The papal government was characterized by centralization in the 14th century in which the tax system and the papal beneficial policy were two main factors. The Avignon popes strived to extend their influence on every stratum of the ecclesiastical hierarchy by rewarding the members of the curia’s developing administrative system with benefices in the local churches. The changes in the functioning of the papal curia offered a great opportunity for a growing number of qualified clerics to build successful careers in the papal service.

The process briefly described above had an impact on the contemporary ecclesiastical structure of the Hungarian Kingdom, as more and more clerics tried to obtain benefices with papal protection, especially in the second half of the 14th century. Soon not only papal officers, but cardinals and the members of their entourage held Hungarian ecclesiastical titles as well. The main aim of the present paper is to analyse the lifespan of a curialist, Petrus Begonis. First procurator of cardinal Guillaume de la Jugie, later papal chaplain, Petrus Begonis was granted various church offices – also in the Hungarian Kingdom – and charged with diverse diplomatic tasks in different parts of Europe (Hungary, Holy Roman Empire, Italy). His ecclesiastical career – spanning from the reign of Clement VI to that of Urban VI – gives an insight in the functioning of the papal curia in Avignon and helps us comprehend the administrative changes in the 14th century.
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* This paper was conceived based on my research supported by the „Pápai megbízottak a 14. századi Magyarországon – online adattár – Papal delegates in Hungary in the XIVth century – online database (NKFIH NN 124763)” /2017–2021/ project.

1 The centralization of the Avignon popes is occasionally considered as a strive for legitimacy. In this interpretation, centralized power was meant to compensate for the constant absence of the popes from Rome (and from Italy in general), and the mysticism associated with the Eternal City was replaced by the idea of the supreme pontiff. ROLLO-KÖSTER 2015. p. 149.
concentration of the Holy See’s power was the result of a long process established by the reforms of Gregory VII and Innocent III, but it was also prompted by the long-term absence of the papal court from Italy that compelled the papal Curia to restructure its finances in order to supplement its income. Thus, the Avignon popes introduced new tax types and enforced a more consistent collection of the already existing fees, especially that of the payments imposed on ecclesiastical benefices. The implementation of the reforms increased the number of the administrative personnel which offered opportunity for a growing number of qualified clerics to build successful careers in the papal service, but also added to the costs of the Curia.

The process briefly described above inevitably influenced the beneficial policy of the Holy See. To remunerate the members of the Curia’s developing administrative system, the Avignon popes intensified their control over the collation of the benefices, even in European countries which could be considered earlier as peripheric in the papal policy. The changes also had an impact on the contemporary ecclesiastical structure of the Hungarian Kingdom, as more and more clerics tried to obtain church benefices with papal protection, especially in the second half of the 14th century. Soon, not only papal officers, but cardinals and the members of their entourage held Hungarian ecclesiastical titles as well. Guillaume de la Jugie, a nephew of Clement VI (1342–1352) and cousin of Gregory XI (1370–1378) was probably one of the most successful prelates in accumulating benefices (cumulatio beneficiorum): only in the Hungarian Kingdom he held fourteen of them. The Hungarian ecclesiastical titles of de la Jugie were first mentioned in

---

2 The centralization of power also fits the general political trend of the era, as secular monarchies showed similar tendencies in government. FAVIER 2006. p. 181–182.
3 The extension of the papal reservation served as the legal basis for the process. MOLLAT 1912. p. 383–388.
4 The popes thus tried to appoint their own candidates not only to consistorial benefices, but they also actively interfered in the decisions concerning the ecclesiastical offices of middle and lower ranks. In beneficia cases, the growing importance of the papal court is reliably indicated in the 14th century by the increase in the number of expectatives and provisions, supplications and appeals to the Curia, and the appointment of conservators and judge delegates. On the office of conservators see HÉNAFF 1997. p. 71–88; HÉNAFF 2000. p. 283–308; HÉNAFF 2005. p. 341–353. On judge delegates see HERDE 2002. 20–43; BARABÁS 2013. p. 175–199. On the cases which concerned Hungarian benefices and were managed by conservators or judge delegates in the first half of the 14th century see MALÉTH 2020. p. 89–120, 121–126.
5 HC I. p. 18, 41, 51.
6 From the de la Jugie family two brothers Guillaume and Pierre became cardinals. Through their mother, they were related to two popes of the Avignon period: Clement VI was their uncle and Gregory XI their cousin. Guillaume de la Jugie was created cardinal deacon of S. Maria in Cosmedin in 1342 by Clement VI, and then he became cardinal presbyter of S. Clement in 1368. According to Anne-Marie Hayez, who studied the de la Jugie family, Guillaume de la Jugie resided continuously in Avignon until his death (1374), except on two occasions (his legations in Castile and Aragon between 1355 and 1358, and his visit to Rome with Pope Urban V). Hayez 1980–1981. p. 25–27. On his Hungarian benefices see C. TÓTH 2019. p. 138; REDELES 2005. p. 463–464. (Nr. 396); THOROCZKAY 2014. p. 346–347.
the sources in 1343. Afterwards, the cardinal’s name appeared frequently in papal letters related to the Neapolitan question – the marriage and coronation of prince Andrew – and de la Jugie was mentioned several times as a participant of the negotiations. Although papal sources mention that de la Jugie was a zealous supporter of the interests of the Hungarian king in the papal court, it is better to handle this piece of information critically. Nevertheless, the cardinal was one of Clement VI’s closest confidants – and as such, he often assisted the pope in handling matters of the highest priority –, still he needed the goodwill of Louis I to claim the Hungarian benefices bestowed on him by the pope.

