

Gábor BARABÁS:

Delegated Papal Jurisdiction and the Religious Orders in the Diocese of Veszprém in the First Half of the 13th Century*

The paper is a short contribution to the history of papal delegated jurisdiction in Hungary in the first half of 13th century. The main aim of the study is to analyse the participation of the monasteries of religious orders in the diocese of Veszprém at the practical work of the system of papal judge-delegation. The connection could be formed in two quite separated ways: their officials, or as legal persons the convents themselves could function either as papal judges-delegate in foreign litigations, or they could be contestants of their own cases. The paper introduces the known cases of the second group from the selected era, since the main characteristics of the activities as papal judges-delegate are presented as well.

Key words: papal judges-delegate, delegated jurisdiction, diocese of Veszprém, monasteries, Benedictine order, Cistercian order



In the present study we shall give a short introduction into the history of papal judges-delegate in the Hungarian diocese of Veszprém. We intend to analyse how the religious orders got into touch with the system of judges-delegate, and how this relation was formed until the middle of the 13th century. These types of connections of the monasteries were formed in two quite separated ways: the convents or their officials could function either as judges-delegate in foreign litigations, or they could be contestants in their own cases. The survey of these affairs can offer a detailed picture about the institution of papal delegated jurisdiction, and this way we can compare the characteristics of the diocese with the general (“international”) tendencies,

* Research for this article was supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Found (OTKA NN 109690). I am grateful to Professor Endre Sashalmi for the correction of the text.

and also with other parts of the Kingdom of Hungary. First, however, we have to examine and present the foundation and the substance of the system of papal judge-delegation: to introduce the way it functioned because the role of religious orders can only be understood this way.

1. General characteristics of papal delegated jurisdiction

The inception of the system can be found in the 12th century.¹ The foundation of delegated jurisdiction was the willingness of the churches and clerics to turn to the papacy for decision, with the aim of having the decision corroborated by papal authority. The system itself can be linked to the reform papacy of the outset of the 11th century: i.e. to the increase of its power over the Church, and its universal claims. On the other hand it has to be mentioned, that the papal delegated jurisdiction gave an opportunity to local churches to skip over the level of ordinary courts. At the same time, it is interesting that the delegated judges came from the circle of local clerics, who at first were mostly bishops and abbots.² We can thus say that the needs of the two parties affected the formation of the papal judge-delegation. On the one hand, local clerics and churches were involved who turned to the papacy, on the other hand the Holy See which intended to increase its authority.³ It remains a puzzle, however, whether this phenomenon can

¹ James Ross SWEENEY: *Innocent III, Canon Law and Papal Judges Delegate in Hungary*. In: *Popes, Teachers, and Canon Law in the Middle Ages*. Ed. James Ross SWEENEY – Stanley CHODROW. Ithaca – New York. 1989. p. 26–51. (hereafter: SWEENEY 1989), here: p. 26.

² Cf. Matthias SCHRÖR: *Metropolitangewalt und papstgeschichtliche Wende*. Husum. 2009. (Historische Studien, Band 494.) 129–137; Othmar HAGENEDER: *Die geistliche Gerichtsbarkeit in Ober- und Niederösterreich. Von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn des 15. Jahrhunderts*. Linz. 1967. (hereafter: HAGENEDER 1967), p. 27; Peter HERDE: *Zur päpstlichen Delegationsgerichtsbarkeit im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit*. *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonische Abteilung* 119 (2002), p. 20–43. (hereafter: HERDE 2002), here: p. 22; Ludwig FALKENSTEIN: *Appellationen an den Papst und Delegationsgerichtsbarkeit am Beispiel Alexanders III. und Heinrichs von Frankreich*. *Zeitschrift der Kirchengeschichte* 97 (1986), p. 36–65, here: p. 37–39; Jochen JOHRENDT – Harald MÜLLER: *Zentrum und Peripherie. Prozesse des Austausches, der Durchdringung und der Zentralisierung der lateinischen Kirche im Hochmittelalter*. In: *Römisches Zentrum und kirchliche Peripherie. Das universale Papsttum als Bezugspunkt der Kirchen von den Reformpäpsten bis zu Innozenz III.* Hrsg. Jochen JOHRENDT – Harald MÜLLER. Berlin – New York. 2008. (hereafter JOHRENDT – MÜLLER 2008), p. 1–16. (hereafter: JOHRENDT–MÜLLER 2008a), here: p. 14; Charles DUGGAN: *Papal Judges Delegate and the Making of the “New Law” in the Twelfth Century*. In: Charles DUGGAN: *Decretals and the creation of “new law” in the twelfth century: judges, judgements, equity, and law*. Aldershot – Brookfield – Singapore – Sydney. 1998. p. 172–199. (hereafter: DUGGAN 1998), here: p. 176, 194–195; Andreas HOLNDONNER: *Kommunikation – Jurisdiktion – Integration. Das Papsttum und das Erzbistum Toledo im 12. Jahrhundert (ca. 1085 – ca. 1185)*. Berlin – München – Boston. 2014. (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Neue Folge. Bd. 31: Studien zu Papstgeschichte und Papsturkunden), p. 469–470. (hereafter: HOLNDONNER 2014)

³ Harald MÜLLER: *Entscheidung auf Nachfrage. Die delegierten Richter als Verbindungsglieder zwischen Kurie und Region sowie als Gradmesser päpstlicher Autorität*. In: JOHRENDT

be attributed the acceptance of papal authority by the various regions, or they merely wanted to use papal pretensions to secure their own rights and pursuits.⁴ The spread of the system can be bound to Pope Alexander III (1159–1181), while the judicial background would only be developed by the time of the Fourth Council of Lateran – although it is hard to follow the process of the formation as regional differences make the possibility of a general description complicated.⁵ As a result of the headway of papal judge-delegation local courts got a serious rival, hence more and more clerics turned to the Apostolic See, which in turn would use papal delegation to efface the lower court levels mentioned.⁶ This procedure can be found in the Kingdom of Hungary as the 1252 provision of Béla IV (1235–1270) shows. As an answer to the increase of papal delegated jurisdiction, the Hungarian king prohibited the practice of summoning someone abroad, though he would have to withdraw this measure later, because of pressure coming from Pope Innocent III (1198–1216).⁷ A serious increase in the number of the cases happened generally in the 13th century.⁸

Papal judges-delegate functioned as judges empowered by papal authority (*apostolica auctoritate*).⁹ This formula is one of the main attributes of

– MÜLLER 2008. p. 108–131. (hereafter: MÜLLER 2008a), here: p. 109–110; James BRUNDAGE: *The Medieval Origins of the Legal Profession: Canonists, Civilians, and Courts*. Chicago – London. 2008. (hereafter: BRUNDAGE 2008), here: p. 126–127.

