

Institutional Aspects of The Church History

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

edited by Marko Jerković

Zagreb, 2018

Péter Báling
University of Pécs
baling.peter@pte.hu

Rivalry Among Friends

The Amicitia Phenomenon in the Monarchy of the Árpáds During the 11th and 12th Centuries*

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to present the historiography of the amicitia phenomenon in Hungary and to demonstrate its influence on the dynastic conflicts of the Árpáds. As it is apparent from foreign researches, the amicitia played a significant role in medieval conflict management. In our opinion, with the Western-European Christian and cultural influence, – that was clearly present when the foundation of the Hungarian Kingdom was laid down – the amicitia and the closely related institution of submission (*deditio*) found their way into the monarchy of the Árpáds. The members of the dynasty successfully applied this kind of conflict management during power struggles, which also contributed to the transformation of the familial structure of the Árpáds: from a relative equality of the members of the dynasty a new subordinate system has emerged.

Key words: Amicitia, Árpád dynasty, succession of power, social history, medieval Hungary

In Hungary after the death of St. Stephen the monarchy of the Árpáds was torn by dynastic feuds which were caused by deregulation of succession. This kind of power struggle was not unprecedented in the Central-Eastern-European region, as the neighbouring dynasties of Hungary – the Přemyslids in Bohemia and the Piasts in Poland – were in the same situation, since the local narrative sources report similar conflicts almost in every generation.¹ As we have already mentioned in case of Hungary all this was interpreted with the deregulation of

* The present paper is supported by the „NKFIH NN 124763 – Papal envoys in Hungary in the 14th century – Online database” and „NKFIH K17 123848 – Narrative sources in medieval German language: Hungary in the Chronicle of Ottokar aus der Gaal, the Ungarnchronik of Henry of Mügeln and Jakob Unrest” research projects..

¹ Dániel Bagi, „Egy barátság vége. Álmos 1106. évi alávetése és az Árpádok korai dinasztikus konfliktusai” [End of a Friendship. The submission of Álmos in 1106 and the Early Dynastic Conflicts of the Árpáds.] Századok 147, no. 2 (2013): 383–384.

succession,² but in the case of Bohemia³ and Poland⁴ a normative measure was introduced by the rulers for only one reason: to prevent the future dynastic conflicts. The testaments of Břetislav I and Bolesław III however could not halt members of the next generations from turning against each other.⁵

It is worth to note that the affairs of the dynasty members were not only regulated by the normative law, but also by unwritten customs and obligations that could be interpreted by theology which were evidently influenced by Christian morality and values, subsequently by the Church. The relations between the members of the family were determined equally by the normative man-made legal norms (*leges*) and the unwritten customary law (*consuetudines*) as well as the divine and natural laws. Brigitte Kasten has pointed out that during the Carolingian age the sons of the kings – the potential heirs – were judged according to these rules. Besides

² József Deér, *Pogány magyarság, keresztény magyarság* [Pagan Hungarians, Christian Hungarians] (Budapest, 1938), 126–127. Hungarian historiography however tried to justify the lack of regulation of succession along the legal notions of seniorate and primogeniture. cf. Emma Bartoniek, "Az Árpádok trónöröklési joga," [The Law of Succession of the Árpáds] *Századok* 60, no. 9-10 (1926): 785–841; Emma Bartoniek, "A Magyar királyválasztási jog a Középkorban," [The Hungarian King Election Law in the Middle Ages] *Századok* 70, no. 9-10 (1936): 359–406; Emma Bartoniek, *A magyar királykoronázások története* [The History of Crowning Hungarian Kings] (Budapest, 1987); Gyula Pauler, *A Magyar Nemzet története az Árpád-házi királyok alatt*, vol. 1, [The History of the Hungarian Nation during the Reign of the Árpád Kings] (Budapest, 1899), 21; Ákos Timon, *Magyar alkotmány- és jogtörténet tekintettel a nyugati államok fejlődésére* [Hungarian Constitutional and Legal History with Regard to the Development of Western States] (Budapest, 1919), 105–110; Ferenc Eckhart, *Magyar alkotmány- és jogtörténet*, [Hungarian Constitutional and Legal History] (Budapest, 1946), 80–82; Sándor Domanovszky, "Az Árpádok trónöröklési jogához," [On the Right of Succession of the Árpáds] *Századok* 63 (1929): 37–52; Attila Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és alattvalóik*, [The Árpáds and their Subjects] (Debrecen, 1997), 54; Márta Font, *Im Spannungsfeld der christlichen Großmächte. Mittel- und Osteuropa im 10.–12. Jahrhundert*, Studien zur Geschichte Ost- und Ostmitteleuropas vol. 9, (Herne, 2008), 165–172. For the whole region including the Kievan Rus: Christian Lübke, *Das Östliche Europa*, (München, 2004), 290–322.

³ The succession of the Přemyslids was regulated by the testament of Břetislav I. However, the decree which can be dated to 1055 raises numerous questions: the only source which upheld the text of the prince's last will is the *Chronica Boemorum*, written by Cosmas of Prague in the first third of the 12th century, thus it is hard to analyse its credibility. Furthermore, the narrative source depicts Břetislav as an ideal ruler, hence it is a real possibility that this document was created in context of the dynastic conflicts of Břetislav's children. For historical evaluation v. František Palacky, *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě*, [The History of the Czech Nation in Bohemia and Moravia] vol. 1. (Praha 1836), 311–312; Barbara Krzemińska, *Břetislav I. Čechy a střední Evropa v první polovině XI. století*, [Břetislav I. Bohemia and Central Europe in the First Half of the 11th century] (Praha, 1999) 58–62; Josef Žemlička, *Čechy v době knížecí (1034–1198)*, [Bohemia at the time of the princes (1034–1198)] (Praha, 1997), 73. Martin Wihoda, „Testament kniežete Břetislava” [The Testament of Prince Břetislav] in Renata Fifková ed., *Saga moravských Přemyslovců. Život na Moravě od XI. do počátku XIV. století. Sborník a katalog výstavy pořádané Vlastivědným muzeem v Olomouci a Muzeem města Brna k 700. výročí tragické smrti Václava III., posledního českého krále z dynastie Přemyslovců*, (Olomouc, 2006), 33–50. Johann Loserth, „Das angebliche Senioratsgesetz des Herzogs Břetislav I und die böhmische Succession in der Zeit des nationalen Herzogthums: Ein Beitrag zur altböhmischen Rechtsgeschichte,” *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte* 64 (1882): 1–78.; Berthold Bretholz, *Geschichte Böhmens und Mährens*, vol. 1, (Reichenberg, 1921), 142–144.

⁴ In case of Poland the statute of Bolesław III regulated the issue of succession in 1138. The problems surrounding the testament of the Piast prince are identical with Břetislav's regulation in Bohemia. The text is only preserved in the work of Wincenty Kadłubek, which was written only around 1220. Since Kadłubek had a broad expertise in Roman law the text is abounded with legal terms. For historical evaluation v. Maksymilian Kantecki, *Das Testament des Bolesław Schiefmund. Seniorat und Primogenitur in Polen*, (Posen, 1880) passim; Stanisław Smolka, *Testament Bolesława Krzywoustego*, [The Testament of Bolesław Wrymouth] (Kraków, 1881), passim; Oswald Balzer, *O następstwie tronu w Polsce*, [On the Succession of the Throne in Poland] (Kraków, 1897), 3–19; Stanisław Rosik, *Bolesław Krzywousty*, [Bolesław Wrymouth] (Wrocław, 2013), 90; Lübke, *Das Östliche Europa*, 290.

⁵ cf. Dániel Bagi, *Divisio Regni. Országmegosztás, trónviszály és dinasztikus történetírás az Árpádok, Piastok és Přemyslidák birodalmában a 11. és a korai 12. században*, [Divisio regni. Division of Country, Throne Feud and Dynastic Historiography in the Realms of the Árpáds, Přemyslids and Piast in the 11th and early 12th centuries] (Pécs, 2017), 259–269.

the category of the faithful children, the less loyal and the rebellious classification also existed. Furthermore, Kasten drew attention to the fact that the normative regulation which administered the relation between sons and fathers and was primarily initiated by the ruler, has undergone substantial changes since the reign of Louis the Pious.⁶ It is well known that Louis' sons, born from different marriages, turned against their father and each other as well on several occasions. During one such feud, Lothar – born from the emperor's first wife Ermengarde – confronted with his father and emerged victorious, so he forced Louis to resign from imperial power.⁷ By proclaiming Louis guilty, the regulation between fathers and sons became bilateral, which of course depended on the actual balance of power and the outcome of armed conflicts. This change induced a series of changes in the royal family model and was essentially related to the succession of power: during the age of the Carolingians the family model could be interpreted rather on a horizontal scale, later in the time of the Saxon emperors it was based on a narrower vertical concept.⁸ Undoubtedly this has to be interpreted in the context of the fact that the Ottos have given up exercising the institution of *divisio regni*. At this point we must mention another factor: from the results of social science researches turned out that the phenomenon of friendship (*amicitia*) and submission (*deditio*) was essential in this process. The *amicitia* served at least as important bond between the members of the ruling family – and amidst of different dynasties as well – as the different blood ties and marriages; it means that another system of relations also existed and within its confines the traditional familial bonds could be reinterpreted. This shift from equality towards a subordinate system can be observed among the Árpáds as well.⁹ Hereinafter we attempt to briefly describe the medieval phenomenon of *amicitia* and its effects on the monarchy of the Árpáds during the 11th and 12th centuries.

From the middle of the 20th century German medievalists began researching links between certain groups based on the entries of fraternal and memorial books (*Verbrüderungs- und Gedenkbücher*) from the 8th and 10th centuries. The recognition that the names kept in these sources from early middle ages are listed as members of different groups is the merit of Gerd Tellenbach.¹⁰ Later on – based on this finding – this kind of medieval sources became the most appreciated fountainheads among the German researchers.¹¹ The results of the method developed by Tellenbach – essentially based on the practice of prosopographical research that unfolded at the end of the 19th century¹² – have not only been able to reveal the identity of a number of unknown people but it has been shown that these individuals, who are usually invisible in other, typically narrative sources, were tied to each other and to the contemporary political elite through kinship, friendship and alliance.