Cardinal de la Jugie sought to secure Hungarian church benefices not only for himself, but for some members of his familia as well. One of his familiares was a cleric named Pétrus Begonis, who – in addition to having Hungarian benefices – visited the Hungarian Kingdom several times, first as the cardinal’s representative and later as papal nuncio. As Pétrus Begonis’ activity in the papal court was outstandingly long (approximately five decades, from the time of Clement VI to Urban VI) and his career is a good example of the opportunities offered by the Curia, I believe it is worth examining his lifepath in detail. For ambitious clerics like Petrus Begonis, the administrative reforms of the 14th century created favourable circumstances, as the importance of (legal, financial, theological) expertise grew significantly. Simultaneously, professionalization of the officers and establishment of procedures were also taking place in the everyday procedures of the papal court. Not only the most important offices of the Curia (Cancellaria Apostolica, Camera Apostolica), but
also the prestigious courts of the cardinals employed a growing number of qualified clerics. Studies on the papal Curia have shown that while the kinship of the reigning pope determined the composition of the College of Cardinals and the papal family, the members of the cardinals’ entourage were not chosen based on blood relations. The factors which facilitated the advancement in a cardinal’s familia were mainly individual qualities and a network of contacts (i.e. recommendations).\(^{14}\) This theory is supported by the results of the examination of the court of cardinal Guillaume de la Jugie: although the cardinal himself was of Limousin origin, the members of his entourage mainly came from the north of present-day France and the Paris region, many from central and southern France, and from Italy and Spain.\(^{15}\) In this respect, Petrus Begonis’ case was not unique either, as his family lived in Castres, in the southern Languedoc region.\(^{16}\)

To determine the place of Petrus Begonis in the familia of Guillaume de la Jugie, the best is to take Pierre Jugie’s functional division of the cardinals’ entourage as a starting point. The French specialist of the Avignon papacy distinguished four groups of familiares in his study on Guy de Boulogne’s court: 1.) clerics (chapel clergy, Bible readers, etc.) who performed liturgical duties; they made up slightly more than half of the cardinals’ entourage; 2.) administrative personnel (chancellery, secretariat, chambers, auditors of the cardinal’s curia, etc.); 3.) domestic servants (housekeepers, doctors, etc.) and 4.) security guards. The second (administrative) group included the familiares who represented the cardinal in his benefices\(^ {17}\) – like Petrus Begonis in the case of Guillaume de la Jugie.\(^ {18}\) However, it seems that Petrus Begonis advanced from the role of simple representative, since in 1345 he was already mentioned as the cardinal’s chaplain and commensalis familiaris.\(^ {19}\)

Petrus Begonis can be identified in the papal sources from 1343, when he was described as a cleric from the diocese of Limoges.\(^ {20}\) The titles used in the documents make it clear that he had legal qualification, although due to the lack of data it is not possible to determine which university he studied at. Initially,

\(^{14}\) According to Bernard Guillemain’s estimation, a cardinal’s familia in the Avignon period could count one thousand members, half of whom were clerics. Guillemain 2003. p. 7–11.


\(^{16}\) This information is given in a supplication submitted by cardinal de la Jugie on behalf of Petrus Begonis’ brother, Vincentius. Vincentius was granted a canonry in the church of Albi, near Castres, at the request of the cardinal. 22 March 1349: AAV Reg. Suppl. 17, fol. 216r; MPV III. p. 322–323. (Nr. 324.); FEDELES 2007. p. 27; FEDELES 2018. p. 584. Later, Petrus Begonis requested indulgence for the congregation of the church of S. Maria Magdalena in Castres, which was approved by the pope for a period of one year and forty days. 11 July 1351: MVB I. p. 710. (Nr. 1357.)


