

Éva B. Halász

HIM-MTA-SZTE-MOL Magyar Medievalisztikai Kutatócsoport (Hungarian
Medieval Studies Research Group)

Viola utca 13., Budapest, 1094, Hungary

halasz.eva2005@gmail.com

THE CHANCELLERY AND THE DIPLOMATICS OF THE HUNGARIAN DUKES IN THE 14TH CENTURY

Abstract: The article deals with the diplomatics and the chancellery of the 14th century Hungarian princely dukes: duke Stephen (1349–1354), duchess Margaret (1354–1356) and duke Charles (1371–1372). Altogether, there are 77 known charters issued by these dukes. The paper analyses their external and internal characteristics and describes the seals of the dukes. In the last section, the author discusses the functioning and the staff of the dukes' chancelleries.

Keywords: 14th century, Hungary, Slavonia, Croatia, duke, diplomatics, chancellery, duke's chancellery.

1. The dukedom in Hungary in the 14th century.¹

In the medieval Hungarian kingdom the dukedom appeared two times in the 14th century, in three different territories: in Transylvania, in

¹ There are two different scholarly opinions about the first *ducatus* in Hungary. According to György Györffy the *ducatus* meant the domination of the "crown dukes" over the Khazar-Kabar tribes which accompanied the Hungarians. In the Carpathian basin the *ducatus* was divided territorially into three different places: Bihar, Nyitra and Krassó (GY. GYÖRFFY, *István király és műve [King Stephen and his work]*, Budapest 2000, 34–36). On the other hand, Gyula Kristó wrote that the *ducatus* appeared in Hungary only around 1048, after king Andrew (András) I called his brother Béla back to Hungary and gave him the *ducatus*. Its centres were in Nyitra and Bihar. In this first period of history of the *ducatus*, the *dux* opposed the king and dukes frequently aspired to become kings. King Coloman terminated the *ducatus* in 1107. The second period of the *ducatus* was in the 12th century. It appeared for the first time in 1152, when the title *dux* was held by duke Ladislav (László), later king Ladislav II. The third time the *ducatus* arose in the 13th century. This period started in 1194, when

Szepes and Sáros in the northern part of the country, and in Slavonia and Croatia. Transylvania and Slavonia were two territories which were traditionally governed separately by a *voivoda* and a *ban*,² and sometimes by a prince of the royal family with the title of *dux*. Dukedom did not exist in Szepes and Sáros before the middle of the 14th century.³ The dukedom existed the longest in Slavonia (1350, 1354–56, 1371–72). The first prince who had territorial power⁴ in the 14th century was Stephen (1332–1354), son of king Charles I (1301–1342) and Elisabeth of Poland. He was the younger brother of king Louis I (1342–1382). In 1349, Stephen used for the first time the title “*dux Hungarie ac dominus terre Scepusyensis et de Sarus*”, but one month later he was duke of Transylvania and lord of Szepes and Sáros. In 1350 and between 1353 and 1354 he was duke of Slavonia, Croatia and Dalmatia,⁵ in 1351 duke of Transylvania for the

Emeric (Imre) was *dux* of Dalmatia and Croatia (GY. KRISTÓ, *A XI. századi hercegség története Magyarországon* [*The dukedom in Hungary in the 11th century*], Budapest 1974; IDEM, *A feudális széttagolódás Magyarországon* [*The feudal fragmentation in Hungary*], Budapest 1979, 44–58). The dukedom of the 14th century was very much alike to that of this latest period both in terms of territories concerned and in aspects of its sovereignty.

² Sometimes not only Slavonia, but also medieval Croatia was part of the *banatus*. In these instances the ban was titled Slavonian-Croatian ban. About the variations of the Slavonian ban’s title in the 14th century see É. B. HALÁSZ, *Diplomatička analiza isprava slavonskih banova u razdoblju od 1323. do 1381. godine* [A Diplomatic Analysis of the Charters of the Bans of Slavonia in the period from Period 1323 to 1381], *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 27 (2009) 35–102, pp. 47–49.

³ About the Hungarian provinces see GY. KRISTÓ, *Tájszemlélet és térszervezés a középkori Magyarországon* [*The approach to the landscape and land organization in mediaeval Hungary*], Szeged 2000.

⁴ In the medieval Hungarian Kingdom, male members of the royal family bore the title *dux* from the time of their birth, but without any real power. Some dukes never got any territorial authority. Duke Stephen (István), as a child, was called “*dux Sclavonie*”, while his brother, Louis (Lajos), later king Louis I, was “*dux Transilvanus*” (12 May, 1339. *Regesta: Anjou-kori oklevéltár – Documenta res Hungaricas tempore regum Andegavensium illustrantia*, vol. XXIII (1339), szerk. F. PITI, Budapest – Szeged 1999, no. 273), without any real territorial power. Dukes who had territorial power also had their own chancelleries. About the chancellors of the Arpadian dukes see: A. ZSOLDOS, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1000–1301* [*The secular archontology of Hungary 1000–1301*], Budapest 2011, 118–120.

⁵ In the charters his title was “*Dei gratia dux Slavonie, Croatie et Dalmatie*” – for example, charter no. 3 in the Table of Documents given in the Appendix at the end of the paper (hereafter the documents of the dukes will be referred to by numbers from this Table). About the title of the ban see É. B. HALÁSZ, *Diplomatička analiza*, 47–49.

second time, and in 1352 duke of Szepes and Sáros.⁶ After his death, between 1354 and 1356 Slavonia and Croatia were governed by Stephen's wife, duchess Margaret, daughter of emperor Louis IV of Bavaria.⁷ For the second time the *ducatus* existed in 1371–1372, and its head was Charles of Durazzo, cousin of king Louis I of Hungary, and son of Louis, duke of Durazzo.⁸

2. The diplomatics of the dukes in the 14th century.⁹

There are 77 known preserved documents of 14th century dukes. Of these, 53 charters were issued by duke Stephen, 12 by duchess Margaret and another 12 by duke Charles. One of the 77 charters is missing from the collection of the Hungarian National Archives and has not got any edition,¹⁰ six are known only from the editions,¹¹ three are known only from photos, because the originals are damaged,¹² and one is unreadable since the photo of the whole diploma is black.¹³ We have altogether 18 docu-

⁶ About his life and the chronology of his reign see: É. HALÁSZ, Anjou István hercegsége (1332–1354) [The dukedom of Stephen of Anjou], *Fons* 12 (2005) 26–69.

⁷ About her life see: É. HALÁSZ, Bajor Margit hercegnő (1325–1374) magyarországi tevékenysége [Activity of duchess Margaret of Bavaria (1325–1374) in Hungary], *Turul* 79/3–4 (2005) 109–116.

⁸ About his life see: A. PÓR, Kis Károly és Erzsébet utolsó évei [Charles of Durazzo and the last years of queen Elisabeth], *Századok* 30 (1896) 129–147, pp. 129–130.

⁹ The best summary of the medieval Hungarian Kingdom's diplomatics: I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Magyar oklevéltan [Hungarian diplomatics]*, Budapest 1930. J. STIPIŠIĆ in his book *Pomoćne povijesne znanosti u teoriji i praksi*, Zagreb 1985², summarized the diplomatics, paleography and chronology. About the diplomatics of the Slavonian bans see É. B. HALÁSZ, *Diplomatička analiza*, 35–102. The National Archives of Hungary is collecting the documents and the photos of the documents which are referring to the territory of Hungary before 1918. The photos of the medieval charters are available via the following URL: <http://mol.arcanum.hu/Dl.Df> (Collectio Diplomatica Hungarica. A középkori Magyarország levéltári forrásainak adatbázisa. Internetes kiadás [The database of the archival charters of mediaeval Hungary. Internet edition], Dl.–Df. 5.1, 2009) (cons. February 2013). The Dl. and Df. archival shelfmarks of ducal documents are given in the Table of Documents. These shelfmarks are also used in the paper to refer to other mentioned documents held by the National Archives of Hungary.

Milko Brković wrote several articles about the diplomatics of the medieval Croatian rulers in the period of the independent Croatian Kingdom. Although these charters are from an earlier period, the appropriate articles are referred in this paper.

¹⁰ No. 41.

¹¹ Nos. 3, 4, 13, 35, 51, 64.

¹² Nos. 31, 50, 53.