⁶ Brigitte Kasten, *Königssöhne und Königsherrschaft. Untersuchungen zum Teilhabe am Reich in der Merowinger- und Karlingerzeit*, (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften 44) (Hannover, 1997), 203–204.

⁷ Gerd Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale. Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter*, (Darmstadt, 2003), 57–60.

⁸ Zbigniew Dalewski, "Patterns of Dynastic Identity in the Early Middle Ages," *Acta Poloniae Historica* 107 (2013): 8.

⁹ Bagi, „Egy barátság vége,” 396–408.

¹⁰ Gerd Tellenbach, „Liturgische Gedenkbücher als historische Quellen,” in *Ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze* vol. 2. (Stuttgart, 1988), 426–437.

¹¹ Hans-Werner Goetz, *Moderne Mediävistik. Stand und Perspektive der Mittelalterforschung* (Darmstadt, 1999), 158–159.

¹² At that time the research that inspected the leading class of the Roman society from the age of Augustus to the end of the 3rd century, primarily regarding the senate class and other prominent members of the knight order, but the members of the imperial family and other non-Roman rulers were studied as well. The elaborated methodology defined the position and familial connection of certain people based on written and material sources alike. v. E. Klebs, H. Dessau and P. de Rohden eds., *Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saec. I. II. III. editio prima*, vols. 1–3, (Berlin, 1897–1898).

Initially the analysis concentrated on the surroundings of Lake Constance (*Bodensee*)¹³ but soon it became nationwide and one of the dominant trend in the German historical research which even gave a new impulse to the inquiry of the medieval families and nobility (*Adels- und Familienforschung*). Tellenbach's endeavours have created a school and his work was mainly continued by his disciples. The most influential achievement was reached by Karl Schmid – also a student of Tellenbach – who has pointed out that the structures of the noble families have changed significantly because of the concentration of material assets, the inheritance of offices and fiefdoms, respectively the agnatic succession of power.¹⁴ The results and methods generated long-lasting debates within the German historiography as not all of the researchers accepted the foundations of the Tellenbach-school, since – according to the critical voices – the plurality of names that were preserved in the aforementioned sources cannot be identified as nobles without any doubt.¹⁵ In any case during the polemics the research of medieval names and name giving, the relations between genealogy and fiefdoms (regions and castles) have also gained a new momentum.¹⁶ Based on the results outlined above, Gerd Althoff pointed out that the ties of friendship (*amicitia*) proved to be stronger among the members of the nobility than the obligations towards their ruler.¹⁷ Althoff considers the list of names that were preserved in these sources as a political alliance and he justified their existence with numerous reasons: to defend themselves against external enemies, to attend the memory of the deceased or to safeguard the salvation of their souls. With Latin terms these groups are called as it follows: *coniuratio, pax, amicitia, foedus, pactum, pactum foederis, foedus amicitiae*.¹⁸ It turned out that for medieval people – as well as for modern people – belonging to certain social, political or any other group was a precondition for social and political contacts. Kinship, alliances, friendships and fraternal bonds can be considered as such groups.¹⁹

As numerous works in the field of *amicitia* had highlighted, political friendship is a phenomenon which is rooted in antiquity and played a significant role over the middle ages in social connections, communication and political actions.²⁰ The concept of friendship during

¹³ The Lake Constance was an ideal terrain for research, as Reichenau, Sankt Gallen, Fulda and the monastery of Remieremont in Lorraine had a wide range of sources from necrologies to fraternal books. Karl Schmid is also associated with publishing several critical editions of these kinds of sources in the confines of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* series. (*Libri memoriales et necrologia, Nova Series*) v. Johanne Autenrieth, Dieter Geuenich and Karl Schmid, eds. *Das Verbrüderungsbuch der Abtei Reichenau*, (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Libri Memoriales et Necrologia, Nova Series vol. 1*) passim.

¹⁴ Karl Schmid, „Zur Entstehung und Forschung von Geschlechterbewußtsein,” *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberreihns* 134. (1986): 21–33.

¹⁵ Most firmly Michael Borgolte argued against the methodology, in his view the origins of the people which can be found in ecclesiastical sources cannot be revealed, so it is quite difficult to prove their nobility. v. Michael Borgolte, *Sozialgeschichte des Mittelalters: Eine Forschungsbilanz nach der deutschen Einheit*, (*Historische Zeitschrift, Beiheft 22*) (Oldenbourg, 1996), 197–202.

¹⁶ To the problematics of the research of medieval nobility in Germany v. Werner Hechberger, „Nemesség és hatalom,” [Nobility and Power] *Aetas* 22. no. 3. (2007): 5–23.

¹⁷ Gerd Althoff, *Verwandte, Getreue und Freunde. Zum politischen Stellenwert der Gruppenbindungen im früheren Mittelalter*, (Darmstadt, 1990), 180–181.

¹⁸ Gerd Althoff, *Amicitiae Und Pacta. Bündniss, Einung, Politik Und Gebetsdenken Im Beginnenden 10. Jahrhundert*, (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften 37*) (Hannover, 1992), 12–13.

¹⁹ Althoff, *Amicitiae*, 12.

²⁰ There are numerous works about the subject and to enumerate them all would go beyond the framework of this study, so we only mention those which became classical and are widely quoted: Verena Epp, *Amicitia. Zur Geschichte personaler, sozialer, politischer und geistlicher Beziehungen im frühen Mittelalter*, (*Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*) (Stuttgart, 1999), passim; Verena Epp, “Rituale frühmittelalterlicher amicitia,” in Gerd Althoff ed., *Formen und Funktionen öffentlicher Kommunikation im Mittelalter*, (*Vorträge und Forschungen*) (Stuttgart, 2001), 11–24; Althoff, *Verwandte*, passim; Althoff, *Amicitiae*, passim; With outlook to the late medieval times: Claudia Garnier, *Amicus amicis – inimicus inimicis. Politische Freundschaft und fürstliche Netzwerke im 13. Jahrhundert*, (*Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*) (Stuttgart, 2000)

ancient times was intertwined with ethical principles and manners which was considered even by the medieval sources to be salutary and worth to follow. It is clearly enough to think on the heroes of the Greek mythology and poetry whose history was preserved by the masterpieces of antique literature: Achilles and Patroclus, Theseus and Pirithous.²¹ To the Greeks this kind of friendship was associated with self-sacrifice and commitment. However, the concept of friendship had its most important effect on the social connections in the Roman times. It is worth recalling Cicero's work on friendship in which the author – based on the ideas of Aristotle and Plato – concluded that friendship is more favourable than kinship: „*For it seems clear to me that we were so created that between us all there exists a certain tie which strengthens with our proximity to each other. Therefore, fellow countrymen are preferred to foreigners and relatives to strangers, for with them Nature herself engenders friendship, but it is one that is lacking in constancy. For friendship excels relationship in this, that goodwill may be eliminated from relationship while from friendship it cannot; since, if you remove goodwill from friendship the very name of friendship is gone; if you remove it from relationship, the name of relationship still remains.*”²²

The concept of friendship however was not confined to the private relations of individuals, since we know that it also served to describe the alliances (*foedus*) of certain barbarian tribes and nations with the Roman Empire.²³ This kind of antique concept of friendship, which was inherited by the middle ages, has undergone a major change. From the time of the Merovingian kings the sources certify that friendship agreements had to be strengthen and sealed with an oath.²⁴ The contemporaries interpreted *amicitia* as a relation between relatives or non-relatives which covered the everyday life of people, families, kinsmen and genera. In the Merovingian and Carolingian era the so called *Schwurfreundschaften* and guilds (*Gilden*) can be considered as good examples. Therefore, the friendship as a cohesive link between individuals and groups was not only the specialty of the Roman Empire. As we already noted, one of the most characteristic features of friendship ties since the Merovingian kings were the oath (*iuramentum*)²⁵ and it was strongly influenced by the conception of canon law. Early medieval penitentiary books (*libri poenitentiales*) did not only punish the breaking of oaths but also ordained various retributions for false swearing.²⁶ According to a previous theory, especially in German historiography, loyalty and oath were known primarily among the Germanic tribes and to justify this statement, historians often cited Tacitus' *Germania*. However a recent research has proved that there is no correlation between the German *Treue* and the term *fides* which was widely used during the Middle Ages, moreover the latter was a phenomenon that was elaborated by the church.²⁷

The former sources used the word *fides* to describe the phenomenon of friendship and initially the royal power tried to narrow down the scope for such alliances by envoys (*missi*) and capitularies (*capitularia*).²⁸ The crisis which was started after the death of Charlemagne ended

²¹ Tar Ibolya, "A barátság a görög-római antikvitásban," [Friendship in Greek-Roman Antiquity] *Vigilia* 74 no. 11. (2009): 802.

²² Translated by Wiliam Armistead Falconer. Cicero, *De senectute. De amicitia. De divinatione*, (London–New York, 1923), 129.

²³ For the institution of foedus in late atiquity v. Peter J. Heather, „Foedera and foederati of the fourth century” in Thomas F. X. Noble ed., *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms*, (New York, 2006), 242–256.

²⁴ Wolfgang Fritze, "Die fränkische Schwurfreundschaft der Merowingerzeit. Ihr Wesen und ihre politische Funktion," *Zeitschrift für Savigny-Stiftung Germanistische Abteilung* 71 (1954), 75–124.

²⁵ According to Gerd Althoff oath served to conclude conflicts, forge alliances and validate agreements. v. Gerd Althoff, "Das Grundvokabular der Rituale. Knien, Küssen, Thronen, Schwören," in Gerd Althoff – Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger eds., *Spektakel der Macht. Rituale im alten Europa 800–1800*, (Darmstadt, 2008), 153–154;

²⁶ Wolfgang Schild, "Meineid." in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 6, (Stuttgart, 2000, CD-ROM version) 472–473.