⁴ Cf. JOHRENDT–MÜLLER 2008a. p. 14.

⁵ MÜLLER 2008a. p. 110–111.

⁶ The delegated jurisdiction did not necessary mean the neglect of the local clerics: because of their capabilities (language, local knowledge, etc.) the popes gave mandates to locals persons. Cf. Gábor BARABÁS: A pápai kiküldött bíraskodás Magyarországon a kezdetektől a 13. század közepéig [Delegated Papal Jurisdiction in Hungary from the Origins to the Middle of the 13th Century]. *Történelmi Szemle* LV/2. (2013), p. 175–199. (hereafter: BARABÁS 2013), here: p. 179.

⁷ Cf. György BÓNIS: Egyházi bíraskodás a középkori Magyarországon [Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in Medieval Hungary]. In: György BÓNIS: *Szentszéki regeszták. Iratok az egyházi bíraskodás történetéhez a középkori Magyarországon*. Szeged. 1997. p. 621–658. (hereafter: BÓNIS 1997), here: p. 629–633; Gergely KISS: Az egyházi kormányzat a középkori Magyarországon [Ecclesiastical Government in the Medieval Hungary]. In: Márta FONT – Tamás FEDELES – Gergely KISS – Kata RAFFAYNÉ KÁLSECEZ: *Magyarország kormányzati rendszere (1000–1526)*. Pécs. 2007. p. 101–136. (hereafter: KISS 2007), here: p. 113; Harald MÜLLER: Die Urkunden der päpstlichen delegierten Richter. Methodische Probleme und erste Erkenntnisse am Beispiel der Normandie. In: *Hundert Jahre Papsturkundenforschung. Bilanz – Methoden – Perspektiven. Akten eines Kolloquiums zum Hundertjährigen Bestehens der Regesta Pontificum Romanorum von 9.–11. Oktober 1996 in Göttingen*. Hrsg. Rudolf HIESTAND. Göttingen. 2003. p. 351–371. (hereafter: MÜLLER 2003), here: p. 368–369.

⁸ Although since the 12th century an increase in the amount of the cases can be observed. BRUNDAGE 2008. p. 127–135, 137.

⁹ The mandates of the popes gave the necessary legitimation for the delegates. This is shown by the fact that the judges mostly inserted them in their charters. Harald MÜLLER: Gesandte mit beschränkter Handlungsvollmacht. Zur Struktur und Praxis päpstlich delegierter Gerichtsbarkeit. In: *Aus der Frühzeit europäischer Diplomatie. Zum geistlichen und weltlichen*

delegation¹⁰ but it has to be underlined that those empowered by this, possessed jurisdiction only for individual cases. Their own personality and clerical office were not relevant to their role as judges-delegate, since they were not able to decide any case (*in iurisdictione proprium nihil habens*) on these grounds.¹¹ Delegated jurisdiction, however, gave them such a prestige that they could summon even clerics of higher offices.¹²

In connection with the selection of judges it can be stated, that generally three delegates were appointed to handle the cases, although according to canon law under extraordinary circumstances even a single judges could make a valid decision.¹³ Two of the delegates had to be usually chosen by the litigants, whereas the third by the pope, or rather, in fact, by the auditors of the *audientia* at the papal court.¹⁴ The selection of judges was determined not only with regard to their numbers, but also territorial considerations.

According to general norms the judges had to hold their offices in the same diocese as the litigants, or at least they had to live in within a distance of a two days' trip.¹⁵ Nevertheless, this principle – similarly to other rulings – in practice could not work in every case. Although certain general trends can be observed, no exclusive regulations concerning the aspects of the selection of judges existed. The composition of the delegates shows that before the 13th century they were chosen mostly from members of high clergy, bishops and abbots:¹⁶ most likely because of the prestige of their

Gesandtschaftswesen vom 12. bis zum 15. Jahrhundert. Hrsg. Claudia MÄRTL – Claudia ZEY. Zürich. 2008. p. 41–65. (hereafter: MÜLLER 2008b), here: p. 61–62.

¹⁰ MÜLLER 2003. p. 358. Cf. DUGGAN 1998. p. 194–195; BRUNDAGE 2008. p. 136.

¹¹ MÜLLER 2008b. p. 43–44; DUGGAN 1998. p. 186–194.

¹² DUGGAN 1998. p. 179, 186–195.

¹³ HERDE 2002. p. 33.

¹⁴ MÜLLER 2003. p. 365–366; MÜLLER 2008a. p. 117, 120–122, 130; MÜLLER 2008b. p. 46–47, 63; HAGENEDER 1967. p. 31; Werner MALECZEK: *Papst und Kardinalskolleg von 1191 bis 1216.* Wien. 1984. (hereafter: MALECZEK 1984), p. 327–328; SWEENEY 1989. p. 30; BRUNDAGE 2008. p. 136. An example for the notification of the parties about the delegation of the judges: August POTTHAST: *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum.* Vol. 1. Graz. 1957. (hereafter: POTTHAST) nr. 5684. The triple supervision cannot be found in every case, hence the number of judges could either be more or less than that. MÜLLER 2008a. p. 120–122; Peter HERDE: *Audientia litterarum contradictarum. Untersuchungen über die päpstlichen Justizbriefe und die päpstliche Delegationsgerichtsbarkeit vom 13. bis zum Beginn des 16. Jahrhunderts.* Tübingen. 1970. (hereafter: HERDE 1970), p. 198–200; HAGENEDER 1967. p. 31–32; MALECZEK 1984. p. 327–328, 330.

¹⁵ HERDE 2002. p. 33.