¹³ No. 25.

ments which are preserved in transcripts but their texts are complete. So, we have 48 diplomas to study the external characteristics of the charters issued by the dukes and 66 texts for studying the internal characteristics.

2.1. External characteristics. The documents issued by 14th century dukes were written on traditional materials:¹⁴ parchment or paper. In the Hungarian Kingdom, German type parchment was used, which means that the *vellum* was the same on both sides.¹⁵ Generally privileges were written on parchment, while mandates and other types of documents were written on paper.¹⁶ At the time of duke Stephen most of the charters were written on parchment. Only a few paper-documents are preserved from his chancellery.¹⁷ All of the known original charters of duchess Margaret were written on parchment. We have eleven original charters in the name of duke Charles. Seven of them were written on paper, and only four were written on parchment. Three of them were confirmed by a hanging seal.¹⁸ The paper used by the royal chancellery was made in Italy (80%), France (10 %) and in unknown places (10%).¹⁹ In Slavonia the chancellery of the duke probably used only Italian paper, because of the geographical proximity. The shape²⁰ of the documents is rectangular, aside from subsequent damages.²¹ The lines are running parallel with the longer side (*carta non transversa*). There isn't any *carta transversa* among the documents issued by the dukes in the 14th century, and there isn't any document in the shape of a book (*in forma libri*).²² The size of the charters was suited to the text. For example the charter of duke Stephen, dated 27 June 1350, was written on a paper of 30 cm width and 13 cm long.²³ The paper document of duke Charles, dated 8 May 1371, is approximately 5 x 31 cm.²⁴

Rather larger specimens can be found among the documents on *vellum*. The charter of duke Stephen from 10 March 1353 is 54.5 cm wide and 20 cm long,²⁵ and the charter dated 28 March 1351 is approximately

¹⁴ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 9; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 155–156.

¹⁵ In Italy the Italian-type *vellum* was used, i.e. the *recto* was bleached with chalk (SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 9).

¹⁶ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 10.

¹⁷ Paper: nos. 9, 10, 21.

¹⁸ Only no. 66 was written on *vellum* and confirmed with a pressed seal.

¹⁹ I. BOGDÁN, *A magyarországi papíripar története 1530–1900 [History of the Hungarian paper-industry]*, Budapest 1963, 23.

²⁰ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 10–11.

²¹ Non exactly rectangular e.g. no. 52.

²² A book-shape diploma is found in the 15th century among the documents of duke John Corvin, son of king Matthias I, 29 August 1495 (Df. 231 190).

²³ No. 9.

²⁴ No. 69.

²⁵ No. 34.

64 x 36 cm.²⁶ The *privilegium* of duchess Margaret dated 20 January 1355 is 31.5 x 46 cm.²⁷ However there are several smaller documents as well. The charter of duchess Margaret dated 30 November 1355 is 24 cm wide and 12.5 cm long.²⁸

The used ink is still well readable today, and it is tawny or black.²⁹

In the 14th century the notaries of the dukes never wrote the main text on the back side of the vellum or paper. Only the chancellery notes and the address were written there.³⁰ If the scribe noticed that the *vellum* or paper would not be enough for the whole text, he used smaller letters or serried lines. The individuals (notary, scribe) who wrote the charters were meticulous and proficient in writing. The parchment of the privileges was usually lined with lead in advance (in that case the lines are visible) or with a tool (in that case the lines are invisible).³¹ The margins are lined, too. The distance between the lines is usually 5–8 mm.³² In some cases the whole parchment was lined and not just the necessary part of it.³³ Sometimes only the first line was lined in advance.³⁴ On occasion, the privileges used a larger, ornated first letter as initial. Usually a two or three lines tall letter was drawn and its legs were “empty” or colored with ink. Sometimes a circle was drawn around the first letter. The initial was often left out and its place remained empty.³⁵ There is no example of *scriptura longior*.³⁶ If the writer of the privilege made a mistake, he underlined the wrong word(s) with a broken line. But errors are very rare.³⁷ The numbers were written in Roman numerals or in words.³⁸

In general, the writing of other types of documents (mandates, etc.) was not as proper as that of the privileges, but the charters issued by the dukes were neatly executed. Incorrect text can be found only in a single

²⁶ No. 22.

²⁷ No. 57.

²⁸ No. 61.

²⁹ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 11–12. Black: 20 January 1355 (no. 57), tawny: 5 May 1354 (no. 52).

³⁰ Example from the 15th century: in the charter of Hermann of Cilli dated 31 March 1425 six lines are on the back side. At the end of the front page the notary tried to use serried lines, but the place was not enough for the whole text (DI. 43 628).

³¹ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 12.

³² E.g. duchess Margaret: nos. 58, 62.

³³ E.g. duke Stephen: nos. 22, 40; duchess Margaret: no. 63.

³⁴ No. 46.

³⁵ No. 47.

³⁶ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 12.

³⁷ E.g. the word “ducalis” is underlined with broken line in the 6th row of charter no. 48.

³⁸ E.g. “M^o CCC^o quinquagesimo” from the *datatio* of charter no. 18.

mandate. The word was underlined with a broken line, just like in a privilege.³⁹ If a word or words were skipped, the notary wrote them above the line. For instance, in the charter of duke Charles, dated 25 March, 1372, in the fifth line the word “pacifico” and in the tenth line the word “vocata” were written above the lines.⁴⁰

The writing of the documents is the cursive Gothic of the notarial type which was standard in the period.⁴¹

Usually there are some notes on the back side of the documents. They belong to two types: coeval and later notes. The later notes were added to the documents in custody (archival shelfmarks, etc). There are several types of coeval notes. The docket contains the appellation of the diploma (*citatoria*, *prorogatoria*, etc.), the legal *actus*⁴² and the recipient in case of mandates.⁴³ *Solvit* signs and signatures are not present in documents issued by dukes. The *relatio* and *commissio* notes⁴⁴ are associated with the work of the chancellery and they contain information about the *commissio* and/or *relatio*. These were the most frequent note types in the century.⁴⁵ The relator was the person, who made the *relatio*, that is, the one who reported the order about the writing of the document to the chancellery.⁴⁶ In our case, a total of 24 documents have notes. All of them belong to duke Stephen and duchess Margaret. In the charters of duke Charles there are no notes. Three of the charters with notes are dated in the period of Margaret, the others are attributed to duke Stephen. Eleven cases contain *relatio* notes, six contain *commissio* notes, and in seven both types

³⁹ Thus, the word “accedendo” was deleted in the fifth line of charter no. 10.

⁴⁰ No. 72.

⁴¹ L. MEZEY, *Paleográfia. A latin írás története. Könyv- és oklevélpaleográfiai áttekintés* [Paleography. History of the Latin Writing. Summary of book's and charter's paleography], Budapest 1962, 69–71; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 99–125.

⁴² E.g. “pro magistro Ladislao filio Tuteus contra magistrum Mychelem filium Johanni militis de Campo Zagrabiensis ad octavas festi beati Jacobi apostoli prorogatoria” (no. 69).

⁴³ E.g. “fidelibus suis capitulo Posoniensi pro hospitibus Modor reambulatoria” (no. 10).

⁴⁴ On the privileges, the notes are usually written under the *plica* (no. 43). On the other types they were usually written under the seal, and the *sigillum* partly or fully covers them (for example no. 2, 5). For *commissio* and *relatio* notes see: E. SZABÓ, *A commissió és relatiós oklevelek a középkorban* [Charters with *commissio* and *relatio* notes in the Middle Ages], Debrecen 1927.

⁴⁵ In the 14th century there were some other note-types in the charters. For example the *assecuratio* type, in which the chancellery made identification. The “*communis iusticia regni*” type means that the document was written without any extra order. In the 15th century these types ceased to exist (I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 174).

⁴⁶ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 175.

can be found.⁴⁷ The relators sometimes belonged to the *aula* of the duke and duchess, such as John, son of Pető, or Stephen, son of Michael. Stephen was the member of the *aula* of the duke from the beginning. In 1349, he was *aulae iuvenis* and appeared as *homo ducis*.⁴⁸ In the next year he was *castellanus* of the castle of Ozul (Ozalj, Croatia).⁴⁹ In 1351 he was a relator and his name was written on the back side of a document from 1354.⁵⁰

John, the master builder (*Johannes lapicida*) was not a member of the *aula* of duke Stephen, although his name was written on the back of the duke's document dated 16 January 1352.⁵¹ This is the only occasion when he got in touch with duke Stephen.⁵²

2.2. Internal characteristics. In this part the formulas of the three main parts of the documents (*protocollum*, *contextus*, *eschatocollum*) and their sequence are studied. In different types of charters different formulas were used, and not all of the parts of the "ideal" charter were used in every issued charter.

