

B A N A T I C A

26 – II

2016

MUZEUL BANATULUI MONTAN REȘIȚA

BANATICA

26



II ISTORIE

Editura MEGA | Cluj-Napoca | 2016

COLEGIUL DE REDACȚIE/ EDITORIAL BOARD

DUMITRU ȚEICU (editor-șef/ chief editor), LIGIA BOLDEA (secretar de redacție/ editorial secretary), ADRIAN MAGINA (secretar de redacție/ editorial secretary), LIVIA MAGINA, VASILE RĂMNEANȚU, ALEXANDRU SZENTMIKLOSI

CONSILIUL ȘTIINȚIFIC/ SCIENTIFIC BOARD

NICOLAE BOCȘAN (Cluj-Napoca), RUDOLF GRÄF (Cluj-Napoca), HARALD HEPPNER (Graz), ISTVÁN PETROVICS (Szeged), IOAN AUREL POP (Cluj-Napoca), MARTYN RADY (Londra), VICTOR SPINEI (Iași).

Banatica are calificativul ERIH PLUS (European Reference Index for Humanities)/
Banatica is ranked ERIH PLUS (European Reference Index for Humanities).

Banatica este indexată în baza de date EBSCO (Historical Abstracts with Full Text) /
Banatica is indexed in the EBSCO database (Historical Abstracts with Full Text).

Banatica este indexată în baza de date Index Copernicus /
Banatica is indexed in Index Copernicus database.

Articole din această revistă sunt indexate în „Regesta Imperii” /
Articles appearing in this journal are abstracted in „Regesta Imperii”.

Toate materialele trimise spre publicare trec prin procesul de peer-review /
All papers submitted for publication go through the peer-review process.

ISSN 1222-0612

BANATICA

Orice corespondență se va adresa / Any mail will be sent to the following address:

MUZEUL BANATULUI MONTAN
320151 REȘIȚA, B-dul Republicii nr. 10, ROMÂNIA
E-mail: office@muzeulbanatuluiimontan.ro; lboldea.ist27@gmail.com; adimagina@gmail.com
http: www.muzeulbanatuluiimontan.ro
tel. 0355/401219; fax. 0355/401220



Editura MEGA | www.edituramega.ro
e-mail: mega@edituramega.ro

Volumul cuprinde lucrările
Conferinței internaționale *Politics and Society*
in Central and South-Eastern Europe
(13th–16th centuries)
Timișoara, 29 octombrie 2015

Proceedings of the
International Conference *Politics and Society in*
Central and South-Eastern Europe
(13th–16th centuries)
Timișoara, 29 october 2015

CUPRINS • CONTENTS • INHALT • SOMMAIRE

STUDII ȘI ARTICOLE

MIŠO PETROVIĆ

- Papal power, local communities and pretenders: the Church of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia and the struggle for the throne of the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia (1290–1301) 11
- Puterea papală, comunități locale și pretendenți: biserica din Croația, Dalmația și Slavonia și lupta pentru tronul regatului Ungariei-Croației (1290–1301) 31*

ALEKSANDAR KRSTIĆ

- The rival and the vassal of Charles Robert of Anjou: King Vladislav II Nemanjić 33
- Rivalul și vasalul lui Carol Robert de Anjou: regele Vladislav al II-lea Nemanjić 51*

KATALIN SZENDE

- Continuity and change in the urban network of Hungary in the early Angevin period 53
- Continuitate și schimbare în rețeaua urbană din Ungaria în perioada angevină timpurie 73*

ISTVÁN PETROVICS

- Towns and central places in the Danube-Tisza/Tisa-Maros/Mureș region in the Middle Ages 77
- Orașe și așezări cu caracter urban în regiunea Dunăre-Tisa-Mureș în Evul Mediu 104*

NEVEN ISAILOVIĆ

- Living by the border: South slavic marcher lords in the late medieval Balkans (13th–15th centuries) 105
- Trăind la frontieră: margrafiî sud-slavi în Balcanii Evului Mediu târziu (secolele XIII–XV) 117*

ÉVA B. HALÁSZ

- Iobagio castri – nobilis castri – nobilis regni.* Castle warriors – castle nobles – noblemen. The development of a social stratum in County of Križevci 119
- Iobagio castri – nobilis castri – nobilis regni. Iobagi de cetate, nobili ai cetății, nobilime.* Evoluția unei pături sociale în comitatul Križevci 134

ELEK SZASZKÓ

- Behind the Archontology of Krassó County (Remarks on the Personnel and the Operation of the County Authorities in Krassó) 135

<i>Dincolo de arhondologia comitatului Caraș (reflecții asupra activității oficialilor și a autorităților comitatense în Caraș)</i>	184
BALÁZS NAGY	
Convergences and divergences: the early period of the Luxemburg Dynasty in Bohemia and Hungary.....	185
<i>Convergențe și divergențe: perioada timpurie a dinastiei de Luxemburg în Boemia și Ungaria</i>	194
JÁNOS INCZE	
The price of ascending to the throne. Sigismund of Luxemburg's fight for the throne of Hungary and northwestern Hungary in pledge.....	195
<i>Prețul ascensiunii la tron. Zălogirea Ungariei de nord-vest în lupta lui Sigismund de Luxemburg pentru tronul Ungariei</i>	213
ZOLTÁN IUSZTIN	
Congregația generală a stărilor din anul 1397 de la Timișoara.....	215
<i>The General Congregation of Statues, 1397, in Timișoara.....</i>	233
NEVYAN MITEV	
Notes on the campaign of Vladislav Varnenchik in northeastern Bulgaria in the autumn of 1444	235
<i>Note privind campania lui Vladislav Varnenchik în Bulgaria nord-estică din toamna anului 1444.....</i>	256
MILOŠ IVANOVIĆ	
Foreigners in the service of despot Đurađ Branković on Serbian territory.....	257
<i>Străini în slujba despotului Đurađ Branković pe teritoriul Serbiei</i>	268
LIGIA BOLDEA	
Educational aspirations in the urban environment of Caransebeș by the end of the 15 th century.....	269
<i>Aspirații educaționale în mediul urban al Caransebeșului la sfârșitul secolului XV</i>	278
TIBOR NEUMANN	
The beginnings of the Voivode of Transylvania's right of donation.....	279
<i>Începuturile dreptului de donație al voievodului Transilvaniei</i>	296
MARTYN RADY	
Everyday Law in the Middle Ages.....	297
<i>Dreptul cotidian în Evul Mediu</i>	306
COSTIN FENEȘAN	
Ioan Kendefi, Ioan Glesán și Nikola Crepović – <i>fideles</i> pragmatici în lupta pentru stăpânirea Transilvaniei și Banatului (mijlocul secolului al XVI-lea)	309
<i>Ioan Kendefi, Ioan Glesán, and Nikola Crepović – pragmatic „fideles” in fight for Transylvania and the Banat domination (middle of the 16th century)</i>	334

FLORIN NICOLAE ARDELEAN

- Military leadership in the Transylvanian principality. The captain general in the second half of the 16th century 337
Ierarhia militară în Principatul Transilvaniei. Căpitanul general în a doua jumătate a secolului al XVI-lea 350

DRAGOȘ LUCIAN ȚIGĂU

- Between ephemerality and fiction. Addenda to the history of the Bans of Caransebes and Lugoj 351
Între efemer și fictiv. Completări la istoria banilor de Caransebeș și Lugoj 367

LIVIA MAGINA

- Price of human resource in Transylvania during the 16th–17th centuries 369
Valoarea resursei umane în Transilvania secolelor XVI–XVII 380

ADRIAN MAGINA

- Pledges and debts. Prices of goods in the Banat of the 16th–17th centuries 381
Zălogiri și datorii. Valoarea bunurilor în Banatul secolelor XVI–XVII 400

EDIT SZEGEDI

- The City, the Prince and the Porte: on the feasibilities and limits of the urban privileges and princely power in Transylvania during the 17th century 401
Orașul, principele și Poarta: despre posibilitățile și limitele privilegiilor orășenești și ale puterii princiare în Transilvania secolului al XVII-lea 418

RECENZII, PREZENTĂRI DE CARTE

- Adela Băltăc, Christina Știrbulescu, Andreea Ștefan, în colaborare cu V. Apostol, *Muzeul Național de Istorie al României. Catalogul Colecției Lapidarium. I. Piese greco-romane*, Ed. Conphis, București, 2015, 300 p., 4 anexe. (Ana Cristina Hamat) 419
- C. Găzdac, M. Neagoe, Ágnes Alföldy-Găzdac, Oana Neagoe, *Drobeta. Orașul nepărăsit al Daciei romane*, Ed. Mega, Cluj-Napoca, 2015, 274 p., 17 planșe. (Ștefan Viorel Georgescu) 421
- Marko Popović, Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić, Danica Popović, *Daily Life in Medieval Serbia*, Clio, Belgrad, 2016, 298 p. (Livia Magina) 423
- Žene u srednjovjekovnoj Bosni. Zbornik radova, urednik Emir O. Filipović (*Femeile în Bosnia medievală*). Culegere de studii, editor Emir O. Filipović, Sarajevo, 2015, 255 p. (Adrian Magina) 428
- Martyn Rady, *Customary law in Hungary. Courts, texts, and the Tripartitum*, Oxford University Press, 2015, 266 p. (Livia Magina) 429
- Anna Ananieva (Hrsg.), *Zirkulation von Nachrichten und Waren. Stadtleben, Medien und Konsum im 19. Jahrhundert*, Verlag der Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen, 2016, 287 p. (Maria-Daniela Stanciu) 432

Elis Pleșa, <i>Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej. Cultul personalității (1945–1965)</i> , Ed. Cetatea de Scaun, Târgoviște, 2015, 345 p. (Felician Velimirovici).....	436
Mara Mărginean, <i>Ferestre spre furnalul roșu. Urbanism și cotidian în Hunedoara și Călan (1945–1968)</i> , Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2015, 342 p. (Minodora Damian)	438
NORME DE TEHNOREDACTARE.....	443
EDITORIAL GUIDE	447

BEHIND THE ARCHONTOLOGY OF KRASSÓ COUNTY (REMARKS ON THE PERSONNEL AND THE OPERATION OF THE COUNTY AUTHORITIES IN KRASSÓ)*

Elek Szaszko**

Keywords: Krassó County, comes, vicecomes, noble judge

Cuvinte cheie: comitatul Caraș, comite, vicecomite, jude nobiliar

As far as medieval institutions are concerned, the so-called noble counties are amongst the ones which have been investigated the most thoroughly. The history of noble counties and their operation have been in the focus of research since the late 19th century¹, but the revival of the interest in the subject matter can be dated around the second millennium.² Although several aspects of the topic have already been revealed, the completion of the systematic investigation

* This paper is based on a presentation – entitled “The Noble County of Krassó in the 14th and the 15th Centuries” – held at the International Conference *Politics and Society in Central and South-Eastern Europe (13th–16th Century)* in Timisoara October 29, 2015. Both the presentation and the paper are supported by the MTA Bolyai Academic Scholarship Award.

** Karinthy Frigyes Bilingual Secondary School, Budapest, e-mail: szaelek@yahoo.com

¹ The earliest references can be found in county monographs of the late 19th century, while specific studies discussing the topic are from the first half of the 20th century. See the following works: Gyula Gábor, *A megyei intézmény alakulása és működése Nagy Lajos alatt* (Budapest, 1908); József Holub, *Zala megye története a középkorban. I. A megyei és egyházi közigazgatás története* (Pécs, 1929); Géza Istványi, “A generalis congregatio I–II,” *Levéltári Közlemények* 17 (1939): 50–83 and 18–19 (1940–1941): 179–207. Concerning the medieval Temesköz region see: *Temes vármegye. Magyarország vármegyéi és városai*, ed. Samu Borovszky, Budapest, (1896); Sándor Márki, *Aradvármegye és Arad szabad királyi város története*, vol. II/1. (Arad, 1892); Pesty Frigyes, *Krassó vármegye története*, vol. I–II/1–2. (Budapest, 1882–1884); Frigyes Pesty, *Oklevelek Temesmegye és Temesvárváros történetéhez*, ed. Tivadar Ortvy, vol. IV/1. (1183–1430) (Pozsony, 1896).

² The contribution of Csukovits Enikő, Zsoldos Attila, Tringli István, C. Tóth Norbert, Horváth Richárd, Neumann Tibor and W. Kovács András is undisputable in this matter as their academic articles, studies and document publications revealed new aspects in the history of noble counties. Some of their main works will be cited throughout the paper.

of noble counties in medieval Hungary has not been finished yet.³ This paper intends to continue the academic discussion on the topic through the example of Krassó County. The scope of the present study, however, is restricted to the description of the direction and the work of the county authorities with reference to its personnel.

The medieval archontology of Krassó County was published in the work of Pál Engel.⁴ Although the list of the office holders (*ispáns*, *alispáns* and the captains of castles on the territory of the county) is fairly complete, some new facts could be added to the already existing records. Referring to the list of *ispáns* and *alispáns*, mainly corrections were made to the years of the functions of the office holders. Besides these clarifications, the noble judges missing from Engel's works were included and their number also became cleared in a recent study.⁵ The current paper intends to analyse the existing lists of archontology so as to investigate certain aspects of the history of the county, that of the operation of the county authorities through its personnel. Therefore, it firstly discusses the prestige of the ispanate of Krassó, then the regularity and the occasions when the *ispáns* were present in the county are to be examined. Secondly, the careers and the affiliation of some deputies will be discussed and finally, the third component of the county authorities, the noble judges are to be inspected. Besides focusing mostly on whether their list can be extended or not from the list of people who accompanied noble judges in conducting investigations, the paper will also attempt to reveal the findings about their landed possessions, and additionally, certain suggestions about the affiliation of the noble judges will be made as well.

Overview

What did a noble county look like? The transformation of royal counties into noble counties started in the last decades of the 13th century. As far as it

³ See these recent papers Richárd Horváth, Tibor Neumann, Norbert C. Tóth, "Pontot az „i-re". A Magyarország világi archontológiája című program múltja, jelene és jövője," *Turul* 86 (2013): 41–52.; Zoltán Iusztin, "The Noble Judges in Timiș County (14th–15th Centuries)," *Transylvanian Review* XXII, suppl. no. 4 (2013): 253–264; Zoltan Iusztin, "Comitele de Timiș. Un baron al regatului medieval Maghiar," *Analele Banatului*, Serie Nouă, Arheologie-Istorie XIX (2011): 258–265; István Kádas, "Megyei emberek az északkelet-magyarországi megyei oklevelekben," in Judit Gál, István Kádas, Márton Rózsa, Eszter Tarján, ed., *Micae Mediaevales. Fiatal történészek dolgozatai a középkori Magyarországról és Európáról*, vol. IV. (Budapest, 2015), 107–123.

⁴ Pál Engel, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301–1457*, vol. I–II. (Historia Könyvtár. Kronológiák, adattárak 5.), (Budapest, 1996). (digital version: *Családtörténet, heraldika, honismeret. DVD könyvtár IV.* (Arcanum Digitéka), [Budapest, 2003], "Ispánok – Krassó".

⁵ Elek Szaszko, "Adalékok Krassó megye történetéhez. Krassó megye archontológiája (1319–1439)," *Turul* 86 (2013): 60–65.

can be told, the idea of the establishment of a new type of county institution emanated from the central power at the very end of the 1270s. Due to social and institutional changes accelerated by the donations of royal land, the system of royal counties was dissolved between 1270 and 1320, and they gradually shifted into their second age, that of noble counties. This process naturally took years or decades to be completed and its completion differed in each region within the Kingdom of Hungary.⁶ As far as the Temesköz region is concerned, the earliest data about the new institution are from the first half of the 14th century – Arad (1311), Csanád (1340), Keve (1342), Krassó (1319) and Temes (1321)⁷ – the time when noble counties had become institutionalised throughout the kingdom. This period is characterized by three major innovations: first, the noble judges (*szolgabírák*) joined the comital court, and thereby emerged the classical county tribunal, the *sedria*. Second, the *udvarispán*, who had hitherto acted as a deputy to the *ispán*, was replaced by the *alispán*, whose relation to the *ispán* is often described within the framework of *familiaritas*. Thirdly, the number of sources also increased compared to the former period since the judicial work of the county authorities is better documented from the early 14th century.⁸

The very first document related to the operation of Krassó County is from 1319, in which Simon – from the Kacsics kindred – the *ispán* of the county (1319–25) had a complaint recorded about an illegitimate transportation of the inhabitants of village Egres and ordered his men – one of them was most probably his deputy – to investigate the case who, then, reported the execution of the investigation and testified an interdiction.⁹ The case exemplifies well the usual legal matters which the county authorities often dealt with and the proceedings they were asked to do.

⁶ István Tringli, “Megyék a középkori Magyarországon,” in Tibor Neumann, György Rácz eds., *Honoris causa. Tanulmányok Engel Pál emlékére. Analecta Mediaevalia*, vol. III (Piliscsaba–Budapest, 2008), 496–497; Norbert C. Tóth, “A nemesi megye a középkori Magyarországon. Öt megye példája,” *Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg Megyei Szemle* 45 (2010/4): 405–413.

⁷ For the cited counties see the Database of Archival Documents of Medieval Hungary of the Hungarian National Archives (*A középkori Magyarország levéltári forrásainak adatbázisa DL-DF 4.2. CD-ROM*, György Rácz ed., [Archanum Digitéka]. Budapest, 2003, and its digital version available on the website of the Hungarian National Archives: *Collectio Diplomatica Hungarica. A középkori Magyarország levéltári forrásainak adatbázisa. DL-DF 5.1.* 2009. <http://mol.arcanum.hu/dldf/opt/a140506htm?v=pdf&a=start>). Arad: Diplomatikai Levéltár (further on: DL) 91166, Csanád: DL 76623, Keve: DL 40898, Krassó: see footnote nr. 9. For Temes see the study of István Petrovics, “A Temes megyei tisztikar legkorábbi kiadványai,” in *Acta Universitatis Scientiarum Szegediensis. Acta Historica CXVI* (Szeged, 2002): 21–29.

⁸ Tringli, “Megyék,” 497–501.

⁹ 1319: DL 50668., published in Frigyes Pesty, *Krassó vármegye története*, vol. III (Budapest, 1882), 7.

The “Ispáns”

Just like the royal county, the noble county was led by the *ispán* (*comes*) who represented the king, and as before, was appointed by the king generally from among the barons.¹⁰ It can be said that the list of the *ispáns* (and the *alispáns*) of Krassó is relatively complete.¹¹ But how prominent was to be the head of Krassó in the 14th–15th centuries? With reference to the administration of the south-eastern region, the office (*honor*)¹² of Krassó kept changing since its foundation. First it seems that the territory of Krassó County was divided into smaller *honors*¹³ which were gradually unified upon royal intention during the first ispanate of Szeri Pósa (1325–46). From the 1360s until the end of the Angevin period nine castles and their appurtenancies¹⁴ belonged to the authority of the *ispáns* making the *honor* of Krassó a lucrative and a politically significant office. Later on, the ispanate of Krassó was united with the one of Keve for the first time under Szécsényi Tamás (1346–49) and from the second half of the 14th century the two counties were linked to the authority of the ban of Szörény, and then to the *ispán* of Temes which contributed to the concentration of administration in the “lower parts” making the office even more prestigious.¹⁵ Considering these facts, it is not surprising if members of the highest political elite were amongst the regular office holders of Krassó (e.g. palatines: Opuliai László [1367–71]

¹⁰ C. Tóth, “A nemesi megye,” 406–407.

¹¹ Engel, “Archontológia, Ispánok – Krassó,” and Szasztkó, “Krassó megye,” 61–63.

¹² For the description of the *honor* system see Pál Engel, “A honor. A magyarországi feudális birtokformák kérdéséhez,” in Enikő Csukovits, ed., *Honor, vár, ispánság. Válogatott tanulmányok* (Budapest, 2003), 73–100. and Pál Engel, “Honor, vár, ispánság. Tanulmányok az Anjou-királyság kormányzati rendszeréről,” in Enikő Csukovits, ed., *Honor, vár, ispánság. Válogatott tanulmányok* (Budapest, 2003), 101–161.

¹³ It is suggested by the fact that in the 1310s and 1320s the royal castles on the territory of Krassó were not administered by a single person. The first *ispán*, Simon from the Kacsics kindred appears as the *comes* of Érsomlyó (1919) and (Mező)Somlyó from 1319 to 1322 besides being the *comes* of Krassó. A bit later Érsomlyó was in the hands of Jánki Miklós together with Krassófő (1323), then it was administered by the archbishop of Kalocsa (1335). Illyéd was also assigned to several office holders like Henc fia János (before 1319) and Kartali Tamás (1319) before Szeri Pósa received it while having the title of *comes* of Krassó (1325–26). See György Györffy, *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza*, vol. III (Budapest, 1987), 474 and Engel, “Archontológia, Ispánok – Krassó, Várnagyok és várbirtokosok – Érsomlyó, Illyéd, Kissomlyó, Krassófő”.

¹⁴ Engel, „Archontológia, Várnagyok és várbirtokosok – Haram, Borzafő, Érsomlyó, Krassófő, Illyéd, Mezősomlyó, Sebes, Galambóc and Kövesd”.

¹⁵ Pál Engel, “Vár és hatalom. Az uralom területiális alapjai a középkori Magyarországon,” in Enikő Csukovits, ed., *Honor, vár, ispánság. Válogatott tanulmányok* (Budapest, 2003): 182–183; Iusztin, “Comitele de Timiş,” 258–265.

and Garai Miklós [1375–86], *magister agazonum*: Lackfi Dénes [1355–60], bans of Szörény like Szécsi Miklós [1354–55], Lackfi Dénes, Losonci László and Losonci István [1386–88] or the ban of Bulgaria: Himfi Benedek [1365–67 and 1371–75]).¹⁶

The royal intention to unify the administration in the Temesköz continued and reached its peak during the Era of Sigismund, first, under Csáki Miklós and Marcali Miklós (1394–1402) and then under Ozorai Pipo (1404–27). The latter cumulated the titles of seven counties (Csanád, Arad, Krassó, Keve, Csongrád, Zaránd and Fejér) besides being the ban of Szörény and the ispán of Temes, which provided him the rank of baron.¹⁷ Following Pipo's death, two of the *homo novus* Tallóci brothers, Matkó and Frank were in charge of the administration of the ispanates in the southern region from 1429 to 1438 which made them quickly receive both social and political prestige in the 1430s and 1440s.¹⁸

All in all, examining the list of the *ispáns* of Krassó, it shows that it was an integral part of one of the most important and prestigious offices during the 14th and the 15th centuries, despite the fact that some of its royal castles and their appurtenances were alienated to private owners following the donations in the Era of Sigismund.¹⁹ The office was often awarded to dignitaries or to beneficiaries, so the political significance of the *ispáns* of Krassó is unquestionable. It is also evident, therefore, that the head of the county was hardly ever chosen from the local landowners. The trust of the royal power was well shown if lords with local interests, like the Pósafigs in the first half of the 14th century²⁰, – amongst whom not only Pósa, and two of his sons, János and László were in charge of the administration of Krassó, but their brother István as well²¹ – or Himfi Benedek in the 1360s,²² were appointed to hold the *honor* of Krassó. As

¹⁶ Engel, "Archontológia, Bárók" and Szaszko, "Krassó megye," 61–63.

¹⁷ Pál Engel, "Ozorai Pipo. Ozorai Pipo emlékezete," in Enikő Csukovits, ed., *Honor, vár, ispánság. Válogatott tanulmányok* (Budapest, 2003), 258–261.

¹⁸ Pál Engel, *Királyi hatalom és arisztokrácia viszonya a Zsigmond-korban (1387–1437)* (Budapest, 1977), 78–81.

¹⁹ The castle of Kövesd went to the hands of the Csáki family after 1390 but it was later exchanged from them to the castle of Adorján. Kövesd, then, was in the possession of the Macedonai family (Engel, "Királyi hatalom," 127.). The castle of Érsomlyó also appears to be alienated, first to Perényi Miklós, then to Brankovics György (Engel, "Királyi hatalom," 109–110.).

²⁰ Elek Szaszko, *A Szeri Pósafigak. Egy előkelő dél-alföldi család története a 14–15. században* (unpublished PhD dissertation Pázmány Péter Catholic University, 2014), (22–30). Available at https://www.academia.edu/7209933/A_Szeri_P%C3%B3safigak_csal%C3%A1d_PhD_dissert%C3%A1ci%C3%B3_The_Szeri_P%C3%B3safig_family_PhD_dissertation and Ligia Boldea "O carieră politică în epoca angevină: Posa de Szer, comite de Caraș," *Banatica* 24/II (2014): 233–261.

²¹ Szaszko, "Krassó megye," 62.

²² Engel, "Honor, vár, ispánság," 115–117.

a consequence, the office holding contributed to the rising reputation of the person and his family.

The royal authority vested multiple tasks in the *ispáns* and from the point of view of the operation of the county authorities the most important one was jurisdiction.²³ It can be stated, however, that the *ispáns* seldom conducted their official judiciary duty in person. Their absence from the county is quite understandable knowing that most of the *ispáns* of Krassó were dignitaries. The county law courts (the *sedrias*), which discussed minor legal matters of the county's nobility, were handed over to the deputies, however, it was not exceptional either – but definitely not regular – if the *ispáns* were present at these courts during the first half of the 14th century.

Considering that the ispanate was entrusted to the Pósafigs in this period who were not dignitaries nor barons but members of a prestigious wealthy noble family with local interests, their appearance in the county is more understandable. The first known case is seen in a report of the chapter of Arad which informs us about three noblemen from Krassó County who had to pay off certain fines before Szeri Pósa in 1330.²⁴ Another example is from around November 1346, when Pósa and his company were attacked and robbed at village Petre in Temes County while they were heading home (not mentioned in the source but most probably to Sződi in Arad County where stood the family's mansion) from the office of Pósa (*de honore suo*).²⁵ Our last examples are from his second ispanate when the old-aged Pósa visited Krassó in person in 1350 and in 1352 and he issued two documents related to county affairs in a castle belonging to his office, called Illyéd.²⁶ The next *ispán*, Szeri János, the son of Pósa (1349–1350), for instance, brought his long-running dispute with Jánki Miklós over the borders of their neighbouring estates to the county's *sedria* in 1349.²⁷ In this

²³ It is a general phenomenon that it is difficult to learn about those functions of the noble counties which were not related to jurisdiction even in the well-documented counties. It is known that besides jurisdiction the counties completed military tasks with the county *banderia*, or that they were in charge of executive and administrative tasks as laws and decrees – either general or local ones – were officially announced here. The counties played an important role in tax collection as well. Moreover, from the 15th century the counties could send their representatives to the diets as well. However, because of the nature and the number of the sources, it is rather accidental to get detailed knowledge about the above mentioned functions (Tringli, "Megyék," 504–505. and Norbert C. Tóth, *Szabolcs megye működése a Zsigmond-korban* (Nyíregyháza, 2008), 28, 135–139.).

²⁴ July 4, 1330: DL 91246.

²⁵ Nov. 25, 1346 > Dec. 7, 1346: DL 91375. and Nov. 25, 1346 > Dec. 12, 1346: DL 91376. These data also provide information about the end of the first ispanate of Szeri Pósa. See: Szaszko, "Szeri Pósafigak," (34–35) and Szaszko, "Krassó megye," 61.

²⁶ 1350: DL 91419. and 1352: DF 254974.

²⁷ 1349: DL 91401. and DL 91408.

case, of course, he did not act as the head of the county, and the documents were issued in the name of the four noble judges.²⁸ According to three other documents from 1351 and 1353, when László, the other son of Pósa held the title, he also handled certain issues personally. In the first case, László was the petitioner or the suitor at the *sedria* where he made a complