

Ágnes MALÉTH:

## The Legation of Gui de Boulogne in the Hungarian Kingdom\*

Following the first Italian campaign of Louis I, the papal court tried to prevent the Hungarian king from attacking the Kingdom of Naples for the second time. Pope Clement VI sent a prominent member of the papal curia as *legatus a latere* to Louis I to negotiate: Gui de Boulogne, cardinal presbyter of S. Caecilia. As the consequence of the shortness of his stay in the Hungarian Kingdom, the legatine activity of the cardinal has rather been neglected by the historiography until now. The main aim of this present study is therefore to examine Gui de Boulogne's legation in Hungary in detail, as well as to propose a new approach for the analysis and consider the topic from the institutional-historical point of view.

*Keywords:* Avignon papacy, papal legate, Hungary, faculties, Gui de Boulogne



The missions of papal legates have been in the centre of historical attention since the early time of historical science. The reason for this is presumably the fact that the activity of legates is quite well-documented, especially in comparison to the work of other papal delegates. However, earlier research has been focused primarily on the diplomatic aspect of the legations, and historians started to comprehend the complexity and the versatility of the topic not a long time ago; indicating several new directions for research.<sup>1</sup> The legation of Gui de Boulogne, cardinal presbyter of S. Caecilia in Hungary has been no exception to the earlier general historiographical tendency, which in this case was intensified by the extraordinary events that gave the background for the appointment of the legate – namely the assassination of prince Andrew in the night of 18<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> September 1345, and as its consequence

---

\* This paper was supported by the Hungarian National Research, Development and Innovation Office (NKFIH NN) 124763 “Papal delegates in Hungary in the 14<sup>th</sup> century (1294-1378) – online database” research program.

<sup>1</sup> BLAKE 2006; FIGUEIRA 1991. p. 56–79; FIGUEIRA 2006. p. 73–106; MALECZEK 2003. p. 33–86; KALOUS 2017.

the first Italian campaign of his brother, the Hungarian king, Louis I. Thus, Hungarian historians usually concentrated on the determination and description of the policy of the Holy See under these unfortunate circumstances, and the other aspects of the legation were considered secondary. Consequently, Gui de Boulogne appeared in the Hungarian historical works only as a minor character in the conflict of pope Clement VI and Louis I; as one of the numerous papal delegates who – unsuccessfully – tried to keep away Louis I from the Kingdom of Naples. Cardinal Gui's short stay in Hungary was presented as a political episode of moderate importance between the two Italian campaigns of Louis I.<sup>2</sup> In details it was discussed only by Vilmos Fraknói<sup>3</sup> – who endeavoured to identify every participant of the papal-Hungarian relations – and Antal Pór in his biography of Louis I.<sup>4</sup> Until 2015 there was no historical work available in Hungarian language which would be devoted specifically to the legatine activity of Gui de Boulogne in the Hungarian Kingdom; in that year it was the author of the present paper who tried to clarify some details of the cardinal's itinerary in 1349.<sup>5</sup>

As we can see, the mission of Gui de Boulogne in Hungary belongs to the less-examined topics in Hungarian historiography, while Western European researchers put the emphasis on other aspects of the carrier of the cardinal. As the number of the sources issued during Gui de Boulogne's legation to Hungary is rather limited, the present paper includes a specific type of documents – the mandates or faculties (*facultates*) – in the research which will enable us to approach the topic from the institutional-historical point of view.

### The background of Gui de Boulogne's legation

In spite of the fact that the diplomatic situation increased the frequency of embassies mediating between the Holy See and the Hungarian king, the number of papal legates commissioned to the Hungarian Kingdom did not grow compared to the previous decades. Under the reign of Charles I (1301–1342) two papal representatives received such authorisation: Niccolò Boccasini, cardinal bishop of Ostia and Velletri (later pope as Benedict XI) in 1301–1303, and Gentile da Montefiore, cardinal presbyter of S. Martinus in montibus in 1308–1311.<sup>6</sup> Between 1311 and Gui de Boulogne's mission in 1349 no papal delegate bearing the title *legatus a latere* visited the Hungarian Kingdom, although several members of the

---

<sup>2</sup> György Rác briefly mentions the legation of Gui de Boulogne in a book chapter on the relationship of the Hungarian Angevins with the Holy See. RÁCZ 1996. p. 70.

<sup>3</sup> Fraknói used the name variant Gui de Montfort which he must have borrowed from the Italian or German historiography. FRANKÓI 1901. p. 225, 229–231. However, Pierre Jugie has pointed out that this version is not correct, as it was the cardinal's brother who held the title of the count of Montfort from 1351. JUGIE 1989. p. 30, note 2.

<sup>4</sup> PÓR 1893. p. 172–173, 211–216.

<sup>5</sup> MALÉTH 2015. p. 29–42.

<sup>6</sup> On Boccasini's and Gentile's legatine activity in Hungary see KISS 2010. p. 101–116; KOVÁCS 2013; MALÉTH 2016. 52–55.

papal curia were authorised to negotiate with king Louis I after the death of prince Andrew. However, the papal delegates who were appointed to handle the Neapolitan case had legatine authorisation mostly in Italy (such as Bertrand de Déaux, cardinal presbyter of S. Marcus<sup>7</sup>), and the envoys who did indeed travel to Hungary between 1345 and 1349 (or at least approached the country) – like Francis, bishop of Trieste,<sup>8</sup> Bertrand de Saint-Geniès, patriarch of Aquileia,<sup>9</sup> and Peter, bishop of Viterbo<sup>10</sup> – were entitled not *legatus*, but *nuntius Apostolice Sedis*.<sup>11</sup>

Gui de Boulogne, cardinal presbyter of S. Caecilia got involved in the Neapolitan issue only a few months after the death of prince Andrew, at the end of 1345. This time Clement VI discharged one of the legates

---

<sup>7</sup> The papal documentation indicates that the legation of cardinal de Déaux, who had been appointed legate since the consistory of October 1345, was considerably delayed. Pierre Bertrand, cardinal presbyter of S. Clementis, was also commissioned in the same time, however, he was soon replaced (see the details below). JUGIE 1989. p. 32.

<sup>8</sup> GUILLEMAIN 1966. p. 249–251. He was first mentioned as *nuntius* in Hungary on 04. 12. 1345: ASV Reg. Vat. 139, fol. 305v, ep. 1342. According to Fraknói, the bishop of Trieste arrived in Buda in June 1346 where he met the queen mother Elisabeth. FRANKÓI 1901. p. 200–201.

<sup>9</sup> Bertrand de Saint-Geniès, patriarch of Aquileia was mentioned as *nuntius* commissioned to Hungary the earliest on: 09. 01. 1346: ASV Reg. Vat. 139, fol. 183v, ep. 782. As the patriarch's mission coincided with Louis I's campaign to protect Zadar, Vilmos Fraknói supposed that the king and the patriarch met somewhere close to this city. 16. 07. 1346: ASV Reg. Vat. 140, fol. 58v, ep. 251, THEINER I. p. 716, nr. MLXXXII, FRANKÓI 1901. p. 203. The patriarch Bertrand was known of his good relationship with Louis I, even the pope had information that the patriarch sympathised with the Hungarian king in case of the Neapolitan issue. 15. 09. 1347: ASV Reg. Vat. 141, fol. 91v, ep. 415; AOKt. XXXI, p. 449. nr. 868. On the mission of the patriarch Bertrand and Francis, bishop of Trieste see: PÓR 1900. p. 13–14.

<sup>10</sup> In the time of the commission of Peter, bishop of Viterbo [13. 05. 1348: ASV Reg. Vat. 141, fol. 279v, ep. 1417. (on the daily allowance of the bishop as a papal delegate), ASV Reg. Vat. 141, fol. 277v, ep. 1406 (the pope informs Louis I about the delegation of the bishop)] Louis I was still in Naples, as his first Italian campaign began in November 1347 and ended around May 1348. FRANKÓI 1901. p. 220, 225. The outcome of the mission of Peter – who was in the meantime transferred from the bishopric of Viterbo to that of Verona – is doubtful; Fraknói believes that the *nuntius* finally did not meet the Hungarian king (FRANKÓI 1901. p. 225.), while Pierre Jugie – who dates the retreat of the Hungarian army to June 1348 – does not doubt that the bishop set off for Buda in May 1348. JUGIE 1989. p. 36. Clement VI was informed by the middle of July that Louis I would return to Hungary, thus he planned that the bishop would join the Hungarian army on the way. 15. 07. 1348: ASV Reg. Vat. 142, fol. 26r, ep. 97, THEINER I. p. 765–766, nr. MCLIV; with the same date the pope informs queen Elisabeth about Peter's delegation: ASV Reg. Vat. 142, fol. 23v–24r, ep. 91–92. The sources also reveal that Peter substituted the late Matteo Ribaldi, bishop of Verona (June 1343 – May 1348, HC I. p. 523.) in his commission as a *nuntius*. Ribaldi was authorised as a *nuntius* originally for Rome for the jubilee year (17. 08. 1347: ASV Reg. Vat. 141, fol. 58, ep. 243.). As only a single document mentions the (already deceased) Ribaldi as a papal delegate sent to Louis I (see the letter of Clement VI from the summer 1348 to queen Elisabeth above), we can suppose that Ribaldi was as well instructed to meet the king in Italy, and not in Hungary.