There is no *invocatio verbalis*⁵³ in the charters of the dukes. In the 14th century the *invocatio verbalis* and *invocatio symbolica* are very rare in Hungarian secular documents.⁵⁴ The *intitulatio*⁵⁵ includes the name and title of the person who issued the document and all of the charters have it. In documents issued by dukes, it was always placed first like in the royal ones. The "Nos" (we) is only part of the *damus pro memoria*-documents and *patentes*.⁵⁶ As Stephen became duke of different territories, the *intitulatio* changed accordingly. From his third charter on, the chancellery used his title in each dukedom consistently.⁵⁷ During the time of his Slavonian

⁴⁷ *Commissio*: nos. 19, 20, 26, 34, 54, 61. *Relatio*: nos. 2, 3, 5, 10, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 31, 43. *Commissio* and *relatio*: nos. 4, 27, 29, 47, 48, 52, 63.

⁴⁸ No. 1.

⁴⁹ No. 3.

⁵⁰ No. 48.

⁵¹ No. 27.

⁵² About his life see: A. PÓR, Nagy Lajos király építőmestere [The master builder of king Louis I.], *Századok* 42 (1908) 753–754.

⁵³ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 19; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 150; M. BRKOVIĆ, Invokacija u poveljama hrvatskih narodnih vladara [The invocatio in the charters of the Croatian national monarchs], *Crkva u svijetu* 16/2 (1981) 165–170.

⁵⁴ In some charters of the Slavonian bans, the left leg of the first letter N (Nos) was lined through like a cross. (ban Nicolas of Szécs, 25 Oct, 1366, Dl. 95 012).

⁵⁵ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 19; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 150.

⁵⁶ All of the charters of ban Stephen Lackfi included "nos" (we) in the *intitulatio* (É. B. HALÁSZ, *Diplomatička analiza*, 46).

⁵⁷ In his first diploma he was named as "dux Hungarie ac dominus terre Scepsyensis et de Sarus" (no. 1) and in the second one "dux Transsilvanus ac dominus terre Scepsyensis et de Sarus" (no. 2).

dukedom, he was always written as “*tocius Slavonie, Croatie et Dalmatie dux*”. In 1351, the charters called him “*dux Transilvanus*” and in the next year “*dux terre Scepsyensis et de Sarus*”.⁵⁸ In the documents of duchess Margaret, the chancellery used the “*regnorum Scalvonie, Croatie et Dalmatie ducissa*” form. The period of duchess Margaret brought a change in the *intitulatio* of Slavonian ban/duke. Before her time, the usual form was “*banus/dux tocius Sclavonie*”. After 1356, the *intitulatio* consistently includes the word “*regni/regnorum*”.

During the time of duke Charles’ *ducatus*, the *intitulatio* shows variety, using the forms “*Duratii et Sclavonie dux*” (twice),⁵⁹ “*de Duratio dux (tocius) regni Sclavonie*” (four times),⁶⁰ “*regni Sclavonie dux*” (once)⁶¹ and “*regnorum Duratii et Sclavonie dux*” (five times).⁶² The latter was used towards the end of his dukedom, in 1372. The first charter that used this form is dated 25 March 1372.⁶³ The other forms were typical in 1371.

The “*Dei gratia*” formula is present in duke Stephen’s and duchess Margaret’s documents, but not in the diplomas of duke Charles.⁶⁴ Based on this it can be said that in the ducal chancellery this formula was used because of the influence of the royal chancellery. Duke Charles never issued a document at the royal court. The presence of Dalmatia in the *intitulatio* of Stephen and Margaret showed the Hungarian claim over this territory, which was then ruled by Venice. During their *ducatus* the ban used a title that referred to Slavonia and Croatia, which showed the real situation. However, by the Treaty of Zadar (17 February 1358) Venice lost Dalmatia to Hungary and the Venetian doge gave up the title of duke of Croatia and Dalmatia.⁶⁵ Thus, the title of duke Charles showed the real situation and it did not refer any claimed territory in it.⁶⁶ We don’t know the exact reason why king Louis I removed duke Charles from Slavonia.⁶⁷

⁵⁸ Only in no. 28 the word “*terre*” is missing.

⁵⁹ No. 66.

⁶⁰ No. 67.

⁶¹ No. 71.

⁶² No. 72.

⁶³ No. 72.

⁶⁴ However, the form is used in no. 71.

⁶⁵ GY. KRISTÓ, *Az Anjou-kor háborúi [Wars in the Angevin Era]*, Budapest 1988, 144.

⁶⁶ Charles in 1375–76 became duke of Dalmatia and Croatia (DI. 38 492).

⁶⁷ Duke Charles was in Hungary since 1364. There are two reasons why he became duke of Slavonia in 1371. First, in the autumn of 1371 there was a battle between the Ottomans and the Serbs at the river Marica. There were probably signs of alarm earlier and that was the reason why king Louis I nominated Charles to Slavonia. Second, from 1364 to 1370 duke Charles was the successor of king Louis. In 1370

The *inscriptio*⁶⁸ denominates the people or institutions⁶⁹ for whom the charter was written, though it could be addressed universally for everyone.⁷⁰ In the documents of the dukes, it always followed the *intitulatio*. All of the mandates and privileges had the *inscriptio*, but in some cases in the *damus pro memoria* type documents it is absent. The mandates have concrete recipients: a person,⁷¹ a group of people,⁷² a community,⁷³ or an institution.⁷⁴ In the mandates usually the word “fidelis” was used, just like in the royal charters. The *patentes* have the “quibus expedit universis” formula. The typical *inscriptio* of the privileges was the “omnibus Christi fidelibus” and its variations.⁷⁵

The *salutatio*⁷⁶ closes the first part of the charters. Among the documents issued by the dukes only the mandates and privileges had *salutatio*. In the mandates the “salutem et gratiam” was always written.⁷⁷ In the privileges a longer, more solemn *salutatio*, e. g.: “salutem in salutis largitore” was used.⁷⁸

Only the privileges have *arenga*⁷⁹ and it was used only during the *ducatus* of duke Stephen and duchess Margaret. The *arenga*, as a general rule, is connected with the object of the document. In the diplomas of duke

Katherine, daughter of king Louis was born, who became the successor of her father with her prospective husband. With the Slavonian dukedom king Louis compensated his cousin.

⁶⁸ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 19; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 150.

⁶⁹ E.g. “fidelibus capitulo ecclesie Zagrabiensis” (duke Stephen, no. 37), “fidelis suo Ladislao filio Petri castellano de Kapruncha” (duchess Margaret, no. 60).

⁷⁰ E.g. “omnibus Christi fidelibus presentibus pariter et futuris presencium noticiam habituris” (duke Stephen, no. 43).

⁷¹ E.g. “fidei suo Nicolao de Kubly tauarnicorum et ianitorum suorum, magistro et iudici curie sue et castellano Scepsyensis” (no.27).

⁷² E.g. “fidelibus suis magnifico viro Nicolao dictorum regnorum suorum Slavonie et Croatie bano et comiti Zagrabiensis, ac universis officialibus, necnon quarumlibet collectarum suarum exactoribus, vicesque eorundem gerentibus quibuslibet nunc constitutis et in futurum constituendis, quibus presentes ostendentur” (no. 55).

⁷³ E.g. “fidelibus suis iudici iuratis civibus et universis hospitibus de Cybinio item villico et universis iobagionibus sui de Ordou” (no. 1).

⁷⁴ E.g. “fidelibus suis capituli ecclesie beati Petri de Posega” (no. 45).

⁷⁵ Duke Stephen: nos. 40, 49; duchess Margaret: no. 63. Only three privileges have the “quibus expedit universis” *inscriptio*, but they are from the *ducatus* of duke Charles (nos. 67, 75, 76).

⁷⁶ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 19; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 150–151.