¹⁶ See: Richard A. SCHMUTZ: Medieval papal representatives: legates, nuncios and judges-delegate. In: *Studia Gratiana post scripta. Essays on Medieval Law and the Emergence of the European State in Honor of Gaines Post.* Ed. Joseph R. STRAYER – Donald E. QUELLER. Rome. 1972. p. 441–463, here: p. 462; Gisela DROSSBACH: Die Entwicklung des Kirchenrechts als raumübergreifendes Kommunikationsmodell im 12. Jahrhundert. In: *Zentrum und Netzwerk. Kirchliche Kommunikationen und Raumstrukturen im Mittelalter.* Hrsg. Gisela DROSSBACH – Hans-Joachim SCHMIDT. Berlin – New York. 2008. (Scrinium Friburgense. Veröffentlichungen des Mediävistischen Instituts der Universität Freiburg, Bd. 22.), p. 41–61, here: p. 48.

offices, or because their proficiency in jurisdiction.¹⁷ The mandate of clerics of lower positions,¹⁸ mostly dignitaries of chapters and deans,¹⁹ became more and more common since the beginning of the 13th century.²⁰ Under the pontificates of Honorius III (1216–1227) and Gregory IX (1227–1241) priors of monasteries, or the convents themselves as legal persons were appointed as papal delegates as well.²¹ Therefore, position of the judges played an important role in the selection. So did their network of contacts, and their skills in canon law. We could even put it this way: papal delegated jurisdiction produced the necessary judges for its own needs.²²

Parallel to the changing circle of the judges grew the strata of litigants. Popes became *iudex ordinarius omnium* at the outset of the 13th century, while *commune et generale forum omnium clericorum et ecclesiarum* meant the delegated judiciary of the Church. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, in general and its Rome-centred type as well, was open not only for clerics, but also for laymen. It could happen in cases when the opponent was a church or a clergyman (*ratione personae*),²³ or if the nature of the litigation required it (*ratione rei, causae spiritualibus admixtae*).²⁴

2. The specificities in Hungary

¹⁷ Although this aspect is not well represented in the sources. MÜLLER 2008b. 48. Furthermore, there are cases in which the delegation of the judges was withdrawn because of their incapacity. See: BRUNDAGE 2008. p. 137.

¹⁸ This refers to the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

¹⁹ In Hungary the term *archidiaconus* was in use instead of *archipresbiter*, and they were not so independent of episcopal power as their colleagues in Western Europe. Cf. Iván BORSA: A hiteleshelyekről [About the Places of Authentication]. In: „Magyaroknak eleiről”. *Ünnepi tanulmányok a hatvan esztendősk Makk Ferenc tiszteletére*. Ed. Ferenc PTTI – György SZABADOS. Szeged. 2000. p. 99–106, here: p. 100; Hans Erich FEINE: *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte, Band 1. Die katholische Kirche*. Weimar. 1955. (hereafter: FEINE 1955), here: p. 369.

²⁰ Cf. MÜLLER 2003. p. 365–367; MÜLLER 2008b. p. 47–48; BÓNIS 1997. p. 632; HERDE 2002. p. 33; Bernát L. KUMOROVITZ: *A magyar pecséthasználat a középkorban* [The Hungarian Usage of Seals in the Middle Ages]. Budapest. 1944. (reprint 1993.), p. 59. (hereafter: KUMOROVITZ 1993)

²¹ E.g. Zirc: Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára, Diplomatikai Fényképtár [The Hungarian National Archive] (hereafter: DF), 206 913; POTTHAST nr. 8822, *Monumenta Romana episcopatus Vespriemiensis. A veszprémi püspökség római oklevéltára. I–IV*. Ed. Guilelmus FRANKNÓI – Josephus LUKCSICS. Budapest. 1896–1907. (hereafter: MREV) I. 88–89; Szentgottárd: POTTHAST nr. 6022, *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis. I–XII*. Ed. Georgius FEJÉR. Budae. 1829–1844. (hereafter: FEJÉR) vol. VII. t. 5. p. 220; Egres: POTTHAST nr. 6443; *Árpád-kori új okmánytár. I–XII*. Ed. Gusztáv WENZEL. Pest–Budapest. 1860–1874. (hereafter: ÁÚO) I. p. 165. The most important change was the delegation of the officials of the chapters, and the archdeacons. MÜLLER 2003. p. 365–367; MÜLLER 2008b. p. 47–48; KUMOROVITZ 1993. p. 59. Cf. HOLNDONNER 2014. p. 470.

²² MÜLLER 2008b. p. 48–49.

²³ E.g. in cases of usury, cf. HERDE 2002. p. 38; HERDE 1970. p. 207–211.

²⁴ HERDE 2002. p. 35; KISS 2007. p. 111.

Concerning the Hungarian situation it has to be stated, that the first known cases come partly from the end of the 12th century but mostly from the early 13th. The circle of judges under the pontificate of Innocent III included archbishops and bishops, abbeys of Benedictine and Cistercian monasteries, and provosts and deans as well. Until 1216 the activity of altogether four Benedictine abbots (Tihany, Pécsvárad, Szekszárd, Bakonybél) are known, while five Cistercian officials (Zirc, Pilisszentkereszt, Egres, Cikádor és Szentgotthárd) were commissioned as judges in almost twice as many cases.²⁵

Under the successors of Pope Innocent III the system continued to evolve further on and it led to the appearance of some new features. The situation in Hungary was also bound to the general tendencies. The pontificates of Honorius III and Gregory IX witnessed a further spread of the system of papal delegations both quantitatively and qualitatively. Concerning our topic the officials of monasteries made up the most important group, which also shows differences if compared to the previous times. Beside the abbots, now priors and convents as legal persons can be found in the sources as delegated judges.²⁶ When we examine the orders of the delegates, it is apparent that the Cistercians became much more significant than the Benedictines.²⁷ The latter group contains the commissions given to abbots of 17 monasteries but most of them appear only once in the sources as papal judges.²⁸ The aldermen of seven monasteries officiated more than once in various cases, among them we know the most details about the abbots of Pécsvárad²⁹ and Tihany³⁰. They are followed by the abbots of Somogyvár³¹ and Szekszárd.³² To return to the Cistercians, the role of priors and convents has to be emphasized, which was characteristic of this order. Among the abbots the superiors of Zirc, Szentgotthárd, Pilis and Egres got most of the commissions, while among the convents the priors of Zirc and Pilis were the most significant ones.³³

²⁵ SWEENEY 1989. p. 30–31. We have to underline, that there is no evidence from this period concerning the delegation of priors, except one. DF 200 003, POTTHAST nr. 4631, MREV I. p. 19.

²⁶ E.g.: Zirc: POTTHAST nr. 8822, 10847, Szentgotthárd: POTTHAST nr. 6022, 7347; Egres: POTTHAST nr. 6443, 8487.

²⁷ See: BARABÁS 2013. p. 186–193.

²⁸ See: BARABÁS 2013. p. 186–193

²⁹ POTTHAST nr. 7354, 8012, 10232, 10234, 10195, DF 206 858, DF 208 315.