<sup>11</sup> It was a tendency characteristic for the 14<sup>th</sup> century that the popes preferred to delegate *nuntii* instead of legates. This had on one hand political reasons (due to their broad authorisation, the legates had to often confront the kings and the local clergy, mostly because of the procurations, see below), and on the other hand, the office of the legate had been strictly determined by the canon law, while the commission of the *nuntius* was more flexible, easier to adapt to the situation. KYER 1979. p. 28–31, 179–181.

commissioned to Italy,<sup>12</sup> cardinal Pierre Bertrand – for the request of the French queen – from his office and replaced him with Gui de Boulogne.<sup>13</sup> Earlier historiography usually explained Gui de Boulogne's appointment with his extended family relations which connected him to the French royal dynasty, as well as to the Neapolitan and Hungarian branches of the Anjou dynasty.<sup>14</sup> However, as Pierre Jugie has emphasized, the significance of these relatively distant family connections should not be overrated, especially considering the fact that the cardinal was one of the main supporters of the Angevins of Taranto in the papal curia.<sup>15</sup> His position inevitably confronted him with another prominent member of the Sacred College, cardinal Élie Talleyrand de Périgord, who was a devoted defender of the interests of the Angevins of Durazzo.<sup>16</sup> The rivalry of the two cardinals probably contributed to the fact that Gui de Boulogne excused himself from the first papal commission.<sup>17</sup> This did not mean, though, that cardinal Gui stayed out entirely of the diplomatic activity of the papal curia or that he distanced himself from the Neapolitan issue. Even before his legation to Hungary, he had been entrusted with diplomatic tasks: he was one of the envoys<sup>18</sup> who represented the pope in front of Joan I. The Neapolitan queen had fled to Provence because of the first Italian campaign of Louis I, and resided in Châteaurenard, in a castle close to Avignon.<sup>19</sup> To refute the theory that the commission of the delegates was delayed by the plague and decided only in the consistory in November 1348,<sup>20</sup> we could evoke the fact that two of Gui de Boulogne's faculties are dated to 22<sup>nd</sup> June 1348. However, these two authorisations were also published with the same date as his other faculties (30. 11. 1348), which means that they have to be considered as duplicates.<sup>21</sup> The problem of

---

<sup>12</sup> On this see note the previous note.

<sup>13</sup> 15. 12. 1345: ASV Reg. Vat. 139, fol. 168 v<sup>o</sup>, n. 707. Clement VI mentioned in a letter written on 05. 12 that he intended to send Gui de Boulogne to the Kingdom of Naples. 05. 12. 1345: ASV. Reg. Vat. 139, fol. 161v–162r, ep. 674–679. (MNL-OL DF 291 831), AOKt XXIX, p. 470, nr. 855.

<sup>14</sup> FRAKNOI 1901. p. 225, 229–230; GUILLEMAIN 1966. p. 249; PÖR 1892. p. 172, especially see note 2. See also MDA II 349, 373.

<sup>15</sup> JUGIE 1989. p. 37.

<sup>16</sup> The sister of the cardinal, Agnes married John, count of Gravina. They had three sons together: Charles, who was later executed by Louis I, Louis and Robert. GUILLEMAIN 1966. p. 244–248.

<sup>17</sup> A letter of Clement VI from the beginning of 1346 reveals his intention to send Gui de Boulogne as a legate to Naples. 01. 02. 1346: ASV. Reg. Vat. 170, fol. 3r, ep. 9; THEINER I. p. 703–706, nr. MLXVII; AOKt XXX, p. 55–56. nr. 75; JUGIE 1989. p. 34.

<sup>18</sup> The other envoy was Pierre Bertrand. JUGIE 1989. p. 35.

<sup>19</sup> Queen Joan I left Naples in January 1348 and arrived in Avignon in March. MOLLAT 1912. p. 188.

<sup>20</sup> Referring to Émile-G. Léonard's Joan I's biography (LÉONARD 1932–1936.) see: JUGIE 1989. p. 36.

<sup>21</sup> 22. 06. 1348: he could give dispensation for 20 people who had been born from presbyters, ASV Reg. Vat. 187, fol. 29, ep. 167r; AOKt XXXII, p. 206, nr. 391; Lettres de Clément VI. nr. 1677; UPLA nr. 001677; he could give permission for 100 people the Holy Sepulchre and other sacred places of the Holy Land, ASV 187, fol. 29, ep. 168r; AOKt XXXII, p. 206, nr. 392; Lettres de Clément VI. nr. 1678; UPLA nr. 001678; the same two faculties with the date 30. 11. 1348: ASV Reg. Vat. 187, fol. 28r, ep. 167; AOKt XXIII, p. 421, nr. 876; Lettres de Clément VI, nr. 1870; UPLA nr. 001870; ASV Reg. Vat. 187, fol. 29r, ep. 168, AOKt XXXIII, p. 422, nr. 877 ; Lettres de Clément VI. nr. 1871; UPLA nr. 001871.

incorrect dating concerns another papal letter (dated to 23.03. 1347 by some publications) in which Clement VI informs Gui de Boulogne about his negotiations with the envoys of Louis I; however, this document was issued only two years later, when the legate had already set off for his mission to Hungary.<sup>22</sup>

### The organisational framework of the legacy

In addition to discussing the political aspects, it is worth approaching the legation of Gui de Boulogne in the Hungarian Kingdom from the point of view of institutional history, as the Avignon period represents a transitory phase in the history of the papal curia and its administration. This transition can be observed also in case of the delegation of legates, especially as far as the financing of the missions is concerned. Until the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the papal legates usually funded their activities “on the go”, with payments collected from the local clergy (*procuratio*). These procurations meant, nevertheless, a heavy burden for the local church, its collection often met resistance and influenced the willingness of the local ecclesiastics for cooperation rather negatively. To moderate the amount of procurations, the Third Lateran Council (1179) regulated the number of the papal legates’ entourage,<sup>23</sup> however, this statute was frequently revoked by the popes (similarly to Boccasini and Gentilis, Gui de Boulogne was exempted from this restriction<sup>24</sup>). For the cardinals as well, legations meant financial difficulties, especially since 1312 when Clement V’s constitution deprived them for the time of their absence of the incomes which they traditionally shared in the papal curia.<sup>25</sup> These circumstances compelled the Holy See to establish a new method for funding the legations: soon central financing was introduced, in other words, the delegates received remuneration from the curia. Nevertheless, this process came to an end only by the 15<sup>th</sup> century;<sup>26</sup> in the time of Gui de Boulogne’s legation, the papal curia tried to supplement the procurations with other occasional sums. Consequently, cardinal Gui had authorisation to demand procuration (table 1. I/nr. 1–4.) and for sanctioning resistance (table 1. I/nr. 8.), and the pope also instructed the prelates to provide the legate with 40 florins and *securus conductus*.<sup>27</sup> The required amount was rather considerable:<sup>28</sup> the daily allowance of the papal collectors

---

<sup>22</sup> 23. 03. 1347: ASV Reg. Vat. 142, fol. 97v, ep. 889; UPLA nr. 004115. It was published with the correct date (1349) in the Anjou-kori oklevéltár: AOklt. XXXIII, p. 120–123, nr. 218.

<sup>23</sup> See especially the canons 26. and 29. HEFELE 1913. p. 1354–1358; KALOUS 2017. p. 129.

<sup>24</sup> 30. 11. 1348. 11: ASV Reg. Vat. 187, fol. 22r, ep. 117.

<sup>25</sup> BAUMGARTEN 1898. XXXVII, p. 1–2. (Documents nr. 1–3.)

<sup>26</sup> KALOUS 2017. p. 137.

<sup>27</sup> 30. 11. 1348: ASV Reg. Vat. 187r, fol. 17v, ep. 87; AOklt. XXXII, p. 405, nr. 811)

<sup>28</sup> To allow comparison, we could evoke the items in the will of Luca Fieschi, cardinal deacon of S. Maria in via Lata who died in the summer of 1336: the most expensive volume of the cardinal’s library was a copy of *Corpus iuris canonici et civilis* valued at 100 florins, and the cheapest was a book containing the sermons of Petrus Lombardus valued at 1 florin. The most precious gem owned by the cardinal was worth 200 florins. ASV Reg. Av. 49, fol. 449v, 452r and 453v.

in the 14<sup>th</sup>-century Hungary was 1–2 florins,<sup>29</sup> while the contemporary papal *nuntii* received 8 florins.<sup>30</sup> The main difference was that the collectors could take their share from the collected sums daily, while the 40 florins ordered for the legate was an occasional, irregular income, and the effectivity of the collection of procurations was rather unpredictable.<sup>31</sup> Fortunately, there are some manuscripts preserved which inform us about the procurations Gui de Boulogne, although in a less detailed way than the account book of cardinal Gentilis.<sup>32</sup> The archdiocese of Salzburg, for instance, was ordered to remunerate 6000 florins:<sup>33</sup> the archbishop of Salzburg and the bishop of Passau had to pay 1400–1400, and their suffragans 3200 florins (table 2. nr. 2.). This means that in case of Salzburg the procurations made up more than half of the estimated annual income (10000 florins) of the archdiocese.<sup>34</sup> As there are no quittances, it cannot be taken for granted that these procurations were indeed settled. Nevertheless, it seems that the cardinal expected that the archbishopric of Salzburg would cover the greatest part of the expenses of his legation to Louis I, as the estimated annual incomes of the archbishoprics of Esztergom and Kalocsa was only 2000 florins.<sup>35</sup> The quittances issued by Ildebrandino Conti, bishop of Padua and subdelegate of Gui de Boulogne show that Csanád, archbishop of Esztergom payed procurations twice, first 66 (table 2. nr. 22.), and then 414 florins (table 2. nr. 23) – in other words, barely one fourth of the estimated annual income of his archdiocese. Besides, the bishops of Győr and Veszprém gave together 66 florins; a sum which they had previously borrowed from archbishop Csanád. Another document (table 2. nr. 21.) provides details on the allowances of the legate's subdelegates: 144 florins were counted for 3 subdelegates and their

---

<sup>29</sup> In addition to the daily allowance, the papal tax collectors received a loan from the Apostolic Chamber to finance their journeys before leaving the Curia, which they had to pay back by deducting the sum from their payment. See the example of Petrus Gervasii in 1338: ASV Cam. Ap. Intr. et Ex. 171, fol. 85r.

<sup>30</sup> So had the *nuntii* sent to Louis I, namely Francis, bishop of Trieste (04. 12. 1345: ASV Reg. Vat. 139, fol. 305v, ep. 1342.), Matteo Ribaldi, *nuntius* was sent to Rome by Clement VI (18. 08. 1347: ASV Reg. Vat. 141, fol. 37v, ep. 148.), and also Peter, bishop of Viterbo (13. 05. 1348: ASV Reg. Vat. 141, fol. 279v, ep. 1417.)

<sup>31</sup> We can evoke the example of Cardinal Gentile: although he was able to collect some payments, the Hungarian clergy remained indebted to the Apostolic Chamber with a considerable part of the procurations. Thus, pope John XXII instructed the tax collector Rufinus who was sent to Hungary in 1317 to finish the collection. 17. 06. 1318: ASV Reg. Vat. 67r, ep. 85, AOKlt V, p. 73, nr. 162.

<sup>32</sup> For the edited version of the account book's fragments see MON VAT I/2, p. 416–472.

