

András RIBI

**Mark of Kált (?), the Custos of Székesfehérvár
(1357/1358–1368)
Remarks on the Biography of the Presumed Compiler
of the Fourteenth-century Chronicle Composition of
Hungary**

This paper reviews the biography of Mark of Kált, who has been long regarded as the presumed compiler of the fourteenth-century Hungarian chronicle composition commonly known as the *Illuminated Chronicle*. Earlier scholarship, following Emil Jakubovich maintained that Mark, custos of Székesfehérvár disappears from the sources after 1358. Based on new evidence, however, this paper extends his documented career by a further decade, demonstrating that he served as custos of the collegiate chapter of Székesfehérvár until 1368.

The study critically re-examines the traditional career outline, while addressing the methodological challenges of distinguishing between several high-ranking clerics bearing the same name in mid-fourteenth-century Hungary. Though the identification of Mark custos with Mark of Kált, provost of Kő, remains uncertain, his prolonged service at Székesfehérvár makes it possible that he could have undertaken the compilation of the chronicle commenced in 1358.

Keywords: Mark of Kált; Illuminated Chronicle; ecclesiastical archontology and prosopography; medieval historiography; collegiate chapter of Székesfehérvár; fourteenth-century Hungary



Within the scholarly community, it is widely acknowledged that the latest findings of professional historical research—those supported by objective evidence or broadly accepted scholarly consensus—should be disseminated to a wider audience, and eventually incorporated into educational materials, at the earliest opportunity. This is particularly true in the case of well-known events or prominent historical figures. Among these ranks the presumed compiler—or, more precisely, the redactor—of the fourteenth-century chronicle composition, commonly referred to as the *Illuminated Chronicle* (*Képes Krónika*): Mark of Kált, custos (keeper) of Székesfehérvár, who was

even honoured with a statue in the latter city during the twentieth century. His biography is most frequently reconstructed on the basis of Gyula Kristó's study, written for the Hungarian translation of the *Illuminated Chronicle in 1986*. The biographical dictionaries and online sources continue to reproduce the information set out therein, invariably including the oft-quoted remark: "After 1358, no further records of Mark of Kált survive."¹

In 2018, I published the archontology of the collegiate chapter of Székesfehérvár for the period 1301–1457. In that work—albeit without particular emphasis, and at the time lacking the intermediate data now presented below—I nonetheless indicated unambiguously that Mark, custos of Székesfehérvár, can be traced in the charter material not merely until 1366, but, as more recent findings reveal, as late as 1368.² This observation prompted the notion that certain careers revealed through archontological research might merit separate, detailed analysis, particularly those of notable clerics. Furthermore, the comprehensive efforts of the Research Group on Medieval Hungarian Ecclesiastical Archontology 1000–1387—which, in addition to the published volumes of the *Anjou-kori oklevéltár*, also undertakes the examination of original diplomatic sources—may yet provide further data. To anticipate the conclusions: this study not only extends by a full decade the known chronology of a supposedly well-documented figure, but also endeavours to impose order—or at the very least raise doubts—among the several high-ranking clerics named Mark who was active in mid-fourteenth-century Hungary.

The compiler of the fourteenth-century chronicle composition was first identified by János Baranyai Decsi in his work published in 1593. According to him this person was a certain chronicler named Mark, who may have served as the principal source for John of Thurocz. It is evident that such a figure could only have been an educated court cleric, active also within the royal chancery—an identification that historyography, following Emil Jakubovich's brief but influential study published a century ago, has come to accept under the name of Mark of Kált.³ In his 1986 study, Gyula Kristó summarised the supposed trajectory of this career (citing exclusively on Jakubovich) as follows:

"The courtly connections of that Mark have been established—the one who, at the end of the 1330's, acquired the estate of Kált in Veszprém County, and who, until the 1960's, had generally been regarded as the author of the *Illuminated Chronicle* (or, more precisely, of the fourteenth-century chronicle composition). His career can be followed for nearly a quarter of a century. In

* Original publication: RIBI 2023. p. 45–55. For this English version I have updated the paper with recently published literature.

¹ KRISTÓ 1986. p. 468. See e. g. SZOVÁK 2004. p. 241–242. Kristó first took a position in favour of Mark in his large-scale 1967 study; KRISTÓ 1967. p. 480–500. The historian later expressed himself somewhat more cautiously regarding the authorship, see KRISTÓ 1994. p. 381–382; KRISTÓ 2002. 86–88.

² RIBI 2018. p. 137. Cf. RIBI – THOROCZKAY 2024. II. p. 1619.

