



RECHERCHER DANS LE LIVRE

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

CITER

PARTAGER

 AJOUTER À ORCID

The ambassadors of Charles I of Hungary in the papal curia (1301-1342)

Agnes Maleth

NOTE DE L'AUTEUR **TEXTE** **NOTES** **AUTEUR**

NOTE DE L'AUTEUR

The author is a member of the research group NKFIH NN 124763 Papal Delegates in Hungary in the XIVth Century (1294-1378) – Online Database. The project and the research have been supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund.

TEXTE INTÉGRAL



The examination of the personnel of the diplomatic relations between the Kingdom of Hungary and the papacy in the XIVth century implies on one hand the analysis of the work of papal legates and collectors in Hungary, and the research of the delegations of the ambassadors of the Hungarian king in the papal curia on the other hand. The corpus of the sources in the first case is quite advantageous. Not only the documents of the legation of Gentilis de Monteflorum (the cardinal sent by Clement V to consolidate the reign of the first Angevin king on the Hungarian throne 1307–1311) were

preserved in the Vatican Secret Archives, but some account books of certain papal collectors as well. Both document groups were published at the end of the XIXth by Hungarian church historians who started to collect all the material somehow connected to Hungarian history just after the opening of the papal archives ¹.

However, the data about the envoys of Charles I (1301/8–1342) are more scattered and scarce. Most probably this is the reason why the topic has not got the deserved attention in Hungarian historiography yet. The primary aim of this paper is to focus on the people who represented Charles I's interest in the papal curia. I try to present what factors led to being chosen for the diplomatic task, to reconstruct the careers of the ambassadors if possible and to show what cases they had to negotiate with the pope.

Methodological approach

The analysis of the delegations and the sources reporting about them raised many questions. The most complicated of these which had to be clarified in the very beginning of the research was how to decide whether a person mentioned in the registers was *really* present in the papal curia or not. If a papal letter granted certain privileges to a certain person, does it mean that the recipient was in the curia in the time of the issuing of the document? Not necessarily. Only if we think about the high clergy, we could point out numerous occasions when the archbishops or bishops did not travel to the papal court, but asked for confirmation through procurators ². It seems equally plausible that when a person, either clergyman, or secular, endeavoured to travel, his closest environment entrusted him with their own supplications or complaints as well. Similarly elusive can be the answer for the question: who can be considered as representant of the royal interest? If a cleric was sent to the pope to ask for the confirmation of an elected bishop, who by the way was advocated by the king, can this person be categorized solely as the bishop's or the king's envoy as well? My primary goal was to identify the envoys with the least possible uncertainty entailed, so I set a certain range of criteria. The most unambiguous cases were those when the source (papal letter, charter of donation, etc.) stated explicitly that the person appeared in the papal court as *nuntius* or *ambaxiator regis*, carried royal letters to the pope, carried out some negotiations on the behalf of Charles I, etc. An illustrative example could be an excerpt from a letter of John XXII to Charles I connected to the delegation of Csanád, provost of Várad in 1320: *Cum itaque dilectus filius Chanadinus prepositus ecclesie Waradiensis, secretarius, cancellarius et comes capelle carissimi in Christo filii nostri Caroli regis Ungarie illustris, sicut ipse nobis exposuit...* ³. In case the envoy was commissioned by a second authority, and not directly by the king, he was included in the examination, if there was clean proof that his mission met the royal interests (e.g. the king supplied him with a letter of recommendation). In a restricted number of cases some people were categorized as royal ambassadors even without explicit evidence: if other signs have been found which indicated that the person was member of a delegation in the papal

court (e.g. several papal letters concerning different requests of the same person which coincided with the documented sojourn of a delegation in the papal court).

The corpus of the research

In order to get a more detailed picture of the activity of the ambassadors who represented the interests of Charles I at the Holy See, we can rely on four types of documents. First of all, the majority of the information – mainly concerning the nature and the outcome of the supplications of the Hungarian ambassadors – is contained in the Vatican and Avignon Registers of the papal chancery⁴. In a more limited number, letters of the diplomatic correspondence of Charles I survived as well. The third most important category of sources consists of charters issued by chapters in Hungary, as a significant number of the royal ambassadors belonged to the middle clergy and had some kind of office in chapters, some of which served as *loca credibilia*, i.e. “offices” authorized to issue and copy legal documents⁵. The names of the members of the chapters were often recorded on legal documents, thus in some fortunate cases it is possible to follow the ecclesiastical advancement of certain individuals. Lastly, a couple of royal charters of donation also indicate diplomatic service as the reason of the king's gratitude, but in this case the missions' nature is almost never detailed. The documents belonging to the two last categories are available today in the diplomatic and photographic collection of Hungarian National Archives (MNL).

The ambassadors

Following the principles determined in the methodological subchapter, I could trace 14 delegations during the 41 years of Charles I's reign. For these 14 occasions, the names of 21 envoys were identified. 14 of the 21 ambassadors were clerics; many of them were members of the middle clergy, *praepositi* and *canonici*, or elected bishops waiting for confirmation.

Table 1 – Clerical envoys.

Name	Time of delegation	Office held in the time of the delegation	Highest office	Office at the royal court
<i>Carachinus</i>	autumn 1308	lector of Kalocsa	lector of Kalocsa	–
<i>Nicolaus dictus Finta</i>	summer 1310	chancellor and procurator of the bishop of Győr	?	–
	after Octob			

<i>Jacobus</i>	er 1311	provost of Zagreb (?)	?	?
<i>Johannes</i>	summer 1313	cantor of Vác	?	-
<i>Petrus</i>	summer 1317	prior of the Dominicans of Székesfehérvár, elected bishop of Bosnia	bishop of Bosnia	royal confessor
<i>Ladislau</i> s of Jánk	summer 1317	royal chancellor, Franciscan friar, elected archbishop of Kalocsa	archbishop of Kalocsa (1317-1337)	royal chancellor 30 October 1317-25 October 1336 ⁶
<i>Chanadinus</i> of Telegd	spring 1320	provost of Várad	archbishop of Esztergom(1330-1349)	royal chaplain 13 July 1319-20 January 1322 ⁷ , <i>secretarius notarius</i>
<i>Ladislau</i> s of Kabol	1325	provost of Titel	archbishop of Kalocsa(1343-1345)	royal chaplain, <i>secretarius notarius</i> , royal vicechancellor 6 June 1322-8 December 1323 ⁸
<i>Johannes</i>	summer 1331	provincial of the Franciscans	provincial of the Franciscans	-
<i>Paulus</i> ⁹	1331, 1332	hermit of Saint Augustine, elected bishop of Belgrade	bishop of Belgrade	royal chaplain and secretary
<i>Gregorius</i> of Kapronca ¹⁰	1331, 1332	provost of Hájszentlőrinc	bishop of Csanád	royal chaplain
<i>Stephanus</i>	spring 1332	provost of Várad	provost of Várad, papal chaplain	royal <i>procurator</i> (?) ¹¹
<i>Thomas</i>	spring 1332	archdeacon of Transylvania	papal chaplain	royal chaplain (1319-1321)
Chama	spring 1332		archdeacon of Küküllő	-