<sup>33</sup> Boccasini obliged the archbishop of Salzburg and the chapter to pay 120 Viennese marks in 1303 as he was passing through the archdiocese. 17. 02. 1303: AT-HHStA SbgE (Österreichisches Staatsarchiv Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Salzburg, Erzstift) AUR 1303 II 17; [http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-HHStA/SbgE/AUR\\_1303\\_II\\_17/charter](http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-HHStA/SbgE/AUR_1303_II_17/charter). (access: July 13, 2018) For the quittance see 12. 03. 1303: (Freisach) AT-HHStA SbgE (Österreichisches Staatsarchiv Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Salzburg, Erzstift) AUR 1303 III 12; [http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-HHStA/SbgE/AUR\\_1303\\_III\\_12/charter?q=ostia](http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-HHStA/SbgE/AUR_1303_III_12/charter?q=ostia). (access: July 13, 2018) In case of Boccasini's legation, only these two documents provide information on the procurations.

<sup>34</sup> HC I. p. 432.

<sup>35</sup> CVH I/9. p. XLVII.

entourage for 12 days, but finally they agreed to have 12 florins less, which means that instead of the originally demanded daily allowance of 4 florins, the subdelegates and their entourage shared 3,6 florins a day. The documents issued during the legation of Gui de Boulogne in Hungary also demonstrate that sometimes concessions were made: the cardinal exempted from the duty of payment the Clarisses of Bratislava (Pozsony) and Trnava (Nagy-szombat) as a result of the request made by queen Elisabeth (table 2. nr. 5.).

After having reviewed the financial aspects of the legation, I would like to present the known members of the legate's court. The above-mentioned Ildebrandino Conti, bishop of Padua<sup>36</sup> was undoubtedly the most significant member of the entourage of the cardinal, as the legate – before his departure from the country only after one week of negotiations – appointed him as his deputy (*subdelegatio*, table 2. nr. 20.). What is more, it is important to emphasize that Conti knew the Neapolitan case in detail. After having been delegated to the Iberian Peninsula and Genova as a *nuntius*,<sup>37</sup> Clement VI sent him in the same function to the Kingdom of Naples in summer 1346, since the departure of the papal legate, cardinal Bertrand de Déau was delayed.<sup>38</sup> In Naples, he had authorisation to handle such crucial issues as the custody of Andrew's son, Charles Martell, and the decision on the dispensation for queen Joan I's next marriage.<sup>39</sup> In spring 1347, he reported to the pope about the initial findings of the investigation concerning Andrew's death,<sup>40</sup> then he probably set off for Padua where he arrived in October.<sup>41</sup> Presumably he joined cardinal Gui de Boulogne when the legate travelled through the city at the beginning of March 1349.<sup>42</sup> Conti was delegated as *nuntius* by the cardinal,<sup>43</sup> and a smaller group of papal representatives met queen Elisabeth

---

<sup>36</sup> Ildebrandino Conti was the bishop of Padua from 27. 06. 1319 until his death on 02. 11. 1352. HC I. p. 385–386. For his biography see KOHL 1983.

<sup>37</sup> On his delegation to Genova see 17. 01. 1345: ASV Reg. Vat. 138, fol. 294v, ep. 1101.

<sup>38</sup> 15. 06. 1346: ASV Reg. Vat. 140, fol. 31r, ep. 101; AOKlt. XXX, p. 280, nr. 453. On the same day Clement VI informed queen Joan I and other people involved about the delegation of the *nuntius*: ASV Reg. Vat. 140, fol. 32r, ep. 102–113; AOKlt. XXX, p. 280, nr. 454.

<sup>39</sup> 17. 07. 1346: ASV. Reg. Vat. 140. fol. 59r–62r, ep. 255–257; THEINER I. p. 716–719. nr. MLXXXIII and MLXXXIV; AOKlt. XXX, p. 321–324, nr. 535–537. The document also reveals that the fellow delegate of Ildebrandino Conti was William, bishop of Cassino. On him see HC I. p. 169.

<sup>40</sup> 22. 04. 1347: ASV Reg. Vat. 140, fol. 276r, ep. 1230; AOKlt. XXXI, p.193, nr. 338.

<sup>41</sup> KOHL 1983.

<sup>42</sup> The itinerary of Gui de Boulogne can be reconstructed as follows: he left the papal curia around 15. 01. 1349, at the end of the month he arrived in Milano, and on 9 March in Padua. He passed through Venice, then he was in Treviso on 13. 04. On 26. 04. 1349 he issued a document in San Salvatore, in the diocese of Ceneda, which means that from Treviso he continued his journey to north east. He crossed the Alps and arrived in Vienna at the end of May or at the beginning of June 1349. From here he travelled together with king Louis I to Bratislava (Pozsony). MALÉTH 2015. p. 32–34. The theory that Ildebrando Conti joined the legate on his way is confirmed by a letter of Clement VI. This document reveals that the Gui de Boulogne informed the pope about the presence of the bishop in his entourage, and the pope had not had any knowledge about it previously. 16. 08. 1349: ASV. Reg. Vat. 143, fol. 62r; AOKlt. XXXIII, p. 302, nr. 607.

<sup>43</sup> “[...] *per reverendissimum patrem dominum Guidonem tituli Sancte Cecilie presbiterum cardinalem apostolice sedis legatum ad serenissimum principem dominum Ludovicum Ungarie*

in Buda (table 2. nr. 19.) after Gui de Boulogne had left Hungary, but there is no sign of the continuation of diplomatic negotiations. The documents issued by the bishop (table 2. nr. 21–23, as mentioned above) concentrate mainly on the collection of the procurations. In addition to Conti, the names of five other members of the legate's entourage are revealed by the sources. Nicholas, a hermit of St. Augustine and professor of theology and Louis, canon of Laon are mentioned as associates (*sociis*) of bishop Conti, chaplains and *familiaris commensales* of Gui de Boulogne (table 2. nr. 20–21.).<sup>44</sup> Furthermore, bishop Conti was accompanied by his own chaplain, John, and as a member of his extended court Theodoricus de Bonavilla papal and imperial notary (*apostolica et imperiale auctoritate notarius*, both mentioned in the same document, table 2. nr. 22.). Two other documents issued by Gui de Boulogne in Rome (table 2. nr. 25–26.) refer to a certain Bartholomeus de Bostario as general auditor of the papal palace and of the cardinal's court (*sacri palatii et nostro generali auditor*), however, in his case it is not clear whether he accompanied the papal legate during his entire mission, or only joined him in Rome.

### The activity of the legate in the light of the faculties

The majority of Gui de Boulogne's legatine authorisations are dated to 30<sup>th</sup> November 1348 (see table 1). The number of the papal bulls publishing the faculties has been estimated to 70 by historians.<sup>45</sup> The fact that Clement VI described the legate's jurisdiction such elaborately resulted from the combination of different factors. First of all, the number of legatine faculties had been increasing since their introduction in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, what is more, the Apostolic Chancellery usually reused the previously published ones as formulae.<sup>46</sup> Secondly, the complexity of the tasks of Gui de Boulogne required him to proceed not only in the Hungarian Kingdom, but in some parts of Italy as well, thus his legatine province was more extensive and heterogenous than that of Boccasini or Gentilis.<sup>47</sup> Furthermore, another circumstance –

---

*regem et partes aliquas eisdem regni nuntius destinatus [...]* – for the document see table 2. nr. 22. He is mentioned with the same title in table 2. nr. 21.

<sup>44</sup> On the general characteristics of the cardinals' *familia* see JÜGIE 1991. p. 41–59; KISS 2015. p. 66–68.

<sup>45</sup> JÜGIE 1989. p. 38; MALECZEK 2003. p. 43; KALOUS 2017. p. 41. As table 1 shows, the estimations differ only slightly from the real number.

<sup>46</sup> KALOUS 2017. p. 41, 71. In comparison: the number of faculties in case of Boccasini was 33, and in case of Gentilis 14.

<sup>47</sup> Boccasini and Gentilis had authorisation for the Hungarian Kingdom, Poland, Dalmatia, Croatia, Bosnia (Rama), Serbia, Lodomeria, Galicia and Cumania as legates. 13. 05. 1301: ASV Reg. Vat. 50, fol. 115v XV; THEINER I. p. 385–386, nr. DCXIX; AOKlt. I, p. 58–59, nr. 40. and 8. 08. 1307: ASV Reg. Vat., 54. fol. 151v ep. 27; THEINER I. p. 415–417, nr. DCLXIV; AOKlt. II, p. 93, nr. 201. Gui de Boulogne had legatine authority for the archdioceses of Salzburg, Aquileia, Milan, Grado, Genova, Split, Ragusa, Antivar and Zadar, for the dioceses of Bologna, Ferrara, Pavia, Parma, Modena and Piacenza and for the territory of Reggio d'Emilia. 30. 11. 1348: ASV Reg. Vat. 187, fol. 16v, ep. 82, and based on the Registers of Avignon: AOKlt. XXXII, p. 404, nr. 807, and JÜGIE 1989. p. 38.

which was unrelated to the Hungarian-Neapolitan issue – should be considered, namely that Gui de Boulogne's delegation was close to the beginning of the jubilee (Christmas 1349). Thus, the legate's mission was designed to offer him an opportunity to visit Rome in 1350 (table 1. IV/nr. 72–73).<sup>48</sup> As a consequence, some specificities emerged in case of Gui de Boulogne's faculties which are evident especially in comparison with the legations of Boccasini<sup>49</sup> and Gentile in Hungary.<sup>50</sup> A significant difference was the application of "localized" faculties, meaning that some authorizations had geographically limited validity (for example, only for the archdiocese of Salzburg, table 1. I/nr. 2, II/nr. 54. and IV/nr. 74). In addition, the legate received particularly broad authority for granting dispensations and spiritual graces (table 1. IV.), presumably as a consequence of the jubilee.<sup>51</sup>

Based on the nature of the cases which the faculties described, four categories can be differentiated.<sup>52</sup> Firstly, Clement VI conferred on cardinal Gui some powers which facilitated the organisation of the legation (table 1. I.). These faculties concerned questions like raising funds for the mission (i.e. the collection of the above-mentioned procurations, and sanctioning the failure of payment), employment of the administrative and other personnel of the legation (e.g. table 1. I/nr. 5: the cardinal could grant the office of *tabellio* for 40 competent people, and table 1. I/nr. 9: he could force ecclesiastics – even outside his legatine provinces, and if necessary with the application of ecclesiastical censures – to perform tasks connected to his legation). The second group of the faculties determined the jurisdiction of the legate (table 1. II.); meaning on what kind of legal issues he could decide, against whom, when and how he could take sanctions. The third type of faculties gave authorisation to the legate to take actions which concerned the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the local church (table 1. III).<sup>53</sup> These faculties enabled the legate to confer ecclesiastical benefices, moreover, they gave power to consent to changes

---

<sup>48</sup> JUGIE 1989. p. 50–56.

