

Gábor BARABÁS

The Hungarian Royal Family and the Delegated Papal Jurisdiction from the Mongol Invasion to the late Thirteenth Century*

This paper is a short contribution to the history of the relations between the Roman pontiffs and the Hungarian rulers, or in a broader sense, the royal family. The focus of the research is on the second half of the thirteenth century, starting with the events after the Mongol invasion of Hungary in 1241–1242 and ending with the death of the last Árpáadian king, Andrew III. The main question is: how did the members of the royal family get in touch with papal judges-delegate in the realm of St. Stephen? In which cases did they turn to the papacy in order to benefit from the system, and under what circumstances did they appear as participants of a procedure? One of the most interesting sources regarding the attitude towards the papal delegated jurisdiction is a petition of King Béla IV. In his response, Pope Innocent IV forbade – with certain exceptions – the citation of the subjects of the king outside of the realm. The initiative of the Hungarian ruler is clear evidence for his awareness of the extension and the significance of the system of delegated jurisdiction in his kingdom.

Keywords: medieval Hungary, Árpád-era, royal family, delegated papal jurisdiction, medieval papacy



This paper is a short contribution to the history of the relations between the Apostolic See and the Hungarian rulers, or in a broader sense, the royal family. The focus of the research is on the second half of the thirteenth century, starting with the events after the Mongol invasion of Hungary in 1241–1242 and ending with the death of the last Árpáadian king, Andrew III in 1301. The main questions are: how did the members of the royal family get in touch with the papal delegated jurisdiction in the realm of St. Stephen? In which cases did they turn to the papacy in order to benefit from the apostolic authority, and

* The research for this study was supported by the National Office of Innovation and Research (NKFIH NN 124763): "Papal Delegates in Hungary in the XIVth Century (1294–1378) – Online Database".

under what circumstances did they appear as participants of a procedure? One of the most interesting sources regarding the attitude towards the papal delegated jurisdiction, and so, the papal authority, is a petition of King Béla IV. In his response, Pope Innocent IV forbade – with certain exceptions – the citation of the subjects of the Hungarian king outside of the realm. The initiative of the ruler is clear evidence for his awareness of the extension and the significance of the system of delegated jurisdiction in his kingdom.

In order to implement a comparative approach, first we have to take a closer look at the characteristics of the papal delegated jurisdiction and its ways of functioning in Hungary in the Árpád-era. Delegated jurisdiction was one of the most important instruments of the papacy to validate its authority from the late eleventh century onwards.¹ The foundation of the system rooted in the willingness of churches and clerics to turn to the Apostolic See for a judicial decision with the aim of having the verdict confirmed by papal authority. The system itself can be linked to the reforms of the papacy (and its power over the Church and its universal claims) at the end of the eleventh century.²

Papal delegated jurisdiction gave an opportunity to local churches to evade the levels of ordinary courts as well. At the same time, it is intriguing to note that the delegated judges came from the circle of local clerics, who, at first, were mostly archbishops, bishops and abbots. Thus, we can conclude that the needs of the parties affected the development of the judiciary system itself. It was in the very best interest of the papacy that local clerics and churches should turn to the pope as the Holy See intended to increase its authority. The system of delegations was a significant instrument of the papacy which helped the popes to shape Western Christianity and influence its regions. The original initiative came from them since they had a say in the selection of the judges.³

The popes dealt with cases of the Hungarian royal family with the help of the delegations as early as the late twelfth century.⁴ Beside ecclesiastical affairs, most importantly the archbishop- and bishop-elections,⁵ papal delegates were empowered to act in connection with the struggle of King Emeric and Prince Andrew,⁶ the quarrel between Andrew II and his son, Béla,⁷ or the issue of the

¹ SWEENEY 1989. p. 26.

² See with further literature: BARABÁS 2013. p. 175–176; MÜLLER 2008. p. 108–131, 109–110; JOHRENDT – MÜLLER 2008. p. 14; DUGGAN 1998. p. 172–199.

³ See HAGENEDER 1967. p. 27; HERDE 2002. p. 22; FALKENSTEIN 1986. p. 37–39; JOHRENDT – MÜLLER 2008. p. 14; DUGGAN 1998. p. 176, 194–195.

⁴ For the Hungarian situation see with further literature: BARABÁS 2013. p. 183–199. For the historiography see BARABÁS 2019. p. 3–23.

⁵ E. g. the case of Provost Gottfried of Arad (ZSOLDOS 2011. p. 107; KOVÁCS 2018. p. 151, 159.), the litigation of Prince Coloman of Slavonia with the Order of the Templars (BARABÁS 2017. p. 41–42.) For the canonical elections see BARABÁS 2021. p. 13–24.

⁶ See BARABÁS 2015. p. 126–130; For the conflict see. SWEENEY 1999; SZABADOS 1999; SZABADOS 2000; KÖRMENDI 2012; KÖRMENDI 2019. p. 18–26; GÁL 2019.

⁷ See BARABÁS 2015. p. 131–133; ZSOLDOS 2018.

Teutonic Order in Hungary.⁸ The intensity of the relations did not decrease after the Mongol invasion.

At first, we have focus on the key document of the selected era, to the charter of Innocent IV issued on 3 December 1252.⁹ It is one of the most important sources in terms of the operation and expansion of the delegated jurisdiction in the mid-thirteenth century Hungary. The pope informed King Béla IV in his letter¹⁰ that he forbade clergymen and laymen from Hungary to be cited outside of the realm, at least not without a special permission of the Apostolic See, as a result of the monarch's former request.¹¹

Nevertheless, it is not completely clear how Béla IV submitted his request: either in the form of a charter or through a verbal statement of his envoys. The latter version seems more plausible since the monarch kept on sending his emissaries to the Apostolic See from the beginning of the Mongol invasion,¹² and, as a matter of fact, he even had an agent, Bishop Bartholomew of Pécs, in the papal court by that time.¹³ Stephen Bánca, bishop of Vác (1240–1242), future archbishop of Esztergom (1242–1252), was the first in the line of royal envoys in 1241,¹⁴ but his role in papal-Hungarian relations was far more important than that.¹⁵ He received several papal commissions after 1243 as a judge-delegate and legate,¹⁶ meanwhile in December 1251, he was promoted to the cardinals' college as the bishop of Preneste, thus becoming its first member of Hungarian origin.¹⁷

A charter of Innocent IV, issued a few weeks prior to the mentioned assurance, on 13 November 1252, must be taken into consideration as well,

⁸ See ZIMMERMANN 2011. p. 131–152.

