 11. 1515: „(...) *Egregius Georgius de Mechke consiliarius noster (...)*“.

¹²⁰ NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 304, 28. 05. 1505: „(...) *praeposituram ecclesie Beati Martini de Scepus (...)* auctoritate nostri iuris patronatus (...) *praefato Iohanni duximus dandam et conferendam (...)*“.

¹²¹ WAGNER (ed.): *Analecta Scepusii* 3, pp. 73–74.

¹²² NEUMANN (ed.): *A Szapolyai család oklevéltára* 1, nr. 356, 04. 02. 1511: „(...) *honorabilis magistri Iohannis Horwath de Lompnycza (...)* *ad preposituram collegiate ecclesie Beati Martini de Scepus (...)* *nunc per mortem et decessum reverendi condam domini Ladislai de Chobad (...)* *vacantem (...)* *auctoritate nostri iuris patronatus (...)* *duximus eligendum et nominandum (...)*“.

¹²³ *Pod osmanskou hrozbou: Osudy Slovenska od Albrechta Habsburského do tragickej bitky pri Moháči v roku 1526 s prihliadnutím na začiatky renesancie v čase vlády Mateja Korvína*. Ed.: Ján LUKAČKA a kol. In: *Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovákov*, vol. 6. Ed.: Pavel DVOŘÁK. Bratislava: Literárne informačné centrum, 2004, p. 137.

¹²⁴ ŽUDEL, Juraj: Osobnosť Lazara, tvorcu mapy Uhorska z roku 1528. In: *Slovenská archivistika*, a. 42, 2007, nr. 2, pp. 32–40; Näheres zur Tabula Hungariae IDEM: Miestne názvy na Lazarovej mape Uhorska so zreteľom na územie Slovenska. In: *Slovenská archivistika*, a. 32, 1997, nr. 2, pp. 48–59; IDEM: Sídelná sieť Slovenska na Lazarovej mape Uhorska z r. 1528. In: *Geografický časopis*, a. 35, 1983, nr. 3, pp. 247–264.

¹²⁵ ŽUDEL: Osobnosť Lazara, tvorcu mapy Uhorska, pp. 32–40.

¹²⁶ MOL DL 63890, 12. 04. 1519: „(...) *venerabili domino Michaelae Rozen abbate monasterii Beate Marie Virginis de Schewnyk (...)*“; WAGNER (ed.): *Analecta Scepusii* 3, Series abbatum B. M. V. de Schavnyk, Ordinis Cisterciensis, pp. 161–162.

¹²⁷ Der Name erscheint in der Literatur in verschiedenen Formen – Utišenić, Utišenić, Utišenić, Utišenić usw. Aus den Quellen ist sein Nachname nicht bekannt, da er meistens als Frater Georgius bezeichnet wurde.

¹²⁸ VERANTIUS, Antonius: De Georgii Utissenii, fratris appellati, vitae et rebus comentarius. In: *Verancsics Antal m. kir. helytartó, esztergomi érsek összes munkái. Monumenta Hungariae historica: Scriptorum*, vol. 2. Ed.: László SZALAY. Pest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1857, pp. 16–34; siehe auch seine Biographie von UTIŠENIĆ, Ognjeslav: *Lebensgeschichte des Cardinals Georg Utišenić genant Martinusius*. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1881.

seines Eintritts in den Orden sind nicht näher bekannt. Es ist aber sehr wahrscheinlich, dass ihm dabei die Zapolyas, großzügige Mäzene des Paulinerordens, geholfen haben.¹²⁹ Aus dem Kloster in Lád wurde er im Jahre 1528 von Johannes Zapolya wieder in seine Dienste berufen.¹³⁰ Wie die folgenden Jahre zeigen sollten, war dies einer der besten, wenn nicht sogar der beste politische Schritt Zapolyas. In Georg Utiešenić gewann Johannes Zapolya einen überragenden Berater, Befehlshaber, Diplomaten und nach seinem Tode den Protektor seines Sohnes Johannes Sigmund.