<sup>49</sup> For Boccasini's faculties see 13. 05. 1301: ASV Reg. Vat., 50. fol. 116r–118v ep. 17–48.

<sup>50</sup> For Gentilis' faculties see 08. 08. 1307: ASV Reg. Vat. 54, fol. 106 r–v, 151v–152v.

<sup>51</sup> The legate commissioned particularly to Rome for the jubilee was Anibaldo Caetani di Ceccano. JUGIE, 1989. p. 56. However, the pope instructed Gui de Boulogne as well to promulgate the jubilar indulgences in his legatine provinces. 30. 03. 1349: ASV Reg. Vat. 142, fol. 189v, ep. 866, ASV Reg. Vat. 244 M, fol. 43, ep. 117; AOKt. XXXIII, p. 131, nr. 239; Lettres de Clément VI France II, p. 531, nr. 4125.

<sup>52</sup> Antonín Kalous also described four categories of the faculties: 1. benefices, 2. indulgences and other graces, 3. cases which belonged to the jurisdiction of Apostolic Penitentiary, and 4. specific cases. KALOUS 2017. p. 69–90. However, Kalous examined the specificities of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, when – especially compared to the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century – the jurisdiction and organisation of the institutes of the papal curia was better defined, more elaborated. Moreover, a considerable part of Gui de Boulogne's faculties would not fit into any of the categories used by Kalous (especially the faculties concerning the organisation of the legation), this is the reason why I decided not to apply Kalous's classification.

<sup>53</sup> While the *nuntii* Francis, bishop of Trieste and Bertrand, patriarch of Aquileia were authorised in separate faculties to convene the local clergy and preside over ecclesiastical synods (28. 12. 1345: ASV Reg. Vat. 139, fol. 175v, ep. 724; 09. 01. 1346: ASV Reg. Vat. 139, fol. 183v, ep. 782.), this right was granted to the legates by the canon law.

concerning ecclesiastical offices which normally depended on papal permission. The fourth category is constituted by the faculties which discussed spiritual graces (table 1. IV): here belong those spiritual privileges which were granted by the pope to the legate for the time of his mission, and also those spiritual concessions which the legate could endow.

As far as Gui de Boulogne's legation to the Hungarian Kingdom is concerned, it is a topic which does not abound with sources. There are only 6 documents which were issued by the legate in the Hungarian Kingdom or concerned the Hungarian church (table 2. nr. 1, 3, 5, and 24–26). The number of the charters published by the legate's deputies is five (table 2. nr. 19, and 20–23). There is another charter issued by the chapter of Székesfehérvár which reports about the execution of the legate's instructions (table 2. nr. 6.). To determine which authorisations Gui de Boulogne used during his legation to Hungary, we have to classify these sources based on the faculty-categories described above. It can be concluded that half of the sources (5) emerged from the first group (namely the faculties concerning the organisation of the legation, table 2. nr. 5, 20–23.). Four other documents are difficult to categorize; the legate handled these cases based on his authority provided by the canon law:<sup>54</sup> one concerns a change in the ecclesiastical structure (he permitted an incorporation table 2. nr. 24.), and three report about measures that were taken to protect the rights of an ecclesiastical institute (the abbacy of Pannonhalma, table 2. nr. 1, 3, 6.).<sup>55</sup> Furthermore, if we include those cases in the examination which Gui de Boulogne managed in Austria and in Bohemia parallel to the stay of his deputies in Hungary, then the sources which ratified some structural changes in the local church predominate the source basis of the legation (mainly granting permissions for further incorporations table 2. nr. 4, 8, 11–13, 15, 17–18.).<sup>56</sup> Besides, the lack of documents granting spiritual graces is striking, especially considering the high number of faculties which described the legate's related powers.

As a conclusion, we can say that the consideration of the institutional-historical aspects of the legation of Gui de Boulogne shed light on some

---

<sup>54</sup> KALOUS 2017. p. 55–62.

<sup>55</sup> The violation of the rights of the abbacy of Pannonhalma to collect tithes in Somogy county was a problem with a rather long history. Previously another papal legate – Niccolò Boccasini – tried to take measures as well: he authorised the abbot of Pannonhalma to excommunicate those laymen in Somogy county who had not paid the tithe to the abbacy for a long time. 31. 10. 1301: MNL-OL DF 283847; AOKt. I 84–85. (nr. 98); PRT II. 96.

<sup>56</sup> The homogeneity of the sources published by the legate suggests that the mission of Gui de Boulogne might have had an underlying reason: to favour the previous supporters of Louis IV (the Bavarian), Holy Roman emperor (1314–1347) and to weaken the Wittelsbach party in the Empire. The political power of the house of Wittelsbach was still considerable, even after the death of Louis IV in October 1347. In order to neutralize the effects of the ecclesiastical retributions of the papal court taken against him, Louis IV pursued an ecclesiastical policy which was characterised by privileges given to monasteries and religious orders. The diocese of Passau lied in the Duchy of Bavaria which was at the time still governed by the sons of Louis IV, so the papal court presumably tried to increase its influence through the concessions which were given by the legate. BENKER 1997. p. 218–223, 251–258.

specificities. First, the funding of the cardinal's mission – namely that the legate was entitled not only to procurations, but as well to an occasional sum provided by the local prelates – reflects a provisional state. Because of the opposition of the local clergy and its uncertain nature which affected the willingness of the cardinals for cooperation, the Holy See gradually replaced the legatine procurations by the end of the century with systematically guaranteed allowance. It can be also concluded that the number of faculties increased considerably in case of Gui de Boulogne's legation, especially in comparison to the commissions of the two *legati a latere* (Niccolò Boccasini, Gentile da Montefiori) who had visited Hungary in the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. This change emerged presumably from two factors: the magnitude of the legatine province, and the proximity of the jubilee of 1350. Although the examination of Gui de Boulogne's legatine activity in Hungary is based on a limited number of sources, it is possible to draw some general conclusions. Most importantly, the diplomatic aim of the legation (namely discouraging Louis I from a second campaign to Naples) could not be achieved: Louis I only was not discouraged from attacking Naples, he only postponed the date of the second military campaign. The sources issued by the legate or his deputies in Hungary report primarily about the collection of the procurations, or promulgated decisions concerning the local ecclesiastical structure (incorporations). Because of the beginning of the jubilee and the great number of related faculties, the lack of spiritual graces granted by the legate in Hungary is rather puzzling.

**Table 1: The faculties of Gui de Boulogne<sup>1</sup>**

| #                               | <i>Facultas</i>   | Signature  | Edited version   |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
| I. Organisation of the legation |   |  |  |
| 1.                              | As a papal legate, he can collect procurations on the territory of the Hungarian Kingdom                                    | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 27v, ep. 158.                | AOklt. XXXII, p. 421, nr. 873., Lettres de Clément VI, p. 248, nr. 1865. |
| 2.                              | He can demand the arrears of procurations of previous legates in the archdiocese of Salzburg                                | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 27, ep. 156.                 | Lettres de Clément VI, p. 248, nr. 1863.                                 |
| 3.                              | He can collect procurations on the territory of Lombardy  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 27v, ep. 160.                | Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1867.                                 |
| 4.                              | He can compel the members of the secular clergy and the religious orders to pay procurations                                | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 22, ep. 118                  | AOklt. XXXII, p. 411, nr. 835, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 247, nr. 1851.  |
| 5.                              | He can confer the office of <i>tabellio</i> to 40 competent people  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 19 v <sup>o</sup> , ep. 100. | AOklt. XXXII, p. 407, nr. 820, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.  |
| 6.                              | He is authorised to exercise his full authority during his legation   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 21 v, ep. 108.               | AOklt. XXXII, p. 409, nr. 825, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.  |
| 7.                              | He can travel freely, as he sees it necessary, despite the constitutions of the Lateran Council <sup>2</sup>                | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 22, ep. 117.                 | AOklt. XXXII, p. 411, nr. 834, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 247, nr. 1850.  |
| 8.                              | He can compel prelates, clergymen and members of religious orders to provision his envoys                                   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 26r-v, ep. 150.              | AOklt. XXXII, p. 419, nr. 868, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.  |
| 9.                              | He can compel clergymen – if necessary with ecclesiastical censures – to render him services outside his legatine provinces | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 26, ep. 148.                 | AOklt. XXXII, p. 419, nr. 866, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 248, nr. 1860.  |
| 10.                             | He is authorised to start exercising his legatine powers  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 19, ep. 93.                  | AOklt. XXXII, p. 406, nr. 814, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.  |
| 11.                             | If he leaves his legatine provinces, he can return and exercise his powers uninterruptedly                                  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 19, ep. 94.                  | AOklt. XXXIII, p. 406, nr. 815, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |

<sup>1</sup> Most of the faculties were dated 30. 11. 1348; if a faculty was issued on a different date, it is indicated in the footnote.