\(^{18}\) See below the commissions of Petrus Begonis as procurator of cardinal de la Jugie in Hungary.

\(^{19}\) See the document about the representation of de la Jugie cited above. 10 June: AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 137, fol. 26v, ep. 73–76 (MNL OL DF 291796), THEINER I. p. 654. (Nr. DCCCCLXXIX.)
Curialists and Hungarian Church Benefices in the 14th Century

he was mentioned as *baccalarius in legibus*21 (and once as *baccalarius in iure civili*, 134622), and later also as *licentiatus*. At the beginning of his ecclesiastic career, Petrus Begonis acquired dignities in the Hungarian and Polish Kingdoms.24 He first became canon of Wrocław (1345–1346),25 later *cancellarius* of the same church (1348–1382).26 In 1348, he was appointed canon of Cracow;27 however, it seems probable that he was unable to exercise his rights for this benefice for some time.28 On the other hand, he did actually occupy the archdeaconate of Zemplén and the canonry of Eger in 1350, which had been reserved for him in 1349.29 At least this is what we can suppose from the fact that he paid the *annata* to the papal tax collectors.30 He exchanged the

---


22 AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 140, fol. 152 v–153 r, ep. 663–664 (MNL OL DF 291857); LCPC CL VI I. p. 157. (Nr. 1246.);


27 14 June 1348: AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 189, fol. 21 r, ep. 47; MVB I. p. 566. (Nr. 999.);

28 Until the publication of the papal letter which reserved the archdeaconate of Zemplén for Petrus Begonis (25 February 1349, see below) he was not able to occupy his canonry in Cracow; this happened only in 1350. KOWALSKI 1996. p. 241.

29 25 February 1349: AAV Reg. Suppl. 17, fol. 158; MPV III. p. 322–323. (Nr. 323.);

30 Petrus Begonis paid the papal tax collectors 125 and 30 florins as *annata* of the canonry in Eger and the archdeaconate of Zemplén. These offices had become vacant with the death of John, son of Demeter. 27 December 1351: AAV Cam. Ap., Collect., vol. 181, fol. 123 r; Mon Vat I/1. p. 449. The pope repeated the donation of the mentioned benefices on the same day. MVB I. p. 730. (Nr. 1411.)
archdeaconate of Zemplén in 1353 for a canonry in Esztergom (1353–1366). From the end of the 1350s, the geographical focus of Petrus Begonis’ ecclesiastical career changed; he gradually exchanged his benefices in Poland and Hungary for Western European ones. For a long time, he was archdeacon of Aure in the diocese of Commignes (1353–1370). He also held minor ecclesiastical benefices in France, such as the rectorship in Jobia (diocese of Gap, 1363) then in Combé (diocese of Béziers, 1370), and a canonry and prebend in the church of S. Stephanus de Tescone (diocese of Montauban, 1370), but he was also granted the expectative rights for a prebend in Commignes (1368), and obtained a canonry and a prebend in Liège (1372) and Paris (1375). In 1370 he was appointed archdeacon of Condroz in the diocese of Liège, for which he had to give up his Polish benefices. However, Petrus Begonis’s representatives were unable to claim this dignity due to the opposition of the chapters’ members. Thus, the pope

---

31 Petrus Begonis was given the canonry of Esztergom, which Andrew, son of Demeter had resigned at the same time in the papal Curia. According to the papal grant, he retained his expectative right for the archdeaconate of Aure and was also allowed to retain his canonries in Cracow and Eger. 26 April 1353: AAV Reg. Aven., vol. 121, fol. 140r–v (MNL OL DF 289417); THEINER II. p. 6. (Nr. XII.) On 26 April 1353, Petrus Begonis paid 27 florins as annata to the papal tax collectors for the canonry of Esztergom. AAV Cam. Ap. Collect., vol. 181, fol. 117; Mon Vat I/2. p. 442; C. TÓTH 2019. p. 194; KOLLÁNYI 1900. p. 57. The canonry in Esztergom, vacated by the resignation of Petrus Begonis, was given to another cleric in 1366. AAV Cam. Ap. Collect., vol. 182, fol. 56; Mon Vat I/1. p. 465.

32 This canonry in Eger vacated in this way was given to Stephen, son of Blasius of Ciiil. 22 July 1370: AAV Reg. Aven., vol. 171, fol. 198.

33 A papal source from 1371 reveals that the archdeaconate of Aure became vacant when Petrus Begonis was given the archdeaconate of Condroz. 3 February 1371: AAV Reg. Aven., vol. 176, fol. 56.

34 We do not know when Petrus Begonis acquired this benefice. In July 1363 he was already holding it, however, in the same month he renounced it. 11 July 1363: AAV Reg. Aven., vol. 151, fol. 277; 28 July 1363: AAV Reg. Aven., vol. 153, fol. 60.