³ "We believe we have managed to establish his identity, origins, and even his brief biography." JAKUBOVICH 1924. p. 15–18.

1336–1337 he served as chaplain to Queen Elizabeth, wife of Charles Robert. From 1342 he was parish priest of Buda-Váralja. By 1352 he was already in the royal court, custodian of the royal archive kept in the chapel, and canon of Székesfehérvár. In 1354 he became provost of Kő, and in 1358 custos of Székesfehérvár [...]. After 1358 no further information is available concerning Mark of Kált. Nor do we possess any source explicitly confirming that he wrote a chronicle. Yet the same is true of Master Ákos, the characteristically oligarchic chronicler of the thirteenth century. Nevertheless, the career paths of both Master Ákos and Canon Mark lend plausibility to this assumption. Until new evidence is brought to light that would disprove it, Mark of Kált may be regarded as the compiler—and, in certain parts, the author—of the chronicle which he began to write on 15 May 1358 (the fourteenth-century chronicle composition).”

As I am not a specialist in chronicle studies, avoiding any definitive statement on the question of authorship, it is nevertheless worthwhile—on the basis of the foregoing—to review the principal elements of the biography. The key issue is obvious: despite the somewhat suspicious sequence of postings—Székesfehérvár, then the Diocese of Szerém/Syrmia (provostry in Kő), then back to Székesfehérvár—do all five data points (1336–1337, 1342, 1352, 1354, 1358) in fact pertain to the same Mark? In an attempt to retrace Jakubovich’s often rather obscure references, and by incorporating new sources, the career may be reconstructed as follows.

The data from 1336–1337 immediately present difficulties, for it was in this period—according to Jakubovich—that Mark received a grant from Queen Elizabeth for lands situated at Kált (also known as Bánkfölde) in Veszprém County, the estate from which his family took its name. In the following year, the act of formal *statutio* also took place. At this point, Jakubovich cites István Sidó of Galántha, an eighteenth-century estate administrator of the Szapáry count family, which also held possessions in the north-eastern part of Veszprém County. In 1795 Sidó mentioned these data in an *elenchus*; a brief register of charter abstracts. Jakubovich discovered this *elenchus* at the age of sixteen in his native village, in the attic of a local landowner. Though he never published the copy he made, it survives in his bequest and provides information on numerous charters otherwise lost.⁴

This explains why neither the relevant volumes of the *Anjou-kori oklevéltár* nor the online archival database contain any reference to such a grant in the royal charters issued by Elizabeth during these two years.⁵ Yet the *statutio* of 1337 is already mentioned in a judgment letter of the judge royal Nicholas Druget, issued in Buda on 12 May 1354. This document reports that the sons of Michael of Kált—Mark, provost of the cathedral chapter of Kő in the Diocese of Szerém, and his brother Bereck—were personally present in a legal dispute with Peter Vörös over certain portions of the estate of Kált. During the proceedings, the claimants presented a charter of King Louis I from 1354,

⁴ BÁC SATYAI 2025.

⁵ AOkt. XX and XXI passim; PITT 2009. p. 55–68; AOkt. Suppl.

which transcribed verbatim a document issued by the chapter of Győr, the territorially competent place of authentication in the north-eastern part of Veszprém County. Although neither of these charters has survived, the judge royal summarised their contents: the estate of Kált had been assigned to Mark and his relatives by a man of Queen Elizabeth, in the presence of a delegate of the chapter of Győr.⁶ The text contains no mention of Mark's having been *capelle reginalis clericus* at the time.⁷

Looking retrospectively to 1337, the source already refers to Mark as provost, though this is most likely an anachronistic slip by the drafter of the charter issued seventeen years later, especially in light of the archontology of the cathedral chapter of Kő.⁸ In any case, his provostship cannot have lasted long. Beyond this datum, the only additional certainty is that Mark, provost of Kő, paid thirty-two florins to the papal tithe collectors during 1353–1354.⁹ His predecessor is documented in office until February 1350, and of his successor it is known that by March 1356 he had already moved on.¹⁰ Thus Mark's tenure was brief, presumably ending by 1355 at the latest; a fact that may nonetheless bear significance for later considerations.