<sup>2</sup> This faculty granted free travel to the legate despite the valid synodal regulations (*constitutione generalis concilii non obstante*). It refers to the fourth canon of the Third Lateran Council (1179) which intended to alleviate the burdens of the local clergy and Christians caused by the provisioning of the legates by – among other things – limiting the number of horses. Accordingly, a cardinal could not travel with an entourage which uses more than 25 horses. HEFELE 1913. p. 1091–1092.

|  |   |                                      |  |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| 12.                                    | He can charge Franciscans, Dominicans or members of other religious orders with tasks and he can give them permission to consume meat or ride a horse in the meantime | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 23, ep. 126.   | AOkt. XXXII, p. 413, nr. 844, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 13.                                    | He and his familiars have the permission to negotiate with excommunicated people  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 24r, ep. 137.  | AOkt. XXXII, p. 416, nr. 855, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 14.                                    | He can provide his delegates sent to Louis I with <i>securus conductus</i> <sup>3</sup>   | ASV Reg. Vat. 143, f. 217v           | Lettres de Clément VI France II, p. 84, nr. 4511.                      |
| <b>II. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction</b> |   |                                      |  |
| 15.                                    | He can inflict ecclesiastical censure on those – including prelates – who disturb the execution of his tasks or contradict him  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 18 v°, ep. 92. | AOkt. XXXII, p. 406, nr. 813, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 16.                                    | He can absolve those who were excommunicated by (since then deceased or absent) judge delegates or executors of the Holy See  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 26, ep. 146.   | AOkt. XXXII, p. 418, nr. 864, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 248, nr. 1862. |
| 17.                                    | He can publish citations and notifications in his legatine provinces  | ASV Reg. Vat. f. 22, ep. 116.        | AOkt. XXXII, p. 411, nr. 833, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 18.                                    | He can absolve 20 men and 20 women who are relatives on the third or fourth degree, yet they married without dispensation   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 20, ep. 101.   | AOkt. XXXII, p. 408, nr. 821, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 19.                                    | He can grant marriage dispensation for 20 men and 20 women who are relatives on the fourth degree   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 26r, ep. 145.  | AOkt. XXXII, p. 418, nr. 863, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 20.                                    | He can absolve people who had incestuous relation with their close female relatives (sisters, granddaughters, aunts)  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 22v, ep. 119.  | AOkt. XXXII, p. 412, nr. 837, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 21.                                    | He can absolve people who murdered or robbed pilgrims, in case they return the possessions they stole   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 22, ep. 113.   | AOkt. XXXII, p. 410, nr. 830, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 22.                                    | He can apply ecclesiastical censures against those who committed crimes heading to or leaving from his legatine curia   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 22v, ep. 122.  | AOkt. XXXII, p. 412, nr. 840, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 247, nr. 1855. |
| 23.                                    | He can compel anybody who committed crime heading to or leaving from his legatine curia to make compensation  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 22v, ep. 120.  | AOkt. XXII, p. 412, nr. 838, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.  |
| 24.                                    | He can absolve priests who blessed second marriages and administered the sacraments   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 22v, ep. 121.  | AOkt. XXII, p. 412, nr. 839, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 247, nr. 1854.  |

<sup>3</sup> 17. 05. 1350.

|     |   |   |  |
|-----|---|---|--|
| 25. | He can give order to arrest those clergymen who preach against his legation   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 23, ep. 123.      | AOkt. XXXII, p. 413, nr. 841, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 26. | He can proceed against heretics and the people who support them   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 23, ep. 125.      | AOkt. XXXII, p. 413, nr. 843, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, 1872. sz. |
| 27. | He can initiate an enquiry against inquisitors of heresies or against those who committed excesses against heretics, he can remove them from their offices and appoint replacements | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 23v-24r, ep. 134. | AOkt. XXXII, p. 415, nr. 852, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 28. | He can summon anybody, including every clerical person  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 23, ep. 127.      | AOkt. XXXII, p. 414, nr. 845, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 248, nr. 1857. |
| 29. | He can punish the forgers of papal letters  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 23 v, ep. 128.    | AOkt. XXXII, p. 414, nr. 846, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 30. | He can absolve those who were excommunicated based on the constitutions of the Council of Vienne  | ASv Reg. Vat. 187, f. 23v, ep. 129.     | AOkt. XXXII, p. 414, nr. 847, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 31. | He can absolve those who were accused of murdering or mutilating their own parents or siblings  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 23v, ep. 133.     | AOkt. XXXII, p. 415, nr. 851, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 32. | He can annul the punishments he proclaimed against those who contradict him   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 24r, ep. 135.     | AOkt. XXXII, p. 416, nr. 853, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 33. | He can absolve in his legatine provinces those who were excommunicated, yet they entered religious orders or administered the sacraments  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 26, ep. 149.      | AOkt. XXXII, p. 419, nr. 867, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 248, nr. 1861. |
| 34. | He can absolve those clergymen who were excommunicated based on the constitutions of Innocent IV, yet they celebrated masses or administered the sacraments                         | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 23v, ep. 130.     | AOkt. XXXII, p. 414, nr. 848, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 35. | He can absolve those who celebrated masses - despite knowing the prohibition - in interdicted places  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 26, ep. 147.      | AOkt. XXXII, p. 419, nr. 865, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 36. | He can absolve those who were excommunicated because of plundering or burning religious places, or committed sacrilege  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 25 v, ep. 144.    | Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.                               |
| 37. | He can absolve those people in Lombardy, Hungary and in the archdiocese of Salzburg who supported Louis the Bavarian and  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 28v, ep. 165.     | AOkt. XXXIII, p. 45, nr. 16, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 252, nr. 1891.  |

|                                      |  |                                     |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|
|                                      | participated in ecclesiastical rituals despite irregularities or being excommunicated <sup>4</sup>   |                                     |   |
| 38.                                  | He can absolve in Lombardy and in Hungary those who were excommunicated because of supporting Louis the Bavarian <sup>5</sup>  | ASV Reg. Vat. 195, f. 2., ep. 5.    | Lettres de Clément VI, p. 276, nr. 2017.                                |
| 39.                                  | He can absolve 100 people <sup>6</sup> in his legatine provinces of <i>publica honestas</i> <sup>7</sup>   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 28, ep. 163.  | AOkt. XXXIII, p. 155, nr. 295, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 268, nr. 1990. |
| <b>III. Ecclesiastical hierarchy</b> |  |                                     |   |
| 40.                                  | He can confer those ecclesiastical benefices in his legatine province which are vacant or are about to fall vacant, which were reserved to the Holy See by the constitutions of the Lateran Council and their annual income does not exceed 30 florins | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 25v, ep. 141. | AOkt. XXXII, p. 427, nr. 859, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.  |
| 41.                                  | He can confer 30 vacant canonicates or prebends in cathedral or collegiate churches regardless any other ecclesiastical benefices of the receiver  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 24v, ep. 139. | AOkt. XXXII, p. 417, nr. 857, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.  |
| 42.                                  | He can reserve in his legatine provinces 10 dignities in cathedral or collegiate churches  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 20, ep. 102.  | AOkt. XXII, p. 408, nr. 822., Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.  |
| 43.                                  | He can confer those ecclesiastical benefices which fall vacant during his legation through the death or resignation of his chaplains or his commensal clerics ( <i>capellanos et clericorum tuorum commensalium</i> )                                  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 18v, ep. 91.  | Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.                                |
| 44.                                  | He can confer ecclesiastical benefices reserved to the pope or vacated in the papal curia, if they are free of tithe and their annual income does not exceed 15 florins  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 24, ep. 138.  | AOkt. XXXII, p. 416, nr. 856, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 248, nr. 1858.  |
| 45.                                  | He can permit for his familiars and 40 other people ( <i>extraneus</i> ) to exchange their ecclesiastical benefices  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 25, ep. 140.  | AOkt. XXXII, p. 417, nr. 858, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 248, nr. 1859.  |
| 46.                                  | He can permit for his familiars and 30 other people ( <i>extraneus</i> ) to exchange their ecclesiastical benefices  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 19, ep. 98.   | AOkt. XXII, p. 407, nr. 818, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.   |
| 47.                                  | He can permit for 6 friars of mendicant orders to enter any other (non-mendicant) orders, and acquire  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 19v, ep. 99.  | AOkt. XXXII, p. 407, nr. 819, Lettres de                                |

<sup>4</sup> 11.01.1349.

<sup>5</sup> 18.06.1349.

<sup>6</sup> 01.05.1349.

<sup>7</sup> The *publica honestas* was a marriage impediment arising from previous illegitimate cohabitation. It happened mostly, if one of the cohabitants wanted to marry a first grade relative (e.g. the child) of the previous partner. ERDŐ 1991. p. 432.

|                      |   |  |  |
|----------------------|---|--|--|
|                      | ecclesiastical offices, including abbas   |  | Clément VI, p. 247, nr. 1849.  |
| 48.                  | He can permit for 10 members of non-mendicant religious orders to enter any other, less strict ( <i>laxior</i> ) order  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 31v, ep. 131           | AOklt. XXXII, p. 415, nr. 849, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.              |
| 49.                  | He can confer ecclesiastical benefices in Hungary and Lombardy which are reserved to the pope or vacated in the papal curia, if they are free of tithe and their annual income does not exceed 8 silver marks | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 28, ep. 162.,          | AOklt. XXXII, p. 421, nr. 875, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1868.              |
| 50.                  | He can give dispensation for 20 clerics younger than 20 of the irregularity of their age  | ASV Reg. Vat. f. 21 v, ep. 111.              | AOklt. XXXII, p. 409, nr. 828, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.              |
| 51.                  | He can dispensation for 50 people with irregularity of birth to become subdeacons or deacons  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 22, ep. 115.           | AOklt. XXXII, p. 410, nr. 832, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.              |
| 52.                  | He can allow archbishops or bishops to establish, consecrate or purify cemeteries or churches   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 23v, ep. 132.          | AOklt. XXXII, p. 415, nr. 850, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.              |
| 53.                  | He can allocate monks in 100 Cistercian, Benedictine, Camaldulose or Vallambrosa monasteries in his legatine provinces, one person in each, to increase the number of monks to 12                             | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 22. alja (szám nélkül) | AOklt. XXXII, p. 411, nr. 836, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 247, nr. 1852–1853.         |
| 54.                  | He can absolve 20 people in the archdiocese of Salzburg who did not take religious orders in the required time <sup>8</sup>   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 27v, ep. 161.          | AOklt. XXXIII, p. 45, nr. 15, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 252, nr. 1890.               |
| 55.                  | He can permit 20 clergymen who want to pursue university studies to receive the income of their ecclesiastical benefices in their absence for 3 years   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 26v, ep. 152.          | AOklt. XXXII, p. 420, nr. 870, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.              |
| IV. Spiritual graces |   |  |  |
| 56.                  | He can absolve 20 people who were born from presbyters <sup>9</sup>   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 29r, ep. 167.          | AOklt. XXXII, p. 206, nr. 391, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 225, nr. 1677 <sup>10</sup> |
| 57.                  | He can absolve of the irregularity of birth 20 people who were born from adultery   | ASV Reg. Vat. f. 21 v, ep. 109.              | Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.   |

<sup>8</sup> 11. 01. 1349.

<sup>9</sup> 22. 06. 1348. (*IX kalende Julii anno septimo*).