³⁰ POTTHAST nr. 8977, 9968, 10847, 10195, 10370.

³¹ POTTHAST nr. 7051, 8822, 9968, DF 200 625, FEJÉR vol. IX. t. 7 p. 648.

³² POTTHAST nr. 9965, 10370, DF 206 858.

³³ Prior of Zirc: POTTHAST nr. 8822, 10847. Prior of Pilisszentkereszt: DF 200 005, POTTHAST nr. 8497. Prior of Szentgotthárd: POTTHAST nr. 6022, 7347. Prior of Egres: POTTHAST nr. 6443, 8487. Convent of Zirc: POTTHAST nr. 6000, 6775, 10847. Convent of Pilisszentkereszt: POTTHAST nr. 10961.

As regards the nature of the cases concerning the period before the mid-13th century they can be classified into three major groups. The largest one is formed by 1.) affairs between churches, arising predominantly because of tithe-rights. Beside them we have the cases of 2.) church-discipline and church government plus 3.) processes of laymen.³⁴ The available sources from the period chosen show that in Hungary certain kind of topics never came up: for example the cases of usury, pledge, and the violation of the rightful price. This shortage is very eye-catching in the practice of delegated jurisdiction in Hungary.³⁵

3. Religious orders in the diocese Veszprém and papal judge-delegation

The situation described so far leads us to the conclusion that the monasteries and their officials could get in touch with papal delegation through two related ways: either 1.) as litigants or 2.) as judges. The latter aspect will not be discussed completely, since it is not reasonable either thematically or quantitatively. At the very end of this paper, however, an enumeration can be found about the judges and the cases examined. At this point we can only underline that among the officials of monasteries in this diocese the abbots of Tihany and Somogyvár made up the largest part of those clerics who were authorised as papal judges, since their colleagues of Bakonybél, Zalavár and Zselicszentjakab can be found only sporadically in the sources. It can also be mentioned as a unique detail that once the dean of Tihany functioned as judge delegate.³⁶ Among the Cistercians the abbey of Zirc exceeded all others regarding our topic because not only its abbot but also the convent as a collective, and even the prior were ordered as judges. The same can be said of the monastery of Pilisszentkereszt.³⁷

After this short survey about the judges we have to examine the cases of the monasteries in the diocese. We have to underline though, that the quantity of sources concerning this matter is not a great one, therefore we have knowledge only about a few litigations. First, the cases of the abbey of Somogyvár will be presented according to the already mentioned typology of the litigations.

The first case to examine is the election of 1204 in the abbey of Somogyvár which can be integrated into the line of problematic canonical elections, therefore into the group of matters concerning ecclesiastical government.³⁸

³⁴ SWEENEY 1989. p. 35–37.

³⁵ Cf. HERDE 1970. p. 233–286; HERDE 2002. p. 38.

³⁶ See the chart.

³⁷ See the chart.

³⁸ This case is a good example for the possible influence various arts of the king on the Hungarian church, so as the resistance of the clerics.

The monk of West-European, mostly of French origin,³⁹ turned to the pope because King Emery (1196–1204) ordered them to elect a Hungarian abbot, which they refused. On the 14th September the pope wrote on this matter to the Hungarian king himself⁴⁰ and this letter contains the details of the dispute. The king appointed his former mentor, Bernhard of Perugia, the actual archbishop of Split,⁴¹ to lead the transformation of the monastery in his capacity as the new abbot. The Dalmatian high priest, who was of Italian descent, started to perform the necessary arrangements, and claimed that many monks had been mishandling the possessions of the abbey. Moreover, the archbishop even made use of lay power against the friars, and tried to replace them with Hungarians.⁴² In this situation the monks decided to seek help from the Holy See, and Pope Innocent III ordered to take a whole range of measures. Beside the king he also wrote to the archbishop of Split himself,⁴³ while he empowered the bishop of Nagyvárad (Oradea), the abbot of Zirc, and the provost of Esztergom as his delegates to examine

³⁹ See Gergely KISS: A somogyvári apátság alapítása és francia kapcsolatai [The Foundation and the French Connections of the Abbey of Somogyvár]. In: *Egyháztörténeti Szemle III/1*. Ed. Judit BALOGH – Dénes DIENES – Csaba FAZEKAS. Sárospatak. 2001. p. 43–61; Márta FONT: Ansiedlung, Integration und Toleranz im mittelalterlichen Ungarn. In: *Minderheitendasein in Mittel- und Osteuropa – interdisziplinär betrachtet*. Hrsg. Zsuzsanna GERNER – László KUPA. Hamburg. 2011. p. 13–24. here: p. 18.

⁴⁰ POTTHAST nr. 2280.

⁴¹ Ferenc MAKK: 'Bernát'. In: *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. század)*. Ed. Gyula KRISTÓ – Pál ENGEL – Ferenc MAKK. Budapest. 1994. p. 99; Judit GÁL: "Qui erat graciosus apud eum" A spliti érsekek szerepe az Árpádok királyságában [The Role of the Archbishops of Split in the Realm of the Árpáds]. In: *Magister historiae. Válogatott tanulmányok a 2012-ben és 2013-ban megrendezett középkorral foglalkozó, mesterszakos hallgatói konferenciák előadásaiából*. Ed. Mónika BELUCZ – Judit GÁL – István KÁDAS – Eszter TARJÁN. Budapest. 2014. (ELTE BTK Történelemtudományi Doktori Iskola, Tanulmányok – Konferenciák 7.), p. 52–71, here: p. 62–63.

⁴² "[...] *secundum antiquum et approbatum morem sui monasterii, elegerunt, quod hactenus tam abbates, quam monachos consuevit habere latinos. Sed tu, fili charissime, quod cum devotione ac reverentia retulerunt, regium sibi noluisti prebere consensum, affirmans, quod in alium, quam Ungarum minime consentiret. Venerabilis autem frater noster Spalatensis archiepiscopus, hoc attendens, ad presentiam tue serenitatis accessit, et monasterium ipsum velociter impetravit, de quo, si verum est, valde miramur, quia, licet professione sit monachus et natione latinus, cum tamen pontificis gerat officium, abbatis non debuit ministerium usurpare, presertim et in aliena dioecesi et per laicam potestatem, qui, non multo post, cum servis monasterii memorati monachos universos super thesauro monasterii apud regiam celsitudinem graviter accusavit, sed ipsi, voluntatem presenties illius, statim, ipso presente, cuidam homini tuo, quem ipse secum adduxerat, et multis aliis bonis viris thesaurum ecclesie non solum integrum assignarunt, sed etiam augmentatum. Verum, idem archiepiscopus, voluntatem suam cupiens adimplere, opportunitate captata, in eos armata manu irruit violenter, et quosdam ex ipsis manu propria flagellavit, quosdam vero coniecit in vincula, cunctisque penitus destitutis, monachos ungaros pro sua instituit voluntate, appellationi non deferens, quam iidem monachi super tanto gravamine ad Sedem Apostolicam emisissent, terminum in assumptione beate Marie proximo preterite prefigentes".* MREV I. p. 12–13.