Returning to the biography accepted by Gyula Kristó on the basis of Jakubovich, the next element is the parish priesthood of Buda-Váralja (*Buda-Suburbium*), allegedly held from 1342 onwards. Jakubovich, citing the work of Jakab Rupp, claims that Mark of Kált served in this church between 1342 and 1349, and even mentions a further data from 1347, again referring to the 1795 *elenchus*. Indeed, Rupp does list a parish priest named Mark—cited only by his first name—in connection with the church dedicated to Saint Peter the Martyr. However, he provides no primary references, relying instead on Xystus Schier's posthumous eighteenth-century work *Buda Sacra sub Priscibus Regibus*, which likewise contains no citations.¹¹ A survey of the relevant volumes of the *Anjou-kori oklevéltár* and associated supplements has yielded no trace of any parish priest of Buda-Váralja from the 1340's.¹²

By contrast, a petition (*supplicatio*) from the summer of 1352 mentions a cleric named Mark who was *custos* of the royal chapel, parish priest of a church dedicated to Saint Peter the Martyr (located in an unidentified settlement within the Diocese of Veszprém), canon of Székesfehérvár, and, at that very

⁶ 12 May 1354 (AOkt. XXXVIII. nr. 280.). Its original is incompletely photographed: MNL OL DF 252 901. A good quality photo is available at: Arhivele Naționale ale României, Serviciul Județean Cluj, Fond Familial Wass, Seria I – Documente Medievale, nr. 57. [The Cluj County Archive of the National Archive of Romania, Wass Family Fond, Series I – Medieval Documents, nr. 57.], arhivamedievala.ro – SIIAN: CJ-F-00457-1-57 – accessed 20-08-2025.

⁷ Cf. JAKUBOVICH 1924. p. 16.

⁸ See. C. TÓTH – TERNOVÁČZ 2020. p. 61–62. From the end of the 1330's two provosts of Kő are known, Dominic and John.

⁹ Mon. Vat. I/1. p. 445.

¹⁰ C. TÓTH – TERNOVÁČZ 2020. p. 62, footnote nr. 25.

¹¹ RUPP 1868. p. 170; SCHIER 1774. p. 68–69.

¹² AOkt. XXIV–XXXIII. passim; PITI 2013. p. 71–82; PITI 2017. p. 31–59; PITI 2019. p. 67–82.

time, a candidate for a canonical benefice in Veszprém.¹³ This information has long been known, and—owing to Jakubovich’s reconstruction—this Mark has been identified in the archontologies of both Székesfehérvár and Veszprém chapters with Mark of Kált.¹⁴

The data enumerated thus far—regardless of whether they are corroborated by extant charters—are linked together by the *elenchus* from the late 1330’s to 1354. Yet it is by no means self-evident that the Mark mentioned exclusively in 1352 as canon of Székesfehérvár is identical with the custos of the same chapter, attested from 1358 onwards. Among the medieval custodians of Székesfehérvár, it was far from common—as far as our evidence allows such inquiry—that they had previously held a canonry within the same chapter.¹⁵ Jakubovich’s reasoning—decidedly not based on the *elenchus* at this point—thus appears somewhat overstated: “From the fact that he was already in receipt of a Székesfehérvár canonry in 1352, *we may be certain* [emphasis mine—A. R.] that we are dealing with the same person. According to our later source,¹⁶ in 1358 he resided in his own house in Székesfehérvár. His well-endowed position bound him to the locality.”¹⁷ Moreover, it had already been noted by Pongrác Sörös, writing nearly a decade earlier that Mark’s custodianship did not terminate in 1358; indeed, Sörös cited reference issued in October 1361—following in the footsteps of György Fejér—confirming his continued tenure.¹⁸

The charter references to Mark, custos of Székesfehérvár—now presented here in full—can be summarised as follows:¹⁹

¹³ 2 July 1352: “Item, quatenus Marco, custodi capelle regie de beneficio ecclesiastico, cum cura vel sine cura, etiamsi dignitas, personatus vel officium existat, spectante communiter vel divisim ad collationem etc. episcopi et capituli Vesprimiensis, vacante vel vacaturo, etiam in ecclesia Vesprimiensis, cum acceptatione, dignemini providere. Non obstantibus, quod parochialem ecclesiam sancti Petri martiris et canonicatum et prebendam ecclesie Albensis, Vesprimiensis diocesis, obtinet, cum aliis clausulis, ut supra.” MREV II. p. 155–156.

¹⁴ RIBI 2018. p. 151; KARLINSZKY 2022. p. 160.

¹⁵ KERTÉSZ 2022. p. 47–50; RIBI 2018. p. 137–138; KÖBLÖS 1994. p. 128.

¹⁶ AO VII. 170. = 27 April 1358 (AOkt. XLII. nr. 445.)

¹⁷ JAKUBOVICH 1924. p. 18.

¹⁸ SÖRÖS 1916. p. 573. In addition the certain Martin custos from 1363—cited from the work of Fejér—is also Mark, see in Table 1.

¹⁹ Cf. RIBI 2018. p. 137.