<sup>10</sup> It is published in the Anjou-kori oklevéltár with the incorrect date of 22. 06. 1349 [AOklt. XXXIII, p. 237, nr. 466. referring also incorrectly to Lettres de Clément VI. (without page number) nr. 1667.]. It was also published dated to 30. 11. 1348 with incorrect folio number (ASV Reg. Vat. 187, fol. 29r instead of 28r, ep. 167.) in Lettres de Clément VI. p. 249, nr. 1870., and as well in AOklt. XXXII, p. 409, nr. 826; AOklt. XXXII, p. 421, nr. 876.

|     |  |                                      |  |
|-----|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| 58. | He can give permission for 100 people to visit the Holy Sepulchre and other sacred places of the Holy Land <sup>11</sup>   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 29r, ep. 168.  | Lettres de Clément VI, p. 225, nr. 1678. <sup>12</sup>                 |
| 59. | He can grant dispensation for 200 of their illegitimate birth in case they want to render service as armed clerics   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 27r, ep. 154.  | AOkt. XXXII, p. 420, nr. 871, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 60. | He can absolve of excommunication those who visited the Holy Sepulchre or paid tribute to the sultan without papal permission  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 19, ep. 97.    | AOkt. XXXII, p. 407, nr. 817, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 61. | He can take the confession of his familiars, he can absolve them, or he can give permission for a competent person to grant absolution for them  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 19, ep. 96.    | Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.                               |
| 62. | He can choose the confessor of his familiars who can grant them absolution in cases that are normally reserved for the apostolic penitentiars ( <i>penitentiarii minores</i> ) <sup>13</sup> | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 23, ep. 124.   | AOkt. XXII, p. 413, nr. 842, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 248, nr. 1856.  |
| 63. | He can permit the clergymen who he hosts to consume meat   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 20 v, ep. 103. | AOkt. XXII, p. 408, nr. 823, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.  |
| 64. | He can grant full indulgence for his familiars in the moment of their death  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 20 v, ep. 104. | AOkt. XXII, p. 408, nr. 824, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.  |
| 65. | He can celebrate mass or have mass celebrated before sunrise   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 19, ep. 95.    | AOkt. XXII, p. 406, nr. 816, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 247, nr. 1848.  |
| 66. | He can celebrate mass or have mass celebrated in interdicted places  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 24r, ep. 136.  | AOkt. XXXII, p. 416, nr. 854, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 67. | He can grant 100 days of indulgence for those who help with building or maintaining churches, hospitals and bridges  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 21 v, ep. 110. | AOkt. XXXII, p. 409, nr. 827, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |
| 68. | He can grant one year and 40 days of indulgence any time he preaches the word of God   | ASV Reg. Vat. f. 26 v, ep. 151.      | AOkt. XXXII, p. 420, nr. 869, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872. |

<sup>11</sup> Published twice with the dates 22. 06. 1348 (*IX kalende Julii anno septimo*) and 30. 11. 1348 in AOkt. XXXII, p. 422., nr. 877, and Lettres de Clément VI. 249. (nr. 1871.)

<sup>12</sup> Published with the incorrect date of 22. 06. 1349 in AOkt. XXXIII, p. 238, nr. 437. referring also incorrectly to Lettres de Clément VI. (without page number) nr. 1668.

<sup>13</sup> The minor penitentiars (*penitentiarii minores*) belonged to the personnel of the Apostolic Penitentiary. They received confessions in the most significant churches of the papacy (Saint Peter's and Lateran Basilicas, and in the Avignon period in the Notre-Dame-des-Domes), and they could grant absolution in cases which were reserved to the pope (e.g. in case of violence against clergymen). GÖLLER 1907. p. 134–136, SALONEN 2016. p. 259–260.

|     |   |  |  |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 69. | He can grant one year and 40 days of indulgence for those who participate in the masses celebrated by him   | ASV Reg. Vat. f. 21 v, ep. 112.  | AOkt. XXXII, p. 410, nr. 829, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.                   |
| 70. | He can grant absolution in the cases which are reserved for the apostolic penitentiars ( <i>penitentiarii minores</i> ), or he can give permission to his penitentiary to do so   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 22, ep. 114.   | AOkt. XXXII, p. 410, nr. 831, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.                   |
| 71. | He can charge people who cannot fulfil their oaths with other pious tasks in the territory of his legation  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 27r, ep. 155.  | AOkt. XXXII, p. 420, nr. 872, Lettres de Clément VI, p. 249, nr. 1872.                   |
| 72. | He is permitted to visit Rome during the jubilee and return to his legatine provinces afterwards  | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 25v, ep. 43, <sup>14</sup> and also ASV Reg. Vat. 142, f. 119r, ep. 621 // Reg. Vat. 244 L f. 60, ep. 164a <sup>15</sup>     | AOkt. XXXII, p. 417–418, nr. 860–861, Lettres de Clément VI France II, p. 502, nr. 4014. |
| 73. | He is authorised to celebrate masses at the main altars of the Roman basilicas during the jubilee   | ASV Reg. Vat. 187, f. 25v, ep. 142, <sup>16</sup> and also ASV Reg. Vat. 142, f. 119r-v, ep. 622 // Reg. Vat. 244 L, f. 60, ep. 164b <sup>17</sup> | Lettres de Clément VI France II, p. 502, nr. 4015.                                       |
| 74. | He can give permission to confessors in the archdiocese of Salzburg – which is ravaged by the plague – to grant full indulgence in the moment of death until the following feast of the purification of Holy Mary <sup>18</sup> | ASV Reg. Vat. 143, f. 70.  | Lettres de Clément VI, p. 284, nr. 2074.   |
| 75. | Anibaldo Caetani di Ceccano and Gui de Boulogne cardinals and papal legates are authorised to grant 15 days of jubilar indulgence even for those who cannot visit Saint Peter's Cathedral or the Lateran basilica <sup>19</sup> | ASV Reg. Vat. 192, f. 5v, ep. 84.  | Lettres de Clément VI, p. 297, nr. 2142.   |

<sup>14</sup> 30. 11. 1348.

<sup>15</sup> 24. 12. 1348.

<sup>16</sup> 30. 11. 1348.

<sup>17</sup> 24. 12. 1348.

<sup>18</sup> 24. 09. 1349.

<sup>19</sup> 20. 02. 1350. With this decision the papal curia intended to alleviate the difficulties arising from the fact that the Holy City was not entirely prepared to provision and accommodate the enormous number of pilgrims who streamed to Rome during the jubilee.

**Table 2: The sources issued during the legation of Gui de Boulogne in Hungary<sup>1</sup>**

| #  | Date       | Issuer          | Place of issue       | Content   | Original  | Edited version                  |
|----|------------|-----------------|----------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. | 12.06.1349 | Gui de Boulogne | Bratislava (Pozsony) | The legate commissions the abbot of the monastery of St. Giles of Somogy and the provost of Győr to enforce the rights of the abbacy of Pannonhalma for the collection of tithes after wines in the county of Somogy. The person who refuses the payment referring to some legal reasons should be summoned to the court of the legate in Bratislava (Pozsony) to the 9 <sup>th</sup> day after the date of the citation. | MNL-OL DF 207199  | AOklt. XXXIII, p. 221, nr. 430. |
| 2. | 20.06.1349 | Gui de Boulogne | Vienna               | The legate instructs the archbishop of Salzburg to pay 6000 florins of procurations in 60 days after the delivery of the present notification. The archbishops and the bishop of Passau is obligated 1400-1400, and the suffragans 3200 florins.  | Bayerische Hauptstaatsarchiv, Urkunden der Kloster Raitenhaslach Nr. 472 <sup>2</sup> | -                               |
| 3. | 27.06.1349 | Gui de Boulogne | Vienna               | The legate instructs the provost of Győr to ensure (if necessary with ecclesiastical censures) that the abbot of Pannonhalma will not be summoned to secular courts in lawsuits concerning tithes   | MNL-OL DF 207169 <sup>3</sup>   | AOklt. XXXIII, p. 242, nr. 476. |
| 4. | 30.06.1349 | Gui de Boulogne | Vienna               | The legate instructs the bishop of Passau to incorporate the pastoral church of Alland to the   | Stiftsarchiv Heiligenkreuz <sup>4</sup>   | Weis p. 210–211.                |

<sup>1</sup> For the first version of the table see MALÉTH 2015, p. 35–38. Compared to the first version, this table is published with minor corrections and alterations. The documents which were issued by Gui de Boulogne outside the Hungarian Kingdom were included in the table because of two reasons: firstly, because they were omitted by the earlier historians, and secondly, because these sources published simultaneously to the activity of Ildebrandino Conti, deputy of the cardinal in Hungary.

<sup>2</sup> [http://monasterium.net/mom/DE-BayHStA/KURaitenhaslach/1349\\_06\\_20/charter](http://monasterium.net/mom/DE-BayHStA/KURaitenhaslach/1349_06_20/charter). (access: March 7, 2019)

<sup>3</sup> [http://monasterium.net/mom/HU-PBFL/PannHOSB/1340\\_VI\\_27/charter?q=guido%20legatus](http://monasterium.net/mom/HU-PBFL/PannHOSB/1340_VI_27/charter?q=guido%20legatus) (incorrectly dated to 1340) (access: March 7, 2019)

<sup>4</sup> [http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-StiAH/HeiligenkreuzOCist/1350\\_VI\\_30/charter](http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-StiAH/HeiligenkreuzOCist/1350_VI_30/charter) (based on Weis incorrectly dated to 1350) (access: March 7, 2019)

|    |            |                          |                |  |                                       |   |
|----|------------|--------------------------|----------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|
|    |            |                          |                | abbacy of Heiligenkreuz, if the arguments presented in their request turn out to be true   |                                       | (dated to 1350)                                     |
| 5. | 18.07.1349 | Gui de Boulogne          | Klosterneuburg | The legate approves to queen Elisabeth's request and absolves the Clarisses of Bratislava (Pozsony) and Trnava (Nagyszombat) of the duty of paying procurations  | MNL-OL DL 4061                        | AOklt XXXIII, p. 274, nr. 548.                      |
| 6. | 22.07.1349 | Székesfehérvári káptalan | Székesfehérvár | The chapter of Székesfehérvár – following the order of the papal legate Gui de Boulogne – transcribes those parts of St. Stephen's legend Szent István legend which concern the privileges of the abbacy of Pannonhalma in connection with the tithes in Somogy county | MNL-OL DF 207051 <sup>5</sup>         | AOklt XXXIII, p. 278, nr. 555.                      |
| 7. | 28.07.1349 | Gui de Boulogne          | Klosterneuburg | The legate confirms the mandate of Albert, bishop of Passau proclaiming that the rector of the pastoral church of Waldkirchen is obliged to pay 14 denars per year to the Augustinian monastery of St. Florian in the diocese of Passau                                | Stiftsarchiv St. Florian <sup>6</sup> | <i>Urkundenbuch</i> VII, p. 119–120.                |
| 8. | 28.07.1349 | Gui de Boulogne          | Klosterneuburg | The legate confirms the mandate the bishop of Passau about the incorporation of the pastoral church of Ried for the Augustinian monastery of St. Florian in the diocese of Passau  | Stiftsarchiv St. Florian              | <i>Urkundenbuch</i> VII, p. 193–194 (dated to 1350) |
| 9. | 01.08.1349 | Gui de Boulogne          | Klosterneuburg | The legate instructs the bishop of Passau to protect the Dominicans and the Minorites from the heresies of Johannes Polliacus (Jean de Pouilly), especially about confessions, and describes the bull of John XXII dated to 24.07.1321 concerning the issue            | Minoriterkonvent Wien <sup>7</sup>    | –   |

<sup>5</sup> Mentioned in PRT II. 56, 95; PRT II. 394–395, nr. 125, see the full transcript of the document.