⁴³ 14 September 1204. POTTHAST nr. 2281.

the complaints and punish Bernhard, if necessary.⁴⁴ We can observe here the clash between ecclesiastical custom and royal patronage, a fact that relates the case to the topic of the royal churches in Hungary too. The monks of Somogyvár could at last reach their goal, so they got the right to choose their abbot freely, while in 1210 the pope took the abbey under the protection of the Apostolic See and confirmed its privileges.⁴⁵ This action did not mean new rights or an *exemptio*, although in the light of later data it seems certain that the abbey belonged directly to the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Esztergom.⁴⁶

During the early 1200s, but prior to the case just reviewed, the Saint Giles abbey of Somogyvár had a quarrel with the superior of the diocese, the bishop of Veszprém, because the matter concerned the rights of the prelate over his bishopric. The abbot took three churches of the diocese under his own power (*potestas jurisdictionis, potestas ordinis*), so he claimed for himself the right of ordering priests and dispensing sacraments.⁴⁷ The bishop turned to the pope, and in 1203 Innocent III ordered the bishops of Vác and Nyitra (Nitra) as his judges-delegate to investigate the complaint.⁴⁸ The petition concerned not the legal situation of the abbey, because being a royal church it was under the direct jurisdiction of the archbishop of Esztergom.⁴⁹ The *potestas ordinis* of the bishop of Veszprém was in fact affected. This power was secured later in a settlement concluded between the bishop and the archbishop of Esztergom in 1216, which concerned the right of

⁴⁴ “Nos enim, venerabili fratri nostro Waradiensi episcopo et dilectis filiis abbati de Buccano, et preposito Strigoniensi, damus firmiter in mandatis, ut inquisita diligentius veritate, si rem invenerint taliter processisse, nisi predictus Spalatensis archiepiscopus ad commonitionem eorum excessum suum per se ipsum curaverit emendare, ipsi ei pro tanta presumptione canonicam poenam infligant, et eo a prelibato monasterio prorsus excluso, faciant illud iuxta formam prescriptam, appellatione postposita, ordinari”. MREV I. p. 13. Cf. SWEENEY 1989. p. 35.

⁴⁵ “Abbati et conventui Simigiensi [...] Dilecti in domino filii, [...] personas vestras et Simigiense monasterium, [...] sub beati Petri et nostra protectione suscipimus, et presentis scripti patrocinio communimus, libertates et immunitates a principibus monasterio vestro concessas, dignitates quoque ac antiquas et rationabiles consuetudines obtentas et hactenus observatas, auctoritate vobis apostolica confirmantes”. MREV I. p. 19.

⁴⁶ Gergely KISS: *Királyi egyházak a középkori Magyarországon* [Royal Churches in Medieval Hungary]. Pécs. 2013. (Thesaurus Historiae Ecclesiasticae in Universitate Quinqueecclesiensi 3.) (hereafter: Kiss 2013), p. 61. As a supplement we have to mention, that the monastery got around this time into the *Liber Censuum*. Gergely KISS: *Abbatia regalia – hierarchia ecclesiastica. A királyi alapítású bencés apátságok egyházi jogi helyzete a 11–13. században* [The Legal Status of the Royal Benedictine Monasteries in the 11th–13th Centuries]. Budapest. 2006. (hereafter: Kiss 2006), p. 92.

⁴⁷ “[...] abbas de Simigio Vesprimiensis diocesis tres ecclesias, de iure ad eum spectantes, contra iustitiam definet occupatas, quarum unam ab extraneo episcopo, contradicente eo, fecit pro sue voluntatis arbitrio consecrari, cum ipse paratus esset eandem pro sui officii debito consecrare”. MREV I. p. 11.

⁴⁸ 7 October 1203. DF 200 002.

⁴⁹ See Kiss 2013. p. 61.

coronation of the Hungarian queen consorts.⁵⁰ The further details of the case of 1203 are unknown, although the *exempt* status of the monastery can be proven by later sources. This status, however, probably cannot be linked to the case of the mentioned churches.⁵¹ On the other hand we have to state the fact that in 1212 pope Innocent III turned to the abbots and priests of the diocese of Veszprém because of a similar matter. In his letter (7th February)⁵² he gave them the order, explicitly naming the *exempt* provostship of Székesfehérvár, to accept the sacramental power only from the bishop of Veszprém,⁵³ as it was his right to give them away (*potestas ordinis*).⁵⁴

From the year 1237 another case is known in which the episcopal right of the bishop of Veszprém was the issue. Bishop Bartholomew had a quarrel with the Holy Salvador monastery of Kapornak (Nagykapornak). He was accused by the abbot of using the yearly visitation to require illegitimate assignments from the monks.⁵⁵ Pope Gregory IX commissioned the abbots of Zalavár, Tihany and Szekszárd to investigate the case, including the right to summon Bishop Bartholomew on the ground that he had damaged the rights of the abbey, and he had excommunicated the abbot and the convent.⁵⁶

⁵⁰ See Kiss 2013. p. 49.

⁵¹ Kiss 2013. p. 61.