Table 1: References to Mark Custos in the Charters

Date	Source	Name	Way of mention
20 August 1357 – 20 August 1358 ²⁰	DL 106 089.	<i>Markus custos</i>	list of dignitaries
27 April 1358	AOKlt. XLII. nr. 445.	<i>Marcus custos</i> ²¹	litigation
7 June 1358	AOKlt. XLII. nr. 639.	<i>Marcus custos</i> ²²	list of dignitaries
25 August 1358	AOKlt. XLII. nr. 938.	<i>Marcus custos</i> ²³	list of dignitaries
20 September 1358	AOKlt. XLII. nr. 1052.	<i>Marcus custos</i> ²⁴	list of dignitaries
25 May 1359	DL 417.	<i>Marcus custos</i>	list of dignitaries
5 June 1360	AOKlt. XLIV. nr. 541.	<i>Marcus custos</i> ²⁵	delegate by the place of authentication
20 July 1360	AOKlt. XLIV. nr. 696.	<i>Marcus custos</i> ²⁶	advocate
4 April 1361	AOKlt. LI. nr. 63.	<i>Marcus custos</i> ²⁷	delegate by the place of authentication
2 October 1361	DL 106 143.	<i>Marcus custos</i>	list of dignitaries
18 October 1361	DF 278 026.	<i>Marcus custos</i>	advocate
30 May 1363	AOKlt. XLVII. nr. 248.	<i>Marcus custos</i> ²⁸	list of dignitaries
15 June 1364	AOKlt. XLVIII. nr. 477.	<i>Marcus custos</i> ²⁹	list of dignitaries
20 August 1366	AOKlt. L. nr. 771.	<i>Marcus custos</i> ³⁰	list of dignitaries
29 July 1368	AOKlt. LII. nr. 608.	<i>Marcus custos</i> ³¹	list of dignitaries

No further references to his person are available from the 1370's either.³² It is worth adding that Mark's predecessor as custos, Demetrius, is last mentioned in June 1356, while his successor, John Cudar, only appears in March 1369.³³ It is likewise known that by 1358 Mark already possessed a house in Székesfehérvár.³⁴ Combined with his repeated mention as a delegate of the

²⁰ The dating of this deficient charter is possible by the mention of dean Ladislaus, who—taking into account the usual change on St Stephen's day in the chapter of Székesfehérvár—was held this office between 20 August 1357 and 20 August 1358. See. RIBI 2018. p. 140.

²¹ MNL OL DL 4730. Although King Louis I mentions only the custos dignity in his mandate (without the name), but this is not conclusive concerning the beginning of Mark's dignity, because the situation is the same with the provost of the St. Nicholas collegiate chapter of Székesfehérvár and the abbot of Zselicszentjakab (OSB); both appear as neighbours in this litigation (AOKlt. XLII. nr. 114).

²² MNL OL DL 77228.

²³ MNL OL DL 87339.

²⁴ MNL OL DF 200945.

²⁵ MNL OL DL 4902.

²⁶ MNL OL DL 4902.

²⁷ MNL OL DL 91.

²⁸ MNL OL DL 5214.

²⁹ MNL OL DF 236491.

³⁰ MNL OL DF 200254.

³¹ MNL OL DL 41759. The charter was issued by the chapter of Veszprém with a notarial authentication of Augustinus, son of Ambrosius of Kapronca, public notar from the Diocese of Zagreb.

³² The charter of the Óbuda chapter dated to 13 January 1371 by the archival database—with a certain Mark canon in its dignity list—is in fact 10 years earlier (MNL OL DL 106093.).

³³ RIBI 2018. p. 137–138. It can be read inappropriate in the cited archontology (based on the work of György Fejér) that the custodianship was vacant on 9 June 1367, because the mentioned charter was, in fact, edited by the chapter of Várad: AOKlt. LI. nr. 408.

³⁴ AOKlt. XLII. nr. 445.

chapter, this fact strongly suggests that he resided locally. One further point of interest is that during the summer of 1360 he was unable to perform his duties as advocate owing to illness; though clearly he later recovered.