<sup>6</sup> [http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-StiASF/StFlorianCanReg/1349\\_VII\\_28/charter](http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-StiASF/StFlorianCanReg/1349_VII_28/charter) (access: March 7, 2019)

<sup>7</sup> <http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-AWMK/WienOFMConv/54/charter>. (access: March 7, 2019)

The Legation of Gui de Boulogne in the Hungarian Kingdom

|     |            |                             |                |  |   |                                  |
|-----|------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| 10. | 04.08.1349 | Gui de Boulogne             | Klosterneuburg | The legate confirms the endowment of St. Stephen's church of Zwentendorf to the chapter of Passau previously made by the bishop of Passau  | Domkaptiel Passau <sup>8</sup>            | –                                |
| 11. | 18.08.1349 | Gui de Boulogne             | Klosterneuburg | The legate instructs the abbot of Zwettl to examine the request of the abbacy of Altenburg about the incorporation of the churches of Röhrnbach and Strögen  | Stiftsarchiv Altenburg <sup>9</sup>       | BURGER p. 227–228.               |
| 12. | 28.08.1349 | Gui de Boulogne             | Znojmo         | The legate instructs the abbot of Melk to examine the request of provost Henry and the Augustinian convent of Waldhausen in the diocese of Passau about the incorporation of the pastoral church of St. Georgen am Walde | OÖLA Linz, Bestand Windhaag <sup>10</sup> | <i>Urkundenbuch</i> VII, p. 126. |
| 13. | 28.08.1349 | Gui de Boulogne             | Znojmo         | The legate instructs the abbot of Melk to examine the request of the Benedictine abbacy of Gleink about the incorporation of the pastoral church of St. Severin in Haidershofen  | OÖLA Linz, Bestand Gleink <sup>11</sup>   | <i>Urkundenbuch</i> VII, p. 127. |
| 14. | 31.08.1349 | Otto, Cist. abbot of Zwettl |                | The abbot of Zwettl reports the results of the examination to the legate <sup>12</sup>   | Stiftsarchiv Altenburg <sup>13</sup>      | BURGER p. 228–229.               |
| 15. | 02.09.1349 | Gui de Boulogne             | Znojmo         | The legate approves the incorporation of the pastoral church in Strögen for the Benedictine abbacy of St. Lambert in Altenburg <sup>14</sup>   | ?   | BURGER p. 229–230.               |

<sup>8</sup> <http://monasterium.net/mom/DE-BayHStA/PassauDomkapitel/417/charter>. (access: March 7, 2019)

<sup>9</sup> [http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-StiAA/Urkunden/1349\\_VIII\\_18/charter](http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-StiAA/Urkunden/1349_VIII_18/charter). (access: March 7, 2019)

<sup>10</sup> [http://monasterium.net/mom/WaldCanReg/1349\\_VIII\\_25/charter](http://monasterium.net/mom/WaldCanReg/1349_VIII_25/charter). (access: March 7, 2019)

<sup>11</sup> [http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-OOeLA/GleinkOSB/1349\\_VIII\\_28/charter](http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-OOeLA/GleinkOSB/1349_VIII_28/charter). (access: March 7, 2019)

<sup>12</sup> At the end of the document there is a remark from Gui de Boulogne with the date of 1<sup>st</sup> of September of the same year, Znojmo.

<sup>13</sup> [http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-StiAA/Urkunden/1347\\_IX\\_02/charter](http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-StiAA/Urkunden/1347_IX_02/charter) (incorrectly dated to 1347). (access: March 7, 2019)

<sup>14</sup> In 1350 Albert II, duke of Austria confirmed the endowment in a German-language document. [http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-StiAA/Urkunden/1350\\_III\\_01/charter](http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-StiAA/Urkunden/1350_III_01/charter). (access: March 7, 2019)

|     |            |                             |           |  |   |                                       |
|-----|------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 16. | 03.09.1349 | Ludovicus,<br>abbot of Melk | Melk      | The abbot of Melk reports to the legate about the insufficiencies of the incomes of the Benedictine abbacy in Gleink   | OÖLA Linz, Bestand Gleink <sup>15</sup> | <i>Urkundenbuch VII</i> , p. 128.     |
| 17  | 04.09.1349 | Gui de Boulogne             | Znojmo    | The legate approves the incorporation of the pastoral church in St. Georgen am Walde for the convent of Waldhausen   | –                                       | <i>Urkundenbuch VII</i> , p. 129–130. |
| 18. | 06.09.1349 | Gui de Boulogne             | Znojmo    | The legate approves the incorporation of the pastoral church in Haidershofen for the abbacy in Gleink  | OÖLA Linz, Bestand Gleink <sup>16</sup> | <i>Urkundenbuch VII</i> , p. 130–131. |
| 19. | 06.09.1349 | Ildebrandino Conti          | Buda      | The bishop testifies that <i>magister</i> John and Petrus Begonis <sup>17</sup> – the procurators of cardinal Guillaume de la Jugie <sup>18</sup> in Hungary – delivered the papal letters to the archbishop of Esztergom which impose biannual tithe on the domain <i>Nigropontis</i> | MNL- OL DF 248989                       | AOklt. XXXIII, p. 331, nr. 672.       |
| 20. | 27.09.1349 | Ildebrandino Conti          | Esztergom | The bishop transcribes the bull of Clement VI addressed to the Hungarian clergy about the legation of cardinal Gui in Hungary, as well as the document in which the legate delegated him as <i>nuntius</i>   | MNL-OL DF 248988                        | AOklt. XXXIII, p. 356–357, nr. 728.   |
| 21. | 28.09.1349 | Ildebrandino Conti          | Esztergom | The bishop ordains the archbishop of Esztergom and the bishops of Győr and Veszprém to pay 132   | MNL-OL DF 248986                        | AOklt. XXXIII, p. 357–358, nr. 731.   |

<sup>15</sup> [http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-00eLA/GleinkOSB/1349\\_IX\\_03/charter](http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-00eLA/GleinkOSB/1349_IX_03/charter). (access: March 7, 2019)

<sup>16</sup> [http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-00eLA/GleinkOSB/1349\\_IX\\_06/charter](http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-00eLA/GleinkOSB/1349_IX_06/charter). (access: March 7, 2019)

<sup>17</sup> Petrus Begonis, clergyman from the diocese of Limoges and John, son of Dominik lector of Eger mentioned as procurators of cardinal Pierre de la Jugie: June 11, 1343: ASV Reg. Vat. 137, fol. 26v–27r, ep. 73–76; AOklt. XXVII 256. (nr. 395–396.); mentioned as *licentiatus in legibus* who was delegated to proceed in the case of prince Andrew: September 8, 1345: ASV Reg. Vat. 139, fol. 114v, ep. 446–447; AOklt. XXIX 361. (nr. 633); *bacallarius in legibus*, papal chaplain, *familiaris commensalis* of cardinal de la Jugie, procurator of the cardinal in Hungary and Poland asked and received a prebend in Wrocław: October 20, 1345: ASV Reg. Av. 10, fol. 72r, ASV Reg. Vat. 169, fol. 230r; AOklt. XXIX 413–. (nr. 750–751.), chancellor of the church of Wrocław, papal chaplain, *bacallarius in legibus*, *nuntius* of the Holy See in Hungary: August 5, 1351: ASV Reg. Vat. 145, fol. 35r–36r, ASV Reg. Vat. 145, fol. 44r, likewise August 7, 1351: ASV Reg. Vat. 145, fol. 49 r–v.

<sup>18</sup> Cardinal deacon of S. Maria in Cosmedin between 1342 and 1368, and cardinal presbyter of S. Caecilia between 1368 and 1374. HC I. p. 40, 51.

The Legation of Gui de Boulogne in the Hungarian Kingdom

|     |            |                    |           |   |  |  |
|-----|------------|--------------------|-----------|---|--|--|
|     |            |                    |           | florins of procuration for his own, friar Nicholas' and Louis', canon of Laon provisions  |  |  |
| 22. | 28.09.1349 | Ildebrandino Conti | Esztergom | The bishop issues a quittance of 132 florins which was paid by Csanád, archbishop of Esztergom  | MNL-OL DF 248987                                 | AOklt. XXXIII, p. 358, nr. 732.                  |
| 23. | 28.09.1349 | Ildebrandino Conti | Esztergom | The bishop and Louis, canon of Laon issue a quittance of 414 florins which was paid by Csanád, archbishop of Esztergom  | MNL-OL DL 4079                                   | AOklt. XXXIII, p. 357, nr. 730.                  |
| 24. | 10.10.1349 | Gui de Boulogne    | Friesach  | The legate approves the incorporation of the pastoral church of Ófalu ( <i>Antiqua villa</i> ) for the Carthusian monastery of Spiš (Szepes)  | MNL-OL DF 266968                                 | AOklt. XXXIII, p. 369, nr. 759.                  |
| 25. | 25.03.1350 | Gui de Boulogne    | Rome      | The legate instructs the bishop of Zagreb, the abbots, priors, provosts, deans, deacons, etc. in the diocese of Zagreb to promulgate the sentence made by papal judge delegates (the Cistercian abbot of Zagreb, the prior of the St. Nicholas convent in Zagreb and the dean of Gorica) and excommunicating several priest of the diocese of Zagreb and the commendator and brothers of the Teutonic order | MNL-OL DF 291740 <sup>19</sup>                   | AOklt. XXXIV, p. 161–162, 303, nr. 243, 540.     |
| 26. | 25.03.1350 | Gui de Boulogne    | Rome      | The legate instructs the bishop of Zagreb, the abbots, priors, provosts, deans, deacons, etc. in the diocese of Zagreb to promulgate his sentence of excommunication of the Knights Hospitaller of the diocese of Zagreb, as they failed to appear in his court in the lawsuit against the chapter of Zagreb concerning some titles   | MNL-OL DF 256203, MNL-OL DF 291740 <sup>20</sup> | AOklt. XXXIV, p. 162, 302–303, nr. 244. and 539. |

<sup>19</sup> Preserved in a transcript dated to 18.07.1350.