⁷⁷ Exceptions: no. 1 (“Gratiam et omne bonum”), and no. 22 (“salutem in eo, in quo resident incrementa salutis”).

⁷⁸ No. 17.

⁷⁹ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 19; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 150.

Stephen and duchess Margaret the *arenga* was usually short and it did not cover the own concept of the person who penned the document.⁸⁰ In the diplomas of duke Charles there was no *arenga* at all.

In many cases the “*memorie commendamus*” or “*memorie commendantes tenore presencium significamus*” form was used for the *promulgatio*.⁸¹ The “*damus pro memoria*” *promulgatio* (the *damus pro memoria* type charter) makes its appearance in the diplomatics of the dukes during the *ducatus* of duke Charles. Sometimes the *promulgatio* is only a couple of words. In the first diploma of duke Stephen only the word “*no-veritis*” is the *promulgatio*.

The *narratio*⁸² is a mandatory part of every diploma. Sometimes the royal chancellery wrote the merits of the beneficiary in a very long, emplotted *narratio* in the privileges, providing information about various events of his life.⁸³ Though some privileges issued by the dukes have been preserved, their chancellery did not write long *narrationes* about the beneficiary.⁸⁴ In the case of mandates, the *narratio* tells us why the complainant went to the duke. In the charter of duke Charles from 16 June 1372, George, son of John from Chernyk complained to the duke because Denk, son of Demeter, and his compeers attacked his property.⁸⁵ If somebody wanted to have another diploma transcribed by the duke, the *narratio* con-

⁸⁰ Duke Stephen: “*Ut digne petentium extollenda sint preconia, racio requerit sapientis*” (no. 22); “*Cum a nobis petitur, quod iustum et honestum est, decet maiestatem ducalem facilem prebere consensum hiis presertim que videntur suorum subditorum commodius convenire*” (no. 23); “*Quoniam subditorum fidelium incommodo decet ducalem maiestatem commodius reformare*” (no. 34); “*Ut ea, que aguntur in tempore inviolabiliter apud posteros perseverent, litterarum testimonio solent perhempnari*” (no. 46); “*Quoniam gesta mortalium sunt cum tempore fluenti et inbecilis memorie statum plerumque turbat oblivio et obrumbrat, provida rationis cautela humanis actibus litterarum adhiberi consuevit testimonium efficax et perhempne*” (no. 51).

Duchess Margaret: “*Ea, que devotio Christi fidelium ad presentium et quondam sancte matris ecclesie offert vel disponit convenit superiori ad effectum perducere et stabilitate perpetua roborare*” (no. 62); “*Dignum est et omni ratione consentaneum, ut hii qui principibus suum pro tempore exhibent obsequium suis laboris premio non fraudentur*” (no. 63); “*Justis petencium desideriis facilem prebere consensum ius invitat, equitas persuadet et ducalis excellencia exortatur*” (no. 65).

⁸¹ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 20; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 151.

⁸² *Ibidem*.

⁸³ See E. MÁLYUSZ, *Királyi kancellária és krónikaírás a középkori Magyarországon* [*The royal chancellery and the chronic-writing in the Mediaeval Hungary*], Budapest 1973.

⁸⁴ In the charter of duchess Margaret the *narratio* tells some facts about the merits of Stephen, son of Thomas, but in very short (no. 63).

⁸⁵ No. 77.

tained the transcribed charter, as well.⁸⁶ In the *litterae prorogatoriae*, the *narratio* and the *dispositio* are almost inseparable, since the first half of the sentence belonged to the *narratio* (the enumeration of the privies) while the second half belonged to the *dispositio* (about the suspense of the act).⁸⁷

The *dispositio*⁸⁸ contains the will of the giver of the charter. In the mandates the *dispositio* tells about the mandate of the duke to the chapter or to the *comes* of the county.⁸⁹

There isn't any *sanctio*⁹⁰ formula in the documents issued by the dukes.

The *corroboratio*⁹¹ tells about the ways the document was confirmed by a hanging or impressed seal. It was not included in every diploma. In privileges the "datum per manus" form occurs. The name of the person who was responsible for the documents was part of this formula. During the time of duke Stephen, it always gives the name of George of Megyericse, and in the *ducatus* of duchess Margaret the name of Peter of Brno.

In the 14th century there were no *subscriptions*⁹² in the diplomas.

The *datatio*⁹³ tells where and when the document was edited. In royal privileges the place was missing from the *datatio*, however in the privileges issued by the dukes the place was usually written.⁹⁴ The date in the privileges was written according to the Roman calendar, while in other diplomas it followed the Christian calendar. The *annus ducalis* is included in the *datatio* only during the time of duke Stephen's first and second Slavonian dukedom.⁹⁵

The *apprecatio*⁹⁶ did not occur.

⁸⁶ No. 76.

⁸⁷ No. 69.

⁸⁸ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 20; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 151.

⁸⁹ Duke Charles' mandate to the chapter of Posega (Požega): no. 73.

⁹⁰ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 20; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 152; M. BRKOVIĆ, Sankcija u ispravama hrvatskih narodnih vladara [The *sanctio* in the charters of the Croatian national monarchs], *Croatica Christiana Periodica* vol 17, no. 31 (1993) 11–24.

⁹¹ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 20; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 152–153.

⁹² I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 20; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 153; M. BRKOVIĆ, Supskripcija i aprekacija u dokumentima hrvatskih narodnih vladara [The *subscriptio* and the *apprecatio* in the charters of the Croatian national monarchs], *Croatica Christiana Periodica* Vol. 19, No. 35 (1995) 79–84.

⁹³ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 20; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 153.

⁹⁴ Place doesn't exist in the privileges of duke Stephen nos. 17 and 23.

⁹⁵ First Slavonian dukedom: no. 17, second Transylvanian dukedom: no. 23.

⁹⁶ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 20; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne*, 153.

3. Sigillography of the dukes.

3.1. Stephen. Duke Stephen was duke of three different territories (Slavonia, Szepes and Sarus, and Transylvania), for five times altogether. Let's see what kind of seals he used in the time of his *ducatus*.

During his first Slavonian dukedom, in 1350 he used two different seals: a bigger and a smaller one. The diameter of his bigger seal was 10 cm and it was pressed in natural color wax even if it was used on the back side of a document.⁹⁷ In the document dated 10 October 1350 the *corroboratio* says that the charter was confirmed by the duplex seal of the duke. This is the only occasion when this type of seal is mentioned. Since the above mentioned source is a transcript, its seal is unknown. However, it is probable that the notary in the royal chancellery in Buda forgot that he was transcribing a charter issued by the duke and not the king.⁹⁸

The diameter of his smaller seal was 2 cm, and it was pressed always to red wax. The circumscription is unknown, because of damage. The coat of arms is party per cross. The first and fourth quarters are three times party per fess. Both the second and third quarters have three crosses. In the second quarter one cross is above, and two crosses are below, while in the third quarter it is *vice versa*.⁹⁹ During his other dukedoms, the diameter of his smaller seal was 2 cm and it was pressed to red wax in every case. However, the wax is damaged in all cases.¹⁰⁰ It seems probable that duke Stephen had only one smaller seal and he used it during all of his dukedoms.¹⁰¹ Because its diameter is 2 cm, it was probably an annular seal.

As the duke of Transylvania, Stephen certainly used a bigger seal. It was used both as a hanging seal¹⁰² and as a pressed one.¹⁰³ Its diameter is 9 cm and it was pressed on natural colored wax. The image shows the duke himself, sitting on a racing horse. He has armor and a helmet and holds a sword in his hand. The circumscription is: S DOMINI STEPHENI [DEI]

⁹⁷ No. 12.

⁹⁸ No. 17. Its corroboratio: “et ut hec nostra donatio prescriptis Thome et Johanni facta, robur obtineat perpetue firmitatis, nec successu temporum per quospiam valeat et possit in irritum revocari, presentes concessimus literas privilegiales dupplicis et autentici sigilli nostri pendentis munimine roboratas.”

⁹⁹ Description: J. HÁZI, *Sopron szabad királyi város története. I. rész 1. kötet. Oklevelek [The History of Sopron. 1 part 1. volume. Charters]*, Sopron 1921, 96. Photo: E. SPEKNER, Adalékok a budavári István torony névadójának kérdéséhez [Data to the matter of the nominator of Stephen's tower in Buda], *Budapest régiségei* 35 (2002) 403–425, p. 425, picture 7 (no. 14).

