

Institutional Aspects of The Church History

University of Zagreb – University Department of Croatian Studies
Institutions and Individuals Series

edited by Marko Jerković

Zagreb, 2018

Ágnes Maléth
University of Pécs
zapala-maleth.agnes@pte.hu

Papal Delegates in the Hungarian Kingdom during the Reign of Charles I (1301–1342)*

Abstract: The descendant of the Neapolitan Angevin and the Árpád dynasties, Charles I succeeded to the Hungarian throne in 1301. Despite his initial difficulties with the Hungarian oligarchs, the first Angevin king of Hungary led a dynamic diplomacy in which his relationship with the papal court had a crucial role. His reign concurred a period of administrative reforms of the papal institutions which aimed to centralize and extend the power of the Holy See. This process increased the importance of the papal representation locally. The purpose of the present paper is to examine in what forms the papal authority manifested in the Hungarian Kingdom in Charles I's time (legations, tax collections, etc.), present prosopographical data on the papal delegates and describe their work in the Hungarian Kingdom.

Key words: papal delegates, papal tax collectors, papal legates, 14th century, Hungarian Kingdom, Charles I

Papal power manifested in medieval European countries in various forms. Recent historical research has emphasized this versatility, and an urge to clarify the institutional framework even of the less direct forms of papal representation has emerged.¹ In order to determine the different forms and levels of the papal representation in the relationship of the Holy See with a certain kingdom, and to categorize the offices of the papal representation (delegation), we have to find answers for a number of questions concerning the selection, the status, the activity of the delegates and several other aspects of the representation. The research, in my opinion, has to include a prosopographical examination to reveal who the papal representatives were: members of the papal curia, or of the local clergy? How did their commission fit into their careers? Then, the reason for the commission has to be studied: did the representatives have diplomatic, financial, or jurisdictional functions, or more at the same time? And lastly, we have to discuss how they were supposed to reach the aims of the Holy See, in other words: what measures did

* The present paper is supported by the „NKFIH NN 124763 – Papal envoys in Hungary in the 14th century – Online database”. The author is a research fellow of the project at the Department of Medieval and Early Modern History in the Institute of History of the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Pécs.

¹ The bibliography of the papal delegation has been significantly enriched in the past decades, so I would like to mention only some fundamental works. On the papal legates see: Robert Figueira, “Subdelegation by papal legates in the thirteenth-century canon: powers and limitations,” in *In iure veritas. Studies in Canon Law in Memory of Schafer Williams*, ed. Steven B. Bowman – Blanche E. Cody (Michigan: University of Cincinnati College of Law, 1991), 56–79, and also Robert Figueira, “The Medieval Papal Legate and his Province: Geographical Limits of Jurisdiction,” in *Plenitude of Power. The Doctrines and Exercise of Authority in the Middle Ages: Essays in Memory of Robert Louis Benson*, ed. Robert Figueira (Aldershot: Routledge, 2006), 73–106; Armand Jamme, “Anges de la paix et agents de conflictualité. Nonces et légats dans l’Italie du XIV^e siècle,” in *Les légats pontificaux (mi XI^e–mi XVI^e siècle)*, ed. Pascal Montaubin (in press); Pierre Jugie, “La légation du cardinal Gui de Boulogne en Hongrie et en Italie (1348–1350),” *Il Santo. Rivista di storia, dottrina ed arte* 2 (1989) 10–50; Gergely Kiss, “Les légats pontificaux en Hongrie au temps des rois Angevins (1298–1311),” in *La diplomatie des États Angevins aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*, ed. Zoltán Kordé – István Petrovics (Rome–Szeged: JATE Press, 2010), 101–116. About the papal tax collectors see: Christiane Schuchard, *Die päpstlichen Kollektoren im späten Mittelalter* (Tübingen: Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom 91, 2000); Amandine Le Roux, “Servir le pape, le recrutement des collecteurs pontificaux dans le royaume de France et en Provence de la papauté d’Avignon à l’aube de la Renaissance (1316–1521),” (PhD diss., Université Paris 1, 2010). W. E. Lunt, *Accounts Rendered by Papal Collectors in England, 1317–1387*, (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1968). About judge delegates and conservators: Peter Herde, “Zur päpstlichen Delegationsgerichtsbarkeit im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit,” *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung* [hereafter: ZSRG KA] 119 (2002) 20–43; Henri Hénaff, “Les conservateurs apostoliques d’après le concile de Vienne,” *Revue de droit canonique* 55 (2005), 341–353. Lastly, on the executors of the papal curia: Kerstin Hitzbleck, *Exekutoren. Die außerordentliche Kollatur von Benefizien im Pontifikat Johann XXII* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).

they have, for what exactly did they have authorisation? Based on the analysis of the sources, three groups of papal delegates can be differentiated during the reign of Charles I: legates, tax collectors and other “occasional” representatives (judge delegates, conservators, administrators). In the present paper, I would like to give an overview of the work and personnel of all three groups, with a special regard to the first two in which cases the corpus of sources allows us to get a more detailed insight.

*

Historians usually consider the papal legation as the highest level of papal representation. Although the institution of the papal legation had existed since the early Christian era (4th century), canon law started to offer its legal definition and differentiate between its different forms since the 11th century. By the 13th century, three main types evolved: 1.) *legatus missus* (a papal envoy, a delegate who has not been given any independent authority); 2.) *legatus a/de latere* (a papal delegate with full authority, the pope’s *alter ego*, mostly one of the cardinals) and 3.) *legatus natus* (a prelate who represented the papal interests permanently in a certain area, but had mainly representative functions).² The history of the legations in the Hungarian Kingdom is probably the segment of the papal representation in the 14th century where the researchers of the topic are in the most favourable situation, as far as the amount of the sources is concerned. However, earlier research was mainly concentrated on the diplomatic aspects, so the complexity of the legates’ work has been acknowledged only recently by historians which opened up numerous new directions for research.

During Charles I’s reign, there were two occasions when the Holy See sent papal legates to Hungary. Both legates had the title *legatus a latere*, and both legates were cardinals. The first time, between spring 1301 and autumn 1303, Nicolaus Bocasinus (Niccolò Boccasini), the cardinal-bishop of Ostia and Velletri was commissioned to the Hungarian Kingdom. The second time, between the spring of 1308 and the autumn of 1311, Gentilis de Monteflorum (Gentile da Montefiori), cardinal-priest of S. Martinus in Montibus (San Martino ai monti) was appointed to represent the Holy See. The activity of the two legates has attracted the attention of historians since the end of the 19th century. The traditional (diplomatic-dynastic) approach to the sources was especially strong in case of these two legates and the other fields of their activity have been almost completely neglected. The reason for this was probably the fact that the inner-political situation of Hungary in the beginning of the 14th century – namely the death of Andrew III which meant the end of the Árpád dynasty, and the following a war of succession with the involvement of several candidates for the throne (Charles of Anjou, Otto of Bavaria, and Wenceslas of Bohemia) – oriented the research towards the examination of the contemporary diplomacy. Especially the legation of cardinal Gentilis has been in the centre of historical research, as the documents connected to his mission were preserved in the papal archives. These documents are scattered in the minor fonds of the Vatican Secret Archives, such as *Instrumenta Miscellanea*, the *Archivum Arcis* and the *Vatican* and *Avignon Registers*, and also in the Vatican Library. They include the coronation document of Charles I,³ oaths of loyalty from some of the oligarchs⁴ and texts of judicial proceedings, like court protocols or testimonies of witnesses. On the other hand, the number of sources of Boccasini’s legation is more limited: the research has to be based on the commissioning bulls, and the authorisations

² Karl Ruess, *Die rechtliche Stellung der päpstlichen Legaten bis Bonifaz VIII* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1912), 48–59, and 64–66.

³ 15. 06. 1309: Archivio Segreto Vaticano Archivum Arcis Armadio C [hereafter: ASV AA Arm. C] 500, and 24. 06. 1309: ASV AA Arm. C 501.

⁴ The agreement with Matthew of Csák (10. 11. 1308): ASV AA Arm. C 502; with Ladislaus, voyvode of Transylvania (08. 04. 1310): ASV AA Arm. C 503, and with Henry of Kőszeg (04. 06. 1309): ASV AA Arm. C 504.

(*facultates*) preserved in the papal registers, and a handful of charters issued by the legate in Hungary.

We are in the fortunate situation that both legates' careers – which show several similarities – can be reconstructed quite well. As it has been mentioned above, both of the legates were cardinals, in other words they belonged to the closest circles of the papal curia. Both of them started as members of the regular clergy (Boccasini as a Dominican, Gentilis as a Franciscan friar), and both of them were appointed cardinals by Boniface VIII.⁵ Niccolò Boccasini entered in 1254 (or a year later) as *novicius* the Dominican cloister of Treviso and was later transferred to Venice. He was provincial of his order in Lombardy twice: first between 1286 and 1289, and between 1292 and 1296. In 1296 he was chosen master general of the order. Two years later he became cardinal-priest of Santa Sabina, and was promoted to the title cardinal-bishop Ostia and Velletri in 1300. One year later he was commissioned by pope Boniface VIII to intermediate in the peace talks between Edward I of England and Philipp IV of France. This first diplomatic task of Boccasini is generally considered as a great success, as the negotiations were concluded with a two-year truce.⁶

Gentilis de Monteflorum was a Franciscan monk who probably studied and taught at the university of Paris.⁷ He was created cardinal in the third promotion by Boniface VIII in 1300, and later became *penitentiarius papae*.⁸ In 1300, he was commissioned together with Boccasini to decide in the conflict of the Franciscans and Dominicans. The decree resulting from their commission regulated the distance between the churches of the two orders, but it was ratified only after the election of Boccasini as pope.⁹ Gentilis' legation to Hungary was the only task of such kind during his career, nevertheless, he showed great resolution. He left Hungary in 1311 in order to participate in the Council of Vienne. Clement V entrusted him with the transportation of some parts of the papal treasury from Italy, but he died soon after, in 1312 in Lucca.¹⁰

Both legates received a number of papal authorisations (*facultates*) which defined their power. These *facultates* can be categorized into four groups. 1.) The authorisations in the first group helped the legates to solve organisational difficulties of the legation, such as to create the financial or the administrative background. Accordingly, they had right to collect money from the local clergy for their provisions (*procuratio*),¹¹ the legates and the members of their entourage were allowed to receive the incomes of their benefices even in case of their absence,¹² and they could appoint notaries.¹³ 2.) The *facultates* of the second group determined the jurisdictional authority of the legates: most importantly they had the right to use ecclesiastical sanctions against everybody (regardless of title, position, or any previous exemption) who refused to cooperate.¹⁴ 3.) The legates were also empowered to meet decisions concerning the church organisation in the territories of their legation, e.g. they had could confer ecclesiastical

⁵ Conrad Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica medii aevi*, vol. I (München: Libraria Regensbergiana, 1913) [Hereafter: HC I.], 13.

⁶ On the life of Benedict XI see Charles Grandjean, "Benoît XI avant son pontificat" *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* [hereafter: MAH] 8. (1888), 219–291; Emil Kindler, *Benedikt XI (1303–1304)* (Posen: A. Förster, 1891); and Paul Funke, *Papst Benedikt XI. Eine Monographie* (Münster: H. Schöningh, 1891); Vito Sibilio, *Benedetto XI*. (Roma: Angelicum University Press, 2004).

⁷ Palémon Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIIIe siècle*. I–II. (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J Vrin, 1933) II. nr. 332.

⁸ 22. 05. 1302: ASV Reg. Vat. 50, f. 190v, ep. 154.

⁹ 05. 12. 1303: ASV Reg. Vat. 51, f. 209, ep. 62.

¹⁰ Laura Gaffuri, "Gentile da Monfifiore (Gentilis de Montefiore)," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 53 (2000), online edition, accessed 31-07-2018, http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/gentile-da-montefiore_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/.

¹¹ 13. 05. 1301: ASV Reg. Vat. 50, f. 117. ep. XXVIII, and XXIX; and 08. 08. 1307: ASV Reg. Vat. 54, f. 152v.

¹² 13. 05. 1301: ASV Reg. Vat. 50, f. 116. ep. XVI.

¹³ 13. 05. 1301: ASV Reg. Vat. 50, f. 118. ep. XLI.

¹⁴ 13. 05. 1301: ASV Reg. Vat. 50, f. 116v ep. XVIII, and 08. 08. 1307: ASV Reg. Vat. 54, f. 106v.

benefices,¹⁵ and Boccasini had the right to reform the Dominican order as well.¹⁶ 4.) The last group consisted of *facultates* connected to spiritual concession: privileges which the legates received from the pope (e.g. the right to choose confessor),¹⁷ and the privileges which the legates could grant in the countries of their legation (e.g. indulgences or absolutions).¹⁸

It is widely accepted that the main aim of both legations was to stabilize the rule of Charles I. Hungarian historiography has traditionally regarded the Holy See as the most ardent supporter of the Angevin succession. However, this notion has been recently questioned. Andreas Kiesewetter has argued that it would be rather problematic to give an example of the concrete intervention of the popes in the Hungarian war of succession before 1303, although the Holy See claimed supremacy over the Hungarian Kingdom.¹⁹ In fact, the sources connected to Boccasini's legation do not offer any evidence for diplomatic negotiations during his stay in Hungary. The documents suggest that the cardinal's work was focused on issues connected to church government and organisational questions, e.g. the protection of the rights of different ecclesiastical institutions to collect tithe or duties in certain territories, and taking sanctions against those who had violated these rights.²⁰

On the other hand, the second legate, Gentilis de Monteflorum had indeed a significant influence on the political situation in Hungary. In spite of the fact that Charles I had been already coronated twice (first in 1301 and in 1309), neither of the coronations fulfilled all three requirements which would have made it legitimate (that is to be coronated by the archbishop of Esztergom, in Székesfehérvár with the Holy Crown of Hungary). What is more, a significant part of the country was ruled by oligarchs, thus, Gentilis negotiated with some of the most powerful lords on behalf of Charles I, and helped him recover the Holy Crown from the voyvode of Transylvania. Similarly to Boccasini, he presided over synods of the Hungarian clergy where he met decisions to improve the situation of the church, and a number of cases - especially concerning ecclesiastical benefices - were decided at his tribunal.²¹

*

In the commission of the second group of delegates, the papal tax collectors different titles were used, such as *collector apostolicus*, *collector et receptor* or *nuntius et collector apostolicus*. In the case of the 14th-century Hungary, the last one, *nuntius et collector apostolicus* was the most common. In spite of the fact that the title *nuntius* frequently entailed some kind of diplomatic mission,²² there is no evidence for such activity of the papal tax collectors in the Hungarian

¹⁵ 13. 05. 1301: ASV Reg. Vat. 50, f. f. 117v ep. XXXIV, and 08. 08. 1307: ASV Reg. Vat. 54, f. 106v.

¹⁶ 05. 05. 1302: ASV Reg. Vat. 50, f. 283v ep. XXXI.

¹⁷ 13. 05. 1301: ASV Reg. Vat. 50, f. 116v ep. XIX, and 08. 08. 1307: ASV Reg. Vat. 54, f. 106v.

¹⁸ 13. 05. 1301: ASV Reg. Vat. 50, f. 117v ep. XXXIII, and 08. 08. 1307: ASV Reg. Vat. 54, f. 106r.

¹⁹ Andreas Kiesewetter, "L'intervento di Niccolò IV, Celestino V e Bonifacio VIII nella lotta per il trono ungherese (1290–1303)," in *Bonifacio VIII. Ideologia e azione politica*, ed. Ilaria Boniccontro (Roma: ISIME, 2006), 139–198.

²⁰ On the synod in Buda Boccasini issued a decree which threatened the usurpaters of possessions, properties or incomes of ecclesiastical institutions with excommunication. 18. 11. 1301. MNL-OL DF 272 686. Kiss, "Les légats pontificaux", 101–116, and György Rácz, "Az Anjou-ház és a Szentszék (1301-1387)," [The Angevin dynasty and the Holy See] in *Magyarország és a Szentszék kapcsolatának ezer éve*, ed. István Zombori (Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség, 1996), 55–81.

²¹ A good example is the trial for the episcopal see of Pécs in 1309. The cathedral chapter elected the archdeacon of Tolna as bishop, but the cantor of the chapter occupied the bishopric palace with the help of an oligarch and appropriated the bishopric incomes. The case was decided in favour of the archdeacon, and the cantor was excommunicated. ASV Reg. Aven. 55, f. 358–365. Antal Pór, "Viszály a pécsi káptalanban, 1302–1309: újabb adalék Gentilis biboros követségé történetéhez Magyarországon" [Feud in the chapter of Pécs, 1302–1309: new details on the legation of cardinal Gentilis in Hungary], *Történelmi Tár* 12 (1889: 3): 401–420.

²² According to Christiane Schuchard, the creation of the *collectoria*-system was the precondition for the financial policy of the Avignon papacy. Schuchard, *Die päpstlichen Kollektoren*, 18–20. On the topic see also Johann Peter Kirsch, *Die päpstlichen Annaten in Deutschland während des 14. Jahrhunderts. I.: Von Johann XXII. bis Innozenz VI.* (Paderborn: Görres-Gesellschaft, 1903); and Ruess, *Die rechtliche Stellung*, 105–106.

Kingdom.²³ The collection of the papal taxes was one of the episodes in the history of the relationship of Charles I with the Holy See which became a source of conflicts between the two powers. The reason for this, not surprisingly, was the fact that in the tax collection (at least initially) only the papal court was interested, so the king did not show a lot of willingness to cooperate. Later, the pope found the right way to motivate the king in helping the papal tax collectors' work: one-third of the collected sum was (often) conceded to the king.

Before presenting the data, it is necessary to give an overview of the change in the system of the papal revenue collection which took place at the end of the 13th and at the beginning of the 14th century. One significant element of this change was that the papal tax collectors started to be responsible for the collection of more tax types at the same time because of the introduction of new taxes and the creation of the *collectoria* system. The starting point of the papal revenue collection was the tithe²⁴ which supposed to give the financial basis for the crusades to the Holy Land, and which – due to its occasional nature – did not require permanent institutional background. Thus, the commission of the collectors was occasional, limited in time for the execution of a certain task, and could be ended at any time by withdrawal or transfer. The temporary nature of the task is also the reason why until the beginning of the 14th century – mostly, but not exclusively – local prelates (archbishops, bishops, abbots, etc.) were charged with the collection of tithe in certain territories.

The case of Hungary is a good example to demonstrate the transformation of the papal tax collection, as the two major factors of the change are easily noticeable. First, unlike earlier, when the collectors were responsible for only one type of revenue, the collectors in the examined period collected three types of taxes in Hungary: 1.) the *decima* for the crusade to the Holy Land, 2.) the rest of the procuration of cardinal Gentilis, and 3.) the tax of the minor ecclesiastical benefices (*fructus primi anni beneficiorum*, shortly called *annata*).²⁵ Secondly, the collectors who were appointed to Hungary in the first half of the 14th century were – if not members of the papal curia in the strict sense – agents of the papal politics, meaning that they received their titles and position from the pope, and they represented exclusively the interests of the Holy See. Between 1301 and 1342, seven collectors were sent to the Hungarian Kingdom, one of them by Boniface VIII, four of them by John XXII and two of them by Benedict XII. Between 1331 and 1342 there were tax collectors continuously in Hungary, meaning that the originally appointed collectors were later replaced or substituted (as two of the collectors died during their missions, of natural causes). The most important sources of the research on the collection of papal revenues in the Hungarian Kingdom during the middle ages are the account books preserved in the Vatican Secret Archives.²⁶ They were among the first documents

²³ Unlike in Poland a couple of years earlier: Galhardus de Carceribus had been appointed not only collector, but he had been authorised to proceed in the conflict of Casimir III with the Teutonic Order. 04. 05. 1338: ASV Reg. Vat. 125, ep. 340.

²⁴ After the tenth introduced by Innocent III (1199), the twentieth imposed by the fourth council of Lateran (1215), and by the first council of Lyon (1245), it was pope Gregory X who tried to obtain the necessary funds for the liberation of the Holy Land by imposing tax on the ecclesiastical benefices on the second council of Lyon in 1274. This tenth was proportionally smaller than earlier, but it was supposed to be collected during six years, and the Holy See tried to levy tax on all Christian countries and all strata of the ecclesiastical society. The collection lasted for decades. In the examined period, the collection of the tenth was announced once: by Clement V on the council of Vienne (1311-1312) for six years. Norman Housley, *The Avignon Papacy and the Crusades* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 162–169.

²⁵ The tax of the consistorial benefices (*servitium*) had to be paid personally or thorough procurators in the papal court. W. E. Lunt, "The Financial System of the Medieval Papacy in the Light of Recent Literature," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 23 (1909: 2), 251–295, 282–283.