35 This office did not involve pastoral care and Petrus Begonis renounced it when he obtained the archdeaconate of Condroz. 9 May 1370: AAV Reg. Aven., vol. 172, fol. 123.


37 The condition of the papal grant was that he would renounce his canonry in Eger when he occupied the benefice in the expectative. 13 December 1368: AAV Reg. Aven., vol. 170, fol. 222.

38 This benefice was vacated by the death of Étienne Aubert the younger, cardinal presbyter of the church of S. Laurentius in Lucina. 25 May 1372: AAV Reg. Aven., vol. 183, fol. 217; HC I. p. 43.


40 Meaning his canonry in Cracow and his chancellorship in Wroclaw. 3 July 1370: AAV Reg. Aven., 172, fol. 229. A document dating between 1378 and 1382 reveals that he renounced his benefices in Poland (MVB p. 66–67. /Nr. 87./), which were given in 1396 to Johannes Pomeranus de Prussia, a cleric of King Louis I of Hungary and Queen Elisabeth. 5 April 1396: MVB V. p. 533–534. (Nr. 982.; KOWALSKI 1996. p. 182–183. (Nr. 87.) The promotion of Petrus Begonis to the archdeaconate of Condroz was mentioned by the account book of the collectoria of Cologne. AAV Cam. Ap. Collect., vol. 5, fol. 151v; KIRSCH 1894. p. 352.

appointed conservators to enforce Begonis’s rights. As later papal sources consistently refer to Petrus Begonis as archdeacon of Condroz, we must assume that the problem was eventually resolved.

Petrus Begonis represented cardinal de la Jugie in the Hungarian Kingdom on several occasions. The chronology of his visits – which can be reconstructed from the sources – suggests that he spent longer periods in the Hungary and, given that the cardinal held Polish benefits as well, in the region. He was first commissioned to Hungary by the cardinal in 1343, in connection with the *magisterium* of the houses of the Stephanites in Esztergom and Budafelhévíz. (*magisterium domus cruciferorum sancti Stephani regis de Strigonia et Calidisaquis*).

Petrus’ next visit to Hungary took place two years later, in the autumn of 1345, as it is indicated by Clement VI’s request for the support of Louis I for Begonis acting as the representative of de la Jugie. This document was preceded by a *supplicatio* dating a few days earlier in which de la Jugie asked the pope to grant him the possibility to retain the archdeaconate of Torontál and the canonry of the church of Várad, because his representatives had occupied these ecclesiastical offices before being informed that the cardinal’s special rights for the archdioceses of Esztergom and Kalocsa had been withdrawn in the consistory. The supplication also reported that Louis I had earlier prohibited the cardinal’s representatives to enter the Hungarian Kingdom for seven months. Although de la Jugie’s delegates were not named in the supplication, the king’s order was presumably directed against the

---

42 The delegated executors were the deans of the of the church of S. Maria ad gradus (diocese of Cologne) and that of the church of S. Paulus (diocese of Liège), and the archdeacon of Hanonia (Honnecourt, diocese of Cambrai). 9 June 1372: AAV Reg. Aven., vol. 185, fol. 146v.
43 Petrus Begonis – a supporter of Urban VI – was eventually deprived of this title by antipope Clement VII. BERLIÈRE 1906. p. 182.
45 The papal letter asking for support for the cardinal’s procurators was not only addressed to the Hungarian king: Clement VI sent a similar letter to the Hungarian queen and, in connection with the cardinal’s Polish benefices, to the Polish king Casimir and his wife. 10 June 1343: AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 137, fol. 26v–27r [MNL OL DF 291796]; THEINER I. p. 654. (Nr. DCCCCLXXIX.)
47 According to György Bónis’ theory, the reason for the expulsion was the dispute over the bishopric of Vészprém (1344–1345). BÓNIS p. 1961. p. 258–259.
envoys who had left the papal court in the summer of 1343 – meaning John, son Domonkos and Petrus Begonis.\textsuperscript{48}

Next time Petrus Begonis was mentioned in the sources in the autumn of 1346. This time he was delegated to Hungary, because some of the villages belonging to the benefices of cardinal de la Jugie had been burnt.\textsuperscript{49} Petrus probably stayed in Hungary continuously until at least the spring of 1347, when he represented the cardinal in a lawsuit against the Dominican sisters of the Rabbits’ Island (Nyulak szigete, today Margitsziget). The legal conflict between de la Jugie, as the magistrate of the Stefanite houses in Esztergom and Budafelhévíz, and the sisters originated in the ownership of some lands in Budafelhévíz and in the rights for the tithe on certain vineyards. As the representative of the Dominican sisters proved the legitimacy of their claim with older documents, Petrus Begonis renounced the disputed properties on behalf of the cardinal.\textsuperscript{50} After this court case in 1347, Petrus Begonis probably no longer represented the interests in person of de la Jugie in Hungary. A document from 1349 reveals that Petrus ‘delegated’ the management of the cardinal’s Hungarian benefices to a cleric named John.\textsuperscript{51}