What remains highly uncertain, however—given that the sources consistently refer to him merely as *Marcus*—is the extent to which he may be identified with Mark of Kált, provost of Kő. Some insight into the family of Mark, custos of Székesfehérvár, may be gleaned from a charter of Bishop William of Pécs from 1361, which mentions Mark's nephew (*nepos*) Dominic, custos of Győr.³⁵ The latter held this benefice between 1361 and 1382, though nothing is known of his ancestry.³⁶ In the 1354 charter listing the relatives of Mark of Kált, provost of Kő, no individual named Dominic is mentioned; a fact not necessarily decisive, since Dominic's more than two-decade-long tenure suggests he may still have been a minor at that date. Another difficulty lies in the fact that, although the office of custos at the royal collegiate chapter of Székesfehérvár was undoubtedly a valuable benefice,³⁷ it does not necessarily represent an obvious promotion for a provost of a cathedral chapter.³⁸ Moreover, the years between 1354/1355 and 1357/1358 remain unaccounted. Kornél Szovák supposes that Mark of Kált received the provostship of Kő merely as a reward for his loyal service to the ruler, while spending most of his time at the royal court.³⁹ However, it seems unlikely that he would have lost that benefice after only a few months—indeed, at most three and a half years, given the July 1352 charter, which does not mention the provostship—without immediately obtaining a higher office. From the provostship of Kő, he could not have transferred to the custodianship of Székesfehérvár between the second half of 1354 and early 1356 (more precisely, 1355), for that position was still held by Demetrius custos, at least until the summer of 1356. Furthermore, the brevity of the provostship—although the cleric may have occasionally resided on site—raises doubts as to whether he could have incorporated into the chronicle composition (begun only in 1358) the original text of the *Chronicle of Pozsony* (*Pozsonyi Krónika*), notable for its numerous references to Szerém county.⁴⁰

³⁵ MNL OL DF 278 026.

³⁶ C. TÓTH – HORVÁTH 2019, p. 37.

³⁷ KERTÉSZ 2022, p. 20–22.

³⁸ However, it is true that the chapter of Kő was one of the smallest in the country. See C. TÓTH – TERNOVÁČZ 2020, p. 59–60. We know of a similar example of promotion in the late Árpád era: Andronicus, provost of Veszprém became the custos of Székesfehérvár. See KERTÉSZ 2022, p. 50.

³⁹ SZOVÁK 2004, p. 242.

⁴⁰ JAKUBOVICH 1924, p. 18. The *Chronicle of Pozsony* is an extract of the Fourteenth-century Chronicle Composition of Hungary which was compiled most probably on the request of Ugrin Csák, a follower of King Charles I. The text contains independent additions referring to the southern part of the country. See KRISTÓ 2002, p. 85. Concerning the different versions of the Fourteenth-century Chronicle Composition a short summary is available in German: THOROCZKAY 2016, p. 230–231.

The matter is further complicated by the surprising high number of clerics named Mark known from this period. To render the issue more transparent, I have compiled a comparative table of the clerics in question:⁴¹

Table 2: Clerics Named Mark in Mid-Fourteenth-Century Hungary

Name	Ecclesiastical benefice	Tenure
Mark	cantor of Veszprém	1334–1346
Mark of Hanva	cantor of Esztergom	1335–1356
Mark	canon of Kalocsa	1345–1353
Mark	custos of the royal chapel, canon of Székesfehérvár and parish priest of the church of Saint Peter the Martyr	1352
Mark of Kált	provost of Kő	1353 (?) – 1355 (?)
Mark	parish priest of Patak, royal chaplain	1355
Mark	custos of Székesfehérvár	1357/1358–1368

Between 1334 and 1346, the cantor of Veszprém bore the name Mark,⁴² while from 1335 to 1356 the cantor of Esztergom was likewise so called.⁴³ More recent findings reveal that the latter was related to the Hanva family, landholders in Gömör County.⁴⁴ However, nothing is known concerning the former's origins, nor do the sources suggest that their disappearance from office coincided with their deaths. Between 1345 and 1353, a Mark is likewise attested as a canon of Kalocsa,⁴⁵ while in 1355 the parish priest of Patak also bore this name.⁴⁶ Thus—at least on purely chronological grounds—it cannot be ruled out that the cantor of Veszprém or the canon of Kalocsa was identical with Mark of Kált, provost of Kő (though the successor of the cantor of Veszprém is already documented in 1347). Mark of Hanva of Esztergom, whose successor is not known until 1362, could likewise, in principle, be identified with the Mark who became custos of Székesfehérvár by 1358, though no relative named Dominic is known in his case either. Even the parish priest of Patak might have been the same individual as the custos of Székesfehérvár.

In such a scenario, however, the Mark who served as canon of Székesfehérvár and parish priest of the church of Saint Peter the Martyr in 1352, while also fulfilling duties at the royal chapel, would have to be regarded

⁴¹ Remark: one can find in Table 2 only such clerics named Mark who may be identical with Mark of Kált and/or Mark, custos of Székesfehérvár. There is one more Mark, a canon of Óbuda mentioned in the sources between 13 January 1361 (MNL OL DL 106093) and 25 January 1364. (AOkt. XLVIII. nr. 52).