²⁶ ASV Cam. Ap. Coll. vol. 180. and 183.

concerning Hungarian history which were published in 1887, shortly after the opening of the papal archives.²⁷

Table 1: Papal tax collectors in the Hungarian Kingdom during the reign of Charles I (1301–1342)

#	Date of the commission	Name of the collector(s)	Ecclesiastical title in the time of the commission	Result of the collection in the Hungarian Kingdom
1.	1301/1304-1308 (?)	Bonaiutus de Casentino	canon of Aquileia, papal chaplain	?
2.	1317-1320	Rufinus de Civinio	archdeacon of Tolna (<i>dioc. Quinqueecclesien.</i>)	1223 florins
3.	1331-1334	Raimundus de Bonofato (1334†)	rector of the cathedral of St Michael in Limoges	ca. 11,000 florins
4.	1331-1340	Jacobus Berengarii	operarius of the convent of Lagrasse (Carcassone)	
5.	1333-1339	Jacobus de Lengres (1339†)	sacrista of the church in Carpentras	
6.	1338-1342	Galhardus de Carceribus	provost of Titel (Тител, SRB)	
7.	1338-1342	Petrus Gervasii	canon of Le Puy	

After establishing the historical context, I would like to return to the original research questions of this paper, and give answers with the help of the data available on the tax collectors who were sent to the Hungarian Kingdom during the reign of Charles I. We are in a favourable situation, as the sources offer some detailed information on the careers of the tax collectors, thus it is possible to follow their lead in the majority of the cases. As it is shown in Table 1, only one of them – Bonaiutus de Casentino²⁸ – had office in the papal curia. Initially he is mentioned as *scriptor papae* in a papal letter in 1299;²⁹ he received the titles which he had at the time of his commission (canon of Aquileia and papal chaplain) a couple of years later, under Benedict XI. It seems that he did not receive any further promotion during the reign of Clement V. A papal letter from 1312 redistributing Bonaiutus' benefices after his death suggest that he

²⁷ László Fejérpataky et al., ed., *Rationes collectorum pontificiorum. Pápai tized-szedők számadásai, 1281–1375. Monumenta Vaticana historiam Regni Hungariae, I/1.* (Budapest: Franklin, 1887) [Hereafter: MON VAT I/1.]

²⁸ In the sources Bonaiutus de Casentiono is consequently entitled *magister*. However, research on the Apostolic Chancery has proved that in the context of the Apostolic Chancery, this title did not refer to university studies, but it was conferred to people who belonged to the social group of notaries and jurists. Brigide Schwarz, *Die Organisation kurialer Schreiberkollegien von ihrer Entstehung bis zum Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts*, (Tübingen: Niemayer Max Verlag, 1972), 75–79.

²⁹ This time he was the canon of the cathedral of Le Mans (01. 06. 1299) Georges Digard et al., ed., *Les registres de Boniface VIII: recueil des bulles de ce pape publiées ou analysées d'après les manuscrits originaux des archives du Vatican*, vol. I–IV (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1884–1935) [Hereafter: Registres de Boniface VIII], II, 443–444. (nr. 3130) According to Bernard Barbiche, among the papal *scriptors* appointed during the reign of Boniface VIII, Bonaiutus was the only one who never exercised his administrative authority. On the other hand, Boniface VIII commissioned him several times for tasks outside the curia. Bernard Barbiche, “Les "Scriptores" de la chancellerie apostolique sous le pontificat de Boniface VIII (1295-1303)”, *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 128 (1970): 115–187, 130 and 169.

had acquired “*terras et possessions*” close to Bologna.³⁰ Although Bonaiutus de Casentino is well-known in the Western European historiography because of the literary piece he created,³¹ his work as a papal tax collector has not been examined yet in details.³²

As far as the other tax collectors are concerned, the majority of them had benefices in France (Table 1, nr. 3, 4, 7.), or in the Comtat Venaissin (*ibid.*, nr. 5.), and two of them in the Hungarian Kingdom (*ibid.*, nr. 2. and 6.). However, the Hungarian benefices do not necessarily mean that Rufinus de Civinio or Galhardus de Carceribus (Galhard of Carcès) were members of the “local” clergy. Rufinus is believed to have been recruited in the service of the Apostolic See by cardinal Gentilis. His name is mentioned for the first time in the documents of a trial for a prebend in the cathedral of Pécs. The case was decided at the tribunal of the papal legate in favour of Rufinus. It is not known though when exactly he became archdeacon of Tolna: the papal letters commissioning him for the collection of the taxes in 1317 already entitle him like that,³³ but at the end of his account book he used the expression *olim* when speaking about this office³⁴ which suggests that after his return to the papal curia in 1320 he resigned from the archdeaconate. On the other hand, the sources offer more details in connection with the career of Galhardus de Carceribus (t. 1. nr. 6.).³⁵ Galhardus came from the province of Quercy,³⁶ and he was qualified in canon law (*licentiatus in legibus*). In 1311 he was *domicellus* in the papal curia.³⁷ First he received benefices in the dioceses of Cahors³⁸ and Rodez,³⁹ later he became rector of the city Benevento for a short period. Before, and parallel to his commission to Hungary he was appointed *nuntius apostolicus* to the Polish Kingdom where his main task was – in addition to tax collection – to intermeditate in the conflict of Casimir the Great with the Teutonic order.⁴⁰ He held high offices in the Hungarian Kingdom: first he became provost of

³⁰ 29-04-1312: ASV Reg. Vat., 59. f. 102v ep. 492.

³¹ The collection includes 14 poems of varying length and an unfinished treatise from the period between 1292 and 1297. For the edited version of the manuscript BAV Vat. Lat. 2854 see Marco Petoletti, “Il Divesiloquium di Bonaiuto da Casentino, poeta di curia ai tempi di Bonafacio VIII”, *Aevum* 75 (2001), 381–448.

^{32,33} Bonaiutus de Casentino is mentioned or briefly presented by Adolf Gottlob, *Die päpstlichen Kreuzzugs-steuern des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Heiligenstadt: F. W. Cordier, 1892), 109; Johann Peter Kirsch, *Die päpstliche Kollektorien in Deutschland während des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1894), XXXI–XXXIII, and LXVI; Barbiche, “Les “Scriptores””; also Schuchard, *Die päpstlichen Kollektoren*, 199. Most recently: Ágnes Maléth, “Egy elfeledett pápai adószedő”, in *Középkortörténeti tanulmányok* 8, ed. Márta Tóber – Ágnes Maléth (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2015), 141–156. Two documents connected to Bonaiutus de Casentino’s work as a collector have been published *in extenso* lately: Edgár Artner et al., ed., *Magyarország mint a nyugati keresztény művelődés védőbástyája*. *A Vatikáni Levéltárnak azok az okiratai, melyek őseinknek a Keletről Európát fenyegető veszedelmek ellen kifejtett erőfeszítéseire vonatkoznak (ca. 1214–1606)*, *Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae* I/1. (Budapest–Róma: Gondolat, 2004) [Hereafter: CVH I/1.], 40–42 (nr. 52. = ASV Instr Misc 426); 43–45 (nr. 54. = ASV Instr. Misc. 476).

³³ Although the documents of the trial mention exclusively the canonicate in Pécs, the church historian György Timár believes that Rufinus became archdeacon of Tolna in the same year (1309). Timár György, “Pécs egyházi társadalma Károly Róbert korában”, [The ecclesiastical society of Pécs in the time of Charles Robert] *Baranyai Helytörténetírás* (1981), 13–56, 40. For the documents of the trial see MON VAT I/2. 257–262.

³⁴ MON VAT I/1. 13.

³⁵ Summaries of his career in Hungarian: Kálmán Juhász, *A csanádi püspökség története: 1307–1386*, [The history of the bishopric of Csanád: 1307–1386] I/3 (Makó: Makói Könyvnyomda, 1946) 53–57; és Gábor Thoroczkay, “A Szent Bölcsesség egyháza: A titeli társaskáptalan története a kezdetektől a XIV. század közepéig” [The church of the Holy Wisdom: the history of the chapter of Titel from the beginning until the middle of the 14th century], *Fons* 21 (2014) 331–350, esp. 343–346.

³⁶ Carcès is located in present day Tarn-et-Garonne departement. Sylvain Gouguenheim, “Le procès pontifical de 1339 contre l’Ordre Teutonique”, *Reveu historique* 647 (2008), 567–603, note 9.

³⁷ 23. 07. 1311: ASV Reg. Vat., 58. f. 239v ep. 958.

³⁸ 23. 05. 1328: ASV Reg. Vat., 88. ep. 3380. (ASV Reg. Av., 31. f. 372r)

³⁹ 01. 01. 1331: ASV Reg. Vat., 97. ep. 130. (ASV Reg. Av., 38. f. 501r)

⁴⁰ It is not clear why John XXII delegated a *nuntius* instead of a legate to handle such a delicate issue. According to the concepts of canon law, a *nuntius* had more restricted authority than a legate. Stanisław Szczur, “Papal collectors and state power in Central Europe during the fourteenth century,” in *Central and Eastern Europe in*

Titel (1336–1344), and later bishop of Csanád (1344–1345). Clement VI wanted to transfer him to the bishopric of Veszprém, but Louis I refused to accept the candidate of the pope. The reason for this was presumably the political importance of this prelatore, given that the bishops of Veszprém were traditionally appointed chancellors of the queens. Galhardus was compensated with the archbishopric of Brindisi.⁴¹

Two other collectors from the list above had very similar lifepaths to that of Galhardus de Carceribus: Raymundus de Bonofato (Table 1, nr. 3.) and Jacobus de Lengres (*ibid*, nr. 5.). Both of them had qualifications in canon law, Raymundus de Bonofato was *iurisperitus*,⁴² while Jacobus de Lengres had the title *baccalaureus in legibus*.⁴³ Furthermore, similarly to Galhardus, both of them started their careers at the time of the papacy of John XXII. The first information on Raymundus de Bonofato offered by the papal letters dates to September 1330 when he was granted the expectative right of a canonicate in the diocese of Périgueux. He was in this time already the *rector* of the St Michael cathedral in Limoges from which he did not have to resign when entering the new benefice.⁴⁴ Shortly after his commission to the Hungarian Kingdom, he was exempted for three years from the obligation to be ordained from subdeacon to presbyter, and the pope also allowed him to extract money from his benefices even in case of his absence.⁴⁵ Bonofato was one of the two collectors who did not return to the curia: he died in Hungary probably in the beginning of 1333.⁴⁶ Earlier historiography dated his death to the beginning of 1334,⁴⁷ but the papal letters which filled in the vacancies caused by Bonofato's death were issued in May 1333.⁴⁸

Jacobus de Lengres was the tax collector who succeeded Raymundus de Bonofato. He came from a family which moved from Bourgogne to Marseille at the end of the 13th century, and established their wealth with naval transportation.⁴⁹ Jacques, son of Hughues received his first

the Middle Ages. A Cultural History, ed. Piotr Górecki and Nancy van Deusen (London–New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers, 2009), 130–136.

⁴¹ HCl, 149.