Petrus Begonis’ career changed dramatically in the early 1350s, as the talented cleric came to the attention of the pope. From 1351, Begonis was entitled papal chaplain in the sources,\textsuperscript{52} and it seems that this was not only an honorary title, but he left cardinal de la Jugie’s court and started to work directly for the pope. This theory is confirmed by the fact that Petrus Begonis no longer acted as de la Jugie’s representative; as a matter of fact, the documents mention the names of different clerics as the cardinal’s delegates from the end of the 1350s.\textsuperscript{53} On the other hand, Petrus was mainly sent on

\textsuperscript{49} 18 October 1346: AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 140, fol. 152v–153r, ep. 663–664 (MNL OL DF 291857), LCPC CL VI. I. p. 157. (Nr. 1246.) As de la Jugie was a close relative and confidant of pope Clement VI, we cannot exclude the possibility that the king’s resentment caused by the Holy See’s policy after the death of Prince Andrew (September 1345) was behind this conflict.
\textsuperscript{50} A document issued by the chapter of Buda described Petrus Begonis as a person skilled in law \textit{(iuris peritus)}, as procurator and special envoy \textit{(nuntius specialis)} of cardinal de la Jugie. 14 March 1347: MNL OL DL 2873, MES III. p. 622–624. (Nr. 816) This charter transcribed the decision of Thomas, archbishop of Esztergom dating to 24 March 1316, in which he had prohibited the Stefanites to collect tithe of the vineyards in question. For this see MNL OL DL 1866; MES II. p. 722–723. (Nr. 817.); MÁLÉTH 2020. p. 99.
\textsuperscript{51} This is revealed by a document issued in Buda by Ildebrandino Conti, bishop of Padua, deputy of cardinal Gui de Boulogne during his legation to Hungary in 1349. 6 September 1349: MNL OL DF 248989, MES III. p. 696. (Nr. 935.)
\textsuperscript{52} 5 August 1351: AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 145, fol. 35 = AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 244 N, fol. 95, ep. 228B; CVH I/1. p. 69. (Nr. 73, dated to 1352) See also BARABÁS 2021. p. 143.
\textsuperscript{53} In 1357 Johannes Pelros, archdeacon of Arad was the \textit{vicarius generalis procurator} of cardinal de la Jugie. 30 October 1357: MNL OL DF 277381; URKUNDEBUCH II. p. 145–148. (Nr. 729). In 1364, Peter, son of Stephen of Monostor, archdeacon of Szabolcs later papal tax collector, and Johannes Bastardi, canon of Rouen are mentioned as the procurators of the cardinal’s Hungarian benefices. 1 July 1364: AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 246, fol. 244v; THEINER II. p. 61–62. (Nr. CXIV.). For Peter, son of Stephen see PEDELES 2018. p. 575–586. However, a record of the Apostolic Chamber from 1363 considered Petrus Begonis still a close associate of cardinal de la Jugie (\textit{socius domini cardinalis Guillermi}) 22 June 1363: AAV Cam. Ap., Intr. et Ex., vol. 300, fol. 146; AAV Cam. Ap., Intr. et Ex., vol.
papal missions afterwards. Many of these assignments were diplomatic in their nature. In 1351, he was sent by Clement VI to Hungary as nuntius. The mission must have been connected to the agreement that was supposed to be concluded between Queen Joan I of Naples and Louis I. The Hungarian king returned to Buda from his second Neapolitan campaign at the end of October 1350, and negotiations were conducted for almost two years through papal mediation. Petrus Begonis was not entirely unfamiliar with the conflict between the two branches of the Angevin dynasty: a papal letter dated to 1345 states that he had been involved as a representative of cardinal de la Jugie in the diplomatic negotiations which were presumably concerned with the coronation of prince Andrew. However, the commission in 1351 was not prolonged, as Petrus Begonis was back in the papal Curia at the end of the year, paying servitium to the Apostolic Camera on behalf of Michael, bishop of Zagreb.

Petrus Begonis was delegated to the Hungarian Kingdom by the pope on two more occasions. In 1363, according to an entry in the Apostolic Chamber’s Introitus et exitus books, he received 400 gold florins to cover the costs of his mission to Hungary and to the German territories (ad partes Alamannie et Ungarie). Although we have no further details of this commission – neither the purpose nor the outcome of the journey is known –, it is generally considered as a tax collector’s commission in historiography.