¹⁰⁰ From the circumscription a letter “S” is visible (no. 15).

¹⁰¹ A 2 cm seal was pressed to red wax on nos. 2, 5, 9, 14, 15, 16, 29.

¹⁰² No. 22.

¹⁰³ No. 21.

GRACIA DVCIS TRANSSILVANI (“sigillum Stepheni Dei gratia ducis Transsilvani”).¹⁰⁴ There are no charters confirmed by the smaller seal of the duke. The charter dated 18 Oct 1351 was confirmed by the “secreto sigillo” of duke Stephen. It was mentioned in the *corroboratio*, but the seal is missing and its diameter and image are unknown.¹⁰⁵

From the time of his dukedom of Szepes and Sáros only charters confirmed by pressed seals are known. The diameter of the seal was 2 cm and it was pressed to red wax.¹⁰⁶

From the time of the second Slavonian dukedom of duke Stephen only one seal is surely known. Its diameter is 5.5 cm and it was pressed to red wax, when it was used as a pressed seal. Neither the picture, nor the circumscription are known. Two of his documents were confirmed by his “secretiori sigillo”. Since the originals are damaged, the diameter and the color of the seal are not known.¹⁰⁷

3.2. Margaret. Duchess Margaret had only one seal, which was used both as a hanging and pressed seal. The diameter of the round seal is 39 mm. The coat of arms is an isosceles triangle with stars around it. The image of the coat of arms is quartered. In the first and fourth quarters there are lozenges (from the Bavarian coat of arms), the second and third area are three times party per fess (from the dynasty of Arpad’s coat of arms). All of the documents of the duchess were confirmed by this seal. When it was appended to a privilege, it was pressed in natural color wax. On the back side of charters it was pressed to red wax.¹⁰⁸

3.3. Charles. Two seals of duke Charles are known for certain, and maybe he also had a third one. The document issued on 27 April 1371 was

¹⁰⁴ No. 22. The photo is on the internet: <http://mol.arcanum.hu/Dl.Df>. Editions (e.g.): G. PRAY, *Syntagma historicum de sigillis regum et reginarum Hungariae pluribusque aliis*. Budae 1805, table X, seal no. 3 – the picture is very different to the real seal. [D. CSÁNKI,] *A Magyar Királyi Országos Levéltár Diplomatikai Osztályában őrzött pecsétek mutatója. Tizenkét fénynyomatú táblával [The index of the seals from the Diplomatic Department of the Hungarian Royal National Archives. With 12 tables]*, Budapest 1889, picture no. 17. A. NYÁRY casted doubts on the originality of the seal because of the differences (A. NYÁRY, *A heraldika vezérfonala [The syllabus of the heraldic]*, Budapest 1886, 209, footnote 1). D. DERCSÉNYI, *Nagy Lajos király [King Louis, the Great]*, Budapest 1990, 127; I. BERTÉNYI, *Nagy Lajos király [King Louis, the Great]*, Budapest 1989, Table VIII, picture no. 4; *Megpecsételt történelem. Középkori pecsétek Esztergomból [Sealed history. Medieval seals from Esztergom]*, ed. A. HEGEDŰS, Esztergom 2000, 45, picture no. 3. Fragments: no. 21. Copy of the seal: Hungarian National Archives, section V, no. 2 438 and no. 8 113.

¹⁰⁵ No. 24.

¹⁰⁶ No. 29.

¹⁰⁷ Nos. 50, 53.

¹⁰⁸ Nos. 58, 60, 61. As hanging seal: no. 56.

confirmed by his bigger seal, which was pressed to natural color wax and attached by a purple ply. The diameter of the *sigillum* is 55 mm. Around the coat of arms there are six lobes, in the middle of each lobe there is a flower. The sides of the coat are chambered and equal. The top side of the coat of arms is 2.5 cm in length. There are lilies in it, and in front of them there is a label. The circumscription is the following: + S KAROLI DE DURACIO [...] VONIE (that is to say “sigillum Karoli de Duratio ducis Sclavonie”), and its internal and external sides are a rope.

The image of the duke’s smaller seal is similar to his bigger one. Its diameter is 2.8 cm and it is very likely that the circumscription was the following: + SIGILLUM KAROLI DUCIS, but none of them have been wholly preserved. The smaller sigillum was pressed to natural colored wax in every case.¹⁰⁹

4. The chancellery of the dukes in the 14th century.

The independent diplomatics of duke Stephen started in 1349, in line with the organization of his independent *aula*.¹¹⁰ It was modeled on the royal chancellery, and probably had two sections. The first was headed by George of Megyericse. He supervised the practical administration, his name was written in the *datum per manus* formula of the privileges, and he guarded the larger, authentic seal of the duke.¹¹¹ The head of the other section was Peter of Brno, whose title was *comes capelle et secretarius cancellarius*. He guarded the annular seal of duke Stephen, and he participated in the daily work of the chancellery. This is the reason why his name is not found in the charters of duke Stephen.¹¹² After the death of duke Stephen, he became the head of duchess Margaret’s chancellery as chancellor. The chief of duke Charles’ chancellery is unknown. The chancellery of duchess Margaret and duke Charles probably had only one section.

In 1350, when Stephen was Slavonian duke for the first time, he resided in Buda, at the royal court. With his mother, queen Elisabeth, he ruled as regent while king Louis I was away in Italy. All of his documents were issued in Buda. When Stephen was duke of Szepes and Sarus, he didn’t have any “capital” city, and thus he still lived at the court. Most of his charters of that time were issued there. The situation was the same

¹⁰⁹ Nos. 69, 70.

¹¹⁰ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 117, 209.

¹¹¹ Like the prothonarii of the dignitarii. (GY. BÓNIS, *A jogtudó értelmiség a Mohács előtti Magyarországon [The Juristic Elite in Hungary before 1526]*, Budapest 1971, 80.

¹¹² The same title appeared in the royal chancellery after 1320 (I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 158–159, 194–195).

when Stephen was duke of Transylvania. Regularly the seat of the Slavonian duke and the ban was in Zagreb, and that was where their chancellery was located too. Most of the documents of duke Stephen from the period between 1353 and 1354 were issued there. The documents of duchess Margaret were mainly issued in Buda, therefore she lived there, most probably with her children. Her and Stephen's son John was the successor of king Louis I, because king Louis I did not have any children at that time. Duke Charles resided in his territory, in Slavonia. Most of his documents were edited in Zagreb. When the duke dwelt in Buda, only the prothonotarius and/or chancellor followed him. So, the documents must have been written in the royal chancellery. Probably the prothonotarius wrote the rough draft, but he used the formularies which were kept there. Unfortunately, none of the formularies that were certainly used in the royal chancellery is known from the 14th century. The prothonotarius guarded the authentic seal of his lord and he was responsible for the confirmation of the charters.

The people who wrote the documents are unknown. When duke Stephen and duchess Margaret resided in Buda, a member of the royal chancellery wrote their documents. However, the process was controlled by George of Megyericse and Peter of Brno. The chancellery in Zagreb might not have been too big, probably 5–7 notaries worked there.

Who were the heads of the chancellery of 14th century dukes?¹¹³

George of Megyericse. The head of the chancellery of duke Stephen was George, son of Michael from Megyericse, most probably from the time of Stephen's first Slavonia dukedom (1350). His life is unknown before 1350. His name is written for the first time in the "datum per manus" formula of the duke's charter dated on 10 October 1350, when he had the title of prothonotarius.¹¹⁴ From 1351–52, when Stephen was duke of Szepes and Sáros as well as of Transylvania, George was a member of his *aula* and followed his lord, since there are some charters that mention his name in the *eschatocollum*.¹¹⁵ In January of 1353, he was mentioned as a *notarius*.¹¹⁶ During the time of duke Stephen's second Slavonian dukedom, in 1353 George was prothonotarius, as well as *comes et castellanus de Orbaz*.¹¹⁷ Although he was the head of Orbaz county, which was quite

¹¹³ About the banal prothonotars see É. B. HALÁSZ, Szlavón hercegi és báni ítélőmesterek a XIV. században [Ducal and Banal Prothonotaries of Slavonia in the 14th Century], *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis. Acta Historica*. Tomus 130 (Szeged 2009) 69–83.

