

Papal Government and the Hungarian High Clergy in the 14th century: *Servitium* Payments*

Ágnes Maléth

research fellow, DelegatOnline Project

Medieval and Early Modern Department

Institute of History

University of Pécs, Hungary

When considering the success or failure of a government, a special attention has to be paid to the financial factors. The efficiency of taxation proves that the government is able to exercise control and has the power to realise its interests. The imbalance of this fundamental correlation and its consequences are well illustrated by the installation of the papacy in Avignon at the beginning of the 14th century. Compared to Rome, the new papal seat had its advantages, most importantly the relative peacefulness of the city and its proximity to the Holy Roman Empire and the French Kingdom.¹ However, the long-term absence of the pontifical authority from Italy encouraged dissent and rebellion in the Papal States. Parallel to the governmental problems, financial difficulties arose: the costs of the armed conflicts, the administration and the Curia had to be financed even if an important part of the incomes of the Apostolic See, namely the different revenues from the Papal States were more difficult to access. Consequently, the significance of other financial resources, especially that of the taxes of ecclesiastical benefices increased rapidly.²

In order to acquire an ecclesiastical benefice in the medieval period, the elected or nominated candidate had to pay a tax to the Holy See. This tax was estimated based on the annual income of the benefice in question, and it was called *servitium commune* and *servitia consueta* (later called *servitia minuta*³) in case of the consistorial benefices (archbishoprics,

*The research was supported by National Research, Development and Innovation Office - NKFIH NN 124763

¹ RENOARD Yves, *La papauté à Avignon*, Plouédern, Editions Jean-Paul Gisserot, 2003, p. 15-17.

² WEAHLAND John E., « Administrative and Fiscal Centralization under Pope John XXII, 1316–1334 », *The Catholic Historical Review*, n° 54, 1968/2, p. 285-310, 289.

³ The *servitia minuta* was an administrative fee paid by the prelates to the familiars of the pope and the cardinals. Its sum was counted as one-fifth of the *commune servitium*. GOTTLOB Adolf, *Die Servitientaxe im 13. Jahrhundert. Eine Studie zur Geschichte des päpstlichen Gebührenwesens*, Stuttgart, Verlag von Ferdinand Enke, 1908, p. 101-118.

bishoprics, abbeys, etc.),⁴ and *annata* in case of other, minor benefices.⁵ The elected or nominated candidates for consistorial benefices were not confirmed by the pope until the prelate or his procurators paid the *servitium* or at least formally acknowledged the obligation of payment in front of the Apostolic Camera.⁶ While the *annata* was collected in this period by tax collectors together with other types of ecclesiastical taxes in Hungary, the *servitium* had to be paid in the papal court,⁷ meaning that the incomes deriving from *servitium* were registered centrally by the officers of the Apostolic Chamber. As a result, the *servitium* payments of the Hungarian prelates are relatively well-documented in the 14th century. These financial documents enable us to examine how effective the papal government was in collecting taxes from a rather peripheral region of the Western Christendom like the Hungarian Kingdom, how much the prelates respected the papal authority, and how the papal court proceeded in case of the failure of payment.

As far as the sources of the *servitium* payments are concerned, a clear dividing line can be observed between the first and the second halves of the century.⁸ The period until the end of the 1340s is characterized by evolving accounting practices of the Apostolic Chamber, while the documentation becomes more and more consistent towards the end of the century. If a prelate paid, half of the payment – the half which was allocated to the Apostolic Camera and the four-fifths of the *servitia minuta*⁹ – was registered in the *Introitus et exitus* books among the

⁴ From the time of Urban V (1362–1370), the candidates for prelatures were obliged to pay the *servitium*, only if the annual income of the diocese or abbacy was estimated for at least 200 or 100 florins. LUNT W. E., « The financial system of the medieval papacy in the light of recent literature », *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, n° 23, 1909/2, p. 285.

⁵ The terminology of major and minor benefices was used by CAILLET Louis, *La papauté d'Avignon et l'Église de France*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de Paris, 1975.

⁶ FEDELES Tamás, « The Apostolic Camera and the Hungarian Church Benefices during the Conciliarist Era », in Attila BÁRÁNY (ed.), *Das Konzil von Konstanz und Ungarn*, Debrecen, Kapitális, 2016, p. 213-236; MAILLARD-LUYPAERT, Monique, *Papauté, clercs et laïcs. Le diocèse de Cambrai à l'épreuve du Grande Schisme d'Occident (1378–1417)*, Bruxelles, Presses de l'Université de Saint-Louis, 2001, p. 122-123.

⁷ The obligation of the prelates to appear in the papal court was called *visitatio*. In addition to sending procurators, there was another way to avoid travelling to the papal curia: the obligation oath could be taken by legates and nuncios. BAUMGARTEN Paul Maria, *Untersuchungen und Urkunden über die Camera Collegium Cardinalium für die Zeit von 1295 bis 1437*, Leipzig, Giesecke und Devrient, 1898, XCVIII, CI; LUNT W. E., « The financial system of the medieval papacy », *op. cit.*, 285.

⁸ This paper examines the period between 1301 and 1378. 1301 signifies the accession of Charles I (1301–1342), the first member of the Angevin dynasty to the Hungarian throne, while the end date was determined by the beginning of the Great Western Schism. Although the two events are of different nature – the first being dynastic-diplomatic, while the second primarily ecclesiastical-historic – I believe that no better framework could be established for the analysis. The reason for this is the fact it would be quite problematic to find any other dates which stand as milestones in the history of both powers.

⁹ The second half of the *servitium* was distributed between the cardinals. KIRSCH Johann Peter, *Die Finanzverwaltung des Kardinalkollegiums im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert*, Münster, Verlag von Heinrich Schönningh, 1895, p. 5-39.

incomes of the papal court.¹⁰ The obligations for the payment of the *servitium (obligatio)*, the quittances (*solutio*) and concessions (e.g. postponement or absolution) were also entered in the *Obligaciones et solutiones* books of the camera. However, the payer of the *servitium* did not automatically receive a quittance; the Apostolic Camera issued it only on demand and for a certain fee.¹¹ As a result, most of the Hungarian prelates decided not to take the *solutio* in the beginning of the examined period. This means that there is no *solutio* in approximately 60% of the recorded payments settled before 1342. As the *obligatio* does not prove that a certain prelate paid, and the proof of the payment – the *solutio* – is quite often missing, the only possibility to reconstruct the payments is to examine the *Introitus et exitus* and *Obligaciones et solutiones* simultaneously.¹² Nevertheless, the administrative procedure gradually changed by the end of the 1340s. The issue of the quittances became more customary, so the *servitium* entries of the *Introitus et exitus* books from the 1350s lose their status as primary sources of the research, and they become references for data verification.