302, fol. 15v; KIRSCH 1894. p. 420.
56 The agreement was concluded in late 1352. CSUKOVITS 2019. p. 48.
57 28 September 1345: AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 139, fol. 11v, ep. 446–447 (MNL OL DF291827); LCPC CL VI. II. p. 56. (Nr. 1998–1999.)
59 According to a papal letter of 1359, Petrus Begonis was sent on behalf of Charles, duke of Normandy, and John, count of Poitou: “Karolus dux Normannie [...] et Johannes comes Pictavensis [...] diletos filios Petrum Begonis archidiaconum de Aura in Ecclesia Convenarum, et nobilem virum Stephanum de Fayno militem, laiores presencium, suntios suos pro certis negotiis, sicut accepimus, per eos ministerio vive vocis tue celsitudini exponendis ad presentiam tuam mittant” – 18 February 1359: MDA II. p. 526. (Nr. 396.) The purpose of the delegation is unknown, but it was probably to obtain the support of the Hungarian king for the Kingdom of France, which had been in a difficult situation during the Hundred Years’ War. Another interesting question is why the archdeacon, who was essentially a papal officer, was mentioned by Innocent VI as a representative of the dauphin. Petrus Begonis may have originally been an intermediary between the pope and prince Charles of Normandy, who had ruled as regent since the battle of Poitiers (1356) and was chosen because of his experience in Hungary. I would like to thank Tamás Fedeles for drawing my attention to this papal letter.
61 BERLIÈRE 1906. p. 181.
This assumption is indeed supported by the reference to the Apostolic Chamber in the above-mentioned note (*super certis negotiis ... ipsam Cameram tangentibus*). However, it is contradicted by the fact that there were other tax collectors working in the Hungarian Kingdom at that time, and by the fact that there are no recordings in the sources of the sums collected by Petrus Begonis. The most probable explanation is that the cleric, who at this time had the title of archdeacon of Aure, was responsible for settling the conflict with the Hungarian king over the papal taxes.

More details are known about Petrus Begonis' mission in 1369. This time, Urban V (1362–1370) sent him with John, bishop of Dax from Rome to Louis I and Charles IV (of Luxembourg) (1346/1355–1378) to have the engagement of the Hungarian king's niece, Elizabeth with the emperor's son, Wenceslas annulled. It is highly probable that the papal envoys were additionally instructed to obtain armed support from the Hungarian king for the pope against the Italian powers, particularly against the city of Perugia, which was supported by Bernabò Visconti. During the spring of the same year, Petrus Begonis had also been commissioned to request similar help from Joan I of Naples.

From the 1360s, Begonis recurrently participated in the Holy See's diplomacy. The tasks entrusted to him varied both in terms of the European powers involved and the nature of the affairs. In 1366, for example, the pope delegated him to establish peace between Guiscard Tavelli (Guichard Tavel), bishop of Sion, and the de la Tour brothers, Anthony and John. Tavelli, who enjoyed the support of count Amadeus VI of Savoy, was in continuous conflict with...

---

62 Arnaldus de la Caucina and Johannes de Capraspina. *Mon Vat I/1*, p. lxxi–lxxvii.
63 Louis I. obstructed the work of the papal tax collectors and forbade the collection. Urban V's letters to the Hungarian king and the archbishop of Esztergom: 10 and 12 May: AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 245, fol. 15r–v; *Theiner II*, p. 54–55. (Nr. XCVIII–XCIX); LC U V I, p. 58. (Nr. 420–421.)
64 Jean de Saie (Johannes de Saya) was bishop of Lombez from 1362 to 1363, of Dax from 1363 to 1375, of Agen from 1375 to 1382, and of Albi from 1382 until his death in 1383. He was originally a cleric from Bordeaux, and he was sent to Louis I not only by Urban V, but also by Gregory XI. POMMEROL–MONFRIN 2001. p. 450. (Nr. 383. 8.); HC I, p. 77, 81, 97.
65 Elizabeth was the daughter of prince Stephen, younger brother of Louis I, born of his marriage to Margaret of Bavaria. As the king of Hungary had no children of his own for a long time, Elizabeth was seen as a potential heir to the throne. Accordingly, several dynastic marriage plans had been made before her engagement to Wenceslas, including prince Albert of Austria as a possible candidate. HALÁSZ 2016. p. 93.
66 9 December 1369: AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 250, fol. 7v and fol. 14; *Theiner II*, p. 89–90. (Nr. CLXXI–CLXXII) The papal delegates with the title of *nuntius* received a daily allowance of 8 florins. 11 December 1369: AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 250, fol. 14v. The relationship between Louis I and Charles IV was strained by the issue of succession to the Polish throne: the emperor tried to secure the Polish crown for his own dynasty by betrothing his son Wenceslas to the illegitimate daughter of king Casimir. FRANKÓI 1901. p. 251–253; Pör 1907. p. 37.
67 The city, which rebelled against papal authority in 1369–1370, even hired the notorious mercenary general John Hawkwood to fight the pope. Consequently, Urban V declared a crusade against the city. HOUSLEY 1982. p. 261.
with the de la Tour family, one of the noble families of Valais (Wallis) canton, during his more than thirty years long office time as bishop (1342–1375).\textsuperscript{70} However, just as previous attempts, Begonis’ endeavour to mediate failed due to the intransigence of the opposing parties.\textsuperscript{71}