⁹ This was not the first case when the royal family got in touch with papal delegated jurisdiction. Innocent IV gave permission to King Béla IV and Queen Mary due to their request to confess to any priest of their choosing and to be absolved by them. RPR nr. 1566, RI IV. nr. 1071, 1072.

¹⁰ For the relation of Béla IV to Pope Innocent IV see SENGÁ 1987; SZÜCS 1978. p. 164–171.

¹¹ *“Nos tuis devotis supplicationibus inclinati, auctoritate presentium indulgemus, ut nulla ecclesiastica secularisque persona regni tui possit per litteras apostolice Sedis, vel legatorum eius, extra regnum ipsum a quopiam in iudicium evocari, absque speciali mandato sedis eiusdem, faciente plenam de hac indulgentia mentionem”* – CDH IV/2. p. 129; RPR nr. 14795; RI IV. nr. 6134. With further literature see BARABÁS 2020. p. 131–135.

¹² SZÜCS 1978. p. 165. See e. g., RA nr. 846.

¹³ KOSZTA 2007. p. 41; DAMIAN 2016. p. 20–21. Cf. RA nr. 933b.

¹⁴ See KISS 2015. p. 22–23, 30; SZÜCS 1978. p. 165.

¹⁵ One of the leading Hungarian medievalists in the second half of the twentieth century, Jenő Szűcs, suggested that the motive behind the archbishop's decision could be his personal bias, since after the Mongol invasion, Stephen Bánca – despite the emerging custom – did not receive the position of the royal chancellor. Instead, the title was granted to Archbishop Benedict of Kalocsa, the former provost of Óbuda (later the elected provost of Székesfehérvár). Szűcs admitted though that it was impossible to decide whether the conflict between Béla IV and Stephen Bánca could be traced back to the monarch's decision; in his view, it is also questionable whether the confirmation of the archbishop in 1245 was related to that at all, or the quarrel around the election in Veszprém caused the tension in the first place. SZÜCS 1978. p. 168. See ZSOLDOS 2011. p. 84, 108; KISS 2015. p. 28–29; THOROCZKAY 2019. p. 527–528; THOROCZKAY 2016. p. 179.

¹⁶ It was analysed recently by Gergely Kiss. KISS 2015. p. 30–32.

¹⁷ For his cardinalate see KISS 2015. p. 32–41. Jenő Szűcs thought, Bánca had to leave because of his ongoing conflict with Béla IV. SZÜCS 1978. p. 168.

which can be related to the letter sent to King Béla IV. According to the pope's decision, the tithes from the Csallóköz-region (today Žitný ostrov, SK) belonged to Stephen Báncsa, and he commissioned the abbots of Pannonhalma and Pilis to ensure this provision.¹⁸ On 30 December Innocent IV even appointed the former archbishop as the administrator *in spiritualibus et temporalibus* of the archdiocese of Esztergom, perhaps to help him to cover the costs of his Italian stay.¹⁹ The bishops of Veszprém and Vác were supposed to carry out the decision, but the king and the cathedral-chapter of Esztergom were informed of the decision as well.²⁰ This turn of events certainly did not please the monarch, as his complaint, which was sent to the pope in the following year, clearly shows it.²¹ The king pointed out in his longer letter written on 11 May 1253, that the state of the archbishopric was no longer tenable, and asked for the confirmation of Benedict, archbishop of Kalocsa as the new prelate of Esztergom.²²

It cannot be stated beyond doubt that the papal assurance regarding the prohibition of citing Hungarian clerics and laymen outside of the realm was connected to Stephen Báncsa's situation, yet the chronological proximity makes it presumable: especially because to our knowledge, there is no other papal measure of similar nature from this time, at least not a series of them. Thus, one cannot speak of a universal papal idea.²³ The reason must be sought most probably within the framework of the papal-Hungarian relations. The initiative might have come from Archbishop Stephen himself, or perhaps he was the one who delivered the royal supplication mentioned in the papal charter, if there was such a request at all.²⁴ The pope's intention may have been to please the Hungarian monarch because Innocent IV counted on his anger about the situation in Esztergom. Nevertheless, these assumptions cannot be supported by solid evidence: they are based solely on the chronology of events and on the dynamics of the delegations and the papal-royal connection.²⁵

Members of the royal family appeared naturally in the sources in connection with other issues as well. Béla IV was, for instance, the subject of a papal procedure right after the Mongol invasion. The abbot and the convent of Pannonhalma made a complaint at the Holy See that the king did not merely

¹⁸ RPR nr. 14769; RI IV. nr. 6085. See Kiss 2015. p. 41.

¹⁹ It happened probably due to Báncsa's request, who intended to cover the costs of his Italian stay that way. Kiss 2015. p. 41. Philip of the Türje kindred was elected in January 1262 as the new archbishop of Esztergom and he was appointed at first as administrator as well. RPR nr. 18212; RU IV. nr. 40.

²⁰ RPR nr. 14816, RI IV. nr. 6165; RPR nr. 14817, RI IV. nr. 6166; RPR nr. 14818, RI IV. nr. 6167. See Kiss 2015. p. 41.

²¹ RA nr. 991.

²² See Szűcs 1978. p. 169–170; Kiss 2015. p. 42–43.

²³ See RPR and RI IV.

²⁴ "*Nos tuis devotis supplicationibus inclinati*" – CDH IV/2. p. 129.