*

The beginning of the 14th century inaugurated a new era not only in the history of the papacy, but also in the history of the Hungarian Kingdom. The first half of the century can be considered as a transitory period for both powers. Following the union of the Árpád dynasty with the Neapolitan Angevins sealed with a double marriage, the grandson of Charles II of Naples succeeded to the Hungarian throne in 1301.¹³ However, Charles I of Hungary (1301–1342) spent the first 20 years of his reign with fighting, first with the two other pretenders to the throne (Wenceslas of Bohemia and Otto of Bavaria), and later with the most

¹⁰ Unfortunately, the *Introitus et exitus* books are incomplete in the first half of the 14th century. The deficiency in the source material was caused by several factors. First of all, paper started to be used in large quantities for everyday administration in the Avignon period which was cheaper, but less long-lasting solution, as paper decays quicker than parchment. FAYEN Arnold (ed.), *Lettres de Jean XXII (1316–1334)*, I, Paris, H. Champion, 1908, I–IV. Furthermore, the transfers of the archives of the Avignon curia resulted in the fact that a considerable amount of the documents were lost or damaged. Only after 1316 are the volumes available for every year, before that there are only a handful of surviving volumes, such as *Introitus et exitus vol. 5.* for the years 1302 and 1303, *vol. 75.* for the years 1308 and 1309, and *vol. 10.* for the years 1309 and 1310. Furthermore *vol. 8.* contains the expenses for the year 1307. This heavily damaged volume was edited by GUILLEMAIN Bernard, *Les recettes et les dépenses de la Chambre apostolique pour la quatrième année du pontificat de Clément V: 1308–1309: Introitus et Exitus 75*, Rome, Boccard, 1978.

¹¹ KOWALSKI Marek Daniel, *Proventus camerae apostolicae debiti: opłaty duchowienstwa polskiego na rzecz papiestwa w latach 1417–1484*, Kraków, Historia Jagellonica, 2010, p. 174.

¹² Some of the surviving fragments of the *Introitus et exitus* books were bound into the Avignon registers. These two fonds are especially useful to supplement the information contained in the *Obligaciones et solutiones* before 1320.

¹³ CSUKOVITS Enikő, « Introduzione. La dinastia degli Angiò e l'Ungheria », in Enikő CSUKOVITS (ed.), *L'Ungheria angioina*, Viella, Roma, 2013, p. 7–22.

powerful members of the Hungarian nobility who had managed to build oligarchic rule in some parts of the country.¹⁴ The inner political situation affected the ecclesiastical life on various levels.¹⁵ The church properties were often pillaged and occupied by lay forces, the war increased the dangers of travel, set obstacles to collecting taxes, and frequently delayed the filling of vacant benefices.¹⁶ Moreover, the period presented examples when the oligarchs intervened in ecclesiastical matters directly and tried to decide on the succession in some prelatures.¹⁷ The impact of these problems cannot be underestimated during the research of the *servitium* payments. Nevertheless, the process of the unification of the kingdom came to an end by the late 1320s.¹⁸ The second half of Charles I's reign, and especially the time of Louis I (1342–1382) was characterized by more stable inner political situation. In the second half of the century, it was rather Louis I's foreign policy which could raise political or financial difficulties. The issue of the Neapolitan succession clearly perturbed the relationship of the Hungarian Kingdom with the Holy See, and Louis I's later military campaigns abroad could also put some extra pressure on the state.¹⁹

In Hungarian historiography, the beneficial policy of the Avignon popes can be considered as one of the less-examined topics. Historians have usually supposed that the inner political difficulties in the beginning of the century, the distance from the papal curia, and mainly the strong royal influence on the ecclesiastical matters prevented the papacy from exercising an effective papal government in the Hungarian Kingdom. Although the data concerning the Hungarian church in the *Obligationes et solutiones* books have recently been

¹⁴ ZSOLDOS Attila, « Province e oligarchi. La crisi del potere reale ungherese fra il XIII e il XIV secolo », in Enikő CSUKOVITS (ed.), *L'Ungheria angioina*, Viella, Roma, 2013, p. 23-58.

¹⁵ The legations of the cardinals Niccolò Boccasini (1301–1303) and Gentile da Montefiore (1308–1311) clearly reflect the problems which the Hungarian church had to face during the war of succession. The statutes passed by the two legates were mostly designed to protect ecclesiastical possession and sanction the violation of the rights of ecclesiastical institutions by the secular powers. KISS Gergely, « Les légats pontificaux en Hongrie au temps des rois Angevins (1298-1311) », in Zoltán KORDE and István PETROVICS (ed.), *La diplomatie des États Angevins aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*, Roma/Szeged, Accademia d'Ungheria in Roma, p. 101-116.

¹⁶ The circumstances are also well illustrated by the fact that the majority of the apostolic conservators were commissioned in the first half of Charles I reign. MALÉTH Ágnes, *A Magyar Királyság és a Szentszék kapcsolata I. Károly korában (1301–1342)* [The Relationship of the Hungarian Kingdom and the Holy See in the Time of Charles I (1301–1342)], Pécs, Molnár Nyomda, 2020, 146-159.

¹⁷ Two good examples are the election of the bishops of Transylvania and Pécs in which cases Ladislaus Kán, voivode of Transylvania, and the oligarch Henry of Némétújvár tried to force the chapters to accept their candidates as bishops. Both cases were examined and decided in the legatine court of cardinal Gentile. KISS Gergely, « Les légats pontificaux en Hongrie » *op. cit.*, p. 110-111.

¹⁸ ENGEL Pál, « The Age of the Angevins », in Peter F. SUGAR, Peter HANÁK and Tibor FRANK (ed.), *A History of Hungary*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1990, p. 37-42.

¹⁹ KRISTÓ Gyula, *Az Anjou-kor háborúi* (The Wars of the Angevin Period), Budapest, Zrínyi Kiadó, 1988, p. 91-161.

edited,²⁰ the research has never been completed with the information revealed by the *Introitus et exitus* volumes and the Avignon registers.

The amount of *servitium* was established by the Apostolic Camera following the assessment of the incomes of consistorial benefices. The sums were always counted in gold florins which was the most frequently used currency in the papal curia. The dioceses of the Hungarian crown were listed among other European dioceses in the taxation books of the Holy See. The prelatures with the highest income – and consequently with the highest sum of *servitium* – were the two archdioceses, Esztergom and Kalocsa with the *servitium* of 2000 florins each, and the dioceses of Pécs and Oradea (Várad) with 3300 (later 3400) and 2000 florins. The two bishoprics with the most modest estimated income were Bosnia and Syrmia with 200 and 100 florins of *servitium*. These two dioceses on the Southern periphery of the Hungarian Kingdom often suffered the consequences of heresy and war, and the continuous succession of bishops could not always be ensured.²¹ Although the amounts listed in table 1. below were used throughout all the examined period, the incomes of the dioceses of Nitra and Veszprém were on one occasion revised in 1336. The appraisal was carried out by two tax collectors, Jacob, son of Berengar (Jacobus Berengarii) and Jacob of Lengres (Jacobus de Lengres).²² It is not clear why the examination was initiated, but the sums of the *servitium* for both bishoprics remained unchanged.²³ Compared to other European archdioceses and dioceses, the taxes of the Hungarian church seem moderate. The amount of *servitium* for the patriarchate of Aquileia and that of the archbishopric of Salzburg was 10,000 florins this time, the archbishops of Gniezno in Poland paid 5000, while the bishop of Avignon 1850 florins.²⁴

1. Table:²⁵

²⁰ LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (dir.), *Cameralia Documenta Pontificia de Regnis Sacrae Coronae Hungariae (1297-1536)*, t. I–II, Budapest/Rome, Gondolat, 2014.

²¹ On the history of the two bishoprics see TERNOVÁ CZ Bálint, « A boszniai latin püspökség története 1344-ig (The history of the Latin Bishopric of Bosnia until 1344) », in FÁBIÁN Laura, GÁL Judit, HARASZTI SZABÓ Péter and UHRIN Dorottya (ed.), *Micae Mediaevales V*, Budapest, ELTE BTK Történettudományok Doktori Iskola, 2016, p. 215-228; and TERNOVÁ CZ Bálint, « A szerémi latin püspökség alapításának és korai történetének vitás kérdései (Disputed questions around the foundation and early history of the Latin bishopric of Sirmium) », *Századok* n° 147, 2013/2, p. 457-470.

²² CARRAZ Damien, « Les Lengres à Marseille au XIV^e siècle. Les activités militaires d'une famille d'armateurs dans un port de croisade », *Revue historique* n° 652, 2009/4, p. 755-777.

²³ AAV Cam. Ap. Oblig. et sol. 6, fol. 149r, 14, fol. 30v, 16, fol. 24v; LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 13. (n° 22.)

²⁴ EUBEL Conrad, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, I, Monasterii, Sumptibus et typis librariae Regensbergianae, 1913, p. 99, 123, 265. and 432.

²⁵ The table was originally published in LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. XLVII-XLVIII. The sums are counted in gold florins.

	Diocese	The amount of <i>servitium</i> in the 14 th century	Estimated annual income in the 14 th century
archbishopric	Esztergom	2000	6000
	Kalocsa–Bács	2000	6000
bishopric	Pécs	3300	9900
		3400	10200
	Oradea (Várad)	2000	6000
	Transylvania	1500	4500
	Veszprém	900	2700
	Csanád	900	2700
	Győr	800	2400
	Eger	800	2400
	Vác	500	1500
	Zagreb	400	1200
	Nitra (Nyitra)	275	825
	Bosnia	200	600
	Syrmia (Szerém)	100	300

The abbacies are not included in the list, as the lack of sources thwarts most of the attempts to identify the abbots in the 14th century. Only the leaders of the most important monasteries are known to the historians. Until 1350, the Apostolic Camera recorded one sole obligation from a Hungarian abbot: that of William of Pannonhalma in 1333.²⁶ Although a growing number of abbots of different monasteries (Bakonybél,²⁷ Hronský

²⁶ 28. 05. 1333.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl. et sol. 6, fol. 126v, 14, fol. 11v; 16, fol. 4r; LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 12. (n° 19.)

²⁷ Obligation: 04. 09. 1354.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 22, fol. 161v, 27, fol. 96r, 29, fol. 106v, BAV Borghese 125, fol. 155v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 29. (n° 50.); part of the payment 09. 04. 1359.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 39, fol. 59r, 33, 75r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 225. (n° 408.)

Beňadik/Garamszentbenedek,²⁸ Szekszárd,²⁹ Pécsvárad³⁰) appear in the *Obligaciones et solutiones* books of the second half of the century, the data are still insufficient to draw general conclusions. Because of this peculiarity of the source base, the research must be focused on the archbishoprics and bishoprics. It is also necessary to exclude the dioceses in Dalmatia which were occupied for shorter or longer time by the Angevin rulers of Hungary. On one hand, the extent of the occupation – especially if we consider the territory where the Hungarian kings exercised *de facto* rule – was different during Charles I's and Louis I's reign, and more importantly, regardless of the military situation, these dioceses were not incorporated into the Hungarian ecclesiastical system. In order to prevent the scattering of the data, I have also decided to not include those elected or nominated archbishops or bishops in the research who did not take the obligation oath. The lack of confirmation by the papal curia could result from different factors. Sometimes the office time of the prelate was too short to follow the official procedure, e.g. due to swift translation to another prelature or death of the candidate.³¹ However, sometimes even recognized prelates failed to pay the beneficial tax due to similar reasons. For example, a former papal tax collector, Galhard (Galhardus de Carceribus)³² was nominated by pope Clement VI within a short period to two different Hungarian bishoprics (first Csanád in 1344,³³ then Veszprém in 1345³⁴), and although he took the obligation oaths, he did not pay *servitium* for any of his Hungarian prelatures. The explanation for the failure of payment was most probably the fact that Galhard could occupy neither of the episcopal sees due to the objection of the Hungarian king.³⁵ On the other hand, a counterexample can also be

²⁸ For his obligation see 29. 11. 1355.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 22, fol. 178v, 27, fol. 109r, BAV Borghese 125, fol. 168v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 30. (n° 52.)

²⁹ 16. 07. 1365.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 35, fol. 93r, 36, fol. 147r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 38. (n° 67.), part of the payment: 04. 04. 1366.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 37, fol. 168r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 235. (n° 433.)

³⁰ For the absolution see 17. 07. 1369.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 36, fol. 227v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 42. (n° 74.)

³¹ According to the statutes of John XXII from 1331 and 1332, if a prelature became vacant twice in the same year, the *servitium* had to be paid only once. BAUMGARTEN Paul Maria, *Untersuchungen und Urkunden*, *op. cit.*, CVIII.

³² SZCZUR Stanisław, « Papal collectors and state power in Central Europe during the fourteenth century », in GÓRECKI Piotr and Nancy VAN DEUSEN (ed.), *Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages. A Cultural History*, London/New York, I. B. Tauris, 2009. p. 130-136.

³³ For his obligation see 23. 08. 1344. 08. 23.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 6, fol. 220r, 14, fol. 89v, 16, fol. 100v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 16-17. (n° 28.)

³⁴ For his obligation see 25. 05. 1345.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 14, fol. 99v, 16, fol. 108v, BAV Borghese 125, fol. 7 r-v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 18. (n° 30.)

³⁵ Louis I's disapproval is mostly explained by the fact that the bishops of Veszprém were traditionally the chancellor of the queens. The Hungarian king presumably sought to ensure that this politically significant position was occupied by one of his confidants. AAV Reg. Vat. 139, fol. 228v-229r. ep. 1011-1012, THEINER Augustin, *Vetera monumenta Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, I, Romae, Typis Vaticanis, 1859, p. 711-712. (n° MLXXIV)

mentioned: Jacques de Corvo, confessor of the French queen Clémence settled the entire sum of the *servitium* for the bishopric of Zagreb, although he was presumably unable to exercise his episcopal powers.³⁶ It also has to be mentioned that the papal recognition could be denied based on political reasons, nevertheless, this scarcely happened in case of the 14th-century Hungarian clergy. In this way, the number of the Hungarian archbishops and bishops who entered into office between 1301 and 1378, made the obligation in the curia and paid, or paid without obligation, or who were confirmed, but neither the obligation, nor the payment survived can be altogether estimated approximately 100.

The sources have revealed some distinct tendencies in the *servitium* payments of the Hungarian archbishops and bishops. First of all, the dividing line between the two halves of the century can be observed not only in the accounting practices of the Apostolic Camera, but also in the way how the *servitium* payments were settled.³⁷ Until the late 1340s, the *servitium* was typically paid at the time of the obligation, or shortly after. The prelates usually paid the tax in one sum, or in up to two instalments. Some of the prelates visited the curia and paid personally – such as Thomas, archbishop of Esztergom in 1309,³⁸ Ladislaus, archbishop of Kalocsa in 1317,³⁹ Peter⁴⁰ and Laurence bishops of Bosnia in 1317 and in 1336,⁴¹ Laurence, bishop of Vác in 1318,⁴² and Nicholas, bishop of Eger in 1330⁴³ – but often procurators were nominated who

³⁶ For the papal documents related to his promotion to the bishopric of Zagreb see 21. 08. 1322.: AAV Reg. Vat. 73, ep. 735. (AAV Reg. Av. 17, fol. 272v); THEINER Augustin, *Vetera monumenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 479–480. (n° DCCXXXII–DCCXXXIII); and 03. 09. 1322.: THEINER Augustin, *Vetera monumenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 481. (n° DCCXXXIV) For his obligation see 24. 11. 1322.: AAV Obl. et sol. 5, fol. 49v, 6, fol. 33v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 9. (n° 13.); for the payment effectuated see 02. 03. 1324.: AAV Cam. Ap. Intr. et ex. 57, fol. 13r, 58, fol. 12r. Jacques de Corvo later became bishop of Cornouaille (1326–1330), then bishop of Toulon (1330–1341). Eubel Conrad, *Hierarchia catholica*, *op. cit.*, I., p. 211, 487.

³⁷ The end of Benedict XII's reign (1342) was interpreted as a dividing line in the *servitium* payment of the English bishops as well. Harvey Katherine, *Episcopal Appointments in England, c. 1214–1344. From Episcopal Election to Papal Provison*, London/New York, Routledge, 2016, p. 145.

³⁸ 07. 06. 1309.: AAV Cam. Ap. Intr. et Ex. 75, fol. 2v.

³⁹ 12. 08. 1317.: AAV Obl. et sol. 5, fol. 10v, 6, fol. 8v; LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 6. (n° 7.)

⁴⁰ 23. 09. 1317.: AAV Obl. et sol. 5, fol. 12r, 6, fol. 9v; LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 7. (n° 8.)

⁴¹ 1336. 12. 11.: AAV Obl. et sol. 6, fol. 153v, 14, fol. 33v, 16, fol. 27v; LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 14. (n° 23.)

⁴² 10. 05. 1318.: AAV Obl. et sol. 5, fol. 19r, 6, fol. 15r; LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 7. (n° 9–10.)

⁴³ 10. 10. 1330.: AAV Obl. et sol. 6, fol. 96v; LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 11. (n° 17.)

were mainly clerics from the diocese of the candidate.⁴⁴ The personnel of the curia were rarely hired for the representation of Hungarian prelates until the end of the 1340s.⁴⁵

The data from the second half of the century differs in a lot of aspects from the earlier practices. The payment rarely started immediately, most frequently the prelates sent the first remittance one year after the registration of the obligation. It also became very common to pay in instalments. Some archbishops or bishops paid throughout all their office time. An extreme example for such a case could be Thomas of Telegd, bishop of Csanád from 1351 to 1358 who settled his *servitium* payment in ten parts,⁴⁶ the last of which he paid when he had already been promoted to the archbishopric of Kalocsa.⁴⁷ Although it was still usual to send procurators from the diocese, hiring permanent members of the curia to manage the *servitium* was more and more prevalent.⁴⁸ We can suppose that the concomitance of several factors led to these changes in

⁴⁴ For example, Paul, canon of Kalocsa as the procurator of Stephen, archbishop of Kalocsa: 29. 03. 1305.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl. et sol. 2, fol. 33r; LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 197. (n° 338.); or Emeric, cantor of Bács and Stephen, canon of Kalocsa representing Vince, archbishop of Kalocsa: 28. 04. 1311.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl. et sol. 2, fol. 85r; LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 198. (n° 340.)

⁴⁵ Petrus de Pontecorvo, *scriptor papae*, canon of Aquino paid as a procurator of Ladislaus, archbishop of Kalocsa in 1319 [02. 04. 1319.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl. et sol. 5, fol. 92r; LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 198-199. (n° 342.)] and in 1322 as procurator of Andrew, bishop of Transylvania [30. 03. 1322.: LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 199-200. (n° 345.)]. Petrus de Verulis, *scriptor papae*, canon of Veroli, Troppau and Cracow, chamberlain of cardinal Luca Fieschi, represented Csanád, archbishop of Esztergom in 1331 [04. 02. 1331.: LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 11. (n° 18.)]; William, abbot of Pannonhalma in 1333 (AAV Cam. Ap. Obl. et sol. 17. fol. 1-19); and Vid, bishop of Nitra in 1336 (AAV Intr. et ex. 150, fol. 14).

⁴⁶ His obligation is dated to 27. 01. 1351.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 23, fol. 120r, 27, fol. 44r, BAV Borghese 125, fol. 106r; LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 27. (n° 46.) The first installment was paid one year later: 07. 01. 1352.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 26, fol. 188v, 28, fol. 62v; LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 207. (n° 362.) Then the rest followed: 03. 07. 1352.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 26, fol. 216r, 28, fol. 90r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 208-209. (n° 366.); 14. 10. 1353.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 30, fol. 2r, AAV Reg. Av. 122, fol. 346r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 212. (n° 375.); 05. 05. 1354.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 30, fol. 28r, AAV Reg. Av. 122, fol. 368v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 213. (n° 377.); 01. 07. 1354. – 25. 12.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 24, fol. 23r, 24r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 214. (n° 379.), fol. 22r; 31. 10. 1354.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 30, fol. 50v, AAV Reg. Av. 122, fol. 386v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 214-215. (n° 381.); 30. 10. 1355.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 30, fol. 87r, AAV Reg. Av. 122, fol. 417v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 217. (n° 386.); 06. 07. 1356.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 30, fol. 118r, AAV Reg. Av. 122, fol. 443r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 218. (n° 389.); 06. 03. 1357.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 30, fol. 140r, AAV Reg. Av. 122, fol. 461r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 220-221. (n° 396.)

⁴⁷ 24. 01. 1360. 01. 24.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 32, fol. 82r, 33, fol. 118v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 226-227. (n° 412.)

⁴⁸ As examples for the curialists who represented Hungarian prelates, we could mention William of Pusterla (Guilelmus de Pusterla), papal chaplain who acted as the procurator of Nicholas, bishop of Pécs (1346–1360): AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 14, fol. 107r, 22, f. 7v, BAV Borghese 125, fol. 15r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 20. (n° 34.); and also Gerard Fabri (Gerardus

the practice of payment, nevertheless, only further research on the process could uncover the exact reasons. Presumably the communication between the Hungarian Kingdom and the Apostolic See improved in general, increasing the frequency of correspondence and delegations in both ways. After the confrontation with Clement VI over the Neapolitan succession, Louis I led several military campaigns from the 1350s which fell in the direct sphere of interest of the papacy, e.g. in Italy against the adversaries of the papal government and against the pagan Lithuania.⁴⁹ These endeavours generated a considerably active diplomatic relationship with last three Avignon popes and probably resulted in an increased Hungarian presence in the Curia. What is more, it was also the second half of the century when curialists of Hungarian origin appeared in Avignon.⁵⁰ It is possible therefore that the Hungarian prelates profited from the improved connectivity to pay more comfortably on the long term by splitting the amount of *servitium* into smaller instalments.

The sources have revealed that the majority of the recognized prelates eventually paid all or some part of the established beneficial tax. The rate of the partially or entirely settled *servitia* grew from the 1350s, however, it is difficult to assess the real extent of the increase due to the loss of sources from the period before 1320. Considering the recognised archbishops of both metropolitan seats of the Hungarian church (namely Esztergom and Kalocsa), we can conclude that all but two prelates effectuated some payment. The two exceptions were two archbishops of Esztergom, Michael (Mihály of Bő, 1303–1304) and John (Johannis de Surdis, 1376–1378). In Michael's case, only the obligation survived, so it would be difficult to decide whether he failed to pay, but John surely remained indebted to the Apostolic Camera, as one of his later successors was obligated to settle the payment posteriorly in 1387.⁵¹ In opposition to the

Fabri), papal scribe who represented Demeter, bishop of Transylvania (1368–1376): AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 35, f. 119r, 36, f. 202r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. (n° 73.)

⁴⁹ HOUSLEY Norman, « King Louis the Great of Hungary and the Crusades, 1342-1382 », *The Slavonic and East European Review* n° 62, 1984/2, p. 192-208.

⁵⁰ The first member of the papal court whose Hungarian origin and contribution to the management of Hungarian cases can be documented was Blasius, son of Andrew of Hungary, a penitentiary of pope Clement VI. His name was several times mentioned in the *Introitus et exitus* books as a recipient of allowances for clothing, e. g. 19. 12. 1347.: AAV Intr. et ex. 250, fol. 183; 13. 06. 1348.: AAV Intr. et ex. 210, fol. 171; and 06. 06. 1349.: AAV Intr. et ex. 260, fol. 177. He was also identified as procurator of John, bishop of Veszprém (1346–1357) in his obligation: 24. 03. 1348.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 22, fol. 38r, BAV Borghese 125, fol. 38v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 21. (36. sz.) The overwhelming majority of the curia consisted of clerics and familiars who came from the present-day France or Italy. The paucity of Hungarian curialists seems less striking, if we consider that even the number of English – a nation probably a lot better connected to the papal court – can be estimated to 24 in the period between 1309 and 1376. BOMBI Barbara, *Anglo-papal Relations in the Early Fourteenth Century. A Study in Medieval Diplomacy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2019, p. 78.