⁴² KARLINSZKY 2022. p. 38.

⁴³ C. TÓTH 2019a. p. 37. The author dates Mark's tenure from 1336, but it seems that he was the cantor of Esztergom a year earlier. See the next footnote.

⁴⁴ 7 August 1335 (AOkt. XIX. nr. 479). Based on the original charter, in my opinion, it is not clear whether cantor Mark was the son of Nicholas of Hanva, as the regesta names him (MNL OL DL 56843). According to a charter from 20 years later, it is more likely that he was only related to the family: 21 March 1355 (MNL OL DL 74823).

⁴⁵ C. TÓTH 2019b. p. 114.

⁴⁶ 28 June 1355 (MNL OL DL 4483)

as yet another distinct personage. Nevertheless, it cannot be excluded that no fewer than six or seven educated clerics bearing the name Mark were simultaneously active in mid-fourteenth-century Hungary.

Naturally, an excessively hypercritical approach is no more productive than categorical assertions.⁴⁷ In the present case, the arguments of chronicle scholarship must also be taken into account. I fully agree with Emil Jakubovich that the career outline he sketches presents every qualification necessary for the compilation of the chronicle.⁴⁸ Nevertheless—since the sources concerning the benefice at Székesfehérvár offer no evidence regarding his origins—the identification of Mark, custos of Székesfehérvár, with Mark of Kált, provost of Kő, must remain open to question until further evidence emerges. The Mark attested in 1352—as parish priest of Buda-Váralja and cleric of the royal court then residing in Buda—would certainly have had the opportunity to study the chronicle of the Franciscans of Buda (in Hungarian: *Budai Minorita Krónika*) recounting the reign of Charles I.⁴⁹ It is also likely that earlier historical works—if anywhere—would have been preserved at Székesfehérvár (aside from the royal court), to which he would have enjoyed access as a canon, though his various offices probably kept him mostly at court. Similar observations may be made regarding Mark, custos of Székesfehérvár, who by virtue of his office was responsible for the archives and books of the ancient provostry. Whether the two figures are indeed one and the same cannot be determined from the sources currently available. Recent scholarship, however, has argued that the conservative ideal of kingship conveyed by the prologue of the work, together with its distinctly French theological learning, renders it more plausible that the compiler was a Franciscan or Augustinian friar with close access to the court of Louis I.⁵⁰ Whatever the case, the fact remains that—contrary to earlier scholarship—Mark, custos of Székesfehérvár, did not disappear from the charters after 1358. He thus had ample time to compile the chronicle begun on 15 May of that year.⁵¹ This circumstance, incidentally, also precludes the unlikely supposition that the abrupt break in the narrative of the *Illuminated Chronicle*—but not the other versions of the Fourteenth-century Chronicle Composition—was caused by the sudden death of its author.⁵²

⁴⁷ Cf. SZABADOS 2022. p. 534, footnote nr. 5.

⁴⁸ JAKUBOVICH 1924. p. 18.

⁴⁹ In a narrower sense the *Budai Minorita Krónika* summarizes the Hungarian history from 1272 up to 1333/1334 and was compiled most probably in the Franciscan Convent of Buda. See KRISTÓ 2002. p. 84.

⁵⁰ BÁCSATYAI 2025.

⁵¹ Research dates the preparation of the codex itself of the *Illuminated Chronicle* to the middle decades of the fourteenth century, the years after 1358. See CSAPODINÉ GÁRDONYI 1986. p. 527.

⁵² See SZOVÁK 2004. p. 242; SRH I. p. 239–505.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