<sup>20</sup> Preserved in a transcript dated to 18.07.1350.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**Sources:**

- ASV Reg. Vat. Archivio Segreto Vaticano (Archivio Apostolico Vaticano), Registra Vaticana.
- ASV Reg. Av. Archivio Segreto Vaticano (Archivio Apostolico Vaticano), Registra Avenionensia.
- Aokt. *Anjou-kori oklevéltár*. Ed. KRISTÓ, Gyula et al. Budapest – Szeged. 1990–.
- BURGER *Urkunden der Benedictiner-abtei zum heiligen Lambert in Altenburg, Nieder-Österreich K. O. M. B. vom Jahre 1144 bis 1522*. Ed. BURGER, Honorius. Wien. 1865.
- CVHI/9. *Cameralia Documenta Pontificia de Regnis Sacrae Coronae Hungariae (1297–1536). I: Obligationes, Solutiones*. Ed. LUKCSICS, József – TUSOR, Péter – FEDELES, Tamás. (Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae I/9). Budapest – Róma. 2014.
- HC I. EUBEL, Konrad: *Hierarchia catholica medii aevii*, I. Regensburg. 1913.
- Lettres de Clément VI *Clément VI (1342–1352): Lettres closes, patentes et curiales intéressant les pays autres que la France*. Ed. par DÉPREZ, Eugène – MOLLAT, Guillaume. Paris. 1960–1961.
- Lettres de Clément VI France I–II *Clément VI (1342–1352): Lettres closes, patentes et curiales se rapportant à la France*, I–II. Ed. DÉPREZ, Eugène – MOLLAT, Guillaume – GLÉNISSON, Jean. Paris. 1901–1961.
- MDA II *Diplomáciai emlékek az Anjou-korból*, II. Ed. WENZEL, Gusztáv. Budapest. 1875.
- MNL-OL DL/DF Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára, Mohács előtti szekció Diplomatiikai levéltár és fényképgyűjtemény [National Archives of Hungary, Diplomatic Archive and Photographic Collection of the pre-1526 Documents]
- MON VAT I/2 *Monumenta Vaticana hitoriam regni Hungariae illustrantia, I/2: Acta legationis Gentilis, 1307–1311*. Ed. PÖR, Antal – FEJÉRPATAKY, László. Budapest. 2000.
- PRT II *A pannonhalmi Szent-Benedek-rend története, II*. [The History of the Benedictines of Pannonhalma]. Ed. SÖRÖS, Pongrácz. Budapest. 1903.
- THEINER I *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, I. Ed. THEINER, Augustinus. Romae. 1859.
- Urkundenbuch VII *Urkundenbuch des Landes ob der Enns, VII: 1347–1360*. Ed. TRINKS, Erich-Sturmberger. Hannover – Wien. 1876.
- UPLA *Ut per litteras apostolicas* database, <http://apps.brepolis.net/litpa/Introduction.aspx>.
- WEIS *Urkunden des Cistercienserstiftes Heiligenkreuz im Wiener Wald. II*. Ed. WEIS, Johann Nepomuk. Wien. 1859.

**Secondary literature:**

- BENKER 1997 BENKER, Gertrud: *Ludwig der Bayer. Ein Wittelsbacher auf dem Kaiserthron (1282–1347)*. München. 1997.
- BLAKE 2006 BLAKE, Beattie: *Angelus Pacis: The Legation of Cardinal Giovanni Gaetano Orsini, 1326–1334*. Leiden. 2006.
- BAUMGARTEN 1898 BAUMGARTEN, Paul Maria: *Untersuchungen über die Camera Collegii Cardinalium für die Zeit von 1295 bis 1437*. Lepzig. 1898.
- ERDŐ 1991 ERDŐ, Péter: *Egyházjog* [Canon Law]. Budapest. 1991.
- FIGUEIRA 1991 FIGUEIRA, Robert C.: Subdelegation by papal legates in the thirteenth-century canon: powers and limitations. In: *In iure veritas. Studies in Canon Law in Memory of Schafer Williams*. Ed. BOWMAN, Steven B. – CODY, Blanche E. Michigan. 1991. p. 56–79.
- FIGUEIRA 2006 FIGUEIRA, Robert C.: The Medieval Papal Legate and his Province: Geographical Limits of Jurisdiction, Plenitude of Power. In: *The Doctrines and Exercise of Authority in the Middle Ages: Essays in Memory of Robert Louis Benson*. Ed. FIGUEIRA, Robert C. Aldershot. 2006. p. 73–106.
- GÖLLER 1907 GÖLLER, Emil: *Die päpstliche Pönitentarie von ihrem Ursprung bis zur ihrer Umgestaltung unter Pius V.* I. Rom. 1907.
- GUILLEMMAIN 1966 GUILLEMMAIN, Bernard: *La cour pontificale d'Avignon, 1309–1376. Étude d'une société*. Paris. 1966.
- HAYEZ 1983 HAYEZ, Marie: Boulogne, Gui de. In: *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, II. Ed. BAUTIER, Robert-Henri – AUTY, Robert et al. Stuttgart – Weimar. 1983. col. 499.
- HEFELE 1913 HEFELE, Charles-Joseph: *Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux*, V/2. Paris. 1913.
- JUGIE 1986 JUGIE, Pierre: *Le cardinal Gui de Boulogne (1316–1373): biographie et étude d'une familia cardinalice*. (École nationale des chartes. Positions des thèses par les élèves de la promotion) Paris. 1986.
- JUGIE 1989 JUGIE, Pierre: La légation du cardinal Gui de Boulogne en Hongrie et en Italie (1348–1350). *Il Santo. Rivista di storia, dottrina ed arte* 2 (1989), p. 10–50.
- JUGIE 1991 JUGIE, Pierre: Les familiae cardinalices et leur organisation interne au temps de la papauté d'Avignon. Esquisse d'un bilan. *Publications de l'École française de Rome* 138 (1990), p. 41–59.
- KALOUS 2017 KALOUS, Antonín: *Late Medieval Papal Legation. Between the Councils and the Reformation*. Roma. 2017.
- KISS 2010 KISS, Gergely: Les légats pontificaux en Hongrie au temps des rois Angevins (1298–1311). In: *La diplomatie des États Angevins aux XIII<sup>e</sup> et XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles*. Ed. KORDÉ, Zoltán – PETROVICS, István. Budapest – Roma. 2010. p. 101–116.
- KISS 2015 Kiss, Gergely: *Dél-Magyarországtól Itáliáig. Bánca nembeli István (1205 k–1270) váci püspök, esztergomi érsek, az első magyarországi bíboros életpályája* [From South Hungary to Italy. Life and Career of Stephen Bánca, Bishop of Vác, Archbishop of Esztergom and First Hungarian Cardinal]. Pécs. 2015.
- KOHL 1983 KOHL, Benjamin G.: Conti, Ildebrandino. In: *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 28. (1983), online version:

- [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/ildebrandino-conti\\_\(Dizionario-Biografico\).](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/ildebrandino-conti_(Dizionario-Biografico).) (access: December 7, 2018)
- KOVÁCS 2013 KOVÁCS, Viktória: *Causae coram nobis ventilatae*. Beiträge zu der Jurisdiktionstätigkeit von Papstlegat Gentilis de Monteflorum in Ungarn (1308–1311). *Specimina Nova Pars Prima Sectio Mediaevalis VII* (2013), p. 39–69.
- KYER 1979 KYER, Ian Clifford: *The Papal Legate and the "Solemn" Papal Nuncio, 1243–1378: The Changing Pattern of the Papal Representation*. PhD thesis. Toronto. 1979.
- LÉONARD 1932–1936 LEONARD, Émile-Guillaume: *Histoire de Jeanne Ire, reine de Naples, comtesse de Provence, 1343–1382*, I–III. Paris – Monaco. 1932–1936.
- MALECZEK 2003 MALECZEK, Werner: Die päpstlichen Legaten im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert. *Vorträge und Forschungen: Gesandtschafts- und Botenwesen im spätmittelalterlichen Europa* 60 (2003), p. 33–86.
- MALÉTH 2015 MALÉTH, Ágnes: Gui de Boulogne magyarországi itineráriuma [The Itinerary of cardinal Gui de Boulogne in Hungary]. *Világtörténet* 5 (37) (2015), p. 29–42.
- MALÉTH 2016 MALÉTH, Ágnes: *I. Károly és a pápaság kapcsolata (1301–1342)* [The Relation of Charles I with the Papacy, 1301–1342]. PhD thesis. Angers – Szeged. 2016.
- MOLLAT 1912 MOLLAT, Guillaume: *Les papes d'Avignon*. Paris. 1912.
- MOLLAT 1938 MOLLAT, Guillaume: Boulogne (Gui de). In: *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique, vol. 10: Bouillon–Bzovius*. Ed. BAUDRILLART, Alfred et al. Paris. 1938. col. 101–106.
- PÓR 1892 PÓR, Antal: *Nagy Lajos, 1326–1382* [Louis the Great, 1342–1382]. Budapest. 1892.
- PÓR 1900 PÓR, Antal: *Nagy Lajos király viszonya az aquiléjai pátriárkához* [The Relation of Louis the Great with the Patriarch of Aquileia]. Budapest. 1900.
- RÁCZ 1996 RÁCZ, Görgy: Az Anjouk és a Szentszék [The Angevins and the Holy See]. In: *Magyarország és a Szentszék kapcsolatának ezer éve*. Ed. ZOMBORI, István. Budapest. 1996. p. 55–81.
- SALONEN 2016 SALONEN, Kirsi: The Apostolic Penitentiary. In: *A Companion to the Medieval Papacy: Growth of an Ideology and Institution*. Ed. LARSSON, Atria A. – SISSON, Keith David. Leiden. 2016. p. 259–275.