Four royal ambassadors belonged to *religious orders*: one was a Dominican (*Petrus*, 1317), two of them were Franciscans (*Ladislau*s of Jánk, 1317;

Johannes, 1331) and one of them was a hermit of Saint Augustine (*Paulus*, later bishop of Belgrade, February 1331 and spring 1332). Out of the four monks, three had offices at the royal court at the time of their missions as *confessor* (*Petrus*), *cancellarius* (*Ladislaus* of Jánk, verifiable between October 1317 and October 1336)¹², or *capellanus regis* and *secretarius regis* (*Paulus*)¹³. Two of the regular envoys held high offices in their order at the time of their delegations, as *Petrus* was the prior of the Dominicans of Székesfehérvár and *Johannes* was the provincial of the Hungarian Franciscans¹⁴. What is more, three of them (*Petrus*, *Ladislaus* and *Paulus*) were elevated to high ranks of the secular church after their visit to the papal curia. However, in case of *Petrus* and *Ladislaus* it was not their mission that influenced their careers so positively. On the contrary, they were delegated to the papal curia, because they were already the confidants of the king, and Charles I requested the pope to confirm their promotion. *Petrus* was elected bishop of Bosnia before his journey and he was confirmed by pope John XXII on the 3rd of July 1317¹⁵. *Ladislaus* was *electus* of the archbishopric of Kalocsa when he set off for Avignon, and he was consecrated in the papal curia possibly on the 15th of August¹⁶. Probably his acquaintance with the pope had an influence on *Ladislaus* of Jánk's later career, as he was charged several times with different duties by John XXII. In 1322, he was one of the three appointed *conservatores* of the rights of the order of Saint Paul¹⁷, then in 1327 he was involved in the investigation on the conditions of the Pauline monks¹⁸. Similarly, important to the service he rendered to the papal curia was what *Ladislaus* of Jánk did for the reign of Charles I. He remained loyal supporter of the king and led the royal chancellery until his death in 1337, and on some occasion he was entrusted with other diplomatic tasks as well¹⁹.

Unfortunately, the limited number of sources sometimes prevents us from reconstructing the careers of the envoys. It occurs even that the only information available comes from the exact same document that reports of the delegation. Most of the cases which are problematic regarding the identification are the missions of those ambassadors who belonged to the middle clergy and most probably did not advance higher. In actual fact, these envoys constitute the majority of the people whose names were recovered from the sources. The best example for the obscure personalities in royal service is *Carachinus*, canon of Kalocsa who visited the papal court possibly in 1309²⁰. *Carachinus* is mentioned neither before, nor after his delegation in the sources, not even in the charters of the chapter of Kalocsa. One sole entry of the Angevin chancellery of Naples mentions him as *clericus et familiaris regis Ungariae* in January 1309. The future tense (*tunc accessuro ad Romanam Curiam*) used in the register makes it clear that the envoy first visited the court of Charles II before continuing his journey to pope Clement V. The document gives only a general description of the purposes of *Carachinus'* mission (*pro certis agendis tangentibus ipsum regem et archiepiscopum Collocensem, cancellarium regem*), but it seems very likely that he was commissioned to report about the arrival and first provisions of cardinal Gentilis²¹.

The most problematic identification is nonetheless an envoy called Jacobus who was sent to the papal curia in 1311. King Charles I did not specify the title of his delegate in his letter to the pope. The Hungarian monarch asked

the protection of pope Clement V for the city Zadar against Venetian aggression and added at the end of his message: *cetera vestre sanctitati refferenda commissimus Jacobo latori presentibus...*²². It is generally accepted that the envoy *Jacobus* was the provost of Zagreb. According to the argumentation of Vilmos Fraknói²³, the royal envoy must have been the provost of Zagreb, as he had participated on the Council of Vienne and contributed to the process against the Templars²⁴. However, Fraknói refers in his monography to a XVIIth-century book which does not clarify which specific source the information comes from²⁵.

In two cases, the king did not delegate his own ambassadors, but he commissioned the envoy of a bishop or a chapter to communicate his requests. First, the king expressed his support of *Nicolaus, electus* of Győr by providing a royal recommendation to the bishop's envoy. *Nicolaus dictus Finta, cancellarius et procurator episcopi lauriensis* visited the papal curia in 1310²⁶. In addition to the king's letter, *Nicolaus* d. F. assured the pope that his legate in Hungary, Gentilis de Monteflorum had advocated the confirmation as well. In the second case, in 1313 *Johannes, cantor ecclesie Vaciensis* represented the interests of one part of his chapter and that of the king in Avignon²⁷.

As it has already been established by several historians²⁸, the diplomatic negotiations between the Hungarian and Neapolitan Angevins in the beginning of the 1330's increased the number of Hungarian delegations in the papal curia as well. Pope John XXII showed a great interest in the issue and was engaged in the elaboration of the details of the marriage plan of the son of Charles I with a granddaughter of Robert I. What has been unclear so far is how significant the increase in the Hungarian presence at the Avignon curia was. Vilmos Fraknói tried to name the royal envoys of Charles I who had been in the papal court during 1331 and 1332 and compiled the list as follows:

- *Paulus*, an hermit of Saint Augustine (February 1331), later bishop of Belgrade (*Albensis*, spring 1332);
- *Stephanus*, provost of Várad (Waradiensis)²⁹, and *Gregorius*, archdeacon of Bekcsény (Bexin/Bezim)³⁰, later provost of Háj (szentlőrinc), *Thomas*, archdeacon of Transylvania and 'two seculars' (end of 1331).