Petrus also represented the Italian policy of Urban V and Gregory XI as a \textit{nuntius apostolicus} on several occasions. The sources suggest that he was a member of the pope’s entourage while Urban V stayed in Rome (and in Italy) from October 1367 to September 1370.\textsuperscript{72} During this period, Begonis was sent twice to the Holy Roman emperor: first in July 1368, because of Charles IV’s visit to Italy and the coronation as empress of his fourth wife, Elizabeth of Pomerania;\textsuperscript{73} and secondly in December 1369, in connection with the failure of the Luxembourg–Anjou marriage alliance and the military situation in Italy (as detailed above). Subsequently, Petrus was also sent to Rome as papal envoy (1370),\textsuperscript{74} and he negotiated with the doge of Genoa on behalf of pope Gregory XI (1374).\textsuperscript{75}

In addition to his diplomatic assignments, Petrus Begonis was also charged with minor missions by the Apostolic Chamber in the 1360s. In 1364, for example, he had to arrange the transfer of goods reserved for the Chamber from the bequest of the archbishop of Cologne,\textsuperscript{76} and then he had to hand over 4000 gold florins to the representatives of the Alberti Company\textsuperscript{77} in Flanders.\textsuperscript{78} As the pope had sent him to the Hungarian king in the summer of 1363, and a record from February 1364 shows that Petrus Begonis was staying in Cologne at the time,\textsuperscript{79} it seems very likely that he was not in the papal court when the Chamber issued the instructions (in June–July 1364); rather further tasks were added to his already existing delegation. In August and December 1364, he

\textsuperscript{70} The members of the family de la Tour were the lords of Châtillon-le-Bas (in German: Niedergesteln, Switzerland). On the origin and the course of the conflict between Tavelli and the de la Tour brothers see BERCHEM 1899. p. 29–395.
\textsuperscript{71} 10 January 1366: AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 248, fol. 25v, fol. 27. In April of the same year, Urban V tried to bring the negotiations to a successful conclusion by sending another delegate. For the documents relating to the pope’s mediation attempts see BERCHEM 1899. p. 369–393.
\textsuperscript{72} MOLLAT 1912. p. 113–116.
\textsuperscript{74} 19 June 1370: AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 250, fol. 106v.
\textsuperscript{76} 4 June 1364: AAV Reg. Vat., vol. 246, fol. 231r. The archbishop in question could be only Wilhelm von Gennep (Guillelmus de Gennep, 1349–1362), who died in September 1362. His successor Adolf von der Mark (Adolfus de Marka) resigned in 1363, and his successor Engelbert von der Mark (Engelbertus de Marka, 1364–1368) did not take office before the mentioned papal order. HCI I. p. 98; KIRSCH 1894. p. xlv.
\textsuperscript{77} In the second half of the 14th century, the Florentine Alberti company was one of the exclusive bankers to the papal court. ROOVER 1958. p. 14–59.
\textsuperscript{79} The papal tax collector of Cologne recorded with the date of 7 February 1364 that he had given Petrus Begonis – who had resided in this time in Cologne – 100 florins following the instructions of the Apostolic Chamber. AAV Cam. Ap., Collect., vol. 9, fol. 71r–v; KIRSCH 1894. p. 333.
fulfilled his mission and delivered certain sums to the Apostolic Chamber from the bequest of the archbishop of Cologne. His financial and legal expertise was also utilized by the Apostolic Camera in Rome (1369), when he assisted in the papal court's accounting as procurator fiscalis and consiliarius camerae.