²⁷ František Graus, "Über die sogenannte germanische Treue," *Historica* 1 (1959): 71–121.

²⁸ Althoff, *Amicitiae*, 16. Particularly fn. 32.

up this practice, Louis the Pious himself tried to maintain peace through friendship contracts. Louis forged alliances based on *amicitia* not only with the lay and ecclesiastical elite but also his different relatives and family members as well. The friendship agreements became so popular and accepted, that from second half of the 9th century the royal family and the elite established alliances of this kind as well in order to achieve certain political and economic goals.²⁹ Naturally a friendship contract or even an oath could not guarantee the peace and absolute loyalty toward the other party – as it was not assured by marriage or blood ties – since we are aware of a number of examples in which on a given chance the parties overturned the terms of contract.³⁰ Although the sources have shown that the participants sworn loyalty to each other as equals, – as abbot Alcuin, the leading scholar and teacher at Charlemagne’s court found it appropriate³¹ – but in many cases the actual equality can be questioned. The most striking example of this statement is clearly the Treaty of Coulaines, in which the nobility and the clergy obliged the king, Charles the Bald to exercise power with them.³² The political structure was so influenced by the notion of friendship, in many cases oaths of fealty were masked as *amicitia* contracts, as the agreements between Otto the Great and Harald Bluetooth, and Konrad I and Henry the Fowler suggest it.³³

Based on the aforementioned description, friendship contracts were initially made – in principles – between equal individuals or groups, for achieving a goal that was beneficial for both parties. However, the research revealed that the Ottos and later the Salian emperors were using these kinds of alliances to ensure their superiority and subordinate their subjects and family members.³⁴

With the help of the church, the concept of friendship survived the Carolingian era, and during the reign of the German emperors its influence has grown along and even beyond the Empire’s eastern borders. In our view this new and changed *amicitia* phenomenon – that was used to subordinate rebellious fractions – is clearly visible in the dynastic conflicts of the Árpáds, Přemyslid and Piasts³⁵ and served as a tool to handle and conclude such feuds. Namely these basically verbal agreements had the same validity as the decrees of the normative legislation. This can be supported with the following statements: according to György Bónis – one of the most prominent Hungarian legal historians – the hierarchy of legislation was not enforced in the Middle Ages, but rather the competition of the provisions can be observed.³⁶ Therefore the written, normative legislation did not take precedence over conventions made in personal agreements and the unwritten law of the country. Even during the reign of Louis the Great (1342–1382) in Hungary, the king as a legislator did not necessarily made new laws but

²⁹ For this period with historiographical review v. Garnier, *Amicus amicis – inimicus inimicis*, 9–12. cf. Althoff, *Amicitiae*, 17. and Althoff, *Verwandte*, 100.

³⁰ For oath breaking v. Zbigniew Dalewski, “Political Culture of Central Europe in the High Middle Ages: Aggression and Agreement.” in Halina Manikowska and Jaroslav Pánek eds., *Political Culture in Central Europe (10th–20th Century). Part I. Middle Ages and Early Modern Era*, (Prague, 2005), 82–83.

³¹ „*Quid est amicitia? – A. Aequalitas amicorum.*” – J-P. Migne ed., *Alcuini Opera omnia. Operum pars septima – opera didascalica*. (Patrologia cursus completus. Series Latina. vol. 101) (Paris, 1863), col. 978.

³² cf. Peter Classen, "Die Verträge von Verdun und von Coulaines 843 als politische Grundlagen des Westfränkischen Reiches," *Historische Zeitschrift* 196 (1963): 1–35.

³³ Althoff, *Verwandte*, 82–83. resp. 108.

³⁴ Althoff, *Verwandte*, 113–116.

³⁵ For conflict management of the aforementioned dynasties v. Dušan Zupka, *Ritual and Symbolic Communication in Medieval Hungary under the Árpád Dynasty (1000–1301)*, (East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages 450–1450 vol. 39) (Leiden – Boston, 2016), 70–116; Zbigniew Dalewski, *Ritual and Politics. Writing the History of a Dynamic Conflict in Medieval Poland*, (East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages 450–1450 vol. 3) (Leiden-Boston, 2008), 41–84; Bagi, *Divisio Regni*, 167–246.

³⁶ György Bónis, *Középkori jogunk elemei. Római jog. Kánonjog. Szokásjog*, [Elements of Medieval Law in Hungary. Roman Law. Canon Law. Customary Law] (Budapest, 1972), 189.

probated the customary law.³⁷ The legal order was not guaranteed by written laws, but by the public perception that adequate guarantees can only be given by personal relationships, which have been strengthened with an oath.³⁸ This finding can be supported by the fact that in Hungary, where the memories of normative legislation are only known from the countries of Central-East Europe, the first occasion when the law was imparted to the authorities in written form can be traced back to the 14th century.³⁹

We believe that the role of the church is also inevitable in the spreading of the idea of *amicitia*. Those relations which were based on friendship agreements and was widely known and used for centuries in the western part of Europe, has been transmitted to Hungary by the influential members of the clergy. The most important narrative sources of the region – written by clergymen – the 14th Century Chronicle Composition, the works of Cosmas of Prague and Gallus Anonymous described the dynastic conflicts and judged the participants by concepts which show a high degree of similarity to the aforementioned *amicitia* phenomenon. The protocol for concluding conflicts offered by the friendship agreements were not solely confined to the empire of the Ottos and Salian emperors, since the sources that are corresponding similar events in France and in England in the 12th century are using the same terminology.⁴⁰

Regarding the eastern ends of the Empire, where the sources can be scarce, we can assume that due to the impulse from the Latin Christian world the norms of political communication have also inveterated in Hungary. József Deér had already pointed out in 1938 that the influence cannot be ignored which was caused by the takeover and application certain imperial models to the Hungarian conditions in the 11th century, when the Christian Hungarian Kingdom was born.⁴¹ The effects of the western Latin culture can be detected in almost every segment of St. Stephen's work as he laid down the foundations of his kingdom. The dynastic marriage between the Bavarian ducal family and the Árpáds gave this process a great impulse.⁴² At this point it is worth recall words of the first law book of St. Stephen: „*Since every people use their own law, we, governing our monarchy by the will of God, and emulating both ancient and modern caesars, and after reflecting upon the law, decree for our people too the way they should lead an upright and blameless life.*”⁴³ It has to be noted that the text is not without any problems: the possible sources and the exact date of the first Hungarian legislative act are the subject of debate since the 18th century. Even though no consensus has been formed in every detail, yet most of

³⁷ László Blazovich, "A Tripartitum és forrásai," [The Tripartitum and its Sources] *Századok* 141, no. 4 (2007): 1019–1020.

³⁸ Zupka, *Ritual and Symbolic Communication*, 29.

³⁹ Such was the case of the decree of 1351, which was imparted in written form. cf. Géza Érszegi, "Az Aranbulla," [The Golden Bull] in László Makkay and Gábor Farkas eds., *Fejér Megyei Történelmi Évkönyv. Tanulmányok és források Fejér megye történetéhez*, (Székesfehérvár, 1972), 5–26.

⁴⁰ Kalus Van Eickels, „Homagium and Amicitia: Rituals of Peace and Their Significance in the Anglo-French Negotiations of the Twelfth Century,” *Francia* 24. (1997): 133–140.

⁴¹ Deér, *Pogány magyarság*, 100–101.

⁴² The dynastic marriages highly contributed to the exchange of cultural assets, the result can be observed in the field of architecture, literacy, art and political representation. v. Hedwig Röckelein, "Heiraten – Ein Instrument hochmittelalterlicher Politik." in Andreas Ranft ed., *Der Hoftag in Quedlinburg 973. Von den historischen Wurzeln zum neuen Europa*, (Berlin, 2006), 118–134.

⁴³ “Et quoniam unaqueque gens propriis utitur legibus, idcirco nos quoque dei nutu nostram gubernantes monarchiam, antiquos ac modernos imitantes augustos, decretali meditatione nostre statuimus genti, quemadmodum honestam et inoffensam ducerent vitam [...]” – The Laws of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary. János M. Bak, György Bónis, Leslie S. Domokos and James Ross Sweeney transl. and eds. vol. 1. (Idyllwind CA, 1999) 1. cf. Levente Závodszy, *A Szent István, Szent László és Kálmán korabeli törvények és zsinati határozatok forrásai. Függelék: a törvények szövege*, [The Sources of Laws and Synodial Resolutions at the Time of St. Stephen, St. Ladislaus and Koloman. Appendix: The Text of the Laws] (Budapest, 1904), 141.

the researchers agree that the laws of St. Stephen are affected by a strong imperial impact.⁴⁴ In addition to the legislation, László Koszta pointed out in his study on the founding of the diocese of Pécs (1009) that the structures of the newly formed bishopric are quite similar to Bamberg, which was established by Henry II two years prior.⁴⁵ Moreover, the founding and construction of the basilica of Our Blessed Lady in Székesfehérvár was made in the term of *imitatio imperii*, following the model of the imperial Palatine Chapel in Aachen.⁴⁶ Furthermore, Latin Christian models played a significant role in the legitimation⁴⁷ of the young Hungarian Kingdom and in the coinage⁴⁸ of St. Stephen as well. The new Latin literacy⁴⁹ itself reflects the patterns and forms of the Christian world as these works were written by clergymen who were born outside of Hungary.⁵⁰ The *Deliberatio*⁵¹ of St. Gerard and the so called *Admontiones*,⁵² which was commissioned by St. Stephen to tutor his son, bearing the idioms which were characteristic during the Carolingian era. As we have mentioned before, the highly educated members of the clergy who have been planted the roots of Latin literacy in Hungary were the primary readership of the newly written works and narratives, and they could interpret the norms and models in these texts through their legal and theological erudition.⁵³ Consequently, it is not unsubstantiated to think that among all those models, forms and ideas which found their way to Hungary the phenomenon of *amicitia* were also present. The examples above are a testimony to the fact that we have to take account of the adaptation of certain Latin Christian models, but as the Hungarian historiography has emphasised on numerous occasions, these ideas were not simply imitated but transformed to the specific local conditions and therefore they paved the way for a distinct model of development for the Hungarian Kingdom. The concept can be furthermore reinforced with the results of the research by Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmerman, namely the *historie croisée*. The methodology of this comparative analysis offered by the authors draws attention to the fact that the mechanical transportation of certain examples – whether economic, social or cultural – can be ineffective, so the process is rather dynamic,

⁴⁴ For summary v. Monika Jánosi, *Törvényalkotás a korai Árpád-korban*, [Legislation in the Early Árpád Age] (Szegedi Középkortörténeti Könyvtár. vol. 9) (Szeged, 1996), 60–96; Tamás Nótári, "A Lex Baiuvariorum hatása Szent István törvényeire," [The Influence of Lex Baiuvariorum on the Laws of St. Stephen] *Jogtudományi közlöny* 66, no. 9 (2011): 417–427.

⁴⁵ László Koszta, "Die Gründung des Bistums," in Tamás Fedeles, László Koszta eds., *Pécs (Fünfkirchen) das Bistum und die Bischofsstadt im Mittelalter*, (Publikationen der ungarischen Geschichtsforschung in Wien vol. 2) (Wien, 2011), 23. For the bishopric of Bamberg v. Stephan Weinfurter, *Heinrich II. Herrscher am Ende der Zeiten*, (Regensburg, 2002), 250–268.

⁴⁶ József Deér, "Aachen und die Herrschersitze der Arpaden," in Peter Classen ed., *Byzanz und das abenländische Herrschertum. Ausgewählte Aufsätze von Josef Deér*, (Sigmaringen, 1977), 372–423. cf. Kornél Szovák, "Szent István királysága," [The Kingdom of St. Stephen] *Vigilia* 75, no. 8 (2010): 568.

⁴⁷ Márta Font, *Dinasztia, hatalom, egyház. Régiók formálódása Európa közepén (900–1453)*, [Dynasty, Power, Church. Shaping of Regions in the Middle of Europe (900–1453)] (Pécs, 2009), 119–120, 124; Gyula Kristó, "Legitimitas és idoneitas (Adalékok az Árpád-kori eszmetörténetünkhöz)." [Legitimitas and Idoneitas. Remarks on the Intellectual History in the Árpád Age] *Századok* 108 (1974): 585–621.

⁴⁸ Bálint Hóman, *Magyar pénztörténet*, [The History of the Hungarian Currency] (Budapest, 1916), 173–174.

⁴⁹ György Györffy, *István király és műve*, [King Stephen and his Work] (Budapest, 2000), 266–267.

⁵⁰ László Veszprémy, "The Birth of a Structured Literacy in Hungary." in Anna Adamska and Marco Mostert eds., *The Development of Literate Mentalities in East-Central-Europe*, (Turhout, 2004), 161.

⁵¹ Karácsonyi Béla and Szegfű László transl. and eds. *Deliberatio Gerardi Moresanae aecclesiae episcopi Sypra Hymnum trium Pverorum. Elmélkedés. Gellért, a marosi egyház püspöke a három fiú himnuszáról*, (Szeged, 1999)

⁵² Iosephus Balogh ed., *Libellus de institutione morum*, (Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum vol. 2) (Budapest, 1999), 613–627. cf. Jenő Szűcs, "Szent István Intelmei, az első magyar államelméleti mű," [The Admontiones of St. Stephen, the First Hungarian Opus on the Theory of the State] in László Veszprémy ed., *Szent István és az államalapítás*, (Budapest, 2002), 271–290.

⁵³ László Veszprémy, "Árpád-kori történeti elbeszélő forrásaink (11–13. század) nyugat-európai kapcsolatai," [The Western European Ties of the Hungarian Narrative Sources in the Árpád Age (11th–13th centuries)] ([Budapest], 2007), 17. (MTA doctoral thesis, manuscript)

the adaptation of ideas always aligns to the local specifications and it is constantly changing, giving specific answers to local problems.⁵⁴

Despite the aforementioned, in the narrative sources that were written in the region, the usage of the Latin term *amicitia* is scarce, thus the Central-East European historiography did not devote attention to the examination of the phenomenon.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, we believe that the territories of these kingdoms were not avoided by *amicitia* and it was used the same way as it was used in the western counterpart of Europe. Henceforth we would like to show two distinct examples to support our thesis.

Cosmas of Prague described the events that took place in May 1099 around Pentecost, when prince Břetislav met the Hungarian king Coloman the Learned on the field of Lucké pole.⁵⁶ Of course the meeting cannot be separated from the throne struggles in Bohemia, which included all branches of the Přemyslid dynasty.⁵⁷ However, the description by Cosmas depicts the same ritualized series of events during which political friendship agreements were made in the Empire, long before the end of the 11th century. The *amicitia* strengthened with a public and solemn oath, the exchange of gifts and the referral to concord and peace were necessities during friendship agreements in the Carolingian and Ottonian era.⁵⁸ Furthermore, Coloman offered his hospitality to the newly appointed bishop of Prague and Seraphim, the archbishop of Esztergom even anointed the author of the chronicle, namely Cosmas.⁵⁹ According to a later entry from the chronicle the son of Coloman, Stephen II wanted to maintain and restore peace and friendship between the Czechs and Hungarians, but the negotiations concluded to an armed conflict, so this political friendship came to an end.⁶⁰ Based on the aforementioned example we might say, peacekeeping was one of the key elements, so an accord could not only be reached through marriage, since the institution of *foedus amicitiae* offered the same result. We can read almost the same in the work Gallus Anonymous. Chapter 18 from *Cronicae et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum* is widely quoted in accordance with the foreign policy of St. Stephen. The chronicler describes that the Hungarian and Czech people kept the peace and friendship

⁵⁴ Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, "Túl az összehasonlításon: Histoire Croisée és a reflexivitás kihívása," [Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity] *Korall* 28–29 (2007): 5–30.

⁵⁵ Recently this trend seems to be changing. In Hungary Dániel Bagi noticed the importance of *amicitia*. In Poland the works Zbigniew Dalewski are noteworthy. Lately Dušan Zupka dedicated a monography to the symbolic communication in Hungary. v. Bagi, *Divisio Regni*, passim; Bagi, „Egy barátság vége,” 381–409; Dalewski, *Ritual and Politics*, passim; Dalewski, „Political Culture,” 65–86; Zupka, *Rituals and Symbolic Communication*, passim.

⁵⁶ „Eodem anno idem dux Bracizlaus veniens cum exercitu in Moraviam reedificat castrum Podiuin et reddit eum, sicut antea fuerat, in potestatem Hermanni episcopi atque ibidem in villa Sliunica pentecosten celebravit. Deinde occurrens Pannonico regi Colomanno in campo, qui dicitur Luczko, multa sunt in invicem concionati placitantes ad placitum utrarumque partium. Ac inter se inmensis mutuatum datis muneribus renovant antiqua amicitie et pacis federa et ea sacramentis confirmant.” – *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum Rerum Germanicarum Nova Series vol. 2) lib. 3. c. 9. 169. cf. Zupka, *Rituals and Symbolic Communication*, 60–61.

⁵⁷ Ferenc Makk, *Magyar külpolitika 896–1196*, [Hungarian Foreign Policy 896–1196] (Szegedi Középkortörténeti Könyvtár. vol. 2) (Szeged, 1996), 149.

⁵⁸ cf. Epp, „Rituale,” 11–24; We can associate such acts with festivities. For Hungarian court festivities v. Zupka, *Rituals and Symbolic Communication*, 55–61.

⁵⁹ „Ibi dux Bracizlaus suum electum Hermannum diaconum committit Seraphim archiepiscopo ordinandum. Qui veniens ad sedem suam urbis Strigonie tempore, quo sacri ordines celebrantur, III. id. Iunii ordinat eum presbiterum et me, quamvis indignum, similiter ad eundem promovit gradum.” – *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, lib. 3. c. 9. 169. For Coloman and foreign rulers v. Zupka, *Ritual and Symbolic Communication*, 97–106.

⁶⁰ „Anno dominice incarnationis MCXVI. Ungara gens viribus ingens, opibus pollens, armis bellicis pre potens et cum quovis rege terrarum pugnare sufficiens, regis sui Colomanni post obitum principes eius mittunt ad ducem Wladizlaum, quatenus cum rege novello, nomine Stephane, renovaret et corroboraret antiquam pacem et amicitiam.” – *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, lib. 3. c. 42. 215.

(*pacem et amicitiam retinebat*).⁶¹ Later on Peter Orseolo, the successor of St. Stephen, was condemned by Gallus since he did not value the friendship of the Czechs and he broke down the inherited *amicitia*.⁶² The next scene from Gallus' work, where he depicts the meeting of King Bolesław II and St. Ladislaus, is also related to Hungarian history. It is well known that Bolesław had to flee from Poland because he was involved in the tragic death of St. Stanislaus, bishop of Cracow in 1079.⁶³ Therefore – according to Gallus – Bolesław went to King Ladislaus, to his friend and brother, but they did not meet as equals since the Polish King was too arrogant and did not give the proper respect to his friend.⁶⁴ The source tells us that Ladislaus swallowed the insult and later on the two acted as friends and brothers (*sicut fratres*).⁶⁵

In our view it is clear from the sources that *amicitia* was an adequate and accepted way to regulate the relations between different dynasties – which could be even inherited –, but it was expected that the parties shall behave like friends. The violation of the terms was considered as a sin and in some cases it had grave consequences and was judged as a rivalry between brothers and kinsmen.

At the same time the *amicitia* based relations within a narrow familial circle – i.e. people who had a similar chance to inherit power – have to be judged differently, since unlike to the aforementioned examples where the friendship was voluntary and based on equality, the members of the same dynasty tried to submit each other. Before examining friendship agreements between dynasty members, we have to draw attention to the fundamental results of

⁶¹ „Eo namque tempore sanctus Stephanus Vngariam gubernabat, eamque tunc primum ad fidem minis et blanditiis convertebat, qui cum Bohemicism Polonorum infestissimis inimicis, pacem et amicitiam retinebat, nec eum liberum, quoadusque vixit, (eorum) gratia dimittebat.” – Karol Maleczyński ed., *Galli Anonymi chronicae et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum*, (Monumenta Poloniae Historica Nova Series vol. 2) lib. 1. c. 18. 41.

⁶² „Hic Petrus etiam rogatus a Bohemicis, ne Kazimirum dimitteret, si cum eis amicitiam ab antecessoribus receptam retinere vellet, voce regali respondisse fertur: Si lex antiqua diffinierit, quod Vngarorum rex Bohemicorum ducis carcerarius fuerit, faciam que rogatis. Et sic Bohemorum legationi eum indignatione respondens, eorumque amicitiam vel inimicicam parvipendens, datis Kazimiro C equis totidemque militibus, qui eum secuti fuerant, armis et vestibus preparatis eum honorifice dimisit, nec iter ei, quocumque vellet ire, denegavit.” – *Galli Anonymi chronicae et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum*, lib. 1. c. 18. 42.

⁶³ Gallus makes a controversial statement since he called the bishop traitor, but in the later works of Vincenty Kadłubek clarified that Bolesław was involved in the assassination of St. Stanislaus and therefore the death of the Polish King and his son Mieszko was the aftermath of the crime. cf. „Non vero post inaudito coreptus longore Boleslaus sibi mortem consciuit, set et unicus eius filius Mescio in primo puberitatis flore veneno emarcuit. Sic tota Boleslai domus sancto penas Stanislao exsolvit. Quia sicut nullum irremuneratum, sic nullum malum impunitum.” – Marian Plezia ed., *Magistri Vincentii dicti Kadlubek Chronica Polonorum*, (Monumenta Poloniae Historica Nova Series vol 11) lib. 2. c. 20. 59. cf. Norbert Kersken, “God and the Saints in Medieval Polish Historiography,” in Lars Mortensen ed., *The Making of Christian Myths in the Periphery of Latin Christendom (c. 1000–1300)*, (Copenhagen, 2006), 178–182.

⁶⁴ „Cum audisset Wladislaus Bolezlauum advenire, partim gaudet ex amico, partim restat locus ire, partim ex recepto quidem fratre gaudet et amico sed de fratre Wladislauo facto dolet inimico. Non eum recipit velud extraneum vel hospitem, vel par parem recipere quisque solet, sed quasi miles principem, vel dux regem, vel rex imperatorem recipere iure debet. Bolezlauus Wladislauum suum regem appellabat, Wladislaus se per eum regem (factum) cognoscebat. In Bolezlauo tamen unum ascribendum est vanitati, quod eius pristinae multum obfuit probitati. Nam cum regnum alienum fugitivus introiret, cumque nullus rusticorum fugitivo obediret, obviam ire Bolezlauo Wladislauus, ut vir humilis properabat, cumque propinquantem eminus equo descendens ob reverentiam expectabat. At contra Bolezlauus humilitatem regis mansueti non respexit, sed in pestifere fastum superbie cor erexit. Hunc, inquit, alumpnum in Polonia educavi, hunc regem in Vngaria collocavi. Non decet eum me ut equalem venerari, sed equo sedentem ut quemlibet de principibus osculari.” – *Galli Anonymi chronicae et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum*, lib. 1. c. 28. 53–54.

⁶⁵ „Quod intendens Wladislaus aliquantulum egre tulit et ab itinere declinavit, ei tamen servicium per totam terram fieri satis magnifice commendavit. Postea vero concorditer et amicabiliter inter se sicut fratres convenerunt, Vngari tamen illua altius et profundius in corde notaverunt.” – *Galli Anonymi chronicae et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum*, lib. 1. c. 28. 54; For further interpretation of the text v. Dalewski, *Ritual and Politics*, 28–30. and Zupka, *Rituals and Symbolic Communication*, 152–156.

historical research that are indispensable to understand the phenomenon of *amicita*. The findings demonstrate that the traditional friendship – i.e. between equal parties – had a different meaning in the 11th century than at the time of the Carolingians. The *amicitia* was ineligible at this point to conclude and avoid further family feuds and throne struggles because one party was necessarily submitted to the other's will, therefore we cannot speak of equality. However, in the light of the sources, friendship agreements and verbal accords continued to play a significant role in social contacts and conflict resolution. This apparent contradiction is related to the legal institution of submission, the *deditio*.⁶⁶ We already mentioned that one of the reasons for the dynastic feuds lies in the equality of the members of the dynasty, this was very well known to the contemporaries as well. In his chronicle Gallus warned everyone: „So let those today and in the future beware lest partners equal in rule fall out.”⁶⁷ By the legacy of the Carolingian era the brothers, cousins and family members could become friends based on equality but this practice was shunning into crisis and the Ottos had already used a version of *amicitia* in which one party submitted the other.

This „compulsory friendship” was a much more conditioned form of relation, since it was based of subordination. The ritual of submission – later we shall discuss it in detail – was an efficient tool to conclude dynastic feuds with the restoration of friendship between the opposing parties. One of the reasons can be found in the fact, that during the ritual of submission the victorious party sought no complete destruction of the defeated one, moreover the *deditio* prescribed certain obligations for both. However, this kind of conflict resolution practice was shaken by crisis according to Gerd Althoff – a specialist on the topic – during the 12th century no conflicts could be resolved with this method, since the sources testify that the submitted family members were imprisoned and their material wealth and titles were also confiscated.⁶⁸

The tradition of *deditio* also has numerous prefigurations and traditions like all ritualized behaviours used in the middle ages. The public presentation of the defeated enemy was considered to be an essential element of the Roman *triumphus* which was also exercised in the medieval Byzantine Empire.⁶⁹ The image of the defeated and subjugated opponent would allow the assumption that the highly ritualized Roman triumph would be one of the models of the medieval *deditio*, however if we take a closer look on the phenomena there is a huge difference: during the *deditio* the defeated enemy would not face total humiliation and physical extermination. The analogy between the Roman *triumphus* and the medieval submission is thus run low in the public presentation of the defeated enemy and besides it is not only peculiar to

⁶⁶ For the *deditio* v. Gerd Althoff, “Das Privileg der ‘Deditio’. Formen gütlicher Konfliktbeendigung in der mittelalterlichen Adelsgesellschaft,” in Otto Oexle and Werner Paravicini eds., *Nobilitas. Funktion und Repräsentation des Adels in Alteuropa*, (Göttingen, 1997), 27–52; Gerd Althoff, “Genugtuung (satisfactio). Zur Eigenart gütlicher Konfliktbeilegung im Mittelalter,” in Joachim Heinze ed., *Modernes Mittelalter*, (Frankfurt a. M., 1994), 247–265; Dalewski, *Ritual and Politics*, 41–84; Zupka, *Rituals and Symbolic Communication*, 72–116; Bagi, *Divisio Regni*, 206–214.

⁶⁷ Translated by Paul W. Knoll and Frank Schaer. János M. Bak, Urszula Borkowska, Giles Constable, Gerhard Jaritz and Gábor Klaniczay eds., *Gesta Principum Polonorum. The Deeds of the Princes of the Poles*, (Central European Medieval Texts vol. 3) (Budapest–New York, 2003), 185. cf. „Unde posteris sibi caveant vel presentes, ne sint in regno pares socii dissidentes.” – *Galli Anonymi chronicae et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum*, lib. 2. c. 35. 105.

⁶⁸ Gerd Althoff, "Vom Konflikt zur Krise: Praktiken der Führung und Beilegung von Konflikten in der spätsalischen Zeit," in Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter eds., *Salisches Kaisertum und neues Europa. Die Zeit Heinrichs IV. und Heinrichs V.*, (Speyer, 2007), 32.

⁶⁹ For the Roman triumphus v. Andreas Alföldi, *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche*, (Darmstadt, 1970), 93–98 and 143–160.

the Roman culture.⁷⁰ We should therefore look for parallels in the Christian religion and in the conflict handling mechanisms of the Carolingian age.

After the long Saxon wars the founder of the medieval imperial power Charlemagne, wanted to incorporate the Bavarian Duchy of Tassilo III into his realm. The duke, who was related to Charlemagne by his mother,⁷¹ pledged his loyalty and sworn fealty to King Pippin in 757 in Compiègne and promised that he would support the king's campaigns with military aid.⁷² Nevertheless Tassilo repeatedly violated his obligations and after 760 he sought an independent policy during which he married Liutperga, the daughter of the Lombard king Desiderius. After 768 the duke sided himself with the Lombards, who were practicing an open anti Frankish policy. Having refused the military contribution to Charles – who succeeded Pippin – for his Hispanic campaign, the duke was forced to travel to Worms in order to revive his oath and to pledge his loyalty under the pressure of royal and papal ambassadors. The king demanded twelve hostages from Tassilo to prevent further oath-breaking. A year later, as a result of the renewed Saxon wars, Tassilo had once again the opportunity to escape from his obligations, he openly supported the prince of Benevento who opposed the Frank rule in Italy. Charles summoned the disobedient Bavarian duke in 787 to the imperial assembly in Worms. However, Tassilo refused to appear, so Charles commanded his troops against Bavaria. The members of Charles' entourage considered that behind the events stood the machinations of Liutperga, a "woman forsaken by God".⁷³ As Tassilo realized the overwhelming military power of the Franks, he gave up the fight, and on the 3rd of October 787 went to Charles' camp at Lechfeld to publicly apologize himself. The duke acknowledged his sins, submitted himself to Charles, gave back his duchy that has been awarded by Pippin to him and this time he offered his son and twelve magnates as hostages. Despite all this, Tassilo continued to plot against the Frankish king, and when his intrigues became known to Charles, he summoned Tassilo once again, but this time to Ingelheim, where the duke was charged with treason and was found guilty. Charles condemned Tassilo to death, but by the king's mercy the duke was imprisoned in the monastery of Jumièges.⁷⁴

It is not a coincidence that Charles chose a completely different strategy for solving the Bavarian question than the Saxon. Traditionally, this is explained by the fact that against the Christian Bavarians – according to the moral norms promulgated by the Church – it was not possible to use all those means that were allowed against the pagan Saxons. All this seems to be supported by the fact that Tassilo was also called by the Pope's ambassadors to reconcile with the Frankish king. In our view, however, the fact that the duke was closely related to Charles deserves special attention, since on his mother's side – she was the daughter of Charles Martell – Tassilo was Charlemagne's uncle. Consequently, in solving conflicts between

⁷⁰ Dalewski, *Ritual and Politics*, 45.

⁷¹ Johannes Fried, *Karl der Grosse*, (München, 2014), 185.

⁷² „Illuc et Tassilo dux Baioariorum cum primoribus gentis suae venit et more Francico in manus regis in vassaticum manibus suis semetipsum commendavit fidelitatemque tam ipso regi Pippino quam filiis eius Karlo et Carlomanno manno, sicut vassus recta mente et firma devotione per iustitiam, sicut vassus dominos suos esse deberet. Sic confirmavit supradictus Tassilo supra corpus sancti Dionisii, Rustici et Eleutherii necnon et sancti Germani seu sancti Martini, ut omnibus diebus vitae eius sic conservaret, sicut sacramentis promiserat; sic et eius homines maiores natu, qui erant cum eo, firmaverunt, sicut dictum est, in locis superius nominatis quam et in aliis multis.” – Georg Heinrich Pertz and Friedrich Kurze eds., *Annales regni Francorum*, (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi vol. 6) ad a. 757. 15–16.

⁷³ Imre Papp, *Nagy Károly és kora*, [Charlemagne and his Age] (Debrecen, 1997), 40. cf. „Et ista omnia supradictus dux Tassilo seu malivola uxor eius, Liutberga Deo odibilis, per fraudem consiliaverunt, Quarta pugna fuit commissa ab Avaris, qui voluerunt vindictam peragere contra Baioarios.” – *Annales regni Francorum*, ad a. 788. 82.

⁷⁴ For summary v. Siegfried Epperlein, *Nagy Károly*, [Charlemagne] (Budapest, 1982), 54–60. cf. Fried, *Karl der Grosse*, 185–190.

relatives, Christian morality played a significant role, according which the physical extermination of relatives was a sinful act. However, the solution applied by Charles has one more aspect related to the Church. In the early church organization, in case of particularly flagrant delinquencies, reconciliation with God was possible through the repentance of public confession and the acknowledgment of crimes. The sinner had to dress in sackcloth and had to confess all his sins and wrongdoings before the community he had committed, furthermore he had to humiliate himself and submissively accept the punishment imposed upon him. After all these, the bishop laid his hand over the guilty, prayed for him and took him back to the community. However, this chance was only offered once to the sinner in his whole lifetime.⁷⁵ Later on – thanks to the Irish monastic communities – the institution of private confession, which replaced the aforementioned public admission became more and more common, and the sanctity of repentance could be received several times, depending on the gravity of the committed sin.⁷⁶ However among the aims of the European Renaissance, that started in the Carolingian era, was the re-introduction of the institution of *poenitentia publica*, that the Frankish kings have also embraced. Therefore, public repentance became an important political instrument among the Frankish rulers: in order to maintain the inner peace, through the *poenitentia publica* the rulers could rebuke insurgent subjects and at the same time they could show the virtue of clemency which was an expression of power and magnitude. According to the public opinion of the Carolingian era the rulers should possess many virtues including *iustitia*, *largitas*, *sapientia* and *clementia*.⁷⁷ The latter, clemency could be practiced through submission as it is indicated by Tassilo's example.

Public humiliation and repentance had not only Christian roots in the time of the Frankish kings. Zbigniew Dalewski pointed out that in the texts of the capitulars the expression *harmiscara* appeared in several cases as a public form of punishment against those who violated the public order and this form a penance did not lack the ritual elements either.⁷⁸ The text of the capitular of Louis the German offers an excellent example: according to the regulation the wrongdoer had to carry a saddle over his shoulder as an act of humiliation.⁷⁹ In other sources a rope hanged in the neck, the carrying of a dog instead of the saddle or holding a sword above the head were also symbols that represented humiliation.⁸⁰ Dalewski's research also revealed that although the *harmiscara* has nothing to do with the traditions of Christian *poenitentia*, yet in both phenomena included gestures of ritual behaviour in which the individual had the opportunity to avoid punishment by public humiliation and the re-occupation the former status within the society was also possible.⁸¹ According to the sources it seems that the *harmiscara* served primarily to regulate the nobles of the Carolingian age and it gave the opportunity to the elite to avoid the penalties for such crimes which were serious: murder, rebellion, robbery, oppression and the seizure of ecclesiastical property.⁸² Consequently, among the prefiguration

⁷⁵ Dalewski, *Ritual and Politics*, 46. cf. Bernhard Poschmann, *Die abendländische Kirchenbuße im frühen Mittelalter*, (Breslau, 1930), 128–132.

⁷⁶ Dalewski, *Ritual and Politics*, 46.

⁷⁷ Bagi, *Divisio regni*, 242–243.

⁷⁸ Dalewski, *Ritual and Politics*, 47.

⁷⁹ „Quicumque caballum, bovem, frisingas, vestes, arma vel alia mobilia tollere ausus fuerit, triplici lege componat; et liber cum armiscara, id est sella ad suum dorsum, ante nos a suis senioribus dirigatur, et usque ad nostram indulgentiam sustineat; servi vero flagellentur et tundantur, et illorum domini, quae ipsi tulerunt, restituant. Quodsi clamor ad seniores venerit et ipsi talia non emenda verint, tunc horum seniores ipsam compositionem faciant et eadem ,armiscara, quamdiu nobis placuerit, sufficere compellantur.” – Alfred Boretius and Victor Krause eds., *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 2. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Legum Sectio) Capitularia Hludowici II. nr. 218. 96.

⁸⁰ For another examples v. Dalewski, *Ritual and Politics*, 51–52.

⁸¹ Dalewski, *Ritual and Politics*, 48.

⁸² Poschmann, *Kirchenbuße*, 128–132.

of *deditio* we will find the Christian ceremonies of confession and repentance and the legal institution of the traditional Germanic *harmiscara*.

In the light of the aforementioned – let us go back to Charlemagne and Tassilo – the Bavarian duke or at least his educated clerical advisors had to be aware that the public penance and the royal pardon at Lechfeld was the last opportunity for Tassilo to retain his ducal power, which suffered a great deal of impairment, since Charles no longer tolerated independent policy. This last chance was forfeited by the duke when he constantly disobeyed the king. After the submission of the duke Tassilo once more appears in the sources: in 794 Charles forced him to renew his apology and he had to abdicate of the ducal power again, but in this time all of this was put down in writing by the synod of Frankfurt. After the duke's death Charles gave him a proper funeral, he was buried in the monastery of Lorsch, in which later Charles' grandson Louis the German was also laid to rest.

The submission of Tassilo later became a model that was used to conclude conflicts during the middle ages. Through the public surrender and submission (*submissio, deditio*) of the defeated provided the possibility of reconciliation (*reconciliatio*) which was reinforced with an oath (*iuramentum*). This highly ritualized behaviour became a possible solution of conflicts and it was generally accepted and used in the 9th century,⁸³ and by the time of the Salian emperors it counted as the most important political instrument to conclude feuds. Similar precedents can be cited from the territory of the West Francia and later from the Kingdom of France which suggest the widespread of the phenomenon,⁸⁴ but interestingly the institution of *deditio* in the 10th century did not lead to the end of the conflicts there. All this indicates that the peace could only be enforced by a strong imperial power. The erosion of the royal authority in the kingdoms west from the Empire disallowed the inveteration of this kind of conflict handling mechanism. However, the new Central-East European dynasties whose rulers emerged from the pagan tribal society at the end of the 10th century, inherited this strategy that has long been known and used by their western neighbours, and with the Christianisation the opportunity was given to them to adapt the institution which was successfully applied by the Ottos. We would like to highlight through some examples the widespread of *deditio* as a possible way of solving dynastic struggles in the region.

In the case of the Árpáds we can quote chapter 147 from the 14th century chronicle composition. It describes that around 1106 Prince Álmos, who had fled the country in his fear from the king, had returned to Hungary. He did not spend much time at home but he went to Poland to his brother-in-law, Bolesław III. Soon after he entered into Hungary again but this time with an army and marched in the castle of Abaújvár. King Coloman who became aware of the situation had besieged the stronghold, but before a decisive battle had taken place the prince suddenly rode out of the city gate and with great haste approached the king's camp alone. As soon as he came near to Coloman's tent he got off his horse and prostrated himself before the king and publicly admitted his crimes.⁸⁵ The king accepted the humiliation of his younger brother and

⁸³ Althoff, *Rituale*, 70.

⁸⁴ Geoffrey Koziol, *Begging Pardon and Favor. Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France*, (Ithaca, 1992), passim; Dalewski, *Ritual and Politics*, 51–52.

⁸⁵ „Anno Domini M-o C-o VI-o reversus est dux Almus de Patauia, qui propter regis timorem illuc fugierat. Quem rex suscepit ad pacem. Deinde fugit in Poloniam et accersito Polonorum et Hungarorum consilio et auxilio reversus est in Hungariam et cepit Nouum Castrum et intravit illud. Rex autem hoc audito obsedit castrum. Cumque in crastinum pugnare vellet, ecce dux subito equum ascendens portas castrum exiens citissime equitavit solus ad castrum regis. Et cum ad tentorium regis venisset, statim de equo descendens et ad pedes regis venisset et in ore omnium se culpabilem proclamavit. Rex autem nichil tale scientibus duci indulsit. Nam et indignationem suam ab Hungaris, qui in castro erant, per intercessionem ducis amovit.” – Alexander Domanovszky ed., *Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV.*, (Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum vol. 1) (Budapest, 1999), c. 147. 426–427. For the interpretation of the text v. Zupka, *Ritual and Symbolic Communication*, 94–96.

forgave him, who went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem afterwards. This event preserved by the chronicle is not unknown to the Hungarian historiography as the researchers emphasized that Álmos' pilgrimage was a form of punishment and in his absence Coloman had deprived him of his properties and overthrew the institution of the *ducatus*.⁸⁶ Recently Dániel Bagi pointed out that the scene can be interpreted in accordance with the rules of *deditio*, the chronicle depicted the scene from the view of the king, so this recognition helped to specify the creation date of this chapter as well.⁸⁷ This proves that the Árpáds had used the legal institution of submission which was used exactly that way as the Ottos had practiced. The submitted party had to accept that their rights would suffer some sort of erosion but in exchange they would not face physical extermination, mutilation or imprisonment. The submission, as it was an unwritten custom, left a wide range of interpretation of crimes and punishment for both parties. In this case Prince Álmos felt that the punishment was too cruel, he hurried to the emperor, Henry V and complained that his rights had been violated and his properties were also lost.⁸⁸ In Coloman's interpretation it was the opposite: the prince sook his life and power and by doing this Álmos renounced his right rule, legally lost his properties but in exchange he could kept his life and was granted some incomes which was due to the members of the dynasty.

The application of *deditio* can be found in the sources until the end of the 12th century, and not only was practiced in Hungary but in Bohemia and Poland as well.⁸⁹ The institute of submission apparently survived the era of the Saxon and Salian emperors but the rules have changed: during the 11th and 12th centuries numerous cases are known where the submitted party's humiliation and apology was not accepted and the confiscation of property, deprivation of prerogatives and titles or even imprisonment awaited for the offender.⁹⁰ In our view the dynasties of Central-East Europe considered the opportunities offered by the institution of *deditio* not as merely as a political instrument to conclude conflict situations but they applied a modified, customized version in order to subjugate their family members who could not count as equal after the submission. In other words: the institution of *deditio* gave the opportunity to the vanquisher to subordinate his family members, therefore it added a great deal to the change from a horizontal family model to a hierarchical one.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Alcuini Opera omnia. Operum pars septima – opera didascalica. (Patrologia cursus completus. Series Latina. vol. 101) Edited by J.-P Migne. Paris, 1863.

Annales regni Francorum. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi vol. 6) Edited by Georg Heinrich Pertz and Friedrich Kurze, Hannover: Hahn, 1895.

⁸⁶ Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok*, 85; For most recent results v. Bagi, „Egy barátság vége,” 381–409.

⁸⁷ Bagi, „Egy barátság vége,” 381–409.

⁸⁸ „Eo tempore orta simultate inter Colomannum regem Pannoniae germanumque eius vocabulo Almus, eo quod uterque sibi potius regiam competere dignitatem iure gentis illius contenderet, spoliatus tam rebus quam ducatu, quo inter Ungros clarus et ut decuit fratrem regis a rege secundus claruit, Almus regem Heinricum adiit, et in auribus totius senatus haut secus quam ille quondam (Hiemsalis germanus) Atherbal miserias suas deplorans, Romani imperii magnilicentiam in compassionem et defensionem sui flectere curavit.” – Georg Waitz ed., *Ekkehardi chronicon universale*, (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum in Folio vol. 6) ad a. 1108. 242.

⁸⁹ For the enumeration of the examples v. Dalewski, *Ritual and Politics*, 72–85.

⁹⁰ Althoff, „Vom Konflikt,” 32.

Capitularia regum Francorum vols. 1-2. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Legum Sectio) Edited by Alfred Boretius and Victor Krause, Hannover: Hahn 1883–1897.

Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV. (Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum vol. 1) Edited by Alexander Domanovszky, 216–505. Budapest: Nap, 1999.

Cicero. *De senectute. De amicitia. De divinatione.* Translated by William Armistead Falconer, London: Heinemann – New York: Putnam's, 1923.

Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum Nova Series vol. 2) Edited by Berthold Bretholz. Berlin: Weidmannsche, 1923.

Das Verbrüderungsbuch der Abtei Reichenau. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Libri Memoriales et Necrologia, Nova Series vol. 1) Edited by: Johanne Autenrieth, Dieter Geuenich and Karl Schmid. Hannover: Hahnsche 1997.

Deliberatio Gerardi Moresanae aecclesiae episcopi Sypra Hymnum trium Pverorum. Elmélkedés. Gellért, a marosi egyház püspöke a három fiú himnuszáról. Translated and edited by Karácsonyi Béla and Szegfü László. Szeged: Scriptorum, 1999.

Ekkehardi chronicon universale. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores in Folio vol. 6) Edited by Georg Waitz, 33–231. Hannover: Hahn, 1844.

Galli Anonymi chronicae et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum. (Monumenta Poloniae Historica Nova Series vol. 2) Edited by Karol Maleczyński. Kraków: nakł. Akademii Umiejętności, 1952.

Gesta Principum Polonorum. The Deeds of the Princes of the Poles. (Central European Medieval Text vol. 3) Translated by Paul W. Knoll and Frank Schaer, edited by János M. Bak, Urszula Borkowska, Giles Constable, Gerhard Jaritz and Gábor Klaniczay. Budapest–New York: Central European University, 2003.

Libellus de institutione morum. (Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum vol. 2) Edited by Iosephus Balogh, 613-627. Budapest: Nap, 1999.

Magistri Vincentii dicti Kadlubek Chronica Polonorum. (Monumenta Poloniae Historica Nova Series vol. 11) Edited by Marian Plezia. Kraków: Wydawnictwo i Drukarnia, 1994.

The Laws of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary, 1000-1301: Decreta Regni Mediaevalis Hungariae. (The Laws of Hungary vol. 1) Translated and edited by M. Bak János, Bónis György, Leslie S. Domokos and James Ross Sweeney. Idyllwind CA: Schlacks, 1999.

Secondary literature

Alföldi, Andreas. *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970.

Althoff, Gerd. "Vom Konflikt zur Krise: Praktiken der Führung und Beilegung von Konflikten in der spätsalischen Zeit." In *Salisches Kaisertum und neues Europa. Die Zeit Heinrichs IV. und Heinrichs V.*, edited by Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter, 27–45. Speyer: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2007.

Althoff, Gerd. "Das Grundvokabular der Rituale. Knien, Küssen, Thronen, Schwören," In *Spektakel der Macht. Rituale im alten Europa 800–1800*, edited by Gerd Althoff and Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, 149–180. Darmstadt: Primus, 2008.

Althoff, Gerd. "Das Privileg der 'Deditio'. Formen gütlicher Konfliktbeendigung in der mittelalterlichen Adelsgesellschaft." In *Nobilitas. Funktion und Repräsentation des Adels in Alteuropa*, edited by Otto Oexle and Werner Paravicini, 27–52. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1997.

Althoff, Gerd. "Genugtuung (satisfactio). Zur Eigenart gütlicher Konfliktbeilegung im Mittelalter." In *Modernes Mittelalter*, edited by Joachim Heinzle, 247–265. Frankfurt a. M.: Insel, 1994.

Althoff, Gerd. „*Die Macht der Rituale. Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter.*” Darmstadt: Primus 2003.

Althoff, Gerd. *Amicitiae Und Pacta. Bündniss, Einung, Politik Und Gebetsdenken Im Beginnenden 10. Jahrhundert.* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften 37.) Hannover: Hahn, 1992.

Althoff, Gerd. *Verwandte, Getreue und Freunde. Zum politischen Stellenwert der Gruppenbindungen im früheren Mittelalter.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990.

Bagi, Dániel. „Egy barátság vége. Álmos 1106. évi alávetése és az Árpádok korai dinasztikus konfliktusai.” [End of a Friendship. The submission of Álmos in 1106 and the Early Dynastic Conflicts of the Árpáds.] *Századok* 147, no. 2 (2013): 381–409.

Bagi, Dániel. *Divisio Regni. Országmegosztás, trónviszály és dinasztikus történetírás az Árpádok, Piastok és Přemyslidák birodalmában a 11. és a korai 12. században* [Divisio regni. Division of Country, Throne Feud and Dynastic Historiography in the Realms of the Árpáds, Přemyslids and Piast in the 11th and early 12th centuries], Pécs: Kronosz, 2017.

Balzer, Oswald. *O następstwie tronu w Polsce.* Kraków: nakł. Akademii Umiejętności, 1897.

Bartoniek, Emma. "A Magyar királyválasztási jog a Középkorban." [The Hungarian King Election Law in the Middle Ages] *Századok* 70, no. 9-10 (1936): 359–406.

Bartoniek, Emma. "Az Árpádok trónöröklési joga." [The Law of Succession of the Árpáds] *Századok* 60, no. 9-10 (1926): 785–841.

Bartoniek, Emma. *A magyar királykoronázások története.* [The History of Crowning Hungarian Kings] Budapest: Akadémiai, 1987.

Blazovich, László. "A Tripartitum és forrásai." [The Tripartitum and its Sources] *Századok* 141, no. 4. (2007): 1011–1023.

Borgolte, Michael. *Sozialgeschichte des Mittelalters: Eine Forschungsbilanz nach der deutschen Einheit.* (Historische Zeitschrift, Beiheft 22.) Oldenbourg: de Gruyter, 1996.

Bretholz, Berthold. *Geschichte Böhmens und Mährens.* vols. 1–4, Reichenberg: Sollors's, 1921–1924.

Classen, Peter. "Die Verträge von Verdun und von Coulaines 843 als politische Grundlagen des Westfränkischen Reiches." *Historische Zeitschrift* 196 (1963): 1–35.