The list gives us the impression that the delegations were separate and were sent after one another for a short period of time. However, the systematization of the sources shows us a different picture. It is more likely that the delegations overlapped each other in time and in some cases the royal ambassadors spent long months in the papal curia. As we will see, it would be problematic to determine exactly how many diplomats represented the Hungarian king and who belonged to their entourage, but the sources prove unquestionably a significant augmentation in the size of the delegations. The first person on the above list, *Paulus*, the hermit is believed to have visited the Avignon curia twice: first in the beginning (early February) of 1331³¹, and secondly in spring of 1332³². There is no evidence of him being continuously in the papal court between these two dates, and one year was sufficient time to make the journey between Avignon and Hungary twice. Thus, it seems very likely that *Paulus* indeed

mediated between Charles I and John XXII on more than one occasion. During his first visit, he was confirmed as bishop of Belgrade³³. Although the pope did not specify whether *Paulus* had been recommended by the Hungarian king for the position, we might surmise that this was the case. It would not have been a unique example for an envoy being in one person the representant and the candidate of the king for an important benefice (see the above the case of *Petrus*, bishop of Bosnia and *Ladislaus* of Jánk, the latter archbishop of Kalocsa). The documents related to *Paulus'* missions shed some light on his lifepath, although there still remains a lot of uncertainty. His father's name is mentioned in the bulla of confirmation: *Lucas* of *Chestulz*³⁴. The identification of this settlement is rather problematic, especially because the papal document did not mention the diocese of the village. The name form *Chestulz* does not occur in any other sources related to the 14th-century Hungary. Most probably it signifies the village name *Kesztölc* which was written in the account of the papal collectors (1332–1337) with the ortography *Kesztelch*, and as *Keztheulch* in a document from 1320/1321³⁵. However, these two versions denote two different villages called the same name in this time: the first one was situated in the diocese of Pécs (*dioc. Quinqueecclesiensis*), and the second one lay close to Esztergom (*Strigonium*)³⁶. Unfortunately, we cannot exclude neither of the two possibilities, even if we suppose that *Paulus* chose the Augustine order because of the proximity of their monastery to his home village. The hermits of Saint Augustine had a monastery not only in Esztergom, but in Pécs as well in the XIVth century³⁷. Although the data did not reveal reliable information about the early life of *Paulus*, it is sure that he belonged to the closest circles of Charles I. During his second visit in the papal curia, he is mentioned as *secretarius regis*. In 1332 he must have stayed at least five months in Avignon, as we have proof that he was still in the curia in July³⁸. However, the date of his return to Hungary cannot be established. Similarly obscure to the beginning of his life is the time of his death, or to be more precise, until when he held the bishopric of Belgrade. The fact that *Paulus'* successor in the episcopal seat of Belgrade was also a monk called *Paulus* could cause some confusion, but the five years vacancy between the two bishops with the same name clarifies the line of succession³⁹.

In addition, Fraknói's list treats the next envoys, *Stephanus* (provost of Várad), *Gregorius* [of Kapronca⁴⁰, provost of Háj(szentlőrinc)], *Thomas* (archdeacon of Transylvania) and the 'two seculars' as the members of the same delegation. In my opinion, it is worth considering *Gregorius*, son of *Georgius* of Kapronca separately from the others. In January 1331, several papal letters were issued relating to him, including one which appointed him as provost of Háj(szentlőrinc)⁴¹. Neither of these documents states explicitly that *Gregorius* in this time would have been in the papal curia. For that we have proof only from a letter dated to 25th of April 1332⁴², when the pope entitles him *nuncius regius* and excuses him by the king for the long period which he would spend in the papal curia due to the negotiations. And indeed, the last papal letter in the year dealing his request was issued in July. Although it cannot be stated surely that *Gregorius* was present in the papal curia in 1331, the possibility that he was in Avignon in the time of his promotion deserves some attention. The

reason is that the two plausible periods of *Gregorius'* delegation (beginning of 1331 and spring–summer of 1332) overlap with the time when *Paulus*, bishop of Belgrade was in Avignon⁴³. Certainly, the delegations consisted of more than person and the most logical decision would have been to commission those envoys for the second time as well who already knew the nature of the negotiations. Presumably, *Paulus* returned in 1332 to Avignon with the envoys (probably including *Gregorius*) who had accompanied him during his first visit. Another interesting aspect of the sources related to *Gregorius* is that his confirmation as provost of Hájszentlőrinc apparently caused some confusion in the papal chancellery, as a papal letter deposing him as archdeacon of Bekcsény and confirming him as provost of Hájszentlőrinc was issued on the 6th of January 1331⁴⁴, and the reverse (deposing him as provost of Hájszentlőrinc and granting him the *praepositura* of Bekcsény) was dated to the 10th of January 1331⁴⁵. There is no later document assigning him the *praepositura* of Hájszentlőrinc for the second time, nevertheless, he is entitled after 1331 consequently as provost of Hájszentlőrinc (even by papal letters) until his transfer to the *praepositura* of Csázma (Chasma) in 1335⁴⁶. The papal letters from 1332 also entitled him *capellanus regis* which means that he, just like the majority of the envoys, belonged to the royal court⁴⁷. What is more, he was granted a prebend this time in the diocese of Zagreb⁴⁸ which he could keep, and even augment by another one in the diocese of Esztergom. He finally had to renounce his benefices when he was appointed bishop of Csanád (*Chanediensis*) in 1345⁴⁹. *Gregorius'* ecclesiastical advancement involved increased diplomatic duties, especially recurring commissions to the papal court. However, the long journeys from Avignon to Hungary were not without danger. In April 1338 Benedict XII had to ask the intervention of the bishops of Constance, Basel and Chur, because *Gregorius*, his *socios* and *familiares* had been raided and held captive by a *miles* called *Johannes Dapifer* from the diocese of Constance. The incident occurred when the provost and his entourage was on the way back from the papal curia where they had been sent by Charles I *pro certis negotiis magnis*⁵⁰. The bishops somehow succeeded to free *Gregorius*, as in May 1339 he was in Visegrád⁵¹, and in September he assisted the papal collectors (Galhard of Carcès and Peter, canon of Le Puy) in Warsaw⁵². Obviously the imprisonment did not discourage *Gregorius*, neither from travelling nor from contributing to the diplomacy of the Hungarian Angevins. In 1343 he accompanied the queen mother on her journey to Naples and he mediated several times between Louis I and Clement VI in the political conflict caused by the assassination of prince Andrew in Aversa⁵³.