²⁵ The papal measure did not cause a definitive censure in the operating of the papal delegated jurisdiction. See BARABÁS 2020. p. 21–24.

fail to help the abbey after the devastation, but he even occupied certain estates and incomes of the Benedictines, too.²⁶

The first papal admonition of April 1244 was followed by two other letters in December, one of them was issued in order to take care of the situation of the Benedictine monastery of Güssing, also following the complaint of Pannonhalma.²⁷ In addition to that, the two archbishops of the realm, Stephen of Esztergom and Benedict of Kalocsa were appointed as executors to convince the king to obey the papal commands.²⁸ Nevertheless, the letters and the mandates given to the prelates were not enough to settle the case for good, that is why Pope Innocent IV repeated the warning in January 1247, again due to the Benedictines' request.²⁹ The connection of the monarch to the abbey of Pannonhalma seemed to get back on the right track again, at least this is what the lack of further papal interventions suggests.

Nevertheless, there are further complaints known that were submitted to the Apostolic See because of the actions of King Béla IV, or to be precise, because of the lack of them. In May 1259, Pope Alexander IV gave Archbishop Benedict of Esztergom the task to convince the Hungarian ruler to fulfil the promise his late father, Andrew II, made to the Hospitallers to pay an appropriate sum for them.³⁰ Beside these tangible tensions, the Holy See also supported Béla IV in his endeavours, for instance, the archbishops of Esztergom and Kalocsa were ordered in 1247 along with the Hungarian bishops to help the preparations of defence against a possible new Mongol attack.³¹

In the 1260s several delegations were assigned to Hungarian clerics due to a 'family affair'³² in strict sense: the conflict of King Béla IV and his firstborn son, the future Stephen V, but not all of them were of diplomatic nature. Nonetheless, the Apostolic See's role and purpose as peacemaker had already appeared in connection with the first agreement between the king and the prince in the Treaty of Pozsony (Bratislava, SK) of 1262. At least Stephen expressed his intention to send the document to the Apostolic See in order to secure it with the pope's authority. Despite the prince's wish, the peace was never confirmed by the Apostolic See, although the Hungarian mission of the

²⁶ "*Cum igitur, sicut ex parte dilectorum filiorum abbatis et conventus monasterii Sancti Martini (de Pannonia) Jauriensis diocesis fuit propositum coram nobis, tu eorum miseris non compatiens, quorum monasterium amissis fere bonis omnibus ab eisdem Tartaris est destructum, ad manus tuas decimas, possessiones, redditus et res alias contra iustitiam receperis eorundem*" – ÁUO II. p. 157. nr. 94; RPR nr. 11358.

²⁷ RPR nr. 11478, 11480.

²⁸ "*Quocirca fraternitati vestre per apostolica scripta mandamus, quatenus dictum regem ad id moneatis et inducere procuretis*" – ÁUO II. p. 160. nr. 97; RPR nr. 11481.

²⁹ RPR nr. 12400.

³⁰ RPR nr. 17585. See HUNYADI 2010. p. 36; HUNYADI 2019. p. 47. Bónis stated, this measure caused the withdrawal of the former assurance given to Béla IV. BÓNIS 1963. p. 196.

³¹ RPR nr. 12414; RI IV. 2958. See the letters addressed to the king. RPR nr. 12408; RI IV. nr. 2957. See Kiss 2015. p. 26.

³² Paraphrasing the title of the book of Attila Zsoldos. ZSOLDOS 2007.

papal chaplain Velasco presented a perfect opportunity for that in 1263.³³ It is not the goal of this paper to give a definitive answer to the question whether Pope Urban IV in fact supported the father in his feud with the Hungarian heir to the throne,³⁴ but one thing is certain, namely that Béla IV requested the papal confirmation of his donations to certain family members of his. Probably with the intention to secure the estates for his younger son, daughter and wife in case the heir, Stephen would have questioned the rightfulness of the royal donations afterwards.³⁵

Regarding these donations, the pope did not merely issue charters,³⁶ but he entrusted Hungarian prelates in July 1264 to act in favour of the Hungarian king. Archbishop Philip of Esztergom and Bishop Paul of Veszprém had to act in relation to the donations given to Prince Béla, second son of Béla IV.³⁷ In addition, the archbishop had to engage in measures regarding the situation of Queen Mary,³⁸ while Bishop Paul was entrusted to take care of the estates of Princess Anna, daughter of Béla IV.³⁹ Beside them, the prior of the Hungarian Knights Hospitaller was empowered by the pope as well,⁴⁰ while the bishop of Győr, the archbishop of Esztergom and the bishop of Veszprém were instructed to convince Prince Stephen to restore the estates of his mother.⁴¹ The delegates were ordered to act as conservators of the pope, since they were ought to secure the rights of the members of the royal family.⁴² Archbishop Philip's role as mediator, between king and his firstborn son, was also mentioned in a royal charter in 1267.⁴³ It is to be emphasized that after the war between Béla IV and Stephen, Pope Clement IV, unlike in previous and later cases did not empower any delegates, the confirmation of the new peace happened solely with a papal charter issued in June, 1266.⁴⁴

A charter of Pope Urban IV issued in July 1264 seems to be in connection with the aforementioned family affair, because the two archbishops of the realm were entrusted to engage in actions in order to force the pagan Cumans

³³ See ZSOLDOS 2007. p. 32–33.

³⁴ Cf. DAMIAN 2016. p. 29–30.

³⁵ ZSOLDOS 2007. p. 34–35.

³⁶ RPR nr. 18745; RU IV. nr. 2367; RPR nr. 18746; RU IV. nr. 2368; RPR nr. 18748; RU IV. nr. 2369; RPR nr. 18749; RU IV. nr. 2370; RPR nr. 18972; RU IV. nr. 2762; RPR nr. 18974; RU IV. nr. 2764; RPR nr. 18975; RU IV. nr. 2766; RPR nr. 18981; RU IV. nr. 2773; RPR nr. 18984; RU IV. nr. 2771.

³⁷ RPR nr. 18973; RU IV. nr. 2763; RPR nr. 18976, RU IV. nr. 2765.

³⁸ RPR nr. 18971; RU IV. nr. 2760.

³⁹ RPR nr. 18982; RU IV. nr. 2774.

⁴⁰ RPR nr. 18978; RU IV. nr. 2761; RPR nr. 18977; RU IV. nr. 2767.