⁵¹ For this information see the obligation of John of Kanizsa, archbishop of Esztergom (1387–1418): 1387. 10. 25.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl. et sol. 48, fol. 94r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 55. n° 96.

archbishops – who seem to have obeyed the papal government – no distinct tendency can be observed in case of the bishops. Nothing indicates, for instance, that the leaders of the affluent bishoprics paid more rigorously than those of the more modest dioceses. It was the diocese of Transylvania whose bishops remitted sums for the *servitium* in the highest proportion, while the bishops of Oradea (Várad) and Győr were the least likely to pay. In addition to the widespread practice of paying in instalments, asking for postponement was considerably common as well, and this concession was granted in the overwhelming majority of the cases. Presumably the delayed payments motivated the Apostolic Camera to make an attempt to increase efficiency, thus, at the end of the 14th century, papal tax collectors were authorized to collect the *servitium* from the prelates. In Hungary, the first collector who was commissioned for such task was Peter, son of Stephen between 1373 and 1375.⁵² It also has to be mentioned that no absolution for archbishops or bishops was recorded in the examined period, only abbots were exempted from the duty of payment. The Apostolic Camera remitted the debts of three abbots, first in 1335 and then twice in 1369: William of Pannonhalma (250 florins),⁵³ the abbot of Pécsvárad⁵⁴ and that of the St. Andrew monastery in Visegrád.⁵⁵

The damage of the sources – especially in the first half of the century – sometimes makes it difficult to differentiate between the cases where the data were lost, and where no payment whatsoever was effectuated. Thus, the complete failure of payment can be considered proven, only if the obligation of a prelate refers to the fact that his predecessor had owed the entire sum of the *servitium* to the Apostolic Camera. In the 14th century, such information was recorded on six occasions: once about the already mentioned John, archbishop of Esztergom,⁵⁶

⁵² For the papal document which appointed Peter as a papal tax collector for the Kingdoms of Hungary and Poland see FRAKNÓI Vilmos (ed.), *Monumenta romana episcopatus Vesprimiensis*, IV, Budapest, Római Magyar Történelmi Intézet, 1907, p. 320. The collector was authorised to issue quittances of the *servitium* payments (20. 01. 1376.), MOLLAT Guillaume, *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Grégoire XI (1370–1378) intéressant les pays autres que la France*, Paris, BEFAR, 1962–1965, n° 3704. On the collector Peter, son of Stephen see FEDELES Tamás, « Petrus Stephani collector apostolicus », in TUSOR Péter, SZOVÁK Kornél and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Magyarország és a római Szentszék II. Vatikáni magyar kutatások a 21. században* (Hungary and the Holy See II. Hungarian Historical Researches of the 21st Century in the Vatican), Budapest/Roma, MTA-PPKE Fraknói Vilmos Római Történelmi Kutatócsoport, 2017, p. 41–42.

⁵³ 20. 07. 1335.: AAV Obl. et sol. 17. fol. 1–19.

⁵⁴ The entry in the *Obligationes et solutiones* book recorded that the monastery of Pécsvárad was not included in the tax books of the camera. 17. 07. 1369.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 36, fol. 227v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 42. (n° 74.)

⁵⁵ 21. 08. 1369.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 36, fol. 229r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 42. (n° 75.) The St. Andrew monastery was founded by king Andrew I (1015–1060) as a monastery of Byzantine rite in the 11th century. The monastery was taken over by the Benedictines in the first half of the 13th century, but later it was deserted. Only at the end of the 14th century was the monastic life revived. ERDÉLYI László and SÖRÖS Pongrác (ed.), *A pannonhalmi Szent-Benedek-Rend története*, XII/B, Budapest, Stephaneum, 1916, p. 47–53.

⁵⁶ 25. 10. 1387.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl. et sol. 48, fol. 94r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 55. n° 96.

once about the bishops of Bosnia,⁵⁷ Csanád⁵⁸ and Oradea (Várad),⁵⁹ and about two bishops of Veszprém.⁶⁰ In the first two cases, the short office time of the prelates can explain the failure of the payment,⁶¹ and in the four remaining examples the nomination of the prelates created some disaccord between the pope and the Hungarian king.⁶²

Although there were no sanctions against the prelates in the above-mentioned incidents, as the successors simply inherited the debts, the established procedure shows that the Apostolic Camera was resolute to take measures in order to discourage dissidence. The text of the obligation oath was reconstructed and published by Adolf Gottlob in the beginning of the 20th century,⁶³ and there are some additional sources which reveal the procedure developed to sanction the failure of payment of the *servitium*. Preserved in the Vatican Apostolic Archives, three manuscripts from the 1340s contain the full authorization given by certain Hungarian prelates to procurators to represent them in front of the Apostolic Camera, take the obligation and eventually pay the *servitium*. The uniformity of the documents indicates the widespread usage of a formula and the fact that the proceedings of the papal curia connected to the *servitium* were already well-established and generally known to the Hungarian high clergy in this period. In these nominations of procurators, the elected prelates declared in their own name, and in the name of their successors that they submit themselves to the jurisdiction of the Apostolic Camera. They put all their possessions and the properties of the diocese at the disposal of the camera, and accepted all decisions and sanctions (suspension, deposition or even major excommunication) taken by the chamberlain against themselves or their successors in case of the failure of payment. They also promised to go to the Curia and not leave until the debt is settled.⁶⁴ The sources do not reveal a great number of cases when the Apostolic See tried to take sanctions. The incident of the abbacy of Pannonhalma, the oldest Benedictine abbacy in

⁵⁷ 04. 04. 1349.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 22, fol. 82r, 23, fol. 80r, 27, fol. 7v, BAV Borghese 125, fol. 71r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 23. (n° 39.)

⁵⁸ 25. 05. 1345.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 14, fol. 99v, 16, fol. 108v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 18-19. (n° 31.)

⁵⁹ 12. 10. 1377.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 43, fol. 51v, AAV Reg. Av. 279, fol. 65v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 50. (n° 88a)

⁶⁰ 25. 05. 1345.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 14, fol. 99v, 16, fol. 108v, BAV Borghese 125, fol. 7 r-v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 18. (n° 30.); 25. 05. 1345.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl et sol. 14, fol. 99v, 16, fol. 108v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 18-19. (n° 31.)

⁶¹ Johannes de Surdis, archbishop of Esztergom died in 1378 after having been promoted in 1376, and Bonjohannes de Campello, bishop of Bosnia was translated to Fermo one year after his nomination as bishop of Bosnia.

⁶² [Galhard (Galhardus de Carceribus, bishop of Csanád 1344–1345), Emeric Czudar, bishop of Várad (1376–1377—Nagy Lajos nem akarta püspöknek) Stephen Harkácsi (Nagy Lajos kalocsai érseknek akarta, nem töltötte be a tisztséget) Veszprém, Galhard (Galhardus de Carceribus, bishop of Veszprém)]

⁶³ GOTTLÖB Adolf, *Die Servitientaxe*, *op. cit.*, p. 161-173.

⁶⁴ Ladislaus, elected archbishop of Kalocsa, 18. 06. 1343.: AAV Inst. Misc. 1620; John, elected bishop of Veszprém, 22. 10. 1346.: AAV Inst. Misc. 1716. and its copy from 25. 10. 1346.: AAV Inst. Misc. 1718.

Hungary reveals the procedure which the curia followed in case of the failure of payment of the *servitium*. The abbot Nicholas was elected in 1319, after a decade of financial difficulties and decadence of monastic life in the abbacy caused by the war of succession. He remained indebted towards the camera with all sum of the *servitium*. The chamberlains of the Apostolic Camera commissioned Thomas, archbishop of Esztergom to compel the abbot to pay. The chamberlains' letter threatens explicitly with suspension, even with excommunication as consequences of the failure of payment. What is more, as it was established in the obligation oath, the abbot was supposed to appear in the papal curia et stay there until the debt is settled. Obviously, the threats did not have the anticipated effect, as the next abbot, William had to oblige himself to pay two *servitia* in 1333: his own and that of his predecessor's (500 florins altogether). At the end, abbot William solicited an absolution of the obligation two years later and he was acquitted from the duty to pay by the Apostolic Camera.⁶⁵ Another example for the application of the procedure was the case of the bishop of Vác in 1320. Berenger, the chamberlain of the cardinals' college⁶⁶ delegated the archbishop of Esztergom (still Thomas) to excommunicate Laurence, bishop of Vác (1318–1328), because he had not settle the *servitium*.⁶⁷ As the obligation of his successor, Rudolf (1329–1341) reveals,⁶⁸ Laurence was indebted to the camera with four-fifth of the required amount, meaning that he paid 100 florins out of 500. The fact that Laurence was sanctioned with excommunication only two years after the beginning of his office time suggests that he probably failed to request a postponement. Two Hungarian ambassadors who were present in the papal curia at the time of the chamberlain's order, Csanád of Telegd provost of Oradea (Várad) and royal chancellor (later archbishop of Esztergom between 1330–1349) and Nicholas, archdeacon of Torda⁶⁹ were commissioned to deliver the mandate.⁷⁰

*

⁶⁵ 20. 07. 1335.: AAV Obl. et sol. 17. fol. 1-19.

⁶⁶ MOREMBERT T. de, « Frédol (Bérenger de) », in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, vol. 18, Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1977, col. 1183.

⁶⁷ 31. 07. 1320.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl. et sol. 5, fol. 114v, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, II., *op. cit.*, p. 317-318. (n° 1409.)

⁶⁸ 19. 06. 1329. 06. 19.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl. et sol. 6, fol. 84r–v, és 10, fol. 22, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, I., *op. cit.*, p. 10. (n° 15.)

⁶⁹ On the mission of Csanád of Telegd and Nicholas, archdeacon of Torda in the papal curia in 1320 see MALÉTH Ágnes, *A Magyar Királyság és a Szentszék*, *op. cit.*, p. 46-58.

⁷⁰ 06. 08. 1320.: AAV Cam. Ap. Obl. et sol. 5, fol. 115r, LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta*, II., *op. cit.*, p. 318-319. (n° 1410.)

Although the period before 1320 is characterized by the loss of sources, the data from the later decades of the 14th century enables us to draw some general conclusions on the *servitium* payments of the Hungarian prelates. The results show that the Apostolic See was more successful in realizing its interests than the Hungarian historians earlier thought. It has usually been supposed that the peripheric location of the Hungarian Kingdom and principally the authoritative ecclesiastical policy of the Anjou dynasty prevented the Apostolic See from exercising an effective government in the Hungarian Kingdom in the 14th century.⁷¹ However, the results suggest that the Avignon papacy – just as it has been observed in connection with the Western European church⁷² – attempted to reinforce its control over the ecclesiastical benefices, even in the Hungarian Kingdom. An important step in this process was the meticulous collection of the beneficial taxes, and due to its value, especially the payment of the *servitium* – the tax levied on the consistorial benefices – was given a special attention. In order to reveal the tendencies of the Hungarian prelates' *servitium* payments in the 14th century, the research has been focused on three archival fonds of the Vatican Apostolic Archives, namely the *Obligationes et solutiones* and the *Introitus et exitus* books of the Apostolic Camera, and the Avignon Registers. The sources have indicated that the majority of the Hungarian prelates – archbishops and bishops, as information on the abbots is scarce in the period – paid some part or all of the *servitium*. The practice of payment shows basic differences in the two halves of the century, especially in the aspects whether the *servitium* was settled by the prelate himself, by his procurators from the diocese in question or by curialists, and whether the tax was paid in one sum or in instalments. Absolution from the duty of payment was granted only three times, and only to abbots. On the other hand, postponement was frequently conceded, sometimes multiple times for the same payment. To manage the problematic cases, especially the failure of payment, the Apostolic Camera developed a strict procedure which became widely known before the middle of the century. However, it can be considered proven that the prelate did not pay only in six cases, and the Curia took sanctions only twice; both times the archbishop of Esztergom was delegated to enforce the payment, or excommunicate the indebted prelate.

⁷¹ For a historiographical summary of the topic see Maléth Ágnes, *A Magyar Királyság és a Szentszék, op. cit.*, p. 13-21.

⁷²

Bibliography

- BAUMGARTEN Paul Maria, *Untersuchungen und Urkunden über die Camera Collegium Cardinalium für die Zeit von 1295 bis 1437*, Leipzig, Giesecke und Devrient, 1898.
- BOMBI Barbara, *Anglo-papal Relations in the Early Fourteenth Century. A Study in Medieval Diplomacy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2019.
- CAILLET Louis, *La papauté d'Avignon et l'Église de France*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de Paris, 1975.
- CARRAZ Damien, « Les Lengres à Marseille au XIV^e siècle. Les activités militaires d'une famille d'armateurs dans un port de croisade », *Revue historique* n° 652, 2009/4, p. 755-777.
- CSUKOVITS Enikő, « Introduzione. La dinastia degli Angiò e l'Ungheria », in Enikő Csukovits (ed.), *L'Ungheria angioina*, Viella, Roma, 2013.
- ENGEL Pál, « The Age of the Angevins », in Peter F. Sugar, Peter Hanák and Tibor Frank (ed.), *A History of Hungary*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1990, p. 37-42.
- ERDÉLYI László, SÖRÖS Pongrác (ed.), *A pannonhalmi Szent-Benedek-Rend története*, XII/B, Budapest, Stephaneum, 1916.
- EUBEL Conrad, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, I, Monasterii, Sumptibus et typis librariae Regensbergianae, 1913.
- FAYEN Arnold (ed.), *Lettres de Jean XXII (1316–1334)*, I, Paris, H. Champion, 1908.
- FEDELES Tamás, « The Apostolic Camera and the Hungarian Church Benefices during the Conciliarist Era », in Attila Bányai (ed.), *Das Konzil von Konstanz und Ungarn*, Debrecen, Kapitális, 2016, p. 213-236.
- FRAKNÓI Vilmos (ed.), *Monumenta romana episcopatus Vesprimiensis*, IV, Budapest, Római Magyar Történelmi Intézet, 1907.
- GOTTLOB Adolf, *Die Servientaxe im 13. Jahrhundert. Eine Studie zur Geschichte des päpstlichen Gebührenwesens*, Stuttgart, Verlag von Ferdinand Enke, 1908.
- GUILLEMAIN Bernard, *Les recettes et les dépenses de la Chambre apostolique pour la quatrième année du pontificat de Clément V: 1308–1309: Introitus et Exitus 75*, Rome, Bocard, 1978.
- HOUSLEY Norman, « King Louis the Great of Hungary and the Crusades, 1342-1382 », *The Slavonic and East European Review* n° 62, 1984/2, p. 192-208.
- KIRSCH Johann Peter, *Die Finanzverwaltung des Kardinalkollegiums im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert*, Münster, Verlag von Heinrich Schöningh, 1895.

- KISS Gergely, « Les légats pontificaux en Hongrie au temps des rois Angevins (1298-1311) », in Zoltán Kordé and István Petrovics (ed.), *La diplomatie des États Angevins aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*, Roma/Szeged, Accademia d'Ungheria in Roma, p. 101-116.
- KOWALSKI Marek Daniel, *Proventus camerae apostolicae debiti: opłaty duchowienstwa polskiego na rzecz papiestwa w latach 1417–1484*, Kraków, Historia Iagellonica, 2010.
- KRISTÓ Gyula, *Az Anjou-kor háborúi* (The Wars of the Angevin Period), Budapest, Zrínyi Kiadó, 1988.
- LUKCSICS József, TUSOR Péter and FEDELES Tamás (ed.), *Cameralia Documenta Pontificia de Regnis Sacrae Coronae Hungariae (1297-1536)*, t. I–II, Budapest/Rome, Gondolat, 2014.
- LUNT W. E., « The financial system of the medieval papacy in the light of recent literature », *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, n^o 23, 1909/2, p. 285.
- MAILLARD-LUYPAERT Monique, *Papauté, clercs et laïcs. Le diocèse de Cambrai à l'épreuve du Grande Schisme d'Occident (1378–1417)*, Bruxelles, Presses de l'Université de Saint-Louis, 2001.
- MALÉTH Ágnes, *A Magyar Királyság és a Szentszék kapcsolata I. Károly korában (1301–1342)* [The Relationship of the Hungarian Kingdom and the Holy See in the Time of Charles I (1301–1342)], Pécs, Molnár Nyomda, 2020.
- MOREMBERT T. de, « Frédo (Bérenger de) », in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, vol. 18, Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1977, col. 1183.
- RENOUARD Yves, *La papauté à Avignon*, Plouédern, Éditions Jean-Paul Gisserot, 2003.
- SZCZUR Stanisław, « Papal collectors and state power in Central Europe during the fourteenth century », in GÓRECKI Piotr and Nancy VAN DEUSEN (ed.), *Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages. A Cultural History*, London/New York, I. B. Tauris, 2009. p. 130-136.
- TERNOVÁČZ Bálint, « A boszniai latin püspökség története 1344-ig (The history of the Latin Bishopric of Bosnia until 1344) », in Fábrián Laura, Gál Judit, Haraszi Szabó Péter and Uhrin Dorottya (ed.), *Micae Mediaevales V*, Budapest, ELTE BTK Történettudományok Doktori Iskola, 2016, p. 215-228.
- TERNOVÁČZ Bálint, « A szerémi latin püspökség alapításának és korai történetének vitás kérdései (Disputed questions around the foundation and early history of the Latin bishopric of Sirmium) », *Századok* n^o 147, 2013/2, p. 457-470.
- THEINER Augustin, *Vetera monumenta Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, I, Romae, Typis Vaticanis, 1859.
- WEAKLAND John E., « Administrative and Fiscal Centralization under Pope John XXII, 1316–1334 », *The Catholic Historical Review*, n^o 54, 1968/2, p. 285-310.

ZSOLDOS Attila, « Province e oligarchi. La crisi del potere reale ungherese fra il XIII e il XIV secolo », in Enikő Csukovits (ed.), *L'Ungheria angioina*, Viella, Roma, 2013, p. 23-58.