⁴² 06. 09. 1330: ASV Reg. Vat., 97. ep. 979. (ASV Reg. Av., 39. f. 391v)

⁴³ 01. 03. 1331: The National Archives of Hungary, Archives of Diplomas and Charters, Pre-Mohács Collection [Hereafter: MNL-OL DF] 291661; Augustinus Theiner, *Vetera monumenta historia Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, vol. I. (Roma: Typis Vaticanis, 1859) [Hereafter: VMH] 536–540, nr. DCCCXXX–DCCCXXXVI, 23. 03. 1331: MNL-OL DF 291661, VMH 540, nr. DCCCXXXVII; and 24. 03. 1331: MNL-OL DF 291661, VMH 540, nr. DCCCXXXVII.

⁴⁴ 06. 09. 1330: ASV Reg. Vat., 97. ep. 979. (ASV Reg. Av., 39. f. 391v)

⁴⁵ For both documents see (07. 04. 1331) ASV Reg. Vat., 99. f. 354r–v ep. 1879. (ASV Reg. Av., 38. f. 303v) and ASV Reg. Vat., 116. f. 199. (228) ep. 1003. The three years of the absolution was counted from the date of the papal letter, and it was valid in case of absence because of studies or sojourn in the papal court.

⁴⁶ Perhaps the most important part of the legacy of Raymundus de Bonofato is his notebook preserved in the Vatican Secret Archives. This document contains not only the schematic structure of the Hungarian church, but also Bonofato's notes about papal legislation connected to revenue collection (especially from contemporary ordinances, like *Clementines* or the decrees of John XXII). ASV Cam. Ap. Collect. vol. 184. The fact that similar notebooks were in the possession of collectors working all over Europe in the 14th century suggests that the professionalization of the system of papal revenue collection moved to a more advanced level. Stefan Petersen, *Benefizientaxierungen an der Peripherie: Pfarrorganisation, Pfündeneinkommen, Klerikerbildung im Bistum Ratzeburg* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 47.

⁴⁷ László Fejérpataky, “Pápai adószedők Magyarországon a XIII. és XIV. században,” [Papal tax collectors in Hungary in the 13th and 14th centuries] *Századok* 21 (1887), 493–517, 512.

⁴⁸ This papal letter conferred Bonofato's former canonicate in the church of St Avit in the diocese of Lectour which he had received one year earlier 02. 05. 1332: ASV Reg. Vat., 101. ep. 678. (ASV Reg. Av., 40. f. 378r), Lettres de Jean XXII, XI. 133. (nr. 56369); and 01. 05. 1333: ASV Reg. Vat., 104. ep. 677. (ASV Reg. Av., 43. f. 374v).

⁴⁹ The different members of the Lengres family did not only join the traditional naval commerce in Marseille (towards Neaples, Mallorca and Catalonia), but they were hired for military expeditions as well (e.g. by Robert I, king of Neaples to transport soldiers and arms, or by the Knights Hospitaller). Damien Carraz, “Les Lengres à Marseille au XIV^e siècle. Les activités militaires d'une famille d'armateurs dans un port de croisade,” *Revue historique* 652 (2009: 4), 755–777.

benefice in Marseille,⁵⁰ which was soon followed by a canonicate in Aix-en-Provence.⁵¹ He became *sacrista* of the church in Carpentras in August 1333, while he could also keep his benefices in Macerata and Aix-en-provence.⁵² He received his last benefice in the St Peter church in Gerberoy (diocese of Beauvais) soon after the succession of Benedict XII.⁵³ Just like his predecessor, Jacobus de Lengres died in Hungary, probably in Pécs in the spring of 1339.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, the papal letters deciding about his vacant benefices were issued only during November and December 1340.⁵⁵

Jacobus Berengarii (t. 1. nr. 6.) was the only tax collector who was member of the regular clergy: he was the *operarius* of the convent on Lagrasse (diocese of Carcassone). He was commissioned to the Hungarian Kingdom by pope John XXII as the “associate” of Raymundus de Bonofato.⁵⁶ He was first confirmed as a collector by Benedict XII, but soon afterwards he was ordered to return to the curia. For unknown reasons, he did not obey the first summons of the pope, and arrived in Avignon only in 1340.⁵⁷

Petrus Gervasii did not advance high in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, but he had an outstandingly long career as a tax collector (Table 1, nr. 8.). He had benefices in Le Puy and Viviers, and before his commission to the Hungarian Kingdom, he had been collecting papal revenues in Sweden, Denmark, Bruges, Flandria and the Polish Kingdom.⁵⁸ From Hungary he returned to Avignon because of the death of Benedict XII. Later he worked as a collector in Le Puy, Clermont (diocese of Clermont-Ferrand), in the diocese of Mende and the city of St. Flour.⁵⁹ He died between 1373 and 1375.⁶⁰

Having reviewed the careers of the tax collectors, the data suggest that as a result of the expanding system of papal administration a specific group of clerics emerged by the second decade of the 14th century. The members of this group belonged to the middle stratum of the ecclesiastical society, most of them were qualified or skilled, and they specialized in revenue collection. With their help, the Holy See was able to claim the papal taxes more efficiently even in the perimeters of the Christianity, such as in the Hungarian or the Polish Kingdoms. When delegating the collectors, the papal bulls described the reason for the taxation (i.e. which tax type was to be collected), how the tax had to be calculated (how long the collection should last, and what proportion of the income should be paid), and in some cases even the expected sum was determined (see the example of 1317 below). Similarly to legates, the collectors received special authorisations (*facultates*) regulating what means they could use to enforce payments. The first commission of papal tax collector(s) to the Hungarian Kingdom during the period 1301–1342 was published by Boniface VIII in September 1301,⁶¹ repeated with a slight

⁵⁰ 05. 10. 1330: ASV Reg. Vat., 99. ep. 1646. (ASV Reg. Av., 38. f. 199v)

⁵¹ 04. 11. 1330: ASV Reg. Vat., 98. ep. 593. (ASV Reg. Av., 37. f. 374v). A papal letter dated to the the same day granted him full indulgence in case of his death. ASV Reg. Vat., 98. ep. 450. (ASV Reg. Av., 37. f. 310r)

⁵² 12. 08. 1333: ASV Reg. Vat., 104. ep. 666. (ASV Reg. Av., 43. f. 365r)

⁵³ 22. 07. 1336: ASV Reg. Vat., 121. ep. 627. (ASV Reg. Av., 49. f. 371.)

⁵⁴ Fejérpataky, “Pápai adószedők Magyarországon,” 515.

⁵⁵ About his canonicate in Narbonne: 25. 11. 1340: ASV Reg. Vat., 128. ep. 383. (ASV Reg. Av., 54. f. 327.) and his benefice in Carpentras: 28. 12. 1340: ASV Reg. Vat., 128. ep. 170. (ASV Reg. Av., 54. f. 163v)

⁵⁶ For the papal commission of 01. 03. 1331 see: MNL-OL DF 291661, VMH 536–537. DCCCXXX.

⁵⁷ The last summons of the pope was issued on 14. 03. 1340: ASV Reg. Vat., 135. f. 14 v ep. 38., VMH 634. DCCCCLV.

⁵⁸ 23. 05. 1336: ASV Reg. Vat., 131. f. 34r ep. 117.

⁵⁹ 05. 03. 1364: ASV Reg. Vat., 262. f. 75v.

⁶⁰ On his life and career see more details in Élisabeth Mornet, “Le chanoine Pierre Gervais, nonce et collecteur pontifical. Jalons pour une biographie,” in *Finances, pouvoirs et mémoire. Hommages à Jean Favier*, ed. Jean Kerhervé – Albert Rigaudière (Paris: Fayard, 1999), 565–577.

⁶¹ 16. 09. 1301.: ASV Reg. Vat., 50. f. 131v ep. 85., Registres de Boniface VIII, III 317–320. (nr. 4408–4409)

modification by Benedict XI in February 1304.⁶² Bonaiutus de Casentino was appointed to collect the tenth imposed by the Second Council of Lyon in the Bohemian and Hungarian Kingdoms, in the Margraviate of Moravia, and in the Duchy of Greater Poland, and also the Saint Peter's pence (*denarius Sancti Petri*) in Poland.⁶³ The papal letters connected to Bonaiutus' first commission as a tax collector in September 1301 did not specify what kind of authority he had, but the papal bulls from February 1304 offer some clarification in this question: he could absolve from excommunication those people who had committed violence against clerics,⁶⁴ he had the right to decide about issues concerning a certain country of his commission, even if he had already departed from it,⁶⁵ in accordance with the decrees of the Second Council of Lyon, he had the authority to excommunicate those who impeded his work,⁶⁶ he could issue quittances about the sums he was paid,⁶⁷ he could use ecclesiastical sanctions (*censura ecclesiastica*) against those who refused to pay,⁶⁸ and he could appoint two notaries (*tabellionatus*).⁶⁹

After Benedict XI's time, no tax collector was delegated to the Hungarian Kingdom until 1317. In spite of the fact that the Council of Vienne (1311–1312) imposed the tithe for a six-year period, John XXII chose to prioritise the collection of other revenues: he imposed a new tax on the vacant benefices in December 1316,⁷⁰ and he also determined the exact sum of silver marks which the Hungarian prelates owed to papal court because of the procuration of cardinal Gentilis.⁷¹ There are several signs which suggest that pope John XXII sought to improve the system of the revenue collection: one collector was responsible for only one country, and the appointed delegate – Rufinus de Civinio – was a person who was probably familiar with Hungary. The *facultates* of Rufinus were restricted on the issues connected to the tax collection: he was allowed to appoint *subcollectors* and a notary,⁷² and he was empowered to

⁶² For the document of the second commission (11. 02. 1304) see: ASV Reg. Vat., 51. f. 208r ep. 52, VMH 412–413. DCLVIII. Boniface VIII originally commissioned two collectors: Bonaiutus de Casentino and Gabriel, priest of Valleneto (*dioc. Pisanensis*), chaplain of Teoderico Raineri, cardinal-bishop of Palestrina, to the Holy Roman Empire, to the Bohemian and the Hungarian Kingdoms, the Duchy of Greater Poland and the Margravate of Moravia. It seems highly probable that the collectors did not start working after this first commission. When Benedict XI renewed the appointment, he divided the territory of responsibility into two: Gabriel was sent to the ecclesiastical provinces of Mainz, Trier, Cologne, Bremen, Magdeburg and Salzburg, and the dioceses of Eichstätt, Bamberg and Kammin, while Bonaiutus had to collect the tithe in the Bohemian and the Hungarian Kingdoms, and the Duchy of Greater Poland. The sources prove that after the second commission both collectors started to work: Gabriel delegated a *subcollector* in Lübeck (19. 09. 1304). *Codex diplomaticus Lubecensis. Urkundenbuch der Stadt Lübeck*, 2. 1 (Lübeck: Verein für Lübeckische Geschichte und Alterthumskunde, 1858), 155–156. (nr. 179–180)

⁶³ The daily allowance of the collectors was three florins. 17. 09. 1301: ASV Reg. Vat., 50. f. 131v ep. 87; VMH 386–387, DCXX.