¹¹⁴ No. 17.

¹¹⁵ For example, no. 22.

¹¹⁶ 14 January 1353 (CD 12, 146–147).

¹¹⁷ *Comes*: nos. 34–51; *castellanus*: nos. 43–47.

far away from Zagreb, he stayed in the center of the territory and directed the chancellery of the duke. After the death of duke Stephen, in 1354 he left the Zagreb court. He was not a member of duchess Margaret's *aula*. Before December 1357, George married Catherine, daughter of Michaels, son of Moyus. They did not have any children. Sometime later, though the exact date is unknown, he was married for a second time, with an Elisabeth whose origin is unknown. They had three daughters: Jakoba, Clara and Anne. In 1361 he appeared as *homo banus*, which means that he was an active member of the political life of Križevci county.¹¹⁸ It is probable that George became wealthy while he was the prothonotarius of duke Stephen, since it is known that he held the property of Megyericse.¹¹⁹ George died before 1386, as he was mentioned as deceased in that year.¹²⁰

Peter of Brno. Peter of Brno (Germ. Brünn), who is known to have been the head of the chancellery of duchess Margaret, probably was a member of the duchess's *familia*. He appears in documents for the first time in 1350 as *comes capellae et secretarius cancellarius* of duke Stephen.¹²¹ Before 1352 he was a lector in Győr, and a prebendary in Esztergom and Zagreb. In this year king Louis I requested a Transylvanian prebend for him from the pope,¹²² and at the end of the year he was proposed by the Hungarian king for the vacant provotship of Vasvár.¹²³ King Louis I mentioned Peter as the chancellor of duke Stephen. Peter is mentioned in this latter position on 21 August 1355.¹²⁴ During the lifetime of duke Stephen, he was *comes capelle and secretarius cancellarius*, but the head of the chancellery was George of Megyericse. After the death of the duke, in August 1354 Peter became the chief of the chancellery of duchess Margaret and his name was mentioned in the "datum per manus" formula.¹²⁵ Probably he left Hungary in 1356, since in 1357 he was bishop of the city

¹¹⁸ Dl. 33 744.

¹¹⁹ "condam magister Georgius litteratus, pater earum [namely daughters of George], dictam possessionem Megyurechye propriis suis laboribus aquiuisse dinoscitur", 21 February 1386 (CD 17, 7–9).

¹²⁰ 21 February 1386 (CD 17, 7–9). About his descendants see: T. PÁLÓSFALVI, *The Noble Elite in the County of Körös (Križevci) 1400–1526*, Budapest 2014, 207–213.

¹²¹ 1 September 1350 (I. NAGY – GY. TASNÁDI NAGY, *Anjoukori Okmánytár V*, 399–402). About his life wrote E. Spekner, too (E. SPEKNER, *Adalékok*, 407).

¹²² 2 June 1352 (Á. BOSSÁNYI, *Regesta supplicationum* vol. I (1342–1352), Budapest 1916, 244).

¹²³ 2 November 1352 (BOSSÁNYI, *Regesta I*, 246).

¹²⁴ A. BOSSÁNYI, *Regesta II* (1352–1394), Budapest 1918, 294–295.

¹²⁵ No. 57.

of Chur in Switzerland.¹²⁶ His patron was probably duchess Margaret, who left Hungary at the same time.

Apart from being head of the chancellery, George and Peter also had other functions. George was *comes* and *castellanus* of the county and the castle of Orbaz. Both of them participated in the general congregation, in the judicial work. In 1350, George of Megyericse took part in a tribunal in Buda presided by Thomas Szentjakabi, *comes Crisiensis*. Nicholas, archbishop of Esztergom, Bereck, provost of Győr, Paul of Ugal, Slavonian-Croatian ban, Pető, *prothonotarius* of the judge royal, were the members of the tribunal at which Farkas, son of Nicholas, filed a suit regarding the possession of Rojcsa. The participation of the two prothonotaries was very significant, because the diploma, which Farkas submitted, was false and because of this he was punished by losing his property. The false *litterae* was created to the name of Mikcs, who was ban of Slavonia between 1323 and 1342, but to the date of 1355(!). In the course of the examination they took notice of the seal (the picture and the setting),¹²⁷ the defacements¹²⁸ and the writing between the lines. The diploma was probably “made” by a very unskillful forger, who had no knowledge of the external characteristics of authentic charters written in the chancellery, nor of the calendar.¹²⁹ In 1353 in Zagreb George took part in the general congregation in the law court of the Slavonian ban, Nicolas Hahót. From that *generalis congregatio* only one charter is known: they tried a forger of “letters”.¹³⁰

5. Conclusion. The diplomatics of duke Stephen and duchess Margaret were very similar to royal diplomatics. These two dukes stayed on several occasions in Buda, the “capital” city, where the king lived and where the seat of the dignitaries was. That was the location of the royal chancellery as well. The heads of their chancellery could work there with royal chancellery staff. Thus they could study the method of work. The

¹²⁶ Today Graubünden in Switzerland. A. BOSSÁNYI, *Regesta* II, 306, 308.

¹²⁷ The seal was forcefully removed from an authentic charter.

¹²⁸ The privileges had to be without any scratching and correction (I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 253).

¹²⁹ “privilegiales ... diligenter exanimari fecisset tandem quia ipse littere privilegiales tam in ipsius sigillo et ipsius sigilli sculptura et eius circumferenciis quam propter eius rasinas et scripturas interlineales predictis regni prelati et nobilibus omnino false et falsa suggestionem emanate extitisse apparuissent” (22 August 1350, DL 33 511). About the contemporary examination of the charters see I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Oklevéltan*, 249–252. The chapter of Zagreb made a very similar examination in June 1380, when their own, 1 May 1358 dated charter was examined. They checked the material, the seal, the writing and the ply (19 July 1380, CD 16, 112–113).

¹³⁰ *Sopron vármegye levéltárának oklevélgyűjteménye I. Középkori oklevelek (1236–1526)* [Collection of the archival charters of county Sopron I. Mediaeval charters], ed. D. SÜMEGHY, Sopron 1928, 28–32.

charters are very similar to royal documents, even when they were edited in Zagreb. When duke Charles got territorial power, he dwelt in his territory, in Zagreb. Probably his chancellery was the same as the chancellery of the Slavonian bans, but its chief is unknown. The charters are similar to the documents of the bans.

Appendix: Table of Documents

The table contains the charters issued by 14th century dukes. The documents are listed in chronological order. The DI./Df. numbers show the shelfmark of the National Archives of Hungary.

Abbreviations:

Anjoukori = I. NAGY – GY. TASNÁDI NAGY, *Anjoukori okmánytár – Codex diplomaticus Hungaricus Andegavensis I–VII*, Budapest 1878–1920.

CD = *Diplomatički zbornik Kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije – Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Sclavoniae* 1–18, ed. T. SMIČIKLAS ET ALII, Zagreb 1904–1990.

Doc. Trans. = Documente privind istoria României. Documenta Romaniae historica. Veacul XIV. C. Transilvania I–XII, București 1953–1985.

Erd. = ZS. JAKÓ, *Erdélyi okmánytár. Oklevelek, levelek és más írásos emlékek Erdély történelméhez I–...*, Budapest 1997–....

FEJÉR = G. FEJÉR, *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis I–XI*, Budae 1829–1844.

HALÁSZ = É. HALÁSZ, Bajor Margit hercegnő oklevéladási tevékenysége és okmánytára [The diplomatics and charters of duchess Margaret of Bavaria], *Fons* 14/1 (2007) 97–118.

IVÁNYI, Eperjes = B. IVÁNYI, *Eperjes szabad királyi város levéltára. Archivum liberae regiaeque civitatis Eperjes 1245–1526*, Szeged 1931.

KATONA = S. KATONA, *Historia critica regum Hungariae*, Pestini – Budae 1779–1817.

KUKULJEVIĆ, Jura = I. KUKULJEVIĆ, *Jura regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Sclavoniae*, Zagrabiæ, 1862.

LASZOWSKI = *Monumenta historica nob. communitatis Turopolje olim “Campus Zagrabiensis” dictae* I 1225–1466, ed. E. LASZOWSKI, Zagrabiæ 1904.

LASZOWSKI, Podatci = E. LASZOWSKI, Podatci o Koprivnici u srednjem vieku, *Vjesnik kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskog zemaljskog arkiva* 2 (1900) 1–11, 170–183, 215–226.

LASZOWSKI, Podjeljenje = E. LASZOWSKI, Podjeljenje plemstva po banu Nikoli god. 1346., *Vjesnik hrv. arheološkoga društva*. Nova serija 4 (1900) 1–7.

MES = F. KNAUZ – L. CRESCENS DEDEK et alii, *Monumenta ecclesiae Strigoniensis I–IV*, Strigonii 1874–1999.

É. B. Halász, The Chancellery and the Diplomatics of the Hungarian Dukes

Pongrác = J. KARÁCSONYI, Oklevélkivonatok a szentmiklóssi és óvári gróf Pongrácz család levéltárából. I. közlemény [Regestas from the archives of family Pongrácz of Szentmiklóss and Óvár. I. part], *Magyar Történelmi Tár* sor. III köt. 19 (1896) 505–528.

THALLÓCZY = L. THALLÓCZY – S. HORVÁTH, *Alsó-Szlavóniai okmánytár (Dubicza, Orbász és Szana vármegyék) – Codex diplomaticus partium regno Hungariae adnexarum (Comitatuum Dubicza, Orbász et Szana) 1244–1717*, Budapest 1912.

TKALČIĆ = I. K. TKALČIĆ, *Monumenta historica liberae regiae civitatis Zagrabiae metropolis regni Dalmatiae, Croatiae et Slavoniae – Povijestni spomenici slob. kralj. grada Zagreba prijestolnice kraljevine Dalmatinsko-Hrvatsko-Slavonske*, vol. I (1093–1399), Zagreb 1889.

Ub = *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen I–VI*, Hermannstadt – Köln – Wien – Bukarest 1892–1981.

WAGNER, Sáros = C. WAGNER, *Diplomatarium comitatus Sarosiensis, Posonii–Cassoviae*, 1780.

Z = A zichi és vásonkeői gróf Zichy-család idősb ágának okmánytára – *Codex diplomaticus domus senioris comitum Zichy de Zich et Vásonkeő I–XII*, Pest – Budapest 1871–1931.

Zala = *Zala vármegye története. Oklevéltár. Első kötet (1024–1363)* [History of county Zala. Charters. 1. vol. (1024–1363)], eds. I. NAGY – D. VÉGHELY – Gy. NAGY, Budapest 1886.

No.	Date	Shelfmark	Edition
1	1349–10–17	Df. 258 977	WAGNER, Sáros 171–172; FEJÉR IX/1, 662–663.
2	1349–11–05	Dl. 57 326	Anjoukori V, 332. Reg.: Doc. Trans. IV, 520; Erd. Okm. III, 212.
3	1350–04–07		Known from edition. CD 11, 591–592.
4	1350–04–19		Known from edition. Anjoukori V, 368.
5	1350–04–29	Dl. 90 347	<i>Hazai Okmánytár – Codex diplomaticus patrius</i> I, Győr 1865, 207; CD 11, 599–600.
6	1350–05–02	Df. 226 960	
7	1350–05–17	Dl. 91 451	Zala I, 500–501; CD 11, 601–602.
8	1350–05–25	Dl. 91 415	
9	1350–06–27	Dl. 4 134	Anjoukori V, 386; CD 11, 608–609.
10	1350–06–27	Df. 273 803	
11	1350–06–29	Dl. 60 262	Anjoukori V, 387–388.
12	1350–07–09	Df. 230 432	KUKULJEVIĆ, Jura I, 118; TKALČIĆ I, 197–198; CD 11, 610–611.
13	1350–08–10		Known from editions. G. WENZEL, <i>Magyar diplomacziái emlékek az Anjoukorból – Acta externa Andegavensia</i> II, Budapest 1875, 390–392; M. HATVANI, <i>Az Anjouk alatti kereskedelmi</i>

			történetünkhez [About mercantile history during the Angevin Era], <i>Magyar Tör-ténelmi Tár</i> sor. 1, köt. 7 (1860) 245–251, pp. 247–248.
14	1350–08–12	Df. 201 775	<i>Sopron szabad királyi város története. I. rész 1 kötet. Oklevelek (1162–1406)</i> [History of Sopron. 1 part 1. vol. Charters], ed. J. HÁZI, Sopron 1921, 95–96. Reg.: E. REISZIG, Vas vármegye főispánjai a XIV. század első felében [The comes of county Vas in the first half of the 14 th century], <i>Vasi Szemle</i> 9/5–6 (1942) 161–169, p. 168.
15	1350–08–27	DI. 91 417	Zala I, 501–502; CD 11, 614–615.
16	1350–08–30	DI. 4 165	L. THALLÓCZY, <i>A kamara haszna (lucrum camerae) története kapcsolatban a magyar adó- és pénzügy fejlődésével</i> [The history of the <i>lucrum camerae</i> connecting with the progress of the Hungarian tax and finance], Budapest 1879, 159–160. Reg.: I. BAKÁCS, <i>Iratok Pest megye történetéhez. Oklevélregeszták 1002–1437</i> [Documents about the history of county Pest. Regestas. 1002–1437], Budapest 1982, 189; L. BÁRTFAI SZABÓ, <i>Óbuda egyházi intézményei a középkorban</i> [Ecclesiastical institutions on Óbuda in the Middle Ages], Budapest 1935, 283; L. HUSZÁR, <i>A magyar pénztörténet okleveles forrásai</i> [Documents about the history of the money in Hungary], <i>Numizmatikai Közlöny</i> 70–71/1 (1971) 39–50, p. 47.
17	1350–10–10	DI. 45 129	THALLÓCZY, 38–40; CD 11, 632–633.
18	1350–10–22	Df. 249 099	
19	1350–12–28	Df. 236 300	FEJÉR IX/1, 782; MES IV, 43.
20	1350–12–28	Df. 236 301	MES IV, 43–44. Reg.: Erd. III, 225.
21	1351–01–26	DI. 91 422	Reg.: Erd. III, 226.
22	1351–03–28	DI. 4 153	FEJÉR IX/2, 84–85; CD 12, 13–14. Reg.: Erd. III, 229.
23	1351–07–21	DI. 91 451	
24	1351–10–18	Df. 286 543 Df. 286 686	KATONA X, 15–17; K. SZABÓ, <i>Székely oklevéltár I</i> (1211–1519), Kolozsvár 1872, 60–61; FEJÉR, IX/2, 85–87; Ub II, 80–81. Reg.: Doc. Trans X, 66–67; GY. BÓNIS, <i>Szentszéki regeszták. Iratok az egyházi bírászkodás történetéhez a középkori Magyarországon</i> . [Documents to the ecclesiastical court in Hungary], ed. E. BALOGH, Szeged 1997, no. 1163; Erd. III, 236.
25	1351–10–18	Df. 277 848	Unreadable. Reg.: M. Papp, <i>Deés város levéltára</i> [Archive of city Deés], <i>Történeti Lapok</i> 1 (1874) 409–411, p. 411; Ub II, 81; Doc Trans. X, 65–66; Erd. III, 236–237.
26	1351–12–28	Df. 228 465	Reg.: IVÁNYI, Eperjes, 26.

É. B. Halász, The Chancellery and the Diplomatics of the Hungarian Dukes

27	1352-01-16	Df. 228 466	WAGNER, Sáros 450-451; FEJÉR IX/2, 165-166; J. BÁRDOSY, <i>Moldavensis vel Szepiensis decimae indagatio et huic innexarum sacroprofanarum iurisdictionum evolutio</i> , Posinii 1802, 147. Reg.: IVÁNYI, Eperjes, 26-27; L. LASZTÓKAY, <i>Eperjes szab. kir. város levéltárában található nevezetesebb okiratok ismertetése</i> [Review of some documents from the archives of city Eperjes], Eperjes 1881, 4.
28	1352-02-19	Dl. 60 979	Anjoukori V, 548-550. Reg.: Doc. Trans. X, 108; Erd. III, 242.
29	1352-04-24	Dl. 4 276	Anjoukori V, 575.
30	1352-05-17	Df. 212 854 Df. 212 865	FEJÉR IX/2, 166-167.
31	1352-05-17	Dl. 83 266	Known from photos.
32	1352-10-25	Df. 285 824	C. WAGNER, <i>Analecta Scepusii sacri et profani</i> I, Vienne 1774, 26-27; M. SCHMAUK, <i>Supplementum analectorum terrae Scepusiensis</i> . Pars II, Szepesváraljae 1889, 109-110; FEJÉR IX/2, 167-168.
33	1352-12-08	Dl. 83 267	
34	1353-03-10	Df. 267 988 Df. 267 992	CD 12, 149-150.
35	1353-03-12		Known from edition. CD 12, 152.
36	1353-04-11	Dl. 45 129	THALLÓCZY, 41-43; CD 12, 155-156.
37	1353-05-14	Dl. 45 129	THALLÓCZY, 47-48; CD 12, 163-164.
38	1353-05-22	Df. 230 476	CD 12, 170.
39	1353-05-22	Df. 264 725	<i>Sopron vármegye levéltárának oklevélgyűjteménye I. Középkori oklevelek (1236-1526)</i> [Collection of the archival charters of county Sopron I. Medieval charters], ed. D. SÜMEGHY, Sopron 1928, 28-32.
40	1353-05-28	Df. 256 379 Df. 230 097	B. A. KERCSÉLICH, <i>De regnis Dalmatiae, Croatiae, Slavoniae notitiae praeliminares</i> , Zagrabiae s.a., 147; D. FARLATI - J. COLETI, <i>Illyrici sacri tomus V</i> , Venetiis 1769, 435; KATONA X, 70-73; FEJÉR IX/2, 243-245, IX/6, 65-66 (in parts); TKALČIĆ I, 205-207; CD 12, 174-175.
41	1353-05-29	Dl. 35 867	Missing from the collection of Hungarian National Archives. Unedited.
42	1353-05-29	Dl. 45 129	THALLÓCZY, 50-51; CD 12, 175-176.
43	1353-06-03	Dl. 33 598	CD 12, 176-177.
44	1353-06-03	Dl. 41 207	CD 12, 177-178.
45	1353-09-16	Dl. 4 386	Anjoukori V, 120-121; CD 12, 195-196.
46	1353-11-27	Df. 230 407 Dl. 35 861 Dl. 35 874 Dl. 32 990	LASZOWSKI, Podjeljenje, 5; CD 12, 212-213.

Initial. A Review of Medieval Studies 3 (2015) 71–94

47	1353–12–08	Df. 267 989	LASZOWSKI, Podatci, 172; CD 12, 215–216.
48	1354–01–06	Df. 267 990	FEJÉR IX/2, 327–328; LASZOWSKI, Podatci, 173; CD 12, 218–219.
49	1354–02–20	Dl. 35 140	THALLÓCZY, 52–53; CD, 12 226–227.
50	1354–04–07	Dl. 94 423	Known from photos. Reg.: Pongrácz, 508–509.
51	1354–05–10		Known from edition. CD 12, 236–238.
52	1354–05–15	Dl. 41 241	KUKULJEVIĆ, Jura I, 124–125; FEJÉR IX/2, 666–668, VI, 286–288; CD 12, 238–240.
53	1354–07–13	Dl. 94 424	Known from photos. Reg.: Pongrácz, 509.
54	1354–11–06	Df. 254 164	HALÁSZ, 110–111.
55	1354–12–02	Df. 267 914	LASZOWSKI I, 71–72; CD 12, 259. Reg.: HALÁSZ, 111.
56	1354–12–04	Df. 267 915	LASZOWSKI I, 72–73; CD 12, 261–262. Reg.: HALÁSZ, 112.
57	1355–01–20	Df. 230 407	LASZOWSKI, Podjeljenje, 5–6; CD 12, 265. Reg.: HALÁSZ, 112.
58	1355–03–01	Df. 255 432	TKALČIĆ I, 207; CD 12, 282. Reg.: HALÁSZ, 113.
59	1355–03–01	Df. 230 447	TKALČIĆ I, 208; CD 12, 281–282. Reg.: HALÁSZ, 113.
60	1355–04–27	Df. 267 991	FEJÉR IX/2, 416–417; LASZOWSKI, Podatci, 174; CD 12, 288–289. Reg.: HALÁSZ, 113–114.
61	1355–11–30	Df. 230 453	CD 12, 313–314. Reg.: HALÁSZ, 114.
62	1355–12–20	Df. 256 900 Df. 256 497	HALÁSZ, 114–116. Reg.: B. A. KERCESELICH, <i>Historiarum cathedralis ecclesiae Zagrabienensis</i> . Pars I, Zagrabiae s.a, 132; FEJÉR IX/2, 417–418; CD 12, 319.
63	1356–01–10	Df. 218 559 Dl. 4 586	FEJÉR IX/2, 500–502; CD 12, 320–321. Reg.: HALÁSZ, 116.
64	1356–01–14		Known from editions. <i>Arkiv za povjestnicu jugoslavensku</i> 3, ur. I. KUKULJEVIĆ, Zagreb 1854, 86–87; TKALČIĆ I, 209–210; CD 12, 321–322. Reg.: HALÁSZ, 116–117.
65	1356		Known from editions. <i>Arkiv za povjestnicu jugoslavensku</i> 3, ur. I. KUKULJEVIĆ, Zagreb 1854, 86–87; TKALČIĆ I, 210–211; CD 12, 383–384.
66	1371–04–16	Df. 267 918	LASZOWSKI I, 88–89; CD 14, 320–321.
67	1371–04–27	Df. 267 919	LASZOWSKI I, 89–90; CD 14, 326–327.
68	1371–05–06	Dl. 5 928	

69	1371-05-08	Dl. 77 472	Z III, 423; CD 12, 340-341. Reg.: Z VII/1, 11.
70	1371-08-10	Dl. 41 850	CD 14, 364.
71	after 1372-03-23	Dl. 41 868 Dl. 43 628	
72	1372-03-25	Dl. 77 507	Z III, 453-454; CD 14, 413-414. Reg.: Z VII/1, 215-216.
73	1372-04-08	Dl. 103 334	
74	1372-05-01	Df. 230 551	CD 14, 416-417.
75	1372-06-15	Dl. 5 517	
76	1372-06-15	Dl. 33 466	CD 14, 421-422.
77	1372-06-16	Dl. 6 031	THALLÓCZY, 84-85; CD 14, 423.

Ева Б. Халас

КАНЦЕЛАРИЈА И ДИПЛОМАТИКА УГАРСКИХ ХЕРЦЕГА У XIV ВЕКУ

Резиме

Рад се бави дипломатиком и канцеларијом угарских принчева XIV века. У Угарској су током владавине анжујске династије забележене три особе принчевског ранга којима је била поверена управа над одређеним територијама титулом херцега. Принц Стефан био је најмлађи син краља Карла I. Он је био херцег Сепеша и Шароша (1349, 1352), херцег Трансилваније (1349, 1351) и херцег Славоније, Хрватске и Далмације (1350, 1353-1354). После његове смрти, његова супруга принцеза Маргарета постала је херцезица Славоније, Хрватске и Далмације. Принц Карло Драчки, рођак краља Лајоша I, био је херцег Славоније и Хрватске између 1371. и 1372.

Укупно постоји 77 повеља које су издали херцеги из наведеног раздобља. Повеље су углавном писане на пергаменту, писмо се лако чита, а грешке су ретке. Канцеларијске белешке могу се прочитати само на повељама херцега Стефана и херцезице Маргарете.

Према унутрашњим обележјима, повеље херцега Стефана и херцезице Маргарете сличне су краљевским и садрже формулу *Dei gratia*. Само су они издавали повластице у којима је канцеларија бележила датум према римском календару. Повеље херцега Карла биле су сличне документима славонских банова.

Херцег Стефан користио је неколико различитих печата, али само два од њих су сачувана. Херцезица Маргарета је имала један *sigillum*, док је херцег Карло сигурно имао два печата.

Старешина канцеларије херцега Стефана био је Јурај од Међуречја, који је носио титулу протоногара. Петар од Брна руководио је канцеларијом херцезице Маргарете као канцелар. Старешина канцеларије херцега Карла није познат.

Кључне речи: XIV век, Угарска, Славонија, Хрватска, херцег, дипломатика, канцеларија, херцешка канцеларија.

Чланак примљен: 28. фебруара 2014.
Чланак прихваћен: 22. децембра 2014.