On the other hand, it seems that *Stephanus*, provost of Várad, *Thomas*, archideacon of Transylvania and the two laics indeed belonged to the same delegation. The reason is a papal letter dated to 29th April 1332 which mentions them together as *ambaxiatores et nuncios Carolis regis Hungariae*. The two secular ambassadors are named as well: Gedeth de Hethes and Taphan de Harazti, *conuncios et conambaxiatores* of the two clergymen⁵⁴. The document most probably marks the end of the negotiations and the departure of the Hungarian envoys from Avignon, as pope John XXII took preventive actions by asking the bishops of Asti and Pavia to take measures in case the Hungarian delegation is attacked or captured. As a consequence

the question arises: if the delegation left Avignon in the very end of April or beginning of May 1332, when had they arrived? The envoys' names can be traced in the registers back until 23rd February 1332. On this day the pope granted *Stephanus*⁵⁵, *Gedeth (dioc. Vesprimiensis)*⁵⁶ and *Taphan (dioc. lauriensis)*⁵⁷ plenary indulgence in case of their death. The same privilege was given the same day to Chama, archdeacon of Transylvania as well⁵⁸, and *Stephanus*, the son of *Dionysius of Lochouch, miles Strigoniensis* was absolved from his vow to participate in the crusade of Philipp VI, king of France⁵⁹. Presumably the two latter were members of the entourage of the royal ambassadors. This hypothesis might be confirmed by the fact that Chama is mentioned twice more in the registers: on the 25th February the pope requested the archbishop of Kalocsa (*dioc. Colocensis*), the bishop of Eger (*Agriensis*) and the provost of Bács (*Baciensis*) to restore Chama as provost of Küküllő, a title which had been taken away from him by the bishop of Várad (*Waradiensis*)⁶⁰, and on the 5th April pope John XXII appointed the bishops of Transylvania and Várad as *conservatores* of Chama's rights for the archdeaconate⁶¹. Chama anyway had built a remarkable, pluralist career and for sure, his name was not unknown in the court of John XXII. His first noteworthy position was provost of Óbuda (*eccl. Sancti Petri de Veteri Buda*)⁶², but already in 1321 he was mentioned as *consiliario* of the king and he held six *canonicatus* and prebends in different dioceses (in addition to the *praepositura* of Óbuda) which he had to renounce in order to receive papal approval for a *canonicatus* in the diocese of Transylvania⁶³. However, this benefice caused him some inconvenience in 1324. The pope appointed somebody else to the *praepositura* of Székesfehérvár (*Albensis*), despite the fact that the chapter had elected Chama, because he was simultaneously provost of Óbuda and archdeacon of Küküllő⁶⁴. Chama obviously had some influence in the chapter of Székesfehérvár, as two years earlier he and two fellow clergymen had been commissioned by the canons to decide on the person of the new provost. Their decision was later examined and approved in the papal curia⁶⁵. When the provost elected by them died, the chapter voted for Chama. The papal intervention for the defence of his rights for the archdeaconate of Küküllő had a positive outcome, as he was entitled archdeacon in the accounts of the papal collectors in 1335⁶⁶. He died most possibly in late 1340 or early 1341⁶⁷.

As far as the list of the envoys in 1331–1332 is concerned, one more person has to be added. *Johannes*, provincial of the Franciscans in Hungary visited the papal curia in August 1331 and his primary task was to report the pope about the victory of Charles I over the *tatars*⁶⁸. About *Johannes'* life there are only a few known details. He was provincial of the Franciscans from approximately 1323 and most possibly he died shortly after his return from Avignon⁶⁹.

Beyond doubt, the lifepaths of those ambassadors who had been members of the middle clergy in the time of their delegations and later were promoted to high offices of the church are the easiest to reconstruct. *Ladislaus* of Jánk, the archbishop of Kalocsa has been already mentioned. It has to be emphasized that there were two other one-time ambassadors of Charles I who succeeded to gain the title of archbishop after their diplomatic missions in the Avignon curia. The best documented delegation

is that of Csanád (*Chanadinus*) of Telegd. Fifteen documents were preserved in connection with his visit in the papal court in summer 1320 where he fulfilled both ecclesiastical and diplomatic functions. Csanád of Telegd's life is quite well-known and well-studied⁷⁰, as the sources reveal almost every stage of his career which he had begun in the chapter of the cathedral church of Várad. In 1295 he was mentioned as *cantor*, then he disappeared for a three-year break from the documents. It is widely accepted that in this time Csanád of Telegd studied in Italy. Although he was indeed entitled *decretorum doctor* later, the attempts of historians to identify at which Italian university he studied have been unsuccessful until now. From the early 1300s, his advancement in the ecclesiastical hierarchy is clearly traceable. In 1306 he was *lector* of the cathedral of Várad, and a document from 1316 shows that he (still entitled *lector*) substituted Imre, the bishop of Várad as his appointed *vicarius* and *prothonotarius* in a legal case which might give us a hint about Csanád's growing significance. From 1318 he was the provost of the chapter of Várad⁷¹, and one year later he started to be mentioned as *capellanus* and *secretarius notarius regis*⁷². It has to be noted that in two documents dated to 1321 Csanád of Telegd is entitled *capellanus papae*⁷³, which cannot be independent from the fact that he had visited the papal curia during the previous year. Between 1322 and 1330, he was the bishop of Eger. He reached the peak of his career in 1330 when, strongly supported by the king, he obtained papal confirmation as archbishop of Esztergom, in spite of the fact that the chapter of the cathedral had previously elected another candidate⁷⁴. This forceful royal intervention in the election was the most distinct manifestation of the royal protection which had started in the time when Csanád of Telegd had held the office of *secretarius notarius*. The close relationship with the royal family seems to have developed both in the personal and in the political dimensions and made Csanád of Telegd a pillar of Charles I's reign. He did not only become the godfather of Stephen, the youngest son of Charles I⁷⁵, but he also accompanied the king on his journey to Naples 1333⁷⁶, on the diplomatic mission which was aimed to unify the Hungarian and Neapolitan branches of the Angevin dynasty. And most importantly, Csanád of Telegd proved his loyalty to the king when the bishops of Hungary sent a letter to the pope complaining about the harms that the arbitrariness of the king had done to the church. The archbishop of Esztergom did not support the unsatisfied high clergy by any means⁷⁷.

The third ambassador who succeeded to gain the title of archbishop after his mission in the papal curia was *Ladislaus* of Kabol, provost of Titel. Just like Csanád of Telegd, *Ladislaus* held the office *comes capelle et secretarius cancellarius regis* in autumn 1325 when he was sent to Avignon as representative of Charles I. However, *Ladislaus* had another additional and very important post at the royal court: he was the personal physician of the king⁷⁸. Unfortunately, there are a lot of unclear details concerning the beginning of his career and the details of his education, even quite important ones, like where he obtained the title *artis medicine scientieque professor*. What we can be sure of, is that *Ladislaus* was promoted to the bishopric of Zagreb in 1326 and in 1343 to the archbishopric of Kalocsa which he held until his death in 1345.

The data suggest that only a respective minority of the ambassadors of

Charles I were *seculars*: 7 people out of 21, but only 4 of them were entrusted with diplomatic tasks, the remaining three people were most probably accompanying envoys as members of a greater delegation.

Table 2 – Secular envoys.

Name	Date of the delegation	Title in the sources
<i>Benedictus</i> de Geszth	1304	<i>nobilis vir, filius comitis Boudo de Gezth</i>
Doncs	end of 1323 ⁷⁹	<i>comes</i> of Zólyom
<i>Georgius</i>	1324–1325, 1327	<i>civis Budensis</i>
Taphan de Harazti	1332	<i>nobilis vir</i>
Gedeth de Hetes	1332	<i>nobilis vir</i>
<i>Stephanus</i> , son of <i>Dionysius</i>	1332	<i>miles Strigoniensis</i>
Humbert of <i>Cholay</i>	1332	<i>comes, nuntius dalphini Viennensi, miles</i>

Not surprisingly, those non-clerical ambassadors who led a certain delegation, or who had been commissioned to hand over royal letters to the pope belonged to the upper social strata and had considerable experience with diplomatic matters. *Benedictus* who visited the papal curia in the beginning of Charles I's reign is described as *filius comitis Boudo de Gezth*, and was well rewarded in 1304 for the negotiations which he had carried out not only with the pope, but with Albert, the Holy Roman emperor and with Charles II of Naples as well ⁸⁰. The envoy with the highest rank was nonetheless Doncs, entitled *comes* of Zólyom in the registers ⁸¹. Doncs was a very significant figure of Charles I's reign, although initially he had supported one of the fiercest enemies of the Angevin pretender, Máté Csák, the oligarch who had controlled the northern part of the country. After Doncs changed side, he was able to use the king's gratitude for acquiring lands and building a remarkable career. Due to the fact that he governed several *comitates*, often simultaneously, his life can be well reconstructed from the sources: he did not only participate in the inner politics of Charles I, but he also accompanied the king important diplomatic journeys, e.g. to Naples and in the military campaign against Wallachia ⁸².

Humbert of *Cholay miles* might a little bit more peculiar than the others in the sense that he was originally the *nuntius* of Humbert II, son of John dauphin of Viennois (1306–1318). Humbert's mother, Beatrix was one of the sisters of Charles I. The Hungarian king I entrusted his nephew's envoy with his own messages to the pope which suggests that even this side of the dynasty was actively involved in the negotiations concerning the Hungarian–Neapolitan marriage ⁸³.

Lastly, there is one person rather mysterious among the secular envoys of Charles I: *Georgius civis Budensis* who visited the papal curia twice, first at

the end of 1324 or in the beginning of 1325,⁸⁴ and secondly in 1327⁸⁵. The identification of Gergious seems unfortunately quite hopeless, as he was mentioned in the sources without title. Nevertheless, it is an intriguing question why Charles I decided to send a *civis* to the papal curia, especially to negotiate such an important issue like *Georgius'* second visit when he carried royal letters asking for marriage dispensation for the the third son of Charles I, *Ladislaus* and Anne, the daughter of John of Bohemia.

The cases

The analysis of the sources has revealed that there were no envoys “specialized” in a certain type of tasks, rather it seems that the ambassadors were commissioned to discuss with the pope issues of divers nature. Considering all the entries in the registers connected to the delegations which have presented in the previous chapter, the cases that they dealt with can be divided to four basic categories:

- Diplomatic issues
- Political cases
- Spiritual life of the royal family
- Private cases of the ambassadors

The first category, the diplomatic one consists of every event of international importance and all requests or negotiations concerning the dynastic policy of the Angevin dynasty of Hungary. Among these cases some affected the royal family personally, for instance the dispensation which Charles I requested from the pope in 1320 to marry Elisabeth, the daughter of the Polish king Wladislaus I (1320–1333)⁸⁶. It was Csanád of Telegd's, the future archbishop's task to negotiate the matter in the papal curia, and his success was marked by two papal letters issued on the 2nd July⁸⁷, and 2nd August⁸⁸. Charles I also informed the papal curia about the birth of his third son in 1325 and the messenger was *Ladislaus* of Kabol, provost of Titel, later archbishop of Kalocsa⁸⁹. As it has been already mentioned, later this third son of Cahrlés I, *Ladislaus* was engaged with Anne, the daughter of John of Bohemia⁹⁰.

Without doubt, the most significant diplomatic issue about which Charles I communicated with the papal court was, as it has been already pointed out, the betrothal of Andrew, younger son of Charles I with Joanna, the eldest granddaughter of Robert I of Naples. Unfortunately it is not possible to give a detailed reconstruction of the exact content of the negotiations between the Hungarian royal envoys and John XXII. However, it seems sure that the pope was well informed from the beginning: Charles I sent ambassadors (*Paulus* and *Gregorius* in 1331 and 1332, *Johannes* in 1331, and *Stephanus*, *Thomas*, Chama and the *milites* in 1332) to the papal curia approximately in the same time when he started the preparations of his journey to Naples, what is more the pope simultaneously kept a busy correspondence about the issue with king Robert I, and possibly with the king of France⁹¹. On some occasions, Charles I turned to the papal curia to obtain support in military matters: in 1311 he asked the pope to intervene for the sake of Zadar *que est de Regno Ungarie, quam Veneti a multis temporibus elapsis potentialiter occupatam tenerunt*⁹², in 1320 he reported the pope about

his victory against Serbia⁹³, and in 1325 he requested the pope to assist the fight of Hungary against the *infideles*⁹⁴. Based on the – negative – answer of the pope to the latter incident, it might be suspected that the papal curia insisted on giving exclusively moral support.

The second group, the political cases comprises the greatest number of documents. Here belong all the requests of the Hungarian monarch which had importance for his inner politics or his church policy, for instance granting benefices for his confidants, obtaining confirmations for bishops or archbishops and clarifying legal issues. As my primary goal was to examine in this paper the career of those people who had visited the papal curia on the behalf of Charles I, I did not extend the research on the lifepaths of those clericals who had been recommended to the pope by the Hungarian king to certain positions, but I believe that it could be the topic of further and intriguing analysis. Especially in the case of those clerics who were allowed to possess multiple benefices at the same time or of whom we know surely that they belonged to the closest environment of the king⁹⁵. Although political cases were managed in the papal curia by most of the delegations, the greatest number of recorded requests was submitted by Csanád of Telegd in 1320: from the twelve documents which are connected to his visit in Avignon seven can be categorized as political cases⁹⁶.