⁶⁴ 11. 02. 1304: ASV Reg. Vat., 51. f. 208 v ep. 53., Charles Grandjean, ed., *Le registre de Benoît XI: recueil des bulles de ce pape* (Paris: A. Fontemoing, 1905) [Hereafter: *Registre de Benoît XI*], 702. (nr. 1156)

⁶⁵ 11. 02. 1304: ASV Reg. Vat., 51. f. 208 v ep. 56., *Registre de Benoît XI* 703. (nr. 1159)

⁶⁶ 11. 02. 1304: ASV Reg. Vat., 51. f. 208 v ep. 57., *Registre de Benoît XI* 704. (nr. 1160)

⁶⁷ 11. 02. 1304: ASV Reg. Vat., 51. f. 208 v ep. 54., *Registre de Benoît XI* 702–703. (nr. 1157)

⁶⁸ 11. 02. 1304: ASV Reg. Vat., 51. f. 208 v ep. 58., *Registre de Benoît XI* 704–705. (nr. 1161)

⁶⁹ 11. 02. 1304: ASV Reg. Vat., 51. f. 209r ep. 91., *Registre de Benoît XI* 706. (nr. 1164)

⁷⁰ ASV Reg. Vat., 63. ep. 174v (ASV Reg. Av., 2. f. 42r), VMH 448–449, nr. DCLXXXIII. One year income had to be paid.

⁷¹ In 1317, the pope ordered the collection of 1711 (silver) marks of Buda, and in 1318, 1741,5 silver marks (without specifying the type) as the rest of the procuration. 01. 05. 1317: ASV Reg. Vat., 63. ep. 300. (ASV Reg. Av., 2. f. 233r); VMH 449–450, nr. DCLXXXIV. and (17. 06. 1318) ASV Reg. Vat., 67. ep. 85. (ASV Reg. Av., 10. f. 460r), Guillaume Mollat, ed., *Jean XXII (1316-1334): Lettres communes*, vol. I-XVI (Paris: de Boccard, 1921–1947) [Hereafter: *Lettres de Jean XXII*] II, 260. (nr. 8209)

⁷² 27. 06. 1317. 06: ASV Reg. Vat., 63. ep. 381., VMH 451, nr. DCLXXXVII.

excommunicate those who disobeyed him; and absolve those who had been excommunicated because of the failure of payment, but later redeemed the debt.⁷³

The collection of the tenth of Vienne started only in 1331. John XXII delegated two collectors in the beginning of March: Jacobus Berengarii and Raymundus de Bonofato.⁷⁴ They received similar authorisations to their predecessors; two important points where the *facultates* differed were the size of the personnel (they could choose 10 notaries),⁷⁵ and the serious sanctions which they could use to compel the clergy to concede the sums collected by earlier tax collectors (they had the right to excommunicate anybody, even if the person was granted exemption from excommunication by papal documents).⁷⁶ Based on the account book preserved in the Vatican, it seems that the two collectors had a systematic approach to the task: they divided the country into two (according to the territorial division of the archdioceses of Esztergom and Kalocsa), delegating at least one *subcollector* in every diocese. With the exception of some exempted places, the tax collection intended to cover the entire country. As a consequence of the agreement of John XXII and Charles I, one third of the collected sum was conceded to the crown, therefore, a royal representative joined the papal collectors (initially the bishop of Csanád (Cenad, RO), and from April 1338, a Dominican friar called Stephanus).⁷⁷ Besides, it is necessary to point out that this was the first time when the collectors were charged with non-finance related duties. First of all, they had to assist the bishop of Győr in examining the election of the provost of Székesfehérvár, and to confirm the election if they found it legitimate.⁷⁸ Secondly, and more importantly, they had to supervise the archdiocese of Esztergom until the investiture of the new archbishop.⁷⁹ The surces also mention a trial handled at the tribunal of Raymundus de Bonofato and Jacobus Berengarii, but unfortunately we do not have any details on this case.⁸⁰

The last aspect in connection with the tax collectors which I would like to consider in the present paper is the result of their work. In this question, the sources show us a rather incomplete picture: in one case we have no sure information, we know the exact sum in the second; and in the last case, due to the prolonged process of the collection, we have only estimates.

In spite of the fact that the papal letters mention concrete sums collected by Bonaiutus de Casentino, the origin of the taxes was mostly not specified (e.g. *in partibus Alamanie, Boemie*). This makes it very problematic to determine how big part of the money came from Hungary, or, more precisely, whether the collection had any results in Hungary at all. The earliest source which provides details about the work of Bonaiutus as a collector reports that Wenceslas II, king of Bohemia (1278–1305) “borrowed” 580 Moravian marks from the tithes of Olomouc, acknowledging in his own and his son’s obligation to pay it back.⁸¹ However, it is obvious that the debt was not paid off in Wenceslas’ time; pope John XXII reminded John of Luxemburg in

⁷³ 01. 07. 1317: ASV Reg. Vat., 63. ep. 407b (ASV Reg. Av., 2. f. 74v)

⁷⁴ 01. 03. 1331: MNL-OL DF 291 661, VMH 536–537.

⁷⁵ The document also transcribes the text of the oath which the notaries had to take. 30. 03. 1331: ASV Inst. Misc. 1174. (MNL-OL DF 291661)

⁷⁶ 1339. 08. 21.: ASV Reg. Vat., 134. f. 77v ep. 273., VMH 631–632, nr. DCCCCXLIX.

⁷⁷ Fejérpataky, *Pápai adószedők Magyarországon*, 511 és 515.

⁷⁸ 1331. 06. 10.: ASV Reg. Vat., 99. ep. 1359. (ASV AV 38. f. 70v; MNL-OL DF 291551), VMH 543, nr. DCCCXLII.

⁷⁹ Csanád of Telegd was elected archbishop of Esztergom already in September 1330. John XXII granted him the pallium in the beginning of the next year (05. 01. 1331: ASV Reg. Vat. 98, ep. 468, VMH 532, nr. DCCCXXIII). So it is highly possible that the collectors arrived only after the consecration of Csanád of Telegd.

⁸⁰ The two collectors issued a document which ordered the provost of Szeben (Sibiu, RO) to compel the dean of the same city and some priests to pay his debt for the collectors’ notary. The dean and the priests owed three silver marks to the notary, because they had asked for copies of papal bulls and the documents of the legal process which they had presented to the collectors. 25. 01. 1332. 01: MNL-OL DF 277271.

⁸¹ „...quingentas et octuaginta marcas grossorum denariorum denariorum Pragensium ad pondus Moravicum sexagintaquatuor grossos pro marca qualibet computando...” VMH 414, nr. DCLX.

1320 that the Bohemian crown still owed this money to the papal curia.⁸² Between 1305 and 1307, Bonaiutus de Casentino deposited money at the representatives of Florentine bank companies three times. From the tax he had collected in German territories (*in Alamanie partibus collecta*) he gave 483 florins to the Bardi,⁸³ as a result of the tax collection in the Bohemian Kingdom he gave 483 florins for the Cerchi,⁸⁴ and 400 florins were taken by the Spini.⁸⁵ In other cases, prelates helped to move the collected tax to the papal court. A document from 1308 describes the amount (weight) of the gold and silver which Bonaiutus entrusted to the bishop of Castello.⁸⁶ 1508 florins were delivered to the papal court by the bishop of Padova.⁸⁷ Nevertheless, the largest part of the collected tax was paid directly to the Apostolic Camera by Bonaiutus himself in May 1309: 2840 and a half florins.⁸⁸ As we can see, there is no sign which would indicate that any of the above mentioned sums was collected in the Hungarian Kingdom. This, combined with the inner political situation in Hungary,⁸⁹ the fact that no document was issued by Bonaiutus in the Hungarian Kingdom, and the silence of the sources about the delegation of any *subcollector* in Hungary⁹⁰ raise the doubts whether Bonaiutus de Casentino visited the Hungarian Kingdom, or his tax collection had any success. Even later, in spite of the continuous improvement of the system of revenue collection during the first half of the 14th century, the collectors had to face numerous difficulties. When Rufinus de Civinio arrived in Hungary in October 1317, it turned out that putting theory into practice was problematic. First, some clarification was necessary about the way how the taxes were counted,⁹¹ and after a couple of month, it became evident that the procedure of the collection consumes a significant part of the profit. John XXII tried to solve the problem with cutting down on the allowances of the *subcollectors*.⁹² What is more, the resistance of the Hungarian clergy meant a serious impediment to the collector's work in some cases. Nonetheless, the

⁸² The papal letter from 25. 01. 1317 [P. Ritter von Chlumecky et al., ed., *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae*, vol. VI (Brünn: Nitsch&Grosse, 1854), 85–87 (CXIII)] was transcribed on the 23. 08. 1320: ASV Reg. Vat., 70. ep. 142, Lettres de Jean XXII, III, 168. (nr. 12225)

⁸³ 25. 10. 1306: ASV Reg. Vat., 53. f. 1v.

⁸⁴ 11. 07. 1307: ASV Reg. Vat., 54. f. 150r ep. 25.

⁸⁵ 25. 10. 1306: ASV Reg. Vat., 53. f. 2r.

⁸⁶ 26. 03. 1308: Augustinus Theiner, *Vetera monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae*, vol. I (Romae: Typis Vaticanis, 1860) [Hereafter: MON POL], 31–32; CVH 1/1. 40–42. (nr. 52)

⁸⁷ The transcription of the document from 26. 08. 1309 dating to 07. 12. 1317: ASV Instr. Misc. 476.

⁸⁸ 11. 05. 1309: ASV Cam. Ap. Intr. et ex. nr. 75 f. 2v, MON POL 31–32, Kirsch, *Die päpstlichen Kollektorien*, 381. (with the incorrect date of 08. 04. 1309).

⁸⁹ On the contemporary political situation in the Hungarian Kingdom see Attila Zsoldos, “Kings and Oligarchs in Hungary at the Turn of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries,” *The Hungarian Historical Review* 2 (2013) 211–242.

⁹⁰ In opposition to the case of Hungary, there was one occasion in the Bohemian Kingdom when Bonaiutus de Casentino passed on his authority (*subdelegatio*): he charged John, bishop of Prague with the revision of some tax exemptions. The document issued by the bishop reports about the subdelegation: 28. 02. 1309: Joseph Emler et al., ed., *Regesta diplomatica nec non epistolaria Bohemiae et Moraviae*, vol. II (Pragae: Typis Gregerianis, 1882), 948.

⁹¹ The papal bull which instructed Rufinus to collect one-year income of the vacant benefices was issued on the 17. 06. 1318: ASV Reg. Vat., 67. ep. 83. (ASV Reg. Av., 10. f. 459v), VMH 462, nr. DCXCVIII.