Besides, the sources provide data on Begonis' two further commissions which do not fit neither in the category of the diplomatic missions, nor in that of the finance related tasks. First, Clement VI appointed Petrus Begonis as executor in a beneficial case in 1346. The pope allowed Guillelmus Giberti, canon of Pécs, to receive the revenues of his sine cura benefices for three years while being in the service of Galhardus, archbishop of Brindisi. The executors – Petrus Begonis among them – were commissioned to ensure the rights of Guillelmus Giberti. Secondly, Innocent VI delegated Petrus in 1353 to supervise the vassals and properties which Johannes Cantelnum, lord of Bovino, had placed under the protection of the Holy See because of his conflict with Louis I, king of Naples.

In conclusion, it can be stated that Petrus Begonis was an active member of the papal court for decades. His legal qualification and personal qualities

---

83 On the executors of beneficial cases see Hitzbleck 2009; on the executors of beneficial cases concerning Hungarian benefices in the first half of the 14th century see MALÉTH 2020. p. 127–134.
84 Guillelmus Giberti (Gitbérti) cleric from Béziers, was a canon of Pécs, Esztergom and Veszprém, and he also held minor benefices in the archdeaconate of Somogy. He probably arrived in Hungary with the papal tax collectors, as a papal notary. He worked as subcollector of Galhardus de Carceribus. He died in the papal Curia on 19 May 1348. For more information about him see, 20 May 1336: AAV Cam. Ap., Oblig. et Sol., vol. 6, fol. 149r; vol. 14, fol. 30v; vol. 16, fol. 24v; CAMERALIA I. p. 13. (Nr. 22, as a cleric from Béziers who examined the incomes of the dioceses of Nyitra and Veszprém); 13 February 1340: Mon Vat I/1. 417. (as notary working for Petrus Gervasii); 25 March; 1347: AAV Instr. Misc. 1735; THEINER I. p. 736–737. (Nr. MCVI, as canon of Pécs, one of the procurators of John, elected bishop of Veszprém). His canonicities in Pécs, Eger, Esztergom and Veszprém, and his incomes from the chapels in the archdeaconate of Somogy were conferred to different people after his decease, see 25 May 1348: Reg. Suppl. I/2. p. 182–183. (Nr. CCCLXVIII–CCCLXX); 31 January 1352: Reg. Suppl. I/2. p. 232–233. (Nr. CDLXXXVI) Also relating: Reg. Suppl. I/1. p. 228–229, 247; TMÁR 1981. p. 46; C.TÓTH 2019. p. 205. Hungarian historiography tends to identify Guillelmus as bishop of Béziers, although it is never mentioned in any of his supplications that he would have been a prelate. The bishop of Béziers in this time (1313–1349) was Guillaume Frédol, younger brother of cardinal Bérenger Frédol the younger. In my opinion, Guillaume Giberti and Guillaume Frédol can hardly be the same person, especially as the latter died in December 1349. MOREMBERT 1977. col. 1183; HC I. p. 137.
85 Galhardus, the former papal tax collector in Hungary, was archbishop of Brindisi between 1346 and 1348. HCl I. p. 149.
86 7 August 1346: AAV Reg. Aven., vol. 87a, fol. 545r–v, ep. 29 (MNL OL DF 292732)
enabled him to play a significant role, first in the entourage of cardinal de la Jugie, and from the 1350s on as papal chaplain in the service of the pope. He did not reach the top of ecclesiastical hierarchy – he obtained only the office of archdeacon (of Zemplén, Aure and later Condroz) – but he often held several benefices simultaneously. Begonis became a versatile and agile papal representative, who gained diplomatic experience through his missions in various parts of Europe (Holy Roman Empire, Hungarian Kingdom, Italy) and sometimes also managed financial tasks on behalf of the Apostolic Camera. His ecclesiastical career, spanning from the reign of Clement VI to Urban VI, gives an insight into the functioning of the Avignonese Curia and helps to understand the administrative processes of the period.

**Ecclesiastical benefices of Petrus Begonis**

1345–1346: canon of Wrocław
1348–1382: *cancellarius* of the church of Wrocław
1348: expectative for a canonry in Cracow
1349/1350–1353: archdeacon of Zemplén
1349/1350–1370: canon of Eger
1350–1378: canon of Cracow
1353–1366: canon of Esztergom
1353–1371: archdeacon of Aure (diocese of Commignes*)
1363: rector of the church of Jobia (diocese of Gap; *rector ruralis ecclesie de Jobia*)
1363: canonry and prebend of the church S. Stephanus de Tescone (diocese of Montauban)*
1368: canon of Commignes
1368: expectative for another canonry in Commignes, with the condition that he resigned of his benefice in Eger
1370: rector of the church of Combes (diocese of Béziers; *rector ruralis ecclesie de Combacio*)
1370: canon of Liège
1370–1385: archdeacon of Condroz (diocese of Liège)
1370: prebend in the diocese of Commignes*
1375: canonry and prebend in Paris*

The dioceses signed with * are located in present-day France.
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