⁵² DF 230 073

⁵³ “*Vesprimiensi episcopo in iure suo, sicut tenemur, adesse, auctoritate vobis presentium districtius inhibemus, ne sacros ordines, crisma et alia ecclesiastica sacramenta, que suscipere debetis ab ipso, quamdiu gratiam Apostolice Sedis habuerit et ea vobis gratis et sine pravitate aliqua voluerit exhibere, ab aliis episcopis recipere presumatis. Nisi hoc forte alicui vestrum ex speciali Sedis Apostolice privilegio sit indultum, neque contra tenorem privilegiorum vestrorum in preiudicium Vesprimiensis ecclesie usurpare vobis aliquid temere attemptetis*”. MREV IV. p. 305. See: Gergely KISS: *Mutatis mutandis? A magyar főpapok jogfelfogásának változásai a 12. század második és a 13. század első felében* [Mutatis mutandis? Changing of Jurisdictional Theories of Some Hungarian Prelates in the Second Half of the Twelfth and in the First Half of the Thirteenth Centuries] In: „*Köztes-Európa*” *vonzásában. Ünnepi tanulmányok Font Márta 60. születésnapjára*. Ed. Dániel BAGI– Tamás FEDELES – Gergely KISS. Pécs. 2012. p. 259–276. here: p. 268; Gergely KISS: *Mutatis mutandis? Les mutations de la pensée juridictionnelle des prelatés hongrois à la fin du XII^e et au début du XIII^e siècle. Specimina Nova Pars Prima Sectio Mediaevalis VII*. Ed. Márta FONT – Gergely KISS. Pécs. 2015. p. 71–101. here: p. 87–88.

⁵⁴ See: FEINE 1955. p. 191–192, 323–324; Kiss 2006. p. 13, 49, 60, 65; Kiss 2007. p. 107–108; Lotte KÉRY: *Klosterfreiheit und päpstliche Organisationsgewalt. Exemption als Herrschaftsinstrument des Papsttums? In: Rom und die Regionen: Studien zur Homogenisierung der lateinischen Kirche im Hochmittelalter*. Hrsg. Jochen JOHRENDT – Harald MÜLLER. Berlin – Boston. 2012. p. 83–144. here: p. 100–101.

⁵⁵ See the papal charter of 21 May 1237. POTTHAST nr. 10370, *Les registres de Grégoire IX. Recueil des bulles de ce pape publiées et analysées d’après les manuscrits originaux du Vatican par Lucien AUVRAY*. t. I-IV. Paris. 1890–1955. (hereafter: RGIX) II. nr. 3692.

⁵⁶ The abbot was forced to leave his monastery as well: “[...] *abbas et conventus monasterii sancti salvatoris de Caparnuch ordinis sancti Benedicti, Vesprimiensis diocesis, gravem ad nos transmisere querelam, quod Vesprimiensis episcopus monasterium ipsum indebitis exactionibus aggravans et molestans, singulis annis unum equum ab eis, contra iustitiam, exigit, et quotiens vult in anno,*

The bishop sent his procurator to Rome,⁵⁷ where the parties managed to come to an understanding with the help of the cardinal priest of S. Maria in Trastevere as a papal charter dated 1238 proves it.⁵⁸ The text of the *amicabilis compositio*⁵⁹ and its details are, however, unknown. The case itself exemplifies well that in a quarrel over legal and material questions not only prelates could turn to the Apostolic See but also abbots and convents of lesser monasteries, where they could find protection against the unlawful pursuits of their *ordinarii*.

Among the known cases of papal delegated jurisdiction in Hungary, as mentioned before, predominantly litigations concerning doubtful tenures and incomes, above all rights of tithes can be found. The lawsuit of Saint Giles abbey of Somogyvár with the abbey of Pannonhalma was one of them. Unfortunately in this case we do not possess the papal mandates given to the judges⁶⁰ but the events can be reconstructed thanks to the charter issued by the delegates and the abbot of Somogyvár in 1215.⁶¹ The origin of this affair can also be bound to doubtful tithes on which the parties could come to an agreement,⁶² although this was not the last step in the process. The charter of the judges, the bishop of Győr and the abbots of Pécsvárad and Bakonybél, informs us, that after the failure of the first round the litigants could come to an understanding.⁶³ The charter contains the

visitationis vel alia de causa, ad monasterium idem accedens, trahensque moram ibidem cum personarum et exactionum multitudine effrenata, bona monasterii pro sua voluntate consumit, ita quod fratres in eo degentes vix habent unde valeant sustentari [...] Quare iudem abbas et conventus huiusmodi gravamina non valentes ulterius tolerare, ad nostram audientiam appellarunt, et cum idem abbas iter arripisset ad nostram presentiam veniendi, dictus episcopus in eos generaliter et specialiter in quosdam eorum excommunicationis sententiam pronulgavit [...] eundem episcopum [...] peremptorie citare curetis, ut infra competentem terminum, quem ei duxeritis prefigendum'. MREV I. p. 107.

⁵⁷ "[...] per se, vel per procuratorem idoneum, compareat coram nobis, facturus et recepturus super hiis quod iustitia svadebit". MREV I. p.107. Cf. FEINE 1955. p. 336–337.

⁵⁸ 18 May 1238. POTTHAST nr. 10601, RGIX II. nr. 4368.

⁵⁹ "[...] dilectum filium nostrum Sancte Marie in Transtiberim presbiterum cardinalem tibi, fili abbas, tam tuo, quam vestro, filii conventus, nomine, ac Sebastiano canonico Vesprimiensi procuratori dicti episcopi apud Sedem Apostolicam constitutus concesserimus auditorem, tandem eodem cardinale mediante amicabilem inter partes compositio interveni, prout in ipsius confectis super hoc litteris plenius continetur, quam apostolico petivistis munimine roborari. Nos igitur vestris iustis postulationibus grato concurrentes assensu, compositionem ipsam ratam habentes et firmam, illam auctoritate apostolica confirmamus, et presentis scripti patrocinio communimus [...]". ÁÚO II. p. 85.

⁶⁰ This case is a good example for the scenario when the parties turned to the papacy after a failed agreement. The known *compositio* was made in 1210. ÁÚO I. p. 102–104.

⁶¹ DF 206 850, ÁÚO XI. p. 131–132. Cf. Gábor BARABÁS: Der Einfluss der Papsturkunden auf die Schreiben der päpstlichen delegierten Richter in Ungarn in der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts. *Specimina Nova Pars Prima Sectio Mediaevalis VII*. Ed. Márta FONT – Gergely KISS. Pécs. 2013. p. 19–37, here: p. 21–25.

⁶² ÁÚO I. p. 102–104.

⁶³ See: SWEENEY 1989. p. 48–49. As mentioned before, this was not the first *compositio*.

statement of the abbot and convent of Somogyvár as well,⁶⁴ saying that they together decided to give up the former illegal exercise, and made a promise on their and their successors' behalf that they would never harm again the papal and royal privileges of Pannonhalma.⁶⁵ As a result of the work of the delegates this litigation could come to an end in a form known as a *compositio*.