⁹² 17. 06. 1318: ASV Reg. Vat., 67. ep. 81. (ASV Reg. Av., 10. f. 459r), VMH 461, nr. DCXCVI. Hungarian historians used to attribute the loss to the high daily allowance of Rufinus (2 florins daily), however, the papal registers suggest that his salary was standard. Lettres de Jean XXII, I, 477. (nr. 5276: a *nuntius* in Aragonia received 2 florins per day; nr. 5278: 3 florins daily for a *nuntius* in the Holy Roman; nr 5279: for a delegate with the same title 2 florins per day in the Iberian Peninsula)

collection was fruitful: after having changed the different currencies with the Bardi,⁹³ Rufinus delivered to the Apostolic Chamber 1223 florins.⁹⁴

About the collection which started in 1331 the letters of Galhardus de Carceribus and Petrus Gervasii provide information. It seems that impostors tried to take advantage of the situation and collect money with forged papal documents;⁹⁵ according to Galhardus, in the chapter of Bács everybody except two people had been excommunicated because of the failure to pay,⁹⁶ Petrus Gervasii was once attacked while travelling,⁹⁷ and even the head of the Hungarian clergy, Csanád of Telegd, archbishop of Esztergom refused initially to cooperate with the collectors.⁹⁸ The results of the prolonged collection of the tithe of Vienne were summarised by László Fejérpataky in the edited version of the collectors' account books. First of all, the collectors succeeded to claim the taxes only in one diocese (Várad /Oradea, RO/) during the assigned six years. Secondly, the taxes had been paid with various currencies which needed to be changed to florins, and as well the collectors lost some part of the sum for the costs of travelling, daily allowances, the funeral of Raymundus de Bonofato and Jacobus de Lengres, and other unexpected expenses. As a consequence, they could deliver approximately 11000 florins to the Apostolic Chamber.⁹⁹

*

The last section discusses several diverse types of commissions which were categorized as one group based on the common characteristics: their occasional nature, that they were limited to one single case, and they gave papal authorisation for local clerics to act locally. The sources connected to this last group are unfortunately deficient; although in the majority of the cases the information they provide is not enough for prosopographical research, it is possible to establish generalities.

The first subcategory in the group of the occasional commissions is constituted by the judge delegates. Without going into details of its institutional history, let us evoke some basic facts about them. The office of *iudex delegatus* originated in the canonical concept that all Christians had the right to appeal to the pope.¹⁰⁰ After a while, the increased number of the appeals prevented the pontiffs from deciding every lawsuit personally, thus the Holy See delegated its authority to proceed.¹⁰¹ The papal universalism and centralisation in the 12th encouraged the

⁹³ At the end of 13th century, the Templars used to change money for the papal court. After the suppression of the order in the beginning of the 14th century, the Lombard bankhouses took over the place of the Templars. Despite the dangers of the long journeys, the preferred method was if the collectors delivered the taxes personally to Avignon. The reason for this was the fact that in the papal city specialized officers (*campsores Camere*) supervised the process of unifying the currencies, and from 1328 even the weight of the florins was fixed in the city. Guillaume Mollat – Charles Samaran, *La fiscalité pontificale en France au XIV^e siècle: période d'Avignon et du Grand Schisme d'Occident* (Paris: A. Fontemoing, 1905), 142–150, and also Yves Renouard, *Les relations des papes d'Avignon et des compagnies commerciales et bancaires de 1316 à 1378* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1941).

⁹⁴ According to the calculation of László Fejérpataky MON VAT I/1. LV.

⁹⁵ 05. 02. 1338: ASV Reg. Vat., 133. 5r–v ep. 12. (MNL-OL DF 291769.), VMH 619–620, nr. DCCCCXXX.

⁹⁶ 11. 06. 1338: MON POL 340–341.

⁹⁷ What is more, it seems that after a while Jacobus de Lengres started to accept alternative payments (e.g. salt). 16. 01. 1340: ASV Cam. Ap. Collect. 180. f. 70.

⁹⁸ 1339. 08. 21: ASV Reg. Vat., 134. f. 78r ep. 274., VMH 632, nr. DCCCCL.

⁹⁹ Fejérpataky, “Pápai adószedők Magyarországon,” 589–595.

¹⁰⁰ Charles Duggan, “Papal judge delegate and the making of the new law in the twelfth century,” in *Decretals and the Creation of the 'New Law' in the Twelfth Century*, by Charles Duggan (Aldershot: Routledge, 1998), 172–199, 172.

¹⁰¹ Usually three judge delegates were commissioned: two were chosen by the interested parties and one appointed by the pope. Until the second half of the 12th, mostly prelates were commissioned, later even clergymen of lower status. It was Boniface VIII who regulated the selection of the judge delegates: clerics with positions lower than dignitary or canon of a cathedral could not be appointed. Harald Müller, “Gesandte mit beschränkter Handlungsvollmacht. Zu Struktur und Praxis päpstlich delegierter Gerichtsbarkeit,” in *Aus der Frühzeit*

process of increase of delegations, so by the 14th century the commission of judge delegates was a standard procedure.¹⁰² In the time of Charles I, the corpus of the sources is dominated by some complicated and prolonged cases which developed from conflicts concerning ecclesiastical authority, filling vacant benefices or rights to collect tithe, or lawsuits for ecclesiastical benefices: such as the trial of the bishopric of Eger against the clerics of the archdeaconate of Tárca /Torysky, SK/ (1330–1332), or the trials of the bishop of Veszprém against the convent of the order *Cruciferi Sancti Stephani Regis* in Esztergom (1301–1331), or against the Pauline order (1335–1336). Among the litigants (institutions and/or individuals) whose cases were handled by judge delegates we find prelates (the bishops of Veszprém, Pécs, even the archbishop of Esztergom), abbats of different monasteries, clerics of lower status (*rectors*, parish priests, etc.). Nevertheless, the Dominican sisters of the Rabbit Island (today Margaret Island), and the bishop (sometimes joined with the chapter) of Veszprém were litigants in the greatest number of lawsuits handled by judge delegates in the examined period. The papal court mostly delegated bishops (Eger, Pécs, Nyitra /Nitra, SK/), provosts (Pozsony /Bratislava, SK/, Győr) and abbots (Pilis, Pannonhalma) as judges, but sometimes archdeacons, canons and archbishops were commissioned as well.¹⁰³

However, the procedure rarely followed a straight line. After the appeal and the commission of judge delegates, there were several variations how the lawsuit could proceed: sometimes the trial had to be postponed, or the originally commissioned judge handed over his authority to another cleric (*subdelegatio*), and it was not rare either that the party unsatisfied with the judgement made a new appeal, and a new judge was delegated. Sometimes the case could not be handled locally, and the process – after several appeals – eventually went back to the papal curia.¹⁰⁴

The trial of the provost and the chapter of Veszprém against the convent of the order *Cruciferi Sancti Stephani Regis* in Esztergom illustrates well how complicated a lawsuit could become. The process developed since the time of Boniface VIII¹⁰⁵ and it arose from the disagreement over certain tithe collection rights. Against the decision of the originally delegated judges (and their subdelegates), the bishop of Veszprém made an appeal to the papal court.¹⁰⁶ After this, Carchinus, provost of Győr was authorised as judge, who first postponed the trial, because the procurators of the cruciferi wanted to consult the papal legate, Boccasini.¹⁰⁷ The provost Carchinus finally decided in favour of the bishop of Veszprém.¹⁰⁸ However, the order protested in the time of Clement V who delegated new judges.¹⁰⁹ The lawsuit was probably discussed later at the tribunal of cardinal Gentilis, as a member of the entourage of the legate with the archbishop of Esztergom were appointed judges, although both of them handed over their commissions. The subdelegates postponed the trial.¹¹⁰ Then, we have a gap of twenty years in

europäischer Diplomatie. Zum geistlichen und weltlichen Gesandtschaftswesen vom 12. bis zum 15. Jahrhundert, ed. Claudia Zey and Claudia Märkl (Zürich: Chronos, 2008), 41–65, 47–48.

¹⁰² Herde, “Zur päpstlichen Delegationsgerichtsbarkeit,” 20–43.

¹⁰³ For example, Tatamerius, provost of Székesfehérvár was commissioned as judge delegate twice: in the lawsuit of the bishop of Veszprém against the Pauline order [02. 05. 1335: MNL-OL DL 2913; 12. 07. 1335: MNL-OL DF 283555 (transcription from 1344), and 07. 12. 1336: MNL-OL DL 3024]; and in the lawsuit of the Benedictine sisters of the Rabbit Island against the priests of the royal chapel in Budavár (10. 04. 1332: MNL-OL DL 2713).

¹⁰⁴ In the problematic, prolonged cases the Holy See frequently intervened: the pope commissioned auditors (auditor was originally a temporary office, but from the 13th century it became permanent). This practice led to the evolution of the *Sacra Romana Rota*. Herde, “Zur päpstlichen Delegationsgerichtsbarkeit,” 25.

¹⁰⁵ 28. 07. 1295: Vilmos Fraknói et al., ed., *A veszprémi püspökség római oklevéltára – Monumenta Romana episcopatus Vespriensis*, vol. II (Budapest: Franklin Társulat, 1898) [Hereafter: MREV II.], 16. (nr. XIX)

¹⁰⁶ 24. 05. 1298: MREV II. 379. (nr. CDCXV)

¹⁰⁷ 27. 11. 1302: MNL-OL DF 200 762.

¹⁰⁸ 08. 03. 1303: MNL-OL DF 200 763, and 03. 05. 1304: MNL-OL DF 262 492.

¹⁰⁹ Clement V’s letter is preserved in transcription from 21. 04. 1308: MNL-OL DF 200 775.

¹¹⁰ 14. 07. 1309.: MNL-OL DF 287 826.

the process: next time the sources report about the case in 1329, when John XXII appointed Oliver, papal chaplain and canon of Poitiers, auditor of the papal curia to investigate the issue.¹¹¹ Unfortunately, this is the point until which we can follow the lead of the case: about the outcome we have no sure information.¹¹²

Similarly to judge delegates, *conservators* had a function in ecclesiastical jurisdiction. *Conservators* were appointed, if an ecclesiastical institution or a member of the clergy sought legal remedy at the papal court as a consequence of the violation of their rights committed by other institutions or individuals. In the time of Charles I, the most frequent reason for the delegation of conservators was some kind of aggression: pillage or forceful occupation of church possessions, unlawful collection of tithes or arbitrary appropriation of other incomes. However, it was a significant difference that in the cases handled by judge delegates both interested parties were known, the papal letters which commissioned conservators mostly used general formulation, and did not provide concrete information on the aggressor(s). The Holy See usually empowered three conservators, frequently of high status, for a limited time (mostly three or five years). In the examined period, mostly bishops, such as the bishops of Pécs,¹¹³ Várad¹¹⁴ and Vác,¹¹⁵ and from the middle clergy the provost of Székesfehérvár¹¹⁶ received such commission. For Hungarian clerics the pope delegated conservators predominantly from the Kingdom of Hungary, and as well, Hungarian clerics were seldom charged with the protection of rights of ecclesiastical institutes or individuals from another country. Nevertheless, if such delegation took place, the dioceses of the plaintiff and that of the *conservator* lay relatively close: the bishop of Olomouc was *conservator* for the bishop of Eger (1330),¹¹⁷ the abbot of the Scottish Abbey in Vienne for the bishop of Veszprém (1330),¹¹⁸ the abbot of Heiligenkreuz for the abbot of Pannonhalma (1333);¹¹⁹ the bishop of Győr for the archbishop of Salzburg (1331).¹²⁰ In spite of the fact that the criteria of the selection of the conservators cannot be determined with absolute certainty, the data suggest that the status of the plaintiff had an influence: for the protection of the rights of the members of the high clergy, prelates were delegated. If, for example, a bishop asked for help from the Holy See, then usually two other bishops (mainly from the neighbouring dioceses, or at least from the vicinity of the diocese of

¹¹¹ The documents issued by the auditor Oliver 27. 12. 1329: MNL-OL DF 200 139, and the transcription of the document of 09. 06. 1331 from the 14. 07. 1331: MNL-OL DF 200 155.

¹¹² During the reign of Charles I there was only one more lawsuit in which a papal auditor was involved. Dynus papal chaplain, provost of Genova was appointed to examine the conflict between the bishop and chapter of Gyulafehérvár (Alba Iulia, RO), and the archdeacon of Küküllő (Târnava, RO), with some *decans*, *rectors* and priest over certain tithe collection rights. As the procurators of the bishop intended to present a petition, the papal chaplain postponed the trial and ordered the preservation of the status quo. 04. 05. 1328: Rudolf Theil and Carl Werner, ed., *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte des Mediascher Kapitels bis zur Reformation* (Hermannstadt: Theodor Steinhaussen, 1870), 6–10. (nr. 5). Later the trial was concluded with the consensus of the parties. Franz Zimmermann et al., ed., *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen*, vol. I. (Hermannstadt–Bucarest: Ausschuss des Vereines für siebenbürgische Landeskunde, 1892), 421–426. (nr. 465) The provost Dynus was mentioned twice more in connection with Hungarian cases: he was appointed *executor* in two cases connected to benefices in the diocese of Transylvania: 25. 02. 1332: ASV Reg. Vat., 103.

¹¹³ Appointed conservator for the bishop and diocese of Zagreb: (28. 05. 1322) ASV Reg. Vat., 73. ep. 129. (ASV Reg. Av., 16. f. 41v), VMH 479, nr. DCCXXXI.

¹¹⁴ Today Oradea (RO). The bishop was delegated as conservator for a provost whose benefices had been usurped. 05. 04. 1332: ASV Reg. Vat., 101. ep. 895. (ASV Reg. Av., 40. f. 460v), Lettres de Jean XXII, XI, 168. (nr. 56827)

¹¹⁵ The bishop of Vác one of the conservators delegated for the bishop and diocese of Győr (22. 11. 1318): ASV Reg. Vat., 69. ep. 156. (ASV Reg. Av., 41. f. 86v), Lettres de Jean XXII, II, 8671.

¹¹⁶ With the archbishops of Kalocsa and Esztergom appointed conservator for the Pauline order (27. 09. 1322): ASV Reg. Vat., 74 ep. 83. (ASV Reg. Av., 17 f. 134a); VMH 481–482, nr. DCCXXVI.

¹¹⁷ 28. 11. 1330: ASV Reg. Vat., 100. ep. 363. (ASV Reg. Av., 39. f. 588r, MNL-OL DF 291556)

¹¹⁸ 01. 12. 1330: ASV Reg. Vat., 98. ep. 370. (MNL-OL DF 291537)

¹¹⁹ 05. 08. 1333: ASV Reg. Vat., 104. 404v–405r. ep. 1205. (ASV Reg. Av., 44. f. 64r, MNL-OL DF 207148).

¹²⁰ 03. 04. 1331: ASV Reg. Vat., 100. ep. 371. (ASV Reg. Av., 39. f. 597v)

the palintiff) and a third cleric (abbot, provost or archdeacon) were commissioned. The two Hungarian archbishops were relatively rarely commissioned as conservators. There were only two cases when both of the archbishops had to proceed together in the same case: first for the Knights Hospitaller,¹²¹ and later for the Pauline eremites¹²² – which means that for the protection of the rights of two ecclesiastical institutions whose network extended to the entire country. Archbishops were appointed for the protection of rights of bishops as well twice (the archbishop of Kalocsa for the bishop of Eger, and the archbishop of Zadar for the bishop of Zagreb). The group of the plaintiffs was very heterogenous. From the archbishop of Esztergom¹²³ to clerics of lower status, many used the possibility to make a complaint at the Holy See, but the majority of the plaintiffs were without doubt bishops. In spite of the fact that the number of commissions of conservators seems to be higher than that of judge delegates during the reign of Charles I, sources of legal processes initiated by conservators are scarce. This suggests that these cases could be handled mostly outside court.¹²⁴

As the last subcategory of the occasional delegations, I would like to evoke some cases when the pope entrusted the administration of a vacant benefice provisionally to a local prelate. These delegates were entitled *administrators* by the papal bulls, and their main task was to ensure that nobody seizes the possessions and rights attached to the benefice unlawfully until the vacancy is filled. The commission of *administrators* was not very frequent in the examined period; in fact, we have information about only a handful of cases. For example, in the beginning of the century Gergely of Bicske was entitled elected archbishop and administrator of the archdiocese of Esztergom,¹²⁵ or after the death of Bolesław of Toszek, archbishop of Esztergom the bishops of Pécs and Veszprém were appointed as administrators of the archdiocese in 1330 until the investiture of the new prelate.¹²⁶

The aim of the present paper was to examine the forms of papal representation in the Hungarian Kingdom during the reign of Charles I (1301–1342). Based on the analysis of the sources, three groups of delegates have been identified. The first group was constituted by the papal legates: the cardinals Nicolaus Bocasinus (1301–1303) and Gentilis de Monteflorum (1308–1311). Both of them were entitled *legatus a latere* and granted a broad authorisation in ecclesiastical jurisdiction, spiritual matters and organisational questions of the local church organisation. Also, it has to be emphasized that legates (more precisely, cardinal Gentilis) were the only papal representatives in this period who were authorised to intervene in diplomatic issues. The second group was formed the papal tax collectors who were entitled *collector et nuntius apostolicus*.

¹²¹ The archbishops of Kalocsa and Zadar were commissioned. 09. 10. 1319: ASV Reg. Av., 12. f. 66r–68r.

¹²² The archbishops of Esztergom and Kalocsa were delegated. 27. 09. 1322: ASV Reg. Vat., 74, ep. 83. (ASV Reg. Av., 17. f. 134r), VMH 481–482, nr. DCCXXXVI.

¹²³ The bishop of Zagreb, the abbot of Pannonhalma and the provost of Székesfehérvár were nominated as conservators of the archbishop of Esztergom. 08. 12. 1321: ASV Reg. Vat., 73. ep. 680. (ASV Reg. Av., 16. f. 221r), VMH 476–478, nr. DCCXXVIII.

¹²⁴ Obviously, the fact that such documents are rare in Hungary from the examined period does not mean that conservators never initiated legal processes. A good example would be a case handled by Ladislaus, bishop of Pécs, who had been appointed as one of the conservators for Henrik, bishop of Veszprém and vice-chancellor of the queen (01. 12. 1330: ASV Reg. Vat., 98. ep. 370, MNL-OL DF 291 537). The bishop ordered the archdeacon of Szolnok to cite the rector of the St Michael church in Székesfehérvár who had been accused by the bishop of Veszprém of the attempted plunder of a church. The defendant certainly did not appear in court, as the bishop repeated the citation a few months later. The outcome of the process is obscure. For the document connected to the case see (04. 02. 1333): MNL-OL DF 200163 and 200169, as well as (24. 05. 1333): MNL-OL DF 200162.

¹²⁵ In this case it is highly probable that the pope postponed the confirmation of the *electus* because of political reasons. Gregory had been confronted with several members of the Hungarian high clergy, mainly due to his rivalry with former archbishop's family. His confirmation would have probably deteriorated the inner political situation in Hungary which was already stirred up due to the question of succession. Kiesewetter, "L'intervento," 166–167. For the nomination of Gregory of Bicske as administrator see 28. 01. 1299: VMH 382–383, nr. DCXVI; Kiss, "Les légats pontificaux", 101–116, and Rác, "Az Anjou-ház és a Szentszék," 55–81.

¹²⁶ 29. 07. 1330: MNL-OL DF 200 840.

In the examined period, seven collectors were commissioned to the Hungarian Kingdom. One of them (Bonaiutus) had actually offices in the papal curia (papal chaplain and *scriptor*). The rest of the collectors can be considered as direct representatives of the Holy See, meaning that they received their titles and position from the pope, and they pursued exclusively the interests of the Curia. The papal tax collectors were responsible for three types of revenues: the tenth for the crusade, the annata and the rest of the procuration of cardinal Gentilis. Lastly, the third group comprised the clerics who had occasional and temporary authorisation from the Holy See to handle usually one specific issue. The most significant part of the sources connected to the third group of papal representatives report on the work of judge delegates and conservators. The judge delegates were appointed by the pope to investigate and close lawsuits, if either litigant had earlier made an appeal to the papal court. The most common cause of the lawsuits handled by judge delegates in the examined period were conflicts over ecclesiastical authority, vacant benefices and the collection of tithe or other revenues. Conservators were delegated to protect the rights of clerics or ecclesiastical institution. Both the judge delegates and the conservators were chosen from a broad range of clerics, and also the plaintiffs came from every segment of the ecclesiastical society. In addition to judge delegates and conservators, we can find some cases during the reign of Charles I when the pope delegated administrators. The administrators had a role in the church government, as their main task was the provisional administration of a vacant benefice.

Bibliography

Primary sources

- Artner, Edgár et al., ed. *Magyarország mint a nyugati keresztény művelődés védőbástyája*. *A Vatikáni Levéltárnak azok az okiratai, melyek őseinknek a Keletről Európát fenyegető veszedelmek ellen kifejtett erőfeszítéseire vonatkoznak (ca. 1214–1606)*. Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae I/1. Budapest–Róma: Gondolat, 2004.
- Codex diplomaticus Lubecensis. Urkundenbuch der Stadt Lübeck*, 2. 1. Lübeck: Verein für Lübeckische Geschichte und Alterthumskunde, 1858.
- Digard, Georges et al., ed. *Les registres de Boniface VIII: recueil des bulles de ce pape publiées ou analysées d'après les manuscrits originaux des archives du Vatican*, vol. I–IV. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1884–1935.
- Fejérpataky, László et al., ed. *Rationes collectorum pontificiorum. Pápai tized-szedők számadásai, 1281–1375. Monumenta Vaticana historiam Regni Hungariae*, I/1. Budapest: Franklin, 1887.
- Fraknoi, Vilmos et al., ed. *A veszprémi püspökség római oklevéltára – Monumenta Romana episcopatus Vesprimiensis*, vol. II. Budapest: Franklin Társulat, 1898.
- Grandjean, Charles, ed. *Le registre de Benoît XI: recueil des bulles de ce pape*. Paris: A. Fontemoing, 1905.
- Theiner, Augustinus, ed. *Vetera monumenta historia Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, vol. I. Roma: Typis Vaticanis, 1859.
- Theiner, Augustinus. *Vetera monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae*, vol. I. Romae: Typis Vaticanis, 1860.

Secondary literature

- Barbiche, Bernard. "Les "Scriptores" de la chancellerie apostolique sous le pontificat de Boniface VIII (1295-1303)." *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 128 (1970): 115–187.
- Carraz, Damien. "Les Lengres à Marseille au XIV^e siècle. Les activités militaires d'une famille d'armateurs dans un port de croisade." *Revue historique* 652 (2009: 4): 755–777.

- Chlumecky, P. Ritter von et al., ed. *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae*, vol. VI. Brünn: Nitsch&Grosse, 1854.
- Duggan, Charles. “Papal judge delegate and the making of the new law in the twelfth century.” In *Decretals and the Creation of the 'New Law' in the Twelfth Century*, by Charles Duggan, 172-199. Aldershot: Routledge, 1998.
- Emler, Joseph et al., ed. *Regesta diplomatica nec non epistolaria Bohemiae et Moraviae*, vol. II. Pragae: Typis Gregerianis, 1882.
- Eubel, Conrad. *Hierarchia Catholica medii aevi*, vol. I. München: Libraria Regensbergiana, 1913.
- Fejérpataky, László. “Pápai adószedők Magyarországon a XIII. és XIV. században,” [Papal tax collectors in Hungary in the 13th and 14th centuries]. *Századok* 21 (1887): 493–517.
- Figueira, Robert. “Subdelegation by papal legates in the thirteenth-century canon: powers and limitations.” In *In iure veritas. Studies in Canon Law in Memory of Schafer Williams*, edited by Steven B. Bowman and Blanche E. Cody, 56–79. Michigan: University of Cincinnati College of Law, 1991.
- Figueira, Robert. “The Medieval Papal Legate and his Province: Geographical Limits of Jurisdiction.” In *Plenitude of Power. The Doctrines and Exercise of Authority in the Middle Ages: Essays in Memory of Robert Louis Benson*, edited by Robert Figueira, 73–106. Aldershot: Routledge, 2006.
- Funke, Paul. *Papst Benedikt XI. Eine Monographie*. Münster: H. Schöningh, 1891.
- Gaffuri, Laura. “Gentile da Monfefeio (Gentilis de Montefiore)” In *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 53 (2000), online edition. Accessed July 31, 2018. http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/gentile-da-montefiore_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/.
- Glorieux, Palémon. *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIIIe siècle*. I–II. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J Vrin, 1933. II. nr. 332.
- Gottlob, Adolf. *Die päpstlichen Kreuzzugs-steuern des 13. Jahrhunderts*. Heiligenstadt: F. W. Cordier, 1892.
- Gouguenheim, Sylvain. “Le procès pontifical de 1339 contre l’Ordre Teutonique.” *Reveu historique* 647 (2008): 567–603.
- Grandjean, Charles. “Benoît XI avant son pontificat.” *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire* 8. (1888): 219–291.
- Hénaff, Henri. “Les conservateurs apostoliques d’après le concile de Vienne.” *Revue de droit canonique* 55 (2005) : 341–353.
- Herde, Peter. “Zur päpstlichen Delegationsgerichtsbarkeit im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit.” *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung* 119 (2002): 20–43.
- Hitzbleck, Kerstin. *Exekutoren. Die außerordentliche Kollatur von Benefizien im Pontifikat Johann XXII*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Housley, Norman. *The Avignon Papacy and the Crusades*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Jamme, Armand. “Anges de la paix et agents de conflictualité. Nonces et légats dans l’Italie du XIV^e siècle.” In *Les légats pontificaux (mi XI^e–mi XVI^e siècle)*, edited Pascal Montaubin (in press).
- Jugie, Pierre. “La légation du cardinal Gui de Boulogne en Hongrie et en Italie (1348–1350).” *Il Santo. Rivista di storia, dottrina ed arte* 2 (1989): 10–50.
- Juhász, Kálmán. *A csanádi püspökség története: 1307–1386*, [The history of the bishopric of Csanád: 1307–1386] I/3. Makó: Makói Könyvnyomda, 1946.
- Kiesewetter, Andreas. “L’intervento di Niccolò IV, Celestino V e Bonifacio VIII nella lotta per il trono ungherese (1290–1303).” In *Bonifacio VIII. Ideologia e azione politica*, edited by Ilaria Boniconto, 139–198. Roma: ISIME, 2006.
- Kindler, Emil. *Benedikt XI (1303–1304)*. Posen: A. Förster, 1891.

- Kirsch, Johann Peter. *Die päpstliche Kollektorien in Deutschland während des 14. Jahrhunderts*. Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1894.
- Kirsch, Johann Peter. *Die päpstlichen Annaten in Deutschland während des 14. Jahrhunderts. I.: Von Johann XXII. bis Innozenz VI.* Paderborn: Görres-Gesellschaft, 1903.
- Kiss, Gergely. “Les légats pontificaux en Hongrie au temps des rois Angevins (1298–1311).” In *La diplomatie des États Angevins aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*, edited by Zoltán Kordé and István Petrovics, 101–116. Rome–Szeged: JATE Press, 2010.
- Le Roux, Amandine. “Servir le pape, le recrutement des collecteurs pontificaux dans le royaume de France et en Provence de la papauté d'Avignon à l'aube de la Renaissance (1316–1521).” PhD diss., Université Paris 1, 2010.
- Lunt, W. E. “The Financial System of the Medieval Papacy in the Light of Recent Literature,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 23 (1909: 2): 251–295.
- Lunt, W. E. *Accounts Rendered by Papal Collectors in England, 1317–1387*. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1968.
- Maléth, Ágnes. “Egy elfeledett pápai adószedő.” In *Középkortörténeti tanulmányok 8*, edited by Márta Tóber and Ágnes Maléth, 141–156. Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2015.
- Mollat, Guillaume and Charles Samaran. *La fiscalité pontificale en France au XIV^e siècle: période d'Avignon et du Grand Schisme d'Occident*. Paris: A. Fontemoing, 1905.
- Mollat, Guillaume et al., ed. *Jean XXII (1316-1334): Lettres communes*, vol. I–XVI. Paris: de Boccard, 1921–1947.
- Mornet, Élisabeth. “Le chanoine Pierre Gervais, nonce et collecteur pontifical. Jalons pour une biographie.” In *Finances, pouvoirs et mémoire. Hommages à Jean Favier*, edited by Jean Kerhervé and Albert Rigaudière, 565–577. Paris: Fayard, 1999.
- Müller, Harald. “Gesandte mit beschränkter Handlungsvollmacht. Zu Struktur und Praxis päpstlich delegierter Gerichtsbarkeit.” In *Aus der Frühzeit europäischer Diplomatie. Zum geistlichen und weltlichen Gesandtschaftswesen vom 12. bis zum 15. Jahrhundert*, edited by Claudia Zey and Claudia Märkl, 41–65. Zürich: Chronos, 2008.
- Petersen, Stefan. *Benefizientaxierungen an der Peripherie: Pfarrorganisation, Pfündeneinkommen, Klerikerbildung im Bistum Ratzeburg*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.
- Petoletti, Marco. “Il Divesiloquium di Bonaiuto da Casentino, poeta di curia ai tempi di Bonafacio VIII.” *Aevum* 75 (2001): 381–448.
- Pór, Antal. “Viszály a pécsi káptalanban, 1302–1309: újabb adalék Gentilis biboros követsége történetéhez Magyarországon” [Feud in the chapter of Pécs, 1302–1309: new details on the legation of cardinal Gentilis in Hungary]. *Történelmi Tár* 12 (1889: 3): 401–420.
- Rácz, György. “Az Anjou-ház és a Szentszék (1301-1387).” In *Magyarország és a Szentszék kapcsolatának ezer éve*, edited by István Zombori, 55–81. Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség, 1996.
- Renouard, Yves. *Les relations des papes d'Avignon et des compagnies commerciales et bancaires de 1316 à 1378*. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1941.
- Ruess, Karl. *Die rechtliche Stellung der päpstlichen Legaten bis Bonifaz VIII.* Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1912.
- Schuchard, Christiane. *Die päpstlichen Kollektoren im späten Mittelalter*. Tübingen: Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom 91, 2000.
- Schwarz, Brigide. *Die Organisation kurialer Schreiberkollegien von ihrer Entstehung bis zum Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts*. Tübingen: Niemayer Max Verlag, 1972.
- Sibilio, Vito. *Benedetto XI*. Roma: Angelicum University Press, 2004.
- Szczur, Stanisław. “Papal collectors and state power in Central Europe during the fourteenth century.” In *Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages. A Cultural History*, edited by Piotr Górecki and Nancy van Deusen, 130–136. London–New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers, 2009.

Theil, Rudolf and Carl Werner, ed. *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte des Mediascher Kapitels bis zur Reformation*. Hermannstadt: Theodor Steinhaussen, 1870.

Thorockay, Gábor. “A Szent Bölcsesség egyháza: A titeli társaskáptalan története a kezdetektől a XIV. század közepéig” [The church of the Holy Wisdom: the history of the chapter of Titel from the beginning until the middle of the 14th century]. *Fons* 21 (2014): 331–350.

Timár, György. “Pécs egyházi társadalma Károly Róbert korában”, [The ecclesiastical society of Pécs in the time of Charles Robert] *Baranyai Helytörténetírás* (1981): 13–56.

Zimmerman, Franz et al., ed. *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen*, vol. I. Hermannstad–Bucarest: Ausschuss des Vereines für siebenbürgische Landeskunde, 1892.

Zsoldos, Attila. “Kings and Oligarchs in Hungary at the Turn of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries.” *The Hungarian Historical Review* 2 (2013): 211-242.