⁴¹ RPR nr. 18985; RU IV. nr. 2772.

⁴² *"Nos itaque ipsius ducis et prefati regis supplicationibus inclinati, donationem huiusmodi, sicut provide facta est, ratam et firmam habentes, eam auctoritate apostolica duximus confirmandam. Quocirca mandamus, quatenus prefatum ducem non permittas super premissis contra huiusmodi confirmationis nostre tenorem ab aliquibus indebite molestari, molestatores huiusmodi etc. compescendo. Non obstante, si aliquibus a Sede apostolica sit indultum"* – ÁÚO III. p. 97. nr. 66; RPR nr. 18973; RU IV. nr. 2763.

⁴³ RA nr. 1527. See BÁCSATYAI 2020a. p. 1069–1070.

⁴⁴ RPR nr. 19711; RC IV 332. Details of the treaty are unknown. See ZSOLDOS 2007. p. 83–88.

present in Hungary to convert to Christianity.⁴⁵ They were living under the rule of and within territory of Prince Stephen, so it is conceivable that Béla IV was the initiator, especially because it is mentioned in the text of the papal charter that the Hungarian ruler had previously submitted petitions regarding this matter several times. Furthermore, it is to be noted that King Béla IV eventually managed to get the Cumans on his side, and they fought in the royal army during the civil war of 1264–1265.⁴⁶

After the death of King Béla IV, another conflict needed papal intervention: the war between the new Hungarian monarch, Stephen V (1270–1272) and the Bohemian king, Ottokar II (1253–1278).⁴⁷ After the hostilities were finished in 1271, Pope Gregory X confirmed the peace in a charter⁴⁸ due to the request of the Hungarian ruler,⁴⁹ and he also ordered conservators to secure the treaty. On the Bohemian side, the bishops of Prague and Olomouc and in Hungary the Archbishop of Esztergom and the bishop of Vác were entrusted as papal delegates in May 1272.⁵⁰ The peace failed eventually, although not on the prelates' account, after the unexpected death of his Hungarian counterpart, Ottokar II launched a new attack and took several Hungarian counties by force.⁵¹ For his actions he was condemned soon afterwards by the pope, yet, no new delegations were launched by the Holy See.⁵²

In the 1280s, the son of the late Stephen V, Ladislaus IV (*the Cuman*) caused tensions with the Church as his behaviour became non-Christian like, since he acted more and more like the nomadic people of his mother, the Cumans.⁵³ Archbishop Lodomerius of Esztergom was entrusted several times to act in favour of the wife of Ladislaus, Queen Isabelle, at first by Pope Honorius IV (1285–1287)⁵⁴ then after the death of the holy father, during the *sedis vacantia* by the college of cardinals,⁵⁵ and eventually by the new pope, Nicholas IV

⁴⁵ *“fraternitati vestre per apostolica scripta in virtute obedientie sub excommunicationis pena districte precipiendo mandamus, quatenus, si premissa veritate nituntur, vos vel alter vestrum universos Cumanos predictos per vos aut alios, sicut efficacius poteritis, moneatis, ut illi ex eis, quibus provenit perceptio gratie baptismalis, fidem Catholicam firmiter et reverenter observent”* – ÁÚO III. p. 92. nr. 63; RPR nr. 18970; RU IV. nr. 2769.

⁴⁶ *“Quare pro parte supradicti regis instanter petebatur a nobis, ut super hiis providere de opportuno consilio et festino subsidio curaremus”* – ÁÚO III. p. 92, nr. 63. See ZSOLDOS 2007. p. 37. There is a recent discussion regarding the time of the war. See BÁCSATYAI 2020a; ZSOLDOS 2020; BÁCSATYAI 2020b; BÁCSATYAI 2021.

⁴⁷ For the conflict see KÁDÁR 2009. p. 420–421.

⁴⁸ RPR nr. 20540.

⁴⁹ RPR nr. 20526.

⁵⁰ RPR nr. 20541; RG X. nr. 7; PR nr. 20542. Cf. CHOBOT 1915–1917. p. 477.

⁵¹ See Szűcs 1993. p. 283–284.

⁵² RPR nr. 20612.

⁵³ See KARÁCSONYI 1910; Szűcs 1993. p. 316–321; Szűcs 2010. p. 28–37.

⁵⁴ 12 March 1287: *“Quocirca mandamus, quatenus si dictus rex predictam reginam a carcere liberatam resumere, ac, ut predictur, tute tractare noluerit, tu eum ad id per censuram ecclesiasticam auctoritate nostra compellas, non obstante, si eidem regi a Sede apostolica si indultum, quod excommunicari, vel terre ipsius interdici non possit per litteras apostolicas non facientes etc. usque mentionem”* – ÁÚO IV. p. 300. nr. 192; RPR nr. 22586; RH IV. nr. 762.

⁵⁵ UGDS I. p. 154–155. nr. 219.

(1288–1292). The young royal spouse, who came from the Angevin dynasty of Naples was mishandled by his husband, King Ladislaus IV. The prelate was authorized to compel the monarch with ecclesiastical censures, if necessary, and to send back a report to the Holy See, if he would have failed in his endeavours.⁵⁶ It is to be underlined regarding this matter that the tension was so crucial that even the *sedis vacantia* did not cause the lack of further delegations. It is also of importance that Archbishop Lodomerius sent a letter to the bishop of Transylvania in December 1287, and while he was referring to himself as the judge delegate of the Apostolic See, he gave the task to the prelate to provide help for the queen's men to collect the taxes of Beszterce (Bistrița, RO).⁵⁷ Furthermore, Archbishop Lodomerius was entrusted to handle the situation of the non-Christians in Hungary as well.⁵⁸ However, Nonetheless, despite all attempts the behaviour of the Hungarian monarch could not have been changed, and he was eventually killed by his beloved Cumans in 1290.⁵⁹

Papal interventions⁶⁰ also happened even during the reign of the last king of the Árpád-dynasty, Andrew III, yet beside legates and nuncios, there is no sign of authorization of judges-delegate regarding the royal family's matters.

A papal charter of March 1299 has to be taken into consideration though, because it gives information on the operation of papal delegated jurisdiction, even though this time was not the king, but one of the realm's barons who turned to the Apostolic See with their grievances. In his letter, Pope Boniface VIII informed the elected archbishop of Esztergom, Gregory of Bicske,⁶¹ that Ivan of Kőszeg, one of the mightiest oligarchs of the realm,⁶² submitted the request to the Apostolic See in which he wished to be absolved with his followers from the excommunication applied against them by the former archbishop, Lodomerius⁶³ and several other prelates in 1297.⁶⁴ The reason for this action can be found in the conflict of Ivan with the king,⁶⁵ therefore, it is not surprising that the pope, who at least passively favoured the Angevins of Naples as they claimed the Hungarian throne for themselves,⁶⁶ ordered the elected archbishop to annul the former censure.⁶⁷ Gregory of Bicske even

⁵⁶ RPR nr. 22765; RN IV. nr. 195.

⁵⁷ "in hac parte a sede apostolica et omnium cardinalium eiusdem sedis iudex delegatus" – DF 277190; UGDSI. p. 157–158. nr. 222.

⁵⁸ RPR nr. 22587; RH IV. nr. 761. and RPR nr. 22766.

⁵⁹ See Szűcs 1993. p. 321.

⁶⁰ See Kiss 2018.

⁶¹ See recently HUNYADI 2021.

⁶² ZSOLDOS 2011. p. 46, 47, 48, 225; ZSOLDOS 2016.

⁶³ Archbishop Lodomerius took part personally in the campaign against the Kőszegis in 1296, and applied interdict against them. Szűcs 1993. p. 329–330.

⁶⁴ Szűcs 1993. p. 341.

⁶⁵ It is remarkable that Archbishop Lodomerius and Ivan of Kőszeg cooperated in 1290 when they invited the later Andrew III to Hungary. See SKORKA 2019. p. 60; BÁRÁNY 2020. p. 50.

⁶⁶ See Kiss 2018. p. 1356–1362.

⁶⁷ "petitio continebat, quod cum ipse olim venerabili fratri nostro Johanni Auximano tunc exinde episcopo et in partibus illis apostolice Sedis nuntio fidem et devotionem sancte Romane ecclesie debitam observare cum reverentia promississet, ita quod nulli tanquam regi Ungarie pareret [...] nisi destinato seu approbato a sede predicta; quia tamen obedientiam et reverentiam Andree, qui rex

remained with the Kőszegi brothers by this time and had an open conflict with King Andrew III.⁶⁸

The so-called fourteenth-century Chronicle Composition even reports that the Kőszegis alongside another baron, Ugrin of the Csák kindred and other lords turned to Boniface VIII and asked him for a new ruler instead of Andrew III, so the pope sent the young Angevin pretender, Caroberto, later King Charles I to Hungary in 1299 as response.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, Andrew III managed to come to an agreement with the hostile oligarchs of his realm, among them with the Kőszegi brothers and Matthew Csák. Therefore, it is no wonder that they were not amongst those who welcomed the young Angevin prince in Dalmatia.⁷⁰ These events are related to the topic of papal delegated jurisdiction merely indirectly, yet, it is essential to mention them, as the oligarchs turned to the papacy.

At the end of this short contribution, the following can be stated: the papal delegated jurisdiction and the delegates of the Apostolic See appeared in connection with the royal family in certain cases due to the appeals of Hungarian clerics or laymen, who intended to make use of the authority of the Apostolic See. Nonetheless, in the overwhelming majority of the known cases, the rulers themselves turned to the papacy mostly as a result of matters of diplomacy, e. g., to ask for the assistance of the Holy See as peacemaker, both in internal and external conflicts. It could be formulated that they negotiated in order to make use of the authority of the Holy See.

The provision of Innocent IV in 1252 must be emphasized not only because it does not fit into some kind of general pattern, but also because its truly extraordinary nature. The pope forbade to cite the subjects of the Hungarian king outside of the realm. According to the papal charter, the decision was made due to the Hungarian monarch's petition. If this statement is authentic, and there is no serious reason to doubt it, it clearly shows that Béla IV was fully aware of the relevance of the system of papal delegated jurisdiction and how common it was in Hungary. Perhaps this latter aspect motivated the ruler to act in order to put an end to the practice that could have been interpreted as an offense to his own authority, yet, in the end everything was done in vain.

Ungarie nominatur, ignorans ipsius regimen per sedem approbatum eandem, noluit exhibere, tam idem nobilis vir quam sui complices et fautores per bone memorie L(odomerium) archiepiscopum Strigoniensem, et (Theodorum) Jauriensem et (Benedictum) Vesprimiensem episcopos ac alios suffraganeos fuerunt auctoritate ordinaria excommunicationis sententia innodati.... Mandamus, quatenus, si est ita [...] prefatos nobilem, complices ac fautores a dicta excommunicationis sententia, ad cautelam [...] absolvas' – MREV II. p. 23. nr. XXIX ; RPR nr. 24791 ; RB VIII. nr. 2980.

⁶⁸ SZÜCS 1993. p. 333–341; LENKEY – ZSOLDOS 2003. p. 213–214.

⁶⁹ "In cuius imperio quidam nobiles regni, Iohannes scilicet et Herricus banus filii Herrici ac Vgrinus filius Pouchm de Vylac aliique quamplures in preiudicium regis Andree a papa Bonifacio VIII-o regem ut dicitur petierunt. Quorum instantiam papa admittens quendam puerum XI annorum nomine Karolum anno Domini Mo CCo XCo IXo vivente adhuc Andree rege in Hungariam deatinavit." – Chron. Comp. Saec. XIV., cap. 186–187; SRH I. p. 477–478. See LENKEY – ZSOLDOS 2003. p. 218.