In a more limited number of occasions, Charles I solicited spiritual privileges from the pope. The three known requests of such nature were handled by Csanád of Telegd (1320) and *Ladislaus* of Kabol (1325). The pope allowed Charles I to choose his *confessor* in order to get absolution from the sins which he had committed against the church⁹⁷, and a very similar request was granted to the king five years later⁹⁸. In the last case John XXII gave permission to the Hungarian royal couple to eat meat and diary products in the time of feast, *si neccessitas*⁹⁹.

The last group, similarly to the political one, is an umbrella term. All the issues which concerned the ambassadors personally – their status, benefices or spiritual life – can be categorized as private cases of the ambassadors. Obviously many of the royal envoys used the opportunity of being in the papal court to protect their own interests by submitting complaints or supplications. Chama was already mentioned who successfully reclaimed the archdeaconate of Küküllő during his visit in Avignon in 1332, but a lot of other examples could be listed. Csanád of Telegd (1320) requested absolution for the visitors of the altars which had been established by him previously¹⁰⁰. However, *Gregorius*, the son of *Georgius* of Kapronca (1331 and 1332) seems to be the cleric who used his time in the papal curia the most efficiently, as he did not only obtain the *praepositura* of Hájszentlőrinc, but possibly he also gained a prebend in the diocese of Zagreb for his brother, *Petrus*, son of *Georgius* of Kapronca¹⁰¹.

It has to be emphasised nonetheless that the categorization is flexible. The confirmation of a bishop for example was both political and personal issue. In some rare cases even more categories are intertwined. The best example is perhaps the papal letter dated to the 18th december of 1323 which is political, spiritual and private case at the same time: the pope granted

absolution to Doncs, *comes* of Zólyom from his vow to visit the Holy Sepulchre, because his service was needed in Hungary ¹⁰².

Conclusions

At the first sight it might seem challenging to find the guiding principles of how Charles I had chosen the people who represented him in the papal curia. The list of the delegates shows people from all over the country, from different dioceses and with different lifepaths. However, the analysis of the sources has allowed us to draw some general conclusions.

First of all, the ambassadors representing Charles I in the papal curia belonged to official and occasional delegations. Most of the envoys were direct representatives of the king, only two cases (*Nicolaus* in 1310 and Humbert of Cholay in 1332) indicate that Charles I occasionally authorized the delegate of another power to represent his interests. The delegations were charged with managing different sorts of tasks (diplomatic, spiritual, etc.), and some of the envoys used their presence in the papal court to make supplications concerning their own private issues as well.

Furthermore, it also has to be emphasized that the majority of the ambassadors (14 out of 21) were ecclesiastics, mainly members of the secular clergy. Only four of them were regulars: two Franciscans, one Dominican and a hermit of Saint Augustine. Many of the envoys came from the middle clergy (provosts, archdeacons, etc.). This fact proves the theory noted by Hungarian historians, namely that the tendency to entrust the members of this social stratum with diplomatic tasks because of their education and skills strengthened in the end of the XIIIth – in the beginning of XIVth century ¹⁰³. Despite the continuously growing influence of the middle clergy, the sources confirm that being competent or qualified was not enough, and that loyalty to the crown did not cease to be the key factor in choosing the royal representatives. This is why we find prelates amongst the royal ambassadors who were at the same time diplomats of the king and his candidates for major ecclesiastical benefices in Hungary: an elected archbishop (*Ladislaus* of Jánk) and elected bishops (*Petrus*, elected bishop of Bosnia and *Paulus*, elected bishop of Belgrade) asking for the pope's confirmation with the support of the king. The conclusion about the importance of loyalty is also supported by the fact that many of the envoys held offices in the royal court (as *confessor*, *comes capelle*, *secretarius notarius*, etc.), meaning that they belonged to the closest circle of the king. The offices in the royal chapel or in the royal chancellery presuppose literacy and some degree of education, however, the sources provide only in the case of two ambassadors (Csanád of Telegd, *Ladislaus* of Kabol) some details about their qualifications.

The group of the secular envoys of Charles I is probably even more heterogeneous than that of the ecclesiastics. Two of the secular delegates belonged to the Hungarian nobility (Doncs, *comes* of Zólyom and *Benedictus* of Gezth). Three other Hungarians mentioned by name in the sources were probably members of the entourage of the royal ambassadors, but were personally not charged with diplomatic tasks. The remaining two secular envoys were a commoner who visited the papal curia

twice representing the Hungarian king, and the envoy of the dauphin of Vienne who Charles I entrusted with delivering his messages to the pope.

It would be difficult to assess how strongly the visit of the royal ambassadors in the papal curia influenced their further career. Nevertheless, some of them rendered service in the future both to the Hungarian king and the Holy See (e.g. *Ladislaus* of Jánk, *Gregorius* of Kapronca), and several of them (Csanád of Telegd, *Ladislaus* of Jánk, etc.) turned out to be capable and ambitious clergymen who managed to build successful careers.

NOTES

1. The series was called *Monumenta Vaticana*. The first volume contained the account books of the papal tax collectors. *Rationes collectorum pontificiorum in Hungaria: pápai tized-szedők számadásai: 1281–1375*, Budapest, 1887 (*Monumenta Vaticana historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia. Vatikáni magyar okirattár*, 1.1.). The document of cardinal Gentilis' legation was printed in the second tome. *Acta legationis Cardinalis Gentilis. Gentilis bibornok magyarországi követségének okiratai: 1307–1311*, Budapest, 1885 (*Monumenta Vaticana historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia: Vatikáni magyar okirattár*, 1.2.). Most recently the edition of the sources preserved in the Vatican Archives (henceforth ASV) and connected to Hungarian history has been continued in another series. The ninth and tenth volumes published also XIVth-century documents of the Apostolic Camera. *Cameralia Documenta Pontificia de Regnis Sacrae Coronae Hungariae*, I–II, Budapest–Rome, 2014 (*Collectanae Vaticanae Hungariae*, 9–10).
2. Among the envoys presented in this article there were two such procurators: *Nicolaus dictus Finta* and *Johannes, cantor* of Vác. For the reference to the sources see notes 26 and 27 below.
3. 2nd July 1320: A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, I. Rome, 1859, p. 467–468.
4. Not all, but the most important items in the registers which concerned Hungarian history were published by A. Theiner, *Ibid.*, and of course, the short extracts of the document see O.S.B. (ed.) *Regestum Clementis papae V...* 10 vol., Roma, 1885–1892; G. Mollat (ed.), *Lettres communes de Jean XXII (1316–1334)*, 16 vol., Paris, 1904–1947, and J.–M. Vidal (ed.), *Lettres communes de Benoît XII (1334–1342)*, 3 vol., Paris, 1903–1911.
5. A particularly Hungarian type of offices which had approximately the same functions like the public notaries. Usually monasteries and chapters had the right to work as *loca credibilia*. G. Kiss, *La culture juridique des clercs dans le royaume de Hongrie sous les rois angevins au XIV^e siècle. Judicial Culture of Clerics in the Medieval Hungarian Kingdom under the Angevin Kings (XIVth Century)*, in *Belvedere Meridionale. History and Social sciences*, 27, 2015, p. 26–27.
6. P. Engel, *Magyarország világi archontológiája I.*, Budapest, 1996, p. 89.
7. Hungarian National Archives (henceforth MNL) DL 43386.
8. P. Engel, *Magyarország...* cit. n. 6, p. 90.
9. See the edition of the document in *Történelmi Tár*, 1898, p. 385–386.
10. Anjou 1331. p. 14. (nr. 16.): a document from January 1331 reports about the resignation of the former provost.
11. V. Bunyitay, *A váradi püspökség története az alapítástól a jelenkorig II: káptalanok, monostorok*, Nagyvárad, 1883, p. 41.
12. P. Engel, *Magyarország...* cit. n. 6, p. 65.

13. *Paulus* is entitled by the papal letter *capellanus regis* on 15 february 1331: ASV Instr. Misc. 1172 és 1173. A document from March 1332 mentions him as the he is the secretary of the Hungarian king: ASV RV 103, ep. 1388; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 549–550. n° CCCLVII.
14. A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 544–545, n° DCCCXLV.
15. Earlier Hungarian historiography assumed that the date of Petrus' confirmation was the 15th of July: J. Udvardy, *A kalocsai érsekek életrajza (1000–1526)*, Köln, 1991, p. 190. However, the papal bulla was dated to *V nonas Iulii*: ASV RV 66, ep. 3542; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 458–459, n° DCXCII.
16. The papal bulla is dated to the 15th of August and it details the consecration. ASV RV 66, ep. 3481. A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 459–460, n° DCXIV.
17. 27 September 1322: ASV RV 74, ep. 83. A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 481, n° DCCXXXVI.
18. ASV RV 84, ep. 2122.
19. J. Udvardy, *A kalocsai érsekek...* cit. n. 15, p. 195–197. V. Fraknói, *Magyarország egyházi és politikai összeköttetései a római Szentszékkal*, I, Budapest, 1901, p. 147.
20. In January 1309 the royal chancellery of Naples assigned him a handsome sum of money for his costs. G. Wenzel, *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek az Anjou-korból*, I., Budeapest, 1874, p. 186, n° 241.
21. He arrived to Zagreb in September 1308.
22. G. Wenzel, *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek...* cit. n. 20, p. 195–196.
23. Vilmos Fraknói's three-volume book on the relationship of the Hungarian kingdom with the papacy was written in the beginning of the XXth century. The first volume which contains the data on Hungary's Angevin period is still considered as the fundamental piece of historiography on this topic. For the book's details see n. 18.
24. V. Fraknói, *Magyarország egyházi...* cit. n. 18, p. 402–403.
25. B. A. Krčelić, *Historiarum cathedralis ecclesiae Zagrabiensis*, Zagreb ca., 1760, p. 102.
26. A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 822–823, n° MCCLVIII.
27. 1th august 1313: ASV RV 60, fol. 187v ep. 581 ; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 443–444, n° DCLXXIX.
28. V. Fraknói, *Magyarország egyházi...* cit. n. 18, p. 154–158.
29. Today Oradea (RO).
30. Today Becsehely (HU).
31. *Történelmi Tár*, 1898. p. 385–386, n° II.
32. ASV RV 103, ep. 1388; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 549–550, n° CCCLVII (*vii id mart an. xvi*) and p. 553–554, february n° DCCCCLXV.
33. The bulla is dated to 1331. ASV RV 98, ep. 823 (and its copy MNL DF 291549).
34. Read like *Chesluk* in the edition of *Anjou-kori oklevéltár XV. 1331*. p. 37. n° 64.
35. MNL DF 236419.
36. This village still exist with unchanged name.
37. B. Romhányi, *Ágostonrendi remeték a középkori Magyarországon*, in *Aetas*,

20/4, 2005, p. 99–100.

38. A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 591. n° DCCCLXXVII.

39. The bishopric was mentioned to be vacant in January 1341 (MNL DF 278114) and the second *Paulus* followed his predecessor only in 1346. K. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, I, Münster, 1898, p. 355.

40. In the documents it occurs with alternate spelling in the forms of *Caproncha*, *Copruncha* and *Kopruncha*. Today Koprivnica (CR).

41. 6 January 1331: ASV RV 98, ep. 533.

42. A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 551–552, n° DCCCLXI.

43. If he had indeed been in the curia in the beginning of 1331, he must have had returned to Hungary, just like *Paulus* did, as document issued by the chapter of Hájszentlőrinc mentions *Gregorius* as provost in 1331 (unfortunately without month and day). MNL DL 76443.

44. ASV RV 98, ep 533. The same day pope John XXII promoted Jacob Jacques of Piacenza, former provost of Hájszentlőrinc to the *praepositura* of Pozsony (Bratislava). ASV RV 98, ep. 443.

45. ASV RV 98, ep. 999; Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 533. n° DCCCXXV.

46. Today Čazma (CR). For the history of the chapter of Hájszentlőrinc in the XIVth century, see G. Thoroczky, *A messziről jut királyné prépostsága. A hájszentlőrinci prépostság korai története (1342–ig)*, in A. Bárány, G. Dreska, K. Szovák (eds.), *Arcana tabularii I. Tanulmányok Solymosi László tiszteletére*, Budapest–Debrecen, 2014, esp. p. 331–332.

47. 20 July 1332: ASV RV 102, ep. 1244.

48. 25 April 1332: ASV RV 102, ep. 1051.

49. He was bishop of Csanád until his death in 1350. K. Juhász, *A csanádi püspökség története (1307–1386)*, Makó, 1946. p. 57–74.

50. 14 April 1338: ASV RV 126, n. 83 (and its copy MNL DF 291 720).

51. MNL DF 230363.

52. 1st September 1339: G. Wenzel, *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek...* cit. n. 20, p. 374–379.

53. K. Juhász, *A csanádi püspökség...* cit. n. 47, p. 57–74.

54. A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 552, n° DCCCLXII.

55. ASV RV 101, fol. 270v ep. 766.

56. ASV RV 101, fol. 271v, ep. 773.

57. ASV RV 101, fol. 270v ep. 767.

58. ASV RV 101, fol. 270v ep. 765.

59. ASV RV 101, fol. 270v ep. 768 ; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 545 n° DCCCXLVII.

60. ASV RV 103, ep. 1528.

61. ASV RV 101, ep. 895.

62. 1316: MNL DL 29111.

63. Chama was recommed for this benefice by Charles I. He had held benefices in the dioceses of Várad, Pécs, Győr, Esztergom, Veszprém and Zagreb. 8 December 1321: ASV RV 73, fol. 129r–v ep. 346.

64. 7 July 1324: A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 496, n° DCCLVIII.

65. 6 October 1322: ASV RV 74, ep. 58; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...*

cit. n. 3, p. 482–483, n° DCCXXXVII.

66. In the account box of the papal tax collectors from 1335 he was entitled archdeacon of Küküllő as well. *Rationes collectorum...* cit. n. 1., p. 135 and 142.

67. The papal tax collectors' account book reports that the archdiaconate is vacant. 1341 (20 February) ASV Collect. 180, fol. 75–77.

68. MNL DF 291665 ; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 544–545. n° DCCXLV.

69. F. Karácsonyi, *Szt Ferenc rendjének története Magyarországon 1711-ig*, Budapest, 1922, p. 34–36.

70. For a very detailed biography of Csanád of Telegd, see L. Szende, *Telegdi Csanád*, in M. Beke (ed), *Esztergomi érsekek*, Budapest, 2003, p. 161–171.

71. Csanád is mentioned as provost of Várad, 5 February 1318: MNL DL 50 658.

72. In 1319 Csanád of Telegd was entitled provost of Várad, *secretarius notarius* and royal chaplain. MNL DL 322.

73. MNL DL 2027.

74. ASV RV 98, ep. 572; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 527–528, n° DCCCXVI.

75. Charles I had five sons, but only three of them reached adulthood: Louis (1326), Andrew (1327) and Stephen (1332). E. Csukovits, *Az Anjouk Magyarországon I. Károly és uralkodása (1301–1324)*, Budapest, 2012, p. 129.

76. For other members of the royal entourage see: SRH I, 205.

77. Gy. Rácz, *Az Anjou-ház és a Szentszék (1301–1387)*, in I. Zombory (ed.), *Magyarország és a Szentszék kapcsolatának ezer éve*, Budapest, 1996, p. 64–65.

78. *Tam dilecti filii, Ladislavi, prepositi ecclesie Titulensis, physici et nuntii regis, nuper ad nostram presenciam venientis...* A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 501, n° DCCLXXI.

79. A later entry (26 June 1328) in the Vatican Registers indicates that Doncs visited the papal curia a second time. However, there is no proof that in this case Doncs represented the Hungarian king. For the document, see ASV RV vol. 87, ep. 2269 (MNL DL 291492).

80. MNL DL 260317.

81. 24 November 1323: A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 494, n° DCCLIV. Similarly to the other delegations, the exact time of departure and arrival of Doncs to the papal curia is unknown, but in his case are able to make a closer estimate: in April 1323, he was one of the barons who signed Charles I's treaty with the Habsburg princes (8 April 1323: MNL DF 257970). This means that he left Hungary vaguely between April and August 1323.

82. For the life and career of Doncs, comes of Zólyom see E. Csukovits, *Az Anjouk Magyarországon...* cit. n. 76, p. 91, and L. Zolnay, *Donch mester és a Balassák ősei*, in *Turul*, 1937, p. 31–39.

83. 17 June 1332: ASV RV 116, fol. 277 ep. 1296, and 10 June 1332: ASV RV 116, fol. 274v ep. 1279.

84. 28 January 1325: A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 498–499, n° DCCLXIII.

85. 7 December 1327: A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 519, n° DCCC.

86. Wladislaus had been crowned king of Poland in January 1320. However, Charles I and Elisabeth did not wait for the pope's answer, they married in June 1320 before the royal ambassador could have returned from

Avignon. E. Csukovits, *Az Anjouk Magyarországon...* cit. n. 76, p. 128.

87. ASV RV 70, ep. 965.

88. ASV RV 70, ep. 1009.

89. 1st October 1325: A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 501–502, n^o DCCLXXII. Unfortunately the third son of Charles I died as an infant.

90. For the document reference number see note 85.

91. ASV RV 116, fol. 277 ep. 1296.

92. G. Wenzel, *Magyar diplomáciai...* cit. n. 20, p. 195, n^o 253.

93. Pope John XXII sent letters on the 20th July 1320 informing European monarchs (Frederick IV of Habsburg, John of Bohemia and Wladislaus I of Poland) about the Hungarian victory: ASV RV 70, ep. 977. Although the letter mentions incorrectly *Macedonia*, it seems sure that the pope referred to the successful campaign of Charles I against the Serbs and the occupation of Belgrade in autumn of 1319. Gy. Kristó, *Az Anjou-kor háborúi*, Budapest, 1988, p. 78–79.

94. 13 September 1325: A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 501, n^o DCCLXXI.

95. A good example could be Johannes, son of Berke, provost of Székesfehérvár, *vicecancellarius aulae regie* who was granted the archdeaconate of Küküllő in the time of the delegation of Ladislaus, electus of Kalocsa and *Paulus*, bishop of Bosnia (1317). ASV RV 109, fol. 173; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 456, n^o DCLXXXIX.

96. ASV RV 70, ep. 968–970, 973–974 and 982 ; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 470, n^o DCCXIII.

97. ASV RV 70, ep. 966 ; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 467, n^o DCCVIII.

98. 1st September 1325: ASV RV 79, ep. 2097 ; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 500–501, n^o DCLXX.

99. 1st September 1325: ASV RV 79, ep. 2096 ; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 500, n^o DCCLXIX.

100. ASV RV 70, ep. 967.

101. ASV RV 108, ep. 440; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 531, n^o DCCCXXI. The theory that *Gregorius* and *Petrus* were brothers is also confirmed by the fact that a *Petrus* is mentioned in the accounts of the papal tax collectors concerning the diocese of Zagreb as *frater Gregorii praepositi* (1333, 1334). *Rationes collectorum...* cit. n. 1, p. 164, 169–170.

102. ASV RV 112, fol. 78v. ep. 927; A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta...* cit. n. 3, p. 494, n^o DCCLV.

103. As highlighted by L. Koszta, *Conclusions drawn from the prosopographic analysis of the canons belonging to the cathedral chapters in Hungary (1200–1350)*, in *Carrieras ecclesiásticas no Ocidente Cristão (séc. XII–XIV)*, Lisboa, 2007, p. 15–28.

AUTEUR

Agnes Maleth

University of Pécs, Hungary, malethagi@gmail.com