Dalewski, Zbigniew. "Political Culture of Central Europe in the High Middle Ages: Aggression and Agreement." In *Political Culture in Central Europe (10th–20th Century). Part I. Middle Ages and Early Modern Era*, edited by Halina Manikowska and Jaroslav Pánek, 65–86. Prague: Institute of History, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, 2005.

- Dalewski, Zbigniew. „Patterns of Dynastic Identity in the Early Middle Ages.” *Acta Poloniae Historica* 107 (2013): 5–43.
- Dalewski, Zbigniew. *Ritual and Politics. Writing the History of a Dynamic Conflict in Medieval Poland*. (East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages 450–1450 vol. 3) Leiden – Boston: Brill 2008.
- Deér, József. „Aachen und die Herrschersitze der Arpaden.” In *Byzanz und das abenländische Herrschertum. Ausgewählte Aufsätze von Josef Deér*, edited by Peter Classen, 372–423. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1977.
- Deér, József. *Pogány magyarság, keresztény magyarság*. [Pagan Hungarians, Christian Hungarians] Budapest: Egyetemi Nyomda, 1938.
- Eckhart, Ferenc. *Magyar alkotmány- és jogtörténet*. [Hungarian Constitutional and Legal History] Budapest: Politzer, 1946.
- Epp, Verena. “Rituale frühmittelalterlicher amicitia.” In *Formen und Funktionen öffentlicher Kommunikation im Mittelalter*, (Vorträge und Forschungen 51) edited by Gerd Althoff, 11–24. Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2001
- Epp, Verena. *Amicitia. Zur Geschichte personaler, sozialer, politischer und geistlicher Beziehungen im frühen Mittelalter*. (Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters) Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1999.
- Epperlein, Siegfried. *Nagy Károly*. Budapest: Gondolat, 1982.
- Érszegi, Géza. "Az Aranbulla." [The Golden Bull] in *Fejér Megyei Történeti Évkönyv. Tanulmányok és források Fejér megye történetéhez*, edited by Makkay László and Farkas Gábor, 5–26. Székesfehérvár: Farkas, 1972.
- Font, Márta. *Dinasztia, hatalom, egyház. Régiók formálódása Európa közepén (900–1453)*. [Dynasty, Power, Church. Shaping of Regions in the Middle of Europe (900–1453)] Pécs, 2009.
- Fried, Johannes. *Karl der Grosse*. München: C. H. Beck, 2014.
- Fritze, Wolfgang. "Die fränkische Schwurfreundschaft der Merowingerzeit. Ihr Wesen und ihre politische Funktion" *Zeitschrift für Savigny-Stiftung Germanistische Abteilung* 71, no. 1. (1954): 75–124.
- Garnier, Claudia. *Amicus amicis – inimicus inimicis. Politische Freundschaft und fürstliche Netzwerke im 13. Jahrhundert*. (Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters) Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 2000.
- Goetz, Hans-Werner. *Moderne Mediävistik. Stand und Perspektiven der Mittelalterforschung*. Darmstadt: Primus, 1999.
- Graus, František. "Über die sogenannte germanische Treue." *Historica* 1 (1959): 71–121.
- Györffy, György. *István király és műve*. [King Stephen and his Work] Budapest: Osiris, 2000.
- Heather, Peter J. „Foedera and foederati of the fourth century” In *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms*, edited by Thomass F. X. Noble, 292–308. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Hechberger, Werner. „Nemesség és hatalom.” [Nobility and Power] *Aetas* 22. no. 3. (2007): 5-23.
- Hóman, Bálint. *Magyar pénztörténet*. Budapest: MTA, 1916.

Jánosi, Monika. *Törvényalkotás a korai Árpád-korban*. [Legislation in the Early Árpád Age] (Szegedi Középkortörténeti Könyvtár. vol. 9). Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1996.

Kantecki, Maksymilian. *Das Testament des Bolesław Schiefmund. Seniorat und Primogenitur in Polen*. Posen: Chocieszyński, 1880.

Kasten, Brigitte. *Königssöhne und Königsherrschaft. Untersuchungen zum Teilhabe am Reich in der Merowinger- und Karlingerzeit*. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften 44.) Hannover: Hahnsche, 1997.

Kersken, Norbert. "God and the Saints in Medieval Polish Historiography." In *The Making of Christian Myths in the Periphery of Latin Christendom (c. 1000–1300)*, edited by Lars Mortensen, 153–194. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, 2006.

Kosztá, László. "Die Gründung des Bistums," In *Pécs (Fünfkirchen) das Bistum und die Bischofsstadt im Mittelalter*, (Publikationen der ungarischen Geschichtsforschung in Wien vol. 2) edited by Tamás Fedeles and László Kosztá, 7–42. Wien: Institut für Ungarische Geschichtsforschung in Wien, 2011.

Kozziol, Geoffrey. *Begging Pardon and Favor. Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Kristó, Gyula. "Legitimitas és idoneitas (Adalékok az Árpád-kori eszmetörténetünkhöz)." [Legitimitas and Idoneitas. Remarks on the Intellectual History in the Árpád Age] *Századok* 108, no. 3. (1974): 585–621.

Krzemieńska, Barbara. *Břetislav I. Čechy a střední Evropa v první polovině XI. století*. Praha: Garamond, 1999.

Loserth, Johann. „Das angebliche Senioratsgesetz des Herzogs Břetislav I und die böhmische Succession in der Zeit des nationalen Herzogthums: Ein Beitrag zur altböhmischen Rechtsgeschichte." *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte* 64 (1882): 1–78.

Lübke, Christian. *Das Östliche Europa*. München: Siedler, 2004.

Makk, Ferenc. *Magyar külpolitika 896–1196*. [Hungarian Foreign Policy 896–1196] (Szegedi Középkortörténeti Könyvtár. vol. 2) Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1996.

Nótári, Tamás. "A Lex Baiuvariorum hatása Szent István törvényeire." [The Influence of Lex Baiuvariorum on the Laws of St. Stephen] *Jogtudományi közlöny* 66, no. 9 (2011): 417–427.

Palacky, František. *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě*. vols. 1–4. Praha: Nákl, 1836–1867.

Papp, Imre. *Nagy Károly és kora*. [Charlemagne and his Age] Debrecen: Csokonai, 1997.

Pauler, Gyula. *A Magyar Nemzet története az Árpád-házi királyok alatt*. [The History of the Hungarian Nation during the Reign of the Árpád Kings] vols. 1–2. Budapest: Athenaeum, 1899.

Poschmann, Bernhard. *Die abendländische Kirchenbuße im frühen Mittelalter*. Breslau: Müller und Seiffert, 1930.

Rosik, Stanisław. *Bolesław Krzywousty*. Kraków: Chronicon, 2013.

Röckelein, Hedwig. "Heiraten - Ein Instrument hochmittelalterlicher Politik." In *Der Hoftag in Quedlinburg 973. Von den historischen Wurzeln zum neuen Europa*, edited by Andreas Ranft, 118–134. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.

Schild, Wolfgang. "Meineid." In *Lexikon des Mittelalters* vol. 6 (CD-ROM edition) 472–473. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2000.

Schmid, Karl. „Zur Entstehung und Forschung von Geschlechterbewußtsein” *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberreihns* 134 (1986): 21–33.

Szücs, Jenő. "Szent István Intelmei, az első magyar államelméleti mű." [The Admonitions of St. Stephen, the First Hungarian Opus on the Theory of the State] In *Szent István és az államalapítás*, edited by Veszprémy László, 271–290. Budapest: Osiris, 2002.

Tar, Ibolya. "A barátság a görög-római antikvitásban." *Vigilia* 74 no. 11. (2009): 802–809.

Tellenbach, Gerd. „Liturgische Gedenkbücher als historische Quellen.” In *Ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze* vol. 2, edited by Gerd Tellenbach, 426–438. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1988.

Timon, Ákos. *Magyar alkotmány- és jogtörténet tekintettel a nyugati államok fejlődésére*. [Hungarian Constitutional and Legal History with Regard to the Development of Western States] Budapest: Grill, 1919.

Van Eickels, Kalus. „Homagium and Amicitia: Rituals of Peace and Their Significance in the Anglo-French Negotiations of the Twelfth Century.” *Francia* 24. (1997): 133–140.

Veszprémy, László. "Árpád-kori történeti elbeszélő forrásaink (11–13. század) nyugat-európai kapcsolatai." [The Western European Ties of the Hungarian Narrative Sources in the Árpád Age (11th–13th centuries)] MTA doctoral thesis, Budapest: MTA, 2007.

Veszprémy, László. "The Birth of a Structured Literacy in Hungary." In *The Development of Literate Mentalities in East-Central-Europe*, edited by Anna Adamska and Marco Mostert, 161–181. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.

Weinfurter, Stephan. *Heinrich II. Herrscher am Ende der Zeiten*. Regensburg: Pustet, 2002.

Werner, Michael and Zimmermann, Bénédicte. "Túl az összehasonlításon: Histoire Croisée és a reflexivitás kihívása." *Korall* 28–29 (2007): 5–30.

Wihoda, Martin. „Testament kniežete Břetislava.” In *Saga moravských Přemyslovců. Život na Moravě od XI. do počátku XIV. století. Sborník a katalog výstavy pořádané Vlastivědným muzeem v Olomouci a Muzeem města Brna k 700. výročí tragické smrti Václava III., posledního českého krále z dynastie Přemyslovců*, edited by Renata Fífková, 33–50. Olomouc: Vlastivědné muzeum, 2006.

Závodszy, Levente. *A Szent István, Szent László és Kálmán korabeli törvények és zsinati határozatok forrásai. Függelék: A törvények szövege*. [The Sources of Laws and Synodical Resolutions at the Time of St. Stephen, St. Ladislaus and Koloman. Appendix: The Text of the Laws] Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1904.

Žemlička, Josef. *Čechy v době knížecí (1034–1198)*. Praha: Lidové Noviny, 1997.

Zupka, Dušan. *Ritual and Symbolic Communication in Medieval Hungary under the Árpád Dynasty (1000–1301)*. (East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages 450–1450 vol. 39) Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2016.