In the area under research the Cistercian monastery of Pilisszentkereszt had a lawsuit with Pannonhalma as well, also because of some tithe-rights. At first the bishop of Győr was delegated with their colleagues but he who could not accept the mandate because he was taking part in the 5th crusade.⁶⁶ In this situation, on the 22 January 1218, Pope Honorius III gave a delegation to the abbot of Lébény, and the archdeacon and cantor of Győr. The judges however failed to make a sentence.⁶⁷ In 1231, already under the pontificate of the next pope, Gregory IX, the bishop and the cantor of Győr were given an order again, this time together with the provost of their chapter.⁶⁸ This mandate tells us that earlier a papal chaplain, Giles, who was at that moment in the kingdom, was also proceeding in the case. With his help an agreement was reached but after a while the abbots might have been dissatisfied with that – at least they refused to fulfill it. According to the mandate the judges-delegate had to oblige the monks to follow the regulations of the agreement⁶⁹ but the details of their operations are unknown.

A further but very taciturn source informs us about the litigation of Robert, bishop of Veszprém with the Saint Abraham monastery of Csepel

⁶⁴ ÁÚO XI. p. 132–133.

⁶⁵ “[...] *et nos Symigienses, communi consilio et consensu tocius nostri capituli, nolentes sequi maliciam et iniquitatem Hilliberti abbatis et suorum fautorum, qui perturbabant possessiones monasterii Sancti Martini de Pannonia in decimacionibus aratorum, orreorum, cellariorum propriorum, et populorum nostrorum, ac parochianorum capelle Sancti Petri, nolentes eciam contraire privilegiis sancti regis et Romanorum pontificum, sed malentes iuri parere, quam improbe litigare, promittimus et firmiter nos nostrosque successores obligamus ad solutionem predictarum decimarum, quia eas de iure debet habere, plenam et integram prefato monasterio faciendam*”. ÁÚO XI. p. 132–133.

⁶⁶ “[...] *venerabili fratri episcopo Geurinesi et eius collegis commiserit terminandam, tum propter mandatoris mortem, tum quia prefatus episcopus transfretasse dicitur in subsidium Terre Sancte, nec non unus coiudicum ad partes alias est translatus, causa ipsa remansit hactenus indecisa*”. ÁÚO I. 150. See: László VESZPRÉMY: II. András magyar király keresztes hadjárata, 1217–1218 [The Crusade of the Hungarian King Andrew II in 1217–1218]. In: *Magyarország és a keresztes háborúk. Lovagrendek és emlékeik*. Ed. Judit MAJOROSSY – József LASZLOVSZKY – József ZSENGELLÉR. Máriabesznyő – Gödöllő. 2006. p. 99–111. here: p. 109.

⁶⁷ POTTHAST nr. 5680.

⁶⁸ DF 206 914, POTTHAST nr. 8831.

⁶⁹ “[...] *demum in dilectum filium Egidium subdiaconum et capellanum nostrum tunc in Ungaria existentem fuit hinc inde tanquam in arbitrum compromissum, qui equum inter partes arbitrium promulgavit, quod supradictus abbas et conventus Pellisiensis observare pro sue voluntatis arbitrio contradicunt [...] quatinus ipsos ad eiusdem observationem arbitrii, sicut et equum, per penam in compromisso expressam appellatione remota cogatis*”. ÁÚO I. p. 289.

Island, because the monks, so reads the letter Innocents III of 26th January 1212, refused to pay the tithes to the bishop after some products.⁷⁰ The bishop of Győr, the abbot of Tihany, and the provost of Vasvár were appointed as judges in this matter but the further steps remain unknown.⁷¹

Finally we have to examine a case which is special because of the scarcity of related sources. In 1224 Pope Honorius III wrote to Robert bishop of Veszprém⁷² about a case in which *comes* Miksa, known as *the Bearded*,⁷³ the founder of the Benedictine monastery of Telki, had turned to the Holy See with his petition. He described that monastery barely emptied,⁷⁴ due to disciplinary reasons. So the *comes* suggested the pope should hand over and put the monastery under the authority of a Cistercian abbey, perhaps Heiligenkreutz, or Pilisszentkereszt. Robert was involved in the case as the bishop of the diocese⁷⁵ but the proposal failed because Telki belonged to the Benedictine order until 1267.⁷⁶

4. Summary

At the end of our study we have to state that the area of the diocese of Veszprém, and the role of the religious orders could not be treated as an exception to the system of papal delegated jurisdiction. This conclusion is also valid concerning the issues of the known cases: we have information about lawsuits on matters of tithes, ecclesiastical discipline, church government and administration in which the monasteries of the diocese took part. It has to be mentioned, however, that we do not possess information about cases in which laymen were the opponents of religious orders – although it was not a rare phenomenon in other parts of Hungary. As mentioned before, the officials of the monasteries were also active as judges-delegate.

⁷⁰ DF 200 003, POTTHAST nr. 4631.

⁷¹ “[...] *Vesprimiensis episcopus conquestione monstravit, quod fratres de sancto Abraham Vesprimiensis diocesis quasdam decimas sibi debitas contra iustitiam detinent occupatas*”. MREV I. 19. Cf. SWEENEY 1989. p. 33.

⁷² POTTHAST nr. 7208.

⁷³ Beatrix F. ROMHÁNYI: *Kolostorok es társaskáptalanok a középkori Magyarországon* [Monasteries and Collegiate Chapters in the Medieval Hungary]. CD-Rom. Budapest. 2008. (hereafter: ROMHÁNYI 2008) ‘Telki’

⁷⁴ Pope Innocent III had already handled this question. POTTHAST nr. 15, Die Register Innocenz’ III. Band I. Hrsg. Othmar HAGENEDER. Graz. 1964. nr. 6.

⁷⁵ “*Dilectus filius nobilis vir Micha comes fundator et patronus monasterii Thaliki ordinis sancti Benedicti nobis humiliter supplicavit, ut cum idem monasterium, propter dissolutionem et malitiam habitantium hactenus in eodem, sit adeo imminutum, quod vix unus ibi remanserit qui valeat in ipso celebrare divina, illud antequam omnino depereat, monasterio sancte crucis cisterciensis ordinis subici faceremus, parato ipso suum ad id prestare consensum. [...] id si expedire videris studeas adimplere, proviso, ut si qui sunt ibi, vel recipiant Cisterciensis ordinis instituta vel in aliis monasteriis collocentur*”. MREV I. p. 61–62.