* * *

Die Magnatenfamilie Zapolya verfügte als eine der mächtigsten und einflussreichsten Familien des spätmittelalterlichen Königreichs Ungarn über ein breites Netz Getreuer.¹³¹ Sie wurden von verschiedenen Gespanschaften rekrutiert, ihre Ethnizität spiegelte die Nationalitätenstruktur des damaligen Königreichs Ungarn wieder – in den Diensten der Zapolyas fungierten Getreue slowakischer, ungarischer, kroatischer oder rumänischer Herkunft nebeneinander. Die Berater der Familie gehörten zu den vornehmsten Männern

des Königreichs Ungarn, bekleideten wichtige Ämter und ihre Namen sind auch auf der bekannten Deklaration des ungarischen Landtages aus dem Jahre 1505 zu finden.¹³²

Die Zugehörigkeit zur Familie wurde auf verschiedene Weisen geprägt. Als Entgelt für die geleisteten Dienste wurde den Getreuen Lohn ausgezahlt, für äußerst treue langjährige Dienste durfte der Getreue Befreiung von jeglichen Steuern, Erteilung von Erbbesitzen oder Bekleidung eines Amtes für sich oder seine Nachkommen erwarten. Nach dem Tode eines Magnaten kam es dann oftmals zum Aufstieg seiner Getreuen zu gleichbedeutenden Herren. Nach dem Tode eines Getreuen wurde seiner Witwe und den Kindern seitens der Familie auch weiter Patronanz gewährt. Die Gemahlinnen der nahen Getreuen wirkten als Hofdamen und Vertraute der Herrin, die Getreuen wurden zu Taufeltern der Kinder ihres Herren und umgekehrt. Die Verbindung zwischen den Getreuen der Familie wurde noch durch Eheschließungen untereinander verstärkt. In diesen persönlichen Beziehungen verwirklichte sich somit die Bedeutung des Begriffs *familiaritas*.

¹²⁹ KUCHARSKÁ: *Hedviga Tešínska : šľachtičná na prelome stredoveku a novoveku*, pp. 97–108.

¹³⁰ Der Brief von Frater Geogius, in dem er die Umstände seiner Berufung in die Dienste von Zapolya schildert: UTIEŠENOVÍČ: *Lebensgeschichte*, Beilage, pp. 1–2.

¹³¹ Nach KUBINYI, András: *A Szapolyaiak és familiárisaik*, p. 265, können in den Jahren 1458–1526 etwa 250 Personen in den Diensten der Zapolyas belegt werden. Unserer Meinung nach handelt es sich bei dieser Zahl nur um die höhergestellten Getreuen, die in den Quellen erwähnt werden. Mit den vielen "anonymen" Getreuen, die für die Verfasser der Quellen nicht interessant waren, dürfte die Gesamtzahl noch viel höher sein.

¹³² MOL DL 22559, 12. 10. 1505: Michael von Szob, Michael Imrefi, Paul von Dombó, Georg von Mesztesyó, Klemens Rozen, Stefan Mariasi und Adam Horvat.

The Activities of John Corvinus in Slavonia and Croatia and in Slovakia – a Comparison¹

Aktivity Jána Korvína v Slavónsku a Chorvátsku a na Slovensku – porovnanie /
Djelovanje Ivaniša Korvina u Slavoniji i Hrvatskoj te u Slovačkoj – usporedba

The author presents a brief overview, based on contemporary sources and the works of historians on the subject, of the life of John Corvinus and his activities in Slavonia and Croatia, as well as in Slovakia, focusing on and comparing the roles, importance and connections that the respective territories had in his political and military activities in different periods.

Keywords: John Corvinus, fifteenth and sixteenth century, Croatia, Slovakia, comparison

During the many centuries that the areas constituting present-day Croatia and Slovakia were part of the same state, among the many historical figures that played important roles in both countries, the one who stands out at the turn of the sixteenth century is John Corvinus, the illegitimate son of Matthias Corvinus, king of Hungary and Croatia and his long-standing mistress Barbara Edelpöck.

John Corvinus² (Croatian: *Ivaniš Korvin*, Sl.: *Ján Korvín*, Hun.: *Hunyadi Corvin János*) was born on 2 April 1473, probably in Buda. Almost nothing is known of him until, at the age of about six, he joined the court of his royal father. However, it is interesting to note that not long after John's birth, on 3 November 1473, Matthias gave the boy's mother Barbara³ and her parents' lands and properties in and around Banská Bystrica; more precisely, a stone house in Banská Bystrica, a farmstead near the town walls, as well as the

villages of Jakub, Podlavice, Riečka, Majer, Ulmanka, and Nemce in the county of Zvolen.⁴ The relationship between the King and Barbara probably ended around the time their son was born and the donation was certainly intended for the future upkeep of the ex-mistress and their son. Barbara was soon married to Friedrich of Enzersdorf an der Fischa. They are both mentioned in 1476 as members of the *Corpus Christi* confraternity in Bratislava⁵, but she and her husband later moved to Austria, where Barbara spent the rest of her life. She died on 7 February 1495 and was buried in St. Agnes' chapel of the Klosterneuburg monastery.⁶

Whether the royal child stayed with his mother after she was married off or was placed in a separate establishment, as most of all royal children, legitimate and illegitimate, were during the Middle Ages, remains an open question. However, in her will, dated 1491, Barbara left to

* Dražen Nemet, University in Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of History.

¹ The author would like to express his appreciation to the Organising Committee of the Conference "Slovakia and Croatia – Historical Parallels and Connections" for all their efforts, and a special thanks to Prof. Martin Homza, Prof. Neven Budak and Prof. Borislav Grgin for the invitation to present this paper.

² For biographical details about John Corvin, see: SCHOENHERR, Gyula: *Hunyadi Corvin János*. Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1894; KUKULJEVIĆ-SAKCINSKI, Ivan: *Beatrica Frankapan i njezin rod*. Zagreb: Dionička tiskara, 1885; HORVAT, Rudolf: *Ivan Korvin, ban hrvatski*. Zagreb: Dionička tiskara, 1896; ŠIŠIĆ, Ferdo: *Rukovet spomenika o hercegu Ivanišu Korvinu i o borbama Hrvata s Turcima (1473–1496) s "Dodatkom" (1491–1498)*. Zagreb: Tisak Nadbiskupske tiskare, 1936; GLESINGER, Lavoslav: O bolesti Ivaniša Korvina. In: *Liječnički vjesnik*, a. 91, 1969, pp. 1109–1112; GRGIN, Borislav: Ivaniš Korvin. In: *Hrvatski biografski leksikon*. Ed.: Trpimir MACAN. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2005, pp. 135–137.

³ For more details on Barbara Edelpöck and her connections to Slovak lands, see: SKLADANÝ, Marián: Kto bola matka Jána Korvína? In: *Acta historica Posoniensia*, a. 10, 2009, pp. 114–126.

⁴ RITOÓK-SZALAY, Ágnes: Borbála. In: *Nympha super ripam Danubii*. Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2002, p. 103; *Deutschsprachige Handschriften in slowakischen Archiven vom Mittelalter bis zu Frühen Neuzeit*, vol. 2: *Mittelslowakei*. Ed.: Jörg MEIER – Ilpo Tapani PIIRAINEN – Klaus-Peter WEGERA. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009, p. 86.

⁵ ORTVAY, Theodor: *Geschichte der Stadt Pressburg, Zweiter Band, Vierte Abteilung*. Pozsony: Carl Stämpfel, 1903, pp. 424–425.

⁶ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Necrologia Germaniae*, vol. 5. Ed.: Adalbert FUCHS. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913, p. 81.

her son the properties in Banská Bystrica mentioned in the 1473 royal charter.⁷ Since this was the only thing that she left to her son, whom she probably did not see since he was a boy, we can presume that these properties were somehow significant for John and his relationship with his mother. Barbara's act may imply that the area of Banská Bystrica was where John spent his early years, at first most probably with his mother, and after she was married to Friedrich in his own establishment, until he was brought to the court of his father around the age of six.

Matthias openly recognized him as his only child and appointed him the duke of Liptov and count of Hunyad.⁸ John was provided with the best education; among his teachers were the noted Italian humanists Taddeo Ugoletti and Galeotto Marzio. Although at first Matthias planned a career in the Church for his illegitimate son⁹, still not having any offspring from his wife Beatrice of Naples after several years of marriage, he decided to make John his heir and ensure his succession to the throne. He lavished vast estates and fortresses on the young duke throughout the Kingdom, including Croatia and Slavonia and present-day Slovakia, thus making him the richest landowner next to the King and Queen.

Among others, he granted him the ancestral lands of Hunyadi family in Transylvania, the lands of the extinct families Morović and Gorbanski in Slavonia, estates in southern Hungary, towns and estates in Liptov, Turiec, Orava and Trenčín counties, namely the towns of Orava, Likava, Bojnice and Sklabina with all the lands of the extinct Komorovský and Onofri families, as well as the castle of Strečno and town Žilina. Furthermore, John's grandmother Elisabeth Szilágy left him all the estates that she enjoyed after the death of her husband John Hunyadi.¹⁰ In 1485 he was also appointed the duke of Opava.¹¹

Matthias loved his son and doted on him, and John accompanied his father on his campaigns in Austria, notably during the siege of Vienna in

1485, when he was the first to enter the conquered city.¹² In addition to the riches and estates, the King decided to provide his son with a rich bride and his choice fell on Bianca Maria Sforza, sister of the duke of Milan. The pair were engaged in 1487, but the actual marriage ceremony never took place due to the opposition from Queen Beatrice who never looked kindly on her husband's illegitimate son, still hoping she might eventually give birth to a legitimate heir herself or somehow retain the power after the King died, either on her own as the Queen Regnant, or by marrying the new king.

Knowing that despite the numerous estates, riches and well-connected future wife John's succession was still not ensured, Matthias demanded from prelates, barons, towns and counties to swear the oath of allegiance to the young duke, and even tried to persuade Emperor Frederick III to recognize John as his legitimate heir. Also, in October 1489 there was some talk that he intended to make him the king of Croatia and Bosnia.¹³ In early 1490, before leaving for Vienna, he handed over to John the royal castle in Buda with the royal treasury, library and archives, along with the fortresses along the Danube, notably Visegrád, Tata, Komárno and Bratislava. Matthias also intended to proclaim John his heir in Moravia, Silesia and Lusatia.¹⁴ However, the king's sudden death in May 1490 left many of his plans and arrangements unfinished.

Although being the wealthiest landowner in the Kingdom and in the possession of the strategically most important fortresses, as well as the all-important Crown of St. Stephen, John was still inexperienced and lacked resolve. In addition, many of the magnates and prelates who had sworn allegiance to him, notably Palatine Stephen Zápolya and Thomas Bakócz, Bishop of Győr, soon distanced themselves, preferring not to continue with Matthias' style of strong central government.

Realizing that his chances to be elected to the throne were slim, on 17 June 1490 in Buda he

⁷ LUDWIG, Vinzenz Oskar – MASČEK, Franz: König Matthias Corvinus and Barbara Edelpöck. In: *Jahrbuch für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich*, a. 32, 1955/1956, p. 90.

⁸ Šišić, Ferdo: *Rukovet spomenika o hercegu Ivanišu Korvinu i o borbama Hroata s Turcima*, nr. 2, pp. 8–10.

⁹ *Ibidem*, nr. 3, pp. 10–11.

¹⁰ FEJÉRPATAKI, László: Külföldi levéltári búvárlatok. In: *Magyar Könyvszemle*, a. 14, 1889, nr. 1–4, pp. 111–112; Šišić, Ferdo: *Rukovet spomenika o hercegu Ivanišu Korvinu i o borbama Hroata s Turcima*, nr. 4, pp. 12–13.

¹¹ KUKULJEVIĆ-SAKCINSKI, Ivan: *Beatrica Frankapan i njezin rod*, p. 12.

¹² TICHTEL, Johannes: *Tagebuch des Wiener Arztes Johannes Tichtel aus den Jahren 1477–1495*. In: *Fontes rerum Austriacarum*, vol. 1. Vienna: Kaiserl. Königl. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1855, pp. 33–34.

¹³ Šišić, Ferdo: *Rukovet spomenika o hercegu Ivanišu Korvinu i o borbama Hroata s Turcima*, nr. 43, pp. 82–84.

¹⁴ KLAIĆ, Vjekoslav: *Povijest Hroata od najstarijih vremena do svršetka XIX. stoljeća. Knjiga četvrta*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod MH, 1973, pp. 183–85.

agreed to the offer of the barons and prelates that in case he did not get elected, he would retain his titles of duke of Liptov and Opava and would be created king of Bosnia, duke of Slavonia, as well as ban (viceroy) of Dalmatia and Croatia, and keep all his possessions in the Kingdom of Hungary and Croatia. However, he would have to relinquish the estates he held in the regions conquered during the reign of King Matthias.¹⁵ Nevertheless, John still cherished some hope of becoming king, and he retreated to the southern parts of the Kingdom where he still enjoyed the most support. However, his forces were soon defeated, and John retired to Pécs. The estates then duly elected the Bohemian king Vladislaus II Jagiello as their new sovereign.¹⁶

John soon came to terms with the new king and in his inaugural diploma issued at Farkashida (today Vlčkovce) near Trnava on 31 July 1490 Vladislaus confirmed the Buda agreement. However, John did not become the king of Bosnia or ban of Dalmatia and Croatia and he had to return to Vladislaus the three important fortresses given to him by King Matthias – Bratislava, Komárno, and Tata. Nevertheless, he was named duke of Slavonia and managed to keep most of his estates in Croatia and Hungary, which still made him one of the most powerful magnates in the Kingdom. However, the complex, oscillating relationship with the new king would define the rest of his life, Vladislaus always being suspicious of John as the son of the former monarch.

The lands that John owned after that in the Kingdoms of Slavonia, Croatia and Dalmatia are as follows: the entire county of Zagorje with Krapina, Kostel, Tabor, Vrbovec (Mali Tabor), Lohor, Oštrc, Greben, Bela, Trakošćan; Varaždin, Vinica and Jurketinec in the county of Varaždin; Kalnik, Vrbovec, and Rakovec in the county of Križevci; Medvedgrad, Lukavec, Samobor, Lipovec, Jastrebarsko, Vukovina, Steničnjak, Totuševina, Viodina and Ripač in the county of Zagreb; Morović, Čerević and Gorjani in the counties of Vuka and Syrmium; Senj, Novigrad, Starigrad and Bag on the Adriatic coast; as well as Otočac, Prozor,

Obrovac, Krupa, Kličevac, Počitelj, Peć, Japra, Brinje and Belaj. In Slovakia, John held the towns and estates in Liptov, Turiec, Orava and Trenčín counties, namely the towns and castles of Orava, Likava, Bojnice, Sklabina, Strečno and Žilina; Stropkov in the county of Zemplín; Šariš Castle in the county of Šariš; as well as the mines around Banská Bystrica.¹⁷ However, one should bear in mind that in the following years some of the estates were lost, or John pawned them or donated them to his retainers.

Having no alternative but to support Vladislaus, he helped him in the fight against the pretenders to the throne, Vladislaus' brother John Albert and German king Maximilian. John provided the King with mounted soldiers that were sent to Košice which was besieged by John Albert's forces.¹⁸ In 1491 he fought against the German forces of King Maximilian and his local supporters in Slavonia, successfully winning over the town of Zagreb.¹⁹

However, he not only had to fight to keep the crown for Vladislaus, but also to safeguard his own estates from other preying magnates. Jacob Székely took over the castles in the Zagorje county, which he was eventually forced to return to John by the 1491 Treaty of Bratislava (Pressburg). The powerful Frankapan family unsuccessfully tried to reclaim the town of Senj, and their later objection to John settling their family disagreements caused John to resign as the duke of Slavonia in 1492. John was also involved in a dispute with the bishop of Zagreb Osvald Thuz over the castle of Rakovec which eventually escalated into war.²⁰

John's Slovak domains were not spared either. There he was involved in a dispute with Bishop Sigismund Ernuszt regarding the mines and properties in and around Banská Bystrica. On 20 September 1494 John secured a 16-year lease of the mines to Ján Thurzo for 1400 gold pieces a year, but Ernuszt tried to annul the deal claiming that he was the owner of the mines. However, King Vladislaus judged in favour of John, and the mines of Banská Bystrica later formed the basis of the future highly successful Fugger-Thurzo

¹⁵ ŠIŠIĆ, Ferdo: *Rukovet spomenika o hercegu Ivanišu Korvinu i o borbama Hrvata s Turcima*, nr. 59, pp. 99–107.

¹⁶ KLAIĆ, Vjekoslav: *Povijest Hrvata od najstarijih vremena do svršetka XIX. stoljeća. Knjiga četvrti*, pp. 201–203.

¹⁷ ŠIŠIĆ, Ferdo: *Rukovet spomenika o hercegu Ivanišu Korvinu i o borbama Hrvata s Turcima*, nr. 59, 61, pp. 99–107, 108–109.

¹⁸ ISTHVANFI, Nicolaus: *Historia regni Hungariae, post obitum gloriosissimi Matthiae Corvini regis, a quo apostolicum hoc regnum Turcarum potissimum armis barbarae invasum*, vol. 34. Vienna: I.T. Trattner, 1758, p. 8.

¹⁹ KLAIĆ, Vjekoslav: *Povijest Hrvata od najstarijih vremena do svršetka XIX. stoljeća. Knjiga četvrti*, pp. 215–216.

²⁰ ISTHVANFI, Nicolaus: *Historia regni Hungariae, post obitum gloriosissimi Matthiae Corvini regis*, p. 18, 21; BONFINIUS, Antonius: *Rerum Vngaricarum decades quatuor cum dimidia*. Frankfurt: Andreas Wechel, 1581, p. 713; HORVAT, Rudolf: *Ivan Korvin, ban hrvatski*, pp. 30–31, 33–34.

mining company.²¹ John was less successful in the dispute that was brought before the judge of the Royal Court Stephen Báthory on 28 January 1493 regarding the stone house in Banská Bystrica which Ernuszt claimed had been illegally taken away from his father by King Matthias twenty years ago and was now occupied by John. On 1 December 1494 John surrendered the house to the Ernuszt brothers.²² Since it was the same house that his mother had left him in her will, it seems that John had been using this house during the preceding years while his mother was living in Austria. She apparently tried to “legalise” the transfer of the property to her son after her death, but due to the changed circumstances the Ernuszt brothers managed to reclaim the property.

In 1495, while John was occupied in the south, Zápolya seized his estates in the counties of Lip-tov, Turiec and Orava.²³ However, not only was he faced with the attacks of his enemies, but also with the betrayal of his own retainers, notably the castellan of Bojnice, Peter Poky, who surrendered the castle to the Palatine. Poky was also involved in a conspiracy against Corvinus, but he was caught, sentenced to death, and quartered.²⁴ In order to protect and reclaim his domains from the Palatine, John hired Polish mercenaries, but Zápolya accused him as a traitor in front of the king, who soon sent letters to the towns of Prešov and Bardejov informing them that John was going to Poland to gather an army against the Kingdom and that he entrusted the defence of the land to the Palatine. Zápolya soon defeated the Polish forces, and John had to accept the loss of his lands.²⁵

In March 1495 Vladislaus appointed John Ban of Croatia and Slavonia. Although it seems that this was done at the request of Croatian nobles, they soon opposed his choice for vicebanus, a Hungarian noble, John Gyulay. Ultimately, he was allowed to keep Gyulay, but in return he had to guarantee to the nobility that they would have their say in the appointments of the future vicebanus, administrators and deputy administrators

of counties.²⁶ Realizing the weakness of his position in the Kingdom, he tried to consolidate it by marrying Beatrice Frankapan, daughter of the powerful and well-connected Count Bernardin. The marriage produced two children, Elisabeth and Christopher.

However, John’s position was still not completely secure. The complaints from the local nobility continued, particularly regarding the appointment of foreigners. They addressed their complaints to the king, who instructed John to observe the ancient rights and customs of the Kingdom.²⁷ The relationship between John and Vladislaus was still strained, and in the period from 1497 to 1498 the King appointed another ban, George Kaniszay. Eventually, the King and John came to terms, particularly after the death of Stephen Zápolya, and in 1499 John was once again appointed the ban of Croatia. He was confirmed in this office for life a year later, as a sort of compensation from the King for not becoming the new palatine. This second term is characterised by an active anti-Ottoman policy and actions in Dalmatia, around Knin, in Slavonia, and particularly Bosnia. One of the most important military actions was the one in 1501 directed at Jajce, where he won a great victory and broke the Ottoman siege of the town.²⁸

He also managed to establish to a greater extent independent rule in Croatia. In a way copying the policies of his father, he started creating his own power base by awarding offices, land properties and castles to his faithful retainers. They were mostly foreigners, and, being newcomers in the Kingdom, were not looked on kindly by the established nobility, so therefore they depended almost exclusively on John and were more likely to remain loyal to him.

He thus established in Croatia many noble families which would play important roles in the following decades and centuries, such as the Alapy, Pethö de Gerse, Berislavić and Gyulay families. Among them were also families

²¹ LISKOVÁ, Henrieta: Odraz politiky panovníckeho dvora na vývoji mesta Banská Bystrica do konca 15. storočia. In: *Annales Historici Prešovensis*. Ed.: Martin PEKÁR – Patrik DERFIŇÁK – Peter ZMÁTLO. Prešov: Universum, 2005, p. 109; VON PÖLNITZ, Götz: *Jakob Fugger*, vol. 2: Quellen und Erläuterungen. Tübingen: Mohr, 1951, p. 22.

²² RITOÓK-SZALAY, Ágnes: *Borbála*, p. 104, note 16.

²³ See *Registrum omnium proventuum Regalium 1494–95*. In: VON ENGEL, Johann Christian: *Geschichte des Ungarischen Reichs unter seiner Nebenländer*, vol. 1. Halle: Johann Jacob Gebauer, 1797, p. 34, pp. 134–135.

²⁴ BONFINIUS, Antonius: *Rerum Vngaricarum decades quatuor cum dimidia*, p. 730.

²⁵ ŠIŠIĆ, Ferdo: *Rukovet spomenika o hercegu Ivanišu Korvinu i o borbama Hrvata s Turcima*, nr. 192, 194, 195, pp. 250–251, 252–253.

²⁶ *Jura regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*. Ed.: Joannes KUKULJEVIĆ. Zagreb: Ljudevit Gaj, 1861, p. 230.

²⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 232.

²⁸ HORVAT, Rudolf: *Ivan Korvin, ban hrvatski*, pp. 42–52; ISTHVANFI, Nicolaus: *Historia regni Hungariae, post obitum gloriosissimi Matthiae Corvini regis*, p. 30.

originating from Slovakia. On 24 December 1490 in Komárno he gave Emerik Derenčin, Ban of Jajce and the future Ban of Croatia, whose family originated from Drienčany in the Gemer county, the castles of Lipovac and Vivodina.²⁹ He also appointed him captain of the coastal town of Senj and successfully defended it from the aspirations of the Frankapan family.³⁰

However, the most distinguished family were the Rattkays, originating from the place called Ratka (Rathka) near the river Slaná (Sajó), in the Gemer county. On 3 March 1502, as a reward for his military services in the battles against the Ottomans, John awarded the estates of Jurketinec and Veliki Tabor in county of Zagorje to Pavao (Paul) Rattkay, whose family would become one of the most important noble families in Croatia during the Early Modern period, providing many famous individuals, among others, Pavao II (died 1556), vicebanus and a noted military leader, Nikola (Nicholas) (1601–1662), a Jesuit priest and a missionary to India, Juraj (George) II (1612–1666), a distinguished historian, and Ivan (John) (1647–1683), a Jesuit priest and a missionary to Mexico.³¹

In this regard, it is also worth mentioning that John was instrumental in establishing the family Horvath de Lomnicza, later Horvath de Lomnicza-Kissevich, originating from the Turopolje region near Zagreb, in Slovakia. Andreas and Michael Horvath de Lomnicza were castellans of John's towns of Likava and Orava, respectively, and John even pawned Orava to Michael. Michael's son John later became the provost of Spiš Chapter.³²

In Croatia John Corvinus is also remembered as a great benefactor of the Church, especially the Pauline order and their monasteries in Remete and Lepoglava³³, where he was buried after his untimely death in Krapina on 12 October 1504.

To conclude, despite the strong connections to Slovakia – he was probably raised in Banská Bystrica, one of his first titles was the Slovak title of duke of Liptov, and last, but not least, he held vast properties in the region – the changed circumstances after his father's death, notably, the shift of power and the designated titles and offices of duke of Slavonia, and later ban of Croatia and Slavonia, the loss of many estates in Slovakia to more powerful opponents in that region and the concentration of estates in the south of the Kingdom to a larger degree determined the focus of John's later activities on Croatia and Slavonia. There, due to the decline of royal power, he managed to establish a largely independent position, actively organising and taking part in anti-Ottoman operations, as well as successfully negotiating the often troubled and complicated relations with the local nobility and creating a network of local retainers, administrators and officers, some of whom originated from Slovakia, who represented the instrument for carrying out his policies. However, despite having a stronger influence and role in these parts of the Kingdom, he nevertheless still represents one of the most important historical figures connecting the two countries of Croatia and Slovakia where he is even today held in high regard.

²⁹ ŠIŠIĆ, Ferdo: *Rukovet spomenika o hercegu Ivanišu Korvinu i o borbama Hrvata s Turcima*, nr. 73, p. 86, 124.

³⁰ HORVAT, Rudolf: *Ivan Korvin, ban hrvatski*, p. 31.

³¹ GULIN, Ante: *Povijest obitelji Rattkay (1400–1793)*. Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1995, pp. 13–14, 24–26, 28–34, 39–41, 54, 63.

³² KUKULJEVIĆ-SAKCINSKI, Ivan: *Beatrica Frankapan i njezin rod*, pp. 39–40, 47; VON BOJNIČIĆ, Ivan: *Der Adel von Kroatien und Slavonien*. Nürnberg: Bauer und Raspe, 1899, p. 65; WAGNER, Carolus: *Analecta Scepusii sacri et profani*, vol. 4. Posonium et Cassovia: Johann Michael Landerer, 1778, pp. 73–83, 191; WAGNER, Carolus: *Diplomatarium comitatus Sarosiensis*. Posonium et Cassovia: Johann Michael Landerer, 1780, pp. 77–78.

³³ SZABO, Agneza: Ban Ivaniš Korvin u hrvatskoj povijesti i kulturi (u povodu 500. obljetnice smrti). In: *Gazophylacium*, a. 9, nr. 3–4, 2004, pp. 5–14.