- AO *Anjou okmánytár. Codex diplomaticus Hungaricus Andegavensis* I–VII. Ed. NAGY, Imre. Budapest. 1878–1920.
- AOkt. *Anjou-kori oklevéltár. Documenta res Hungaricas tempore regum Andegavensium illustrantia*. I–XXXVIII., XL., XLII., XLIV., XLVI–LIII. Ed. ALMÁSI, Tibor – B. HALÁSZ, Éva – BLAZOVICH, László – KÓFALVI, Tamás – KRISTÓ, Gyula – GÉCZI, Lajos – MAKK, Ferenc – PITI, Ferenc – RÁBAL, Krisztina – SEBŐK, Ferenc – TEISZLER, Éva – TÓTH, Ildikó. Budapest – Szeged. 1990–2025.
- AOkt. Suppl. *Anjou-kori oklevéltár. Supplementum I. Keltezetlen és hiányos keltezésű oklevelek 1301–1342*. [Undated and Incompletely Dated Charters.] Ed. Szócs, Tibor. Budapest–Szeged. 2023.
- MNL OL DF Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára, Diplomatikai Fényképgyűjtemény [State Archive of the Hungarian National Archive, Diplomatic Photo Collection]
- MNL OL DL Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára, Diplomatikai Levéltár [State Archive of the Hungarian National Archive, Diplomatic Archive]
- Mon. Vat. *Monumenta Vaticana Historiam Regni Hungariae Illustrantia I/1. Rationes Collectorum Pontificiorum in Hungaria*. Budapest. 2000.
- MREV *Monumenta Romana Episcopatus Vesprimiensis. A veszprémi püspökség római oklevéltára*. I–IV. Ed. FRAKNÓI, Vilmos – LUKCSICS, József. Budapest. 1896–1907.
- PITI 2009 PITI, Ferenc: Kiegészítések az Anjou-kori Oklevéltár XX. kötetéhez (1336) [Supplements to Volume 20 of Anjou-kori Oklevéltár]. *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis – Acta Historica* 130 (2009), p. 55–68
- PITI 2013 PITI, Ferenc: Kiegészítések az Anjou-kori Oklevéltár XXVI. kötetéhez (1342) [Supplement to Volume 26 of Anjou-kori Oklevéltár]. *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis – Acta Historica* 135 (2013), p. 71–82
- PITI 2017 PITI, Ferenc: Kiegészítések az Anjou-kori Oklevéltár XXVII. kötetéhez (1343) [Supplements to Volume 27 of Anjou-kori Oklevéltár]. *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis – Acta Historica* 142 (2017), p. 31–59.
- PITI 2019 PITI, Ferenc: Kiegészítések az Anjou-kori Oklevéltár XXVIII. kötetéhez (1344) [Supplements to Volume 28 of Anjou-kori Oklevéltár]. *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis – Acta Historica* 144 (2019) p. 67–82.
- SRH *Scriptores regum Hungaricarum*. I–II. Edendo operi praefuit Emericus Szentpétery. Budapest. [reprint] 1999.

Secondary Literature

- BÁCSATYAI 2025 BÁCSATYAI, Dániel: A kompilátor arcéle [The Face of the Compiler]. Manuscript.
- CSAPODINÉ GÁRDONYI 1986 CSAPODINÉ GÁRDONYI, Klára: A Képes Krónika miniatúrái [The Miniatures of the Illuminated Chronicle]. In: *Képes Krónika*. Transl. BELLUS, Ibolya. Budapest. 1986. p. 517–558.
- JAKUBOVICH 1924 JAKUBOVICH, Emil: *Adalékok legrégebb nyelvemlékes okleveleink és krónikáink íróinak személyéhez. Ki volt Anonymus és Márkus krónikás?* [Additions to the Personalities of the

- Authors of our Oldest Language-Memory-Charters and Chronicles. Who were Anonymus and Mark chronicle?] Budapest. 1924. (A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Kiadványai 20.)
- KARLINSZKY 2022 KARLINSZKY, Balázs: *A veszprémi székeskáptalan archontológiája 1079–1556* [The Archontology of the Cathedral Chapter of Veszprém]. Veszprém. 2022. (A Veszprémi Egyházmegye Múltjából 39.)
- KERTÉSZ 2022 KERTÉSZ, Balázs: *A székesfehérvári káptalan archontológiája és oklevéladó tevékenysége az Árpád-korban*. [The Archontology and Charter Issuing Activity of the Chapter of Székesfehérvár in the Árpád Era.]. Székesfehérvár. 2022. (Közlemények Székesfehérvár történetéből)
- KÖBLÖS 1994 KÖBLÖS, József: *Az egyházi középréteg Mátvás és a Jagellók korában (A budai, fehérvári, győri és pozsonyi káptalan adattárával)* [The Ecclesiastical Middle Class in the Age of Mathias and the Jagiellonians. (With the Database of the Chapters of Óbuda, Székesfehérvár, Győr and Pozsony)]. Budapest. 1994. (Társadalom- és Művelődéstörténeti Tanulmányok 12.)
- KRISTÓ 1967 KRISTÓ, Gyula: Anjou-kori krónikáink [Our Chronicles from the Angevin Period]. *Századok* 101 (1967), p. 480–500.
- KRISTÓ 1986 KRISTÓ, Gyula: A Képes Krónika és szerzője [The Illuminated Chronicle and Its Author]. In: *Képes Krónika*. Transl. BELLUS, Ibolya. Budapest. 1986. p. 459–516.
- KRISTÓ 1994 KRISTÓ, Gyula: krónikakompozíció [Chronica Composition]. In: *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. század)*. Ed. KRISTÓ, Gyula. – ENGEL, Pál – MAKK, Ferenc. Budapest. 1994, p. 381–382.
- KRISTÓ 2002 KRISTÓ, Gyula: *Magyar historiográfia I. Történetírás a középkori Magyarországon* [Hungarian Historiography I. Historiography in Medieval Hungary]. Budapest. 2002.
- RIBI 2018 RIBI, András: A fehérvári káptalan archontológiája (1301–1457) [The Archontology of the Chapter of Székesfehérvár]. *Turul* 91 (2018), p. 132–154.
- RIBI 2023 RIBI, András: Kálti (?) Márk fehérvári őrkanonok (1357/1358–1368). Megjegyzések a 14. századi krónikakompozíció feltételezett összeállítójának életrajzához [Mark of Kalt (?), the Custos of Székesfehérvár. Remarks on the Biography of the Presumed Compiler of the 14th-century Chronicle Composition of Hungary]. In: *Főesperesek, krónikairók, monostorok. Tanulmányok*. Ed. FARKAS, Csaba. Pécs. 2023. (Az Árpád- és Anjou-kor magyar egyházi archontológiájának kérdései 5.) p. 45–55.
- RIBI–THOROCZKAY 2024 *A középkori magyar egyház intézménytörténeti és archontológiai kézikönyve (1000–1387). Manuale Historiae Institutionum et Archontologicum Ecclesiae Hungaricae Medii Aevi (1000–1387)*. I–II. Ed. RIBI, András – THOROCZKAY, Gábor. Pécs. 2024.
- RUPP 1868 RUPP, Jakab: *Buda-Pest és környékének helyrajzi története* [Topographical History of Buda-Pest and Its Area]. Pest. 1868.
- SCHIER 1774 P. SCHIER, Xystus: *Buda Sacra sub Priscis Regibus*. Viennae. 1774.

- SÖRÖS 1916 SÖRÖS, Pongrác: A székesfehérvári örkanonokság története 1543-ig [The History of the Custodianship of Székesfehérvár up to 1543]. *Századok* 50 (1916), p. 565–584.
- SZABADOS 2022 SZABADOS, György: Az Árpádok kora a történetírásban [The Age of the Árpáds in the Historiography]. In: *Árpádok országa. Tanulmányok és katalógus*. Ed. RITÓOK, Ágnes – SIMONYI, Erika. Budapest. 2022. p. 533–543.
- SZOVÁK 2004 SZOVÁK, Kornél: Utószó. [Afterword.] In: *Képes Krónika*. Ed. SZOVÁK, Kornél. Transl. BOLLÓK, János. Budapest. 2004, p. 233–256.
- THOROCZKAY 2016 THOROCZKAY, Gábor: Die Legendenliteratur und Geschichtsschreibung Ungarns bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts (Eine Übersicht). *Bulletino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo* 118 (2016), p. 217–248.
- C. TÓTH 2019a C. TÓTH, Norbert: *Az esztergomi székes- és társaskáptalanok archontológiája 1100–1543* [The Archontology of the Cathedral and Collegiate Chapters of Esztergom]. Budapest. 2019. (Subsidia ad historiam medii aevi Hungariae inquirendam 9.)
- C. TÓTH 2019b C. TÓTH, Norbert: *A kalocsa–bácsi főegyházmegye káptalanjainak középkori archontológiája* [The Medieval Archontology of the Chapters of the Archdiocese of Kalocsa–Bács]. Kalocsa. 2019. (Kalocsai Főegyházmegyei Gyűjtemények kiadványai 15. – Subsidia ad historiam medii aevi Hungariae inquirendam 11.)
- C. TÓTH – HORVÁTH 2019 C. TÓTH, Norbert – HORVÁTH, Terézia: *A győri székeskáptalan archontológiája 1200–1458* [The Archontology of the Cathedral Chapter of Győr]. Győr. 2019. (A Győri Egyházmegyei Levéltár Kiadványai. Források, feldolgozások)
- C. TÓTH – TERNOVÁCZ 2020 C. TÓTH, Norbert – TERNOVÁCZ, Bálint: *Káptalanok a Drávántúlon. A boszniai, kői és szenternyei székeskáptalanok és a pozsegi társaskáptalan archontológiája* [Chapters Beyond the Drava. The Archontology of the Cathedral Chapters of Bosnia, Kő/Banoštor and Szenternye/Mačvanska Mitrovica, and the Collegiate Chapter of Pozsega/Požega]. Pécs. 2020. (Thesaurus Historiae Ecclesiasticae in Universitate Quinqueecclesiensi 11.)