⁷⁶ The reason for this is unknown. See: ROMHÁNYI 2008. ‘Telki’

In the sources we meet basically abbots and priors but later also convents collectively empowered with papal accreditation. In the latter case the Cistercian abbots of Zirc and Pilisszentkereszt, as well as the Benedictine abbeys of Tihany and Somogyvár deserve special attention. Concerning the circle of litigants the role of the abbey of Somogyvár can be underlined, which is the best documented subject. Beside this monastery we cannot forget about the role of the bishops of Veszprém, especially Robert, who was involved many times not only as the *ordinarius* of every monastery of the diocese but also as a litigant.

Appendix

The officials of monasteries and their appearances as judges-delegate

Judges	Lawsuits	Sources
OSB		
Abbot of Tihany	The dispute of the archbishop of Esztergom with the abbey of Pannonhalma (1212 and 1215)	POTTTHAST nr. 4631, 4978.
	The litigation of Pannonhalma and the bishop of Zagreb (1232)	POTTTHAST nr. 8977.
	The damaging of the monastery of Güssing (1235)	POTTTHAST nr. 9968, AÜO I. p. 343, 344.
	The dispute of the monastery of Bizere (Bisitra) and the bishop of Csanád (Cenad) (1236)	POTTTHAST nr. 10195.
	The summon of the bishop of Veszprém to Rome (1237)	POTTTHAST nr. 10370.
	The litigation of Pannonhalma with the archdeacon of Somogy and with other priests. (1240)	POTTTHAST nr. 10847.
	The summon of the bishop of Veszprém to Rome (1223)	POTTTHAST nr. 7051.
	The litigation of the abbey of Pannonhalma and the provostship of Szekesfehervár (1231)	POTTTHAST nr. 8822.
	The damaging of the monastery of Güssing (1235)	DF 206955, POTTTHAST nr. 9968.
	The lawsuit of the bishop of Veszprém with the priest of some chapels in his diocese (1226)	DF 200 625
Abbot of Somogyvár	The treaty between the abbey of Somogyvár and Pannonhalma (1215)	DF 206 850, MREV I. 33.
	The litigation of Pannonhalma and the bishop of Zagreb (1226)	POTTTHAST nr. 7598.
Abbot of Bakonybél	The litigation of Pannonhalma and the bishop of Zagreb (1226)	POTTTHAST nr. 7598.
	The dispute of the monastery of Bizere (Bisitra) and the bishop of Csanád (Cenad) (1236)	POTTTHAST nr. 10237.
Abbot of Zalavár	The summon of the bishop of Veszprém to Rome (1237)	POTTTHAST nr. 10370.

Abbot of Zselicszent-jakab	The summon of the bishop of Zagreb to Rome(1223)	POTTHAST nr. 7051.
Dean of Tihany	The damaging of the monastery of Güssing (1235)	POTTHAST nr. 9968.
OCist		
Abbot of Zirc	The canonical investigation against bishop Kalán of Pécs (1199)	POTTHAST nr. 583.
	The mutilation of the papal register (1199)	POTTHAST nr. 584.
	The abbot-election in Somogyvár (1204)	POTTHAST nr. 2281.
	The confirmation of the privileges of the Hospitaller Knights (1208)	POTTHAST nr. 3316.
	The confirmation of a testament (1208)	POTTHAST nr. 3369.
	The investigation of the complaint against the bishop of Vác (1218)	POTTHAST nr. 5795.
	The litigation of Pannonhalma and the bishop of Zagreb (1221 and 1232)	POTTHAST nr. 6466, 8977.
	The problems of the provost of Arad (1222)	POTTHAST nr. 6775.
	The litigation of the Hospitaller Knights with the monastery of Valkó (1225)	POTTHAST nr. 7404.
	The problems of a papal subdeacon (1230)	POTTHAST nr. 8554.
	The litigation of the abbey of Pannonhalma and the provostship of Székesfehérvár (1231)	POTTHAST nr. 8822.
	The damaging of the monastery of Güssing (1235)	DF 206 959, POTTHAST nr. 10048.
	The support of the provost of Székesfehérvár (1237)	POTTHAST nr. 10366.
The investigation against the bishop of Csanád (Cenad) (1237 and 1238)	POTTHAST nr. 10438, 10440, 10627.	
The litigation of the abbey of Pannonhalma and the chapter of Veszprém (1228)	POTTHAST nr. 8183.	
The lawsuit of the bishop of Veszprém with the priest of some chapels in his diocese (1226)	DF 200 625	
Convent of Zirc	The litigation of Pannonhalma with the archdeacon of Somogy and with other priests (1240)	POTTHAST nr. 10847.
Prior of Zirc	The litigation of the abbey of Pannonhalma and the provostship of Székesfehérvár (1231)	POTTHAST nr. 8822.

	The litigation of Pannonhalma with the archdeacon of Somogy and with other priests (1240)	POTTHAST nr. 10847.
	The status of the monasteries of Greek rite in Hungary (1204)	POTTHAST nr. 2184.
	The investigation of the complaint against the bishop of Vác (1218)	POTTHAST nr. 5795.
	The transformation of the orthodox monastery in Visegrád (1221)	POTTHAST nr. 6619.
	The problems of the provost of Arad (1222)	POTTHAST nr. 6775.
	The litigation of the abbey of Pannonhalma and the chapter of Veszprém (1226)	POTTHAST nr. 7284.
	The litigation of the abbey of Pannonhalma and the Hospitaller Knights (1225)	POTTHAST nr. 7414.
	The lawsuit of the bishop of Veszprém and the priest of Pest (1225)	DF 200 005, MIREV I. p. 62-63.
	The damaging of the monastery of Güssing (1235)	DF 206 950.
	The conflict of the archbishop of Esztergom and the provost of Arad (1235)	POTTHAST nr. 10024.
	The canonical investigation in the provostship of Székesfehérvár (1240)	POTTHAST nr. 10861.
	The quarrel over the bishop-election in Várad (Oradea) (1240)	POTTHAST nr. 10961.
	The investigation against the bishop of Csanád (Cenad) (1241)	POTTHAST nr. 10985.
	The lawsuit of the bishop of Veszprém and the priest of Pest (1225)	DF 200 005.
Prior of Pflisszentkereszt	The litigation of Pannonhalma and the St. Thomas Becket provostship of Esztergom (1230)	POTTHAST nr. 8497.
Convent of Pflisszentkereszt	The quarrel over the bishop-election in Várad (Oradea) (1240)	POTTHAST nr. 10961.