⁷⁰ SZÜCS 1993. p. 346–347; LENKEY – ZSOLDOS 2003. p. 219–220.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

- ÁÚO *Árpádkori új okmánytár. Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus continuatus.* I–XII. Ed. WENZEL, Gusztáv. Pest – Budapest. 1860–1874.
- CDH *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis.* I–XI. Ed. FEJÉR, Georgius. Budae. 1829–1844.
- DF Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára Diplomatikai Fényképgyűjtemény
- MREV *Monumenta Romana Episcopatus Vesprimiensis – A veszprémi püspökség római oklevéltára.* I–IV. Ed. FRAKNÓI, Vilmos – LUKCSICS, József. Budapest. 1896–1907.
- RA *Regesta regum stirpis Arpadianae critico-diplomatica. Az Árpád-házi királyok okleveleinek kritikai jegyzéke.* I–II/1. Ed. SZENTPÉTERY, Emericus. Budapest, 1923–1943. II/2–4. Ed. BORSA, Iván. Budapest. 1961–1987.
- RB VIII *Les registres de Boniface VIII.* Ed. DIGARD, G. et alii, Paris. 1884–1935.
- RC IV *Les registres de Clément IV, 1265–1268.* Ed. JOURDAIN, É. Paris. 1945.
- RG X and RJ XXI *Les registres de Grégoire X, 1272–1276, et de Jean XXI, 1276–1277.* Ed. GUIRAUD, J. – CADIER, L. Paris. 1892–1960.
- RH IV *Les registres d'Honorius IV.* Ed. PROU, Maurice. Paris, 1888.
- RI IV *Les registres d'Innocent IV.* I–IV. Ed. BERGER, Élie. Paris, 1881–1919.
- RN IV *Les registres de Nicolas IV.* Ed. LANGLOIS, E. Paris, 1886–1893.
- RPR *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum inde ab anno post Christum natum MCXCVIII ad annum MCCCIV.* I–II. Ed. POTTHAST, August. Berolini. 1874.
- RU IV *Les registres d'Urbain IV (1261–1264). Recueil des bulles de ce pape.* Ed. GUIRAUD, Jean. Paris. 1899–1929.
- SRH *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum.* I–II. Ed. SZENTPÉTERY, Emericus et alii. Budapestini. 1937 – 1938. (Reprint: Budapest. 1999)
- UGDS *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenburgen.* I–VII. Ed. ZIMMERMANN, Franz – WERNER, Carl – GÜNDISCH, Gustav. Hermannstadt – Bucharest. 1892–1981.

Secondary Literature

- BÁCSATYAI 2020a BÁCSATYAI, Dániel: IV. Béla és István ifjabb király belháborújának időrendje [The Chronology of the Civil War between King Béla IV and Younger King Stephen]. *Századok* 154 (2020), p. 1047–1082.
- BÁCSATYAI 2020b BÁCSATYAI, Dániel: Válasz Zsoldos Attila kritikai észrevételeire [Answer to the Critical Remarks of Attila Zsoldos]. *Századok* 154 (2020), p. 1345–1354.
- BÁCSATYAI 2021 BÁCSATYAI, Dániel: Bolgár-magyar háborúk az 1250–1260-as években [Bulgarian-Hungarian wars in the 1250–60's]. *Századok* 155 (2020), p. 1025–1054.
- BARABÁS 2013 BARABÁS, Gábor: A pápai kiküldött bíraskodás Magyarországon a kezdetektől a 13. század közepéig [Delegated Papal Jurisdiction in Hungary from the Beginnings to the Mid-13th Century]. *Történelmi Szemle* 55 (2013), p. 175–199.

- BARABÁS 2015 BARABÁS, Gábor: A pápaság és Magyarország a 13. század első felében. Pápai hatás – együttműködés – érdekellentét [The Papacy and Hungary in the First Half of the Thirteenth Century. Papal influence – cooperation – clash of interests]]. Pécs. 2015. (Thesaurus Historiae Ecclesiasticae in Universitate Quinqueecclesiensi 5.)
- BARABÁS 2017 BARABÁS, Gábor: Kálmán szlavón herceg és IX. Gergely pápa. Magyar királyi herceg az Apostoli Szentzsék szolgálatában? [Duke Coloman of Slavonia and Pope Gregory IX. A Hungarian Royal Prince in the Service of the Holy See?] *Aetas* 32 (2017:3), p. 36–51.
- BARABÁS 2019 BARABÁS, Gábor: A középkori pápai delegáltbírótság nemzetközi és magyar kutatástörténete [International and Hungarian Research History of the Medieval Papal Delegated Jurisdiction]. *Egyháztörténeti Szemle* 20 (2019:3), p. 3–21.
- BARABÁS 2020 BARABÁS, Gábor: Nos tuis supplicationibus inclinati. Pope Innocent IV and the Decline of Delegated Jurisdiction in Hungary in the Mid-13th Century. *Povijesni Prilozi* 39 (2020:59), p. 7–30.
- BARABÁS 2021 BARABÁS, Gábor: Von propositio bis consensus. Die Päpste, die ungarischen Könige und die kanonischen Wahlen in der ungarischen Kirche im 13. Jahrhundert. *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung. Journal of East Central European Studies* 70 (2021), p. 187–226.
- BÁRÁNY 2020 BÁRÁNY, Attila: Magyarország és Anglia az európai politikában az 1290-es években [Hungary and England in the European Politics in the 1290s]. In: Kultúra, művelődés, agrárium. Emlékkönyv ifj. Barta János 80. születésnapjára. Ed. PAPP, Klára – BÁRÁNY, Attila – KEREPESZKI, Róbert – PALLAI, László. Debrecen. 2020. p. 45–74. (Speculum Historiae Debreceniense 29.)
- BÓNIS 1963 BÓNIS, György: Die Entwicklung der geistlichen Gerichtsbarkeit in Ungarn vor 1526. *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonische Abteilung* 49 (1963), p. 174–235.
- CHOBOT 1915–1917 CHOBOT, Ferenc: A váci egyházmegye történeti névtára. Első rész: Az intézmények története. Második rész: A papság életadatai [Historical Archontology of the Diocese of Vác. Part I: History of the Institutions. Part II. Biographies of the Clergy]. Vác. 1915–1917.
- DAMIAN 2016 DAMIAN, Iulian Mihai: Eneco ferences szerzetes inquisítoja Pécs püspökével szemben (1267) [The Inquisition of the Franciscan monk, Eneco against the Bishop of Pécs (1267)]. *Egyháztörténeti Szemle* 17 (2016:2), p. 19–38
- DUGGAN 1998 DUGGAN, Charles: Papal Judges Delegate and the Making of the “New Law” in the Twelfth Century. In: DUGGAN, Charles: *Decretals and the Creation of “New Law” in the Twelfth Century: Judges, Judgements, Equity, and Law*. Aldershot – Brookfield – Singapore – Sydney. 1998. 172–199.
- FALKENSTEIN 1986 FALKENSTEIN, Ludwig: Appellationen an den Papst und Delegationsgerichtsbarkeit am Beispiel Alexanders III. und Heinrichs von Frankreich. *Zeitschrift der Kirchengeschichte* 97 (1986), p. 36–65.
- GÁL 2019 GÁL, Judit: A dalmáciai egyházak szerepe Imre és András trónharca idején (1197–1204) [The Role of the Dalmatian Churches during the Struggle for the Throne Between King

- Imre (Emeric) and Prince András (Andrew) (1197–1204)]. *Századok* 153 (2019), p. 165–178.
- HAGENEDEK 1967 HAGENEDEK, Othmar: *Die geistliche Gerichtsbarkeit in Ober- und Niederösterreich. Von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn des 15. Jahrhunderts*. Graz. 1967.
- HERDE 2002 HERDE, Peter: Zur päpstlichen Delegationsgerichtsbarkeit im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit. *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonische Abteilung* 119 (2002), p. 20–43.
- HUNYADI 2010 HUNYADI, Zsolt: *The Hospitallers in the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary c. 1150–1387*. (METEM Könyvek – METEM Books 70., CEU Mediaevalia 13.) Budapest. 2010.
- HUNYADI 2019 HUNYADI, Zsolt: A johanniták Magyarországon a 12. század közepétől a konstanzi zsinatig [The Knight Hospitallers in Hungary from the Mid-12th Century to the Council of Konstanz]. *Máltai tanulmányok* 1 (2019), p. 11–124.
- HUNYADI 2021 HUNYADI, Sándor: Bicskei Gergely választott esztergomi érsek (1298–1303) [Gregory of Bicske, elected archbishop of Esztergom (1298–1303)]. *Egyháztörténeti Szemle* 22 (2021:2), p. 163–188
- JOHRENDT – MÜLLER 2008 JOHRENDT, Jochen – MÜLLER, Harald: 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. JOHRENDT, Jochen – MÜLLER, Harald. Berlin – New York. 2008. (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Neue Folge 2.) p. 1–16.
- KÁDÁR 2009 KÁDÁR, Tamás: Egy rejtélyes politikai gyilkosság és háttere a XIII. század végi Magyarországon. Béla macsó és boszniai herceg pályája [A Mysterious Political Assassination and its Background in late Thirteenth-Century Hungary. The of Life of Prince Béla of Macsó and Bosnia]. *Fons* 16 (2009:4), p. 411–429.
- KARÁCSONYI 1910 KARÁCSONYI, János: A mérges vipera és az antimonialis. Korkép Kun László király idejéből [The Poisonous Viper and the Antimonialis. An Overview of King Ladislaus the Cuman's Reign]. *Századok* 44 (1910), p. 1–24.
- KISS 2015 KISS, Gergely: *Dél-Magyarországtól Itáliáig. Bánca nembeli István (1205 k. – 1270) váci püspök, esztergomi érsek, az első magyarországi bíboros életpályája* [From Southern Hungary to Italy. The Course of Life of Stephen Bánca (ca. 1205–1270), Bishop of Vác, Archbishop of Esztergom]]. Pécs. 2015.
- KISS 2018 KISS, Gergely: VIII. Bonifác és Magyarország (1290–1303). A pápai hatalmi legitimációs elképzelések és kormányzat összefüggései [Boniface VIII and Hungary (1290–1303) Ideas of Legitimizing Papal Authority and Government in Context]. *Századok* 152 (2018), p. 1353–1376.
- KOSZTA 2007 KOSZTA, László: Egy francia származású főpap Magyarországon. Bertalan pécsi püspök (1219–1251) [A Prelate of French Origin in Hungary. Bishop Bartholomew of Pécs (1219–1251)]. In: KOSZTA, László: *Írásbeliség és egyházszerkezet. Fejezetek a középkori magyar egyház történetéből*. Szeged. 2007. (Capitulum III.) p. 23–44.
- KOVÁCS 2018 KOVÁCS, István: Az aradi káptalan előjárói: a prépostok (1135–1526) [Officials of the Collegiate-Chapter of Arad: the Provosts (1135–1526)]. In: *Mesterek és Tanítványok 2. Tanulmányok a*

- bölcsészeti- és társadalomtudományok területéről.* Ed. CZEFERNER, Dóra – BÖHM, Gábor – FEDELES, Tamás. Pécs. 2018. p. 147–164.
- KÖRMENDI 2012 KÖRMENDI, Tamás: A "varasdi jelenet" kritikája. Megjegyzés Imre király és András herceg trónviszályának történetéhez [Critical Notes on the so-called Scene of Varaždin. Remarks on the History of the Struggle between King Emeric and Prince Andrew]. In: *Tiszteletkőr. Történeti tanulmányok Draskóczy István egyetemi tanár 60. születésnapjára.* Ed. MIKÓ, Gábor – PÉTERFI, Bence – VADAS, András. Budapest. 2012. p. 503–513.
- KÖRMENDI 2019 KÖRMENDI, Tamás: *Az 1196–1235 közötti magyar történelem nyugati elbeszélő forrásainak kritikája* [Critique of the Western Narrative Sources regarding the Hungarian History in 1196–1235]. Budapest. 2019.
- KÖRMENDI 2020 KÖRMENDI Tamás: The Struggle between King Emeric of Hungary and Duke Andrew in Dalmatia (1197–1203). In: *Stefan the First-Crowned and his Time.* Ed. KOMATINA, Ivana. Belgrade. 2020. (Institute of History Collection of Works vol. 42.) p. 195–211.
- LENKEY – ZSOLDOS 2003 LENKEY, Zoltán – ZSOLDOS, Attila: *Szent István és III. András* [St Stephen and Andrew III]. Budapest. 2003.
- MÜLLER 2008 MÜLLER, Harald: Entscheidung auf Nachfrage. Die delegierten Richter als Verbindungsglieder zwischen Kurie und Region sowie als Gradmesser päpstlicher Autorität. In: *Römisches Zentrum und kirchliche Peripherie. Das universale Papsttum als Bezugspunkt der Kirchen von den Reformpäpsten bis zu Innozenz III.* Hrsg. JOHRENDT, Jochen – MÜLLER, Harald. Berlin – New York. 2008. (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Neue Folge 2.) p. 108–131.
- SENGA 1987 SENGA, Toru: IV. Béla külpolitikája és IV. Ince pápához intézett "tatár-levele" [The Foreign Policy of Béla IV and his so-called "Tartar-Letter" sent to Pope Innocent IV]. *Századok* 121 (1987), p. 584–612.
- SKORKA 2019 SKORKA, Renáta: Előjáték egy házasságkötéshez. A Habsburgok útja az első magyar házassághoz [Prelude to a Marriage. The Road of the Habsburgs to their First Hungarian Marriage]. In: *Királynék a középkori Magyarországon és Európában.* Ed. SZOVÁK, Kornél – ZSOLDOS, Attila. Székesfehérvár. 2019. p. 59–77.
- SWEENEY 1989 SWEENEY, James Ross: Innocent III, Canon Law and Papal Judges Delegate in Hungary. In: *Popes, Teachers, and Canon Law in the Middle Ages.* Ed. SWEENEY, James Ross – CHODOROW, Stanley. Ithaca – New York. 1989. p. 26–51.
- SWEENEY 1999 SWEENEY, James Ross: "Summa Potestas Post Deum" – Papal "Dilectio" and Hungarian "Devotio" in the reign of Innocent III Sweeney. In: *"The Man of many devices who wandered full many ways". Festschrift in honor of János M. Bak.* Ed. NAGY, Balázs – SEBŐK, Marcell. Budapest. 1999. p. 492–498.
- SZABADOS 1999 SZABADOS, György: Imre és András [Emeric and Andrew]. *Századok* 133 (1999), p. 85–111.
- SZABADOS 2000 SZABADOS, György: Egy elmaradt kereszties hadjáratról. Magyar-szentszéki kapcsolatok 1198–1204 között [On a Failed Crusade Attempt. Hungarian–Papal Relations between 1196 and 1204]. In: *"Magyaroknak eleiről". Ünnepi tanulmányok a hatvan esztendősk Makk Ferenc tiszteletére.* Ed. PITTI, Ferenc – SZABADOS György. Szeged. 2000. p. 473–492.

- Szűcs 2010 Szűcs, Tibor: Egy második 'tatárjárás'? A tatár-magyar kapcsolatok a XIII. század második felében [A Second "Tartar Invasion"? Mongol-Hungarian Relations in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century]. *Belvedere Meridionale* 23 (2010:3-4), p. 16-49.
- Szűcs 1978 Szűcs, Jenő: A kereszténység belső politikuma a XIII. század derekán. IV. Béla és az egyház [The Inner Politics of Christianity in the Mid-Thirteenth Century. King Béla IV and the Church]. *Történelmi Szemle* 21 (1978), p. 158-181.
- Szűcs 1993 Szűcs, Jenő: *Az utolsó Árpádok* [The Last Árpáds]. (História Könyvtár, Monográfiák) Budapest. 1993.
- THOROCZKAY 2016 THOROCZKAY, Gábor: A székesfehérvári prépostság és bazilika az Árpád-korban [The Provostry and Basilica of Székesfehérvár in the Middle Ages]. In: THOROCZKAY, Gábor: *Ismeretlen Árpád-kor. Püspökök, legendák, krónikák*. Budapest. 2016. p. 141-183.
- THOROCZKAY 2019 THOROCZKAY Gábor: A magyar Aachen első évszázada: a székesfehérvári prépostság története az Árpád-korban [The First Century of the Hungarian Aachen: the History of the Provostry of Székesfehérvár in the Árpád-era]. In: *Szent Márton és Benedek nyomában. Tanulmányok Koszta László emlékére*. Ed. FEDELES Tamás - HUNYADI Zsolt. Szeged - Debrecen. 2019. (Fontes et Libri 4.) p. 522-539.
- ZIMMERMANN 2011 ZIMMERMANN, Harald: *Der Deutsche Orden in Siebenbürgen. Eine diplomatische Untersuchung*. (Studia Transylvanica 26.) Köln - Weimar - Wien. 2011.
- ZSOLDOS 2007 ZSOLDOS, Attila: *Családi ügy. IV. Béla és István ifjabb királyviszálya az 1260-as években* [Family Affair. The Conflict of Béla IV and Stephen, the Younger King in the 1260s]. Budapest. 2007. (História Könyvtár. Monográfiák)
- ZSOLDOS 2011 ZSOLDOS, Attila: *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1000-1301* [Lay Archontology of Hungary 1000-1301]. Budapest, 2011. (Kronológiák, Adattárak)
- ZSOLDOS 2016 ZSOLDOS, Attila: A Henrik-fiak. A Héder nembeli Kőszegiek "családi története" [The Sons of Henry. The Family History of the Kőszegis]. In: ZSOLDOS, Attila: *Vitézek, ispánok, oligarchák. Tanulmányok a társadalom- és a hadtörténetírás határvidékéről*. Budapest. 2016. p. 215-225.
- ZSOLDOS 2018 ZSOLDOS, Attila: A felforgató király esete a hagyománytisztelő herceggel [The Rebellious King and the Traditionalist Prince]. *Korunk* 29 (2018:2.), 11-17.
- ZSOLDOS 2020 ZSOLDOS, Attila: Néhány kritikai megjegyzés az 1264-1265. évi belháború újradatolásának kísérletéhez [Critical Remarks on the Redating of the Civil War of 1264-65]. *Századok* 154 (2020), p. 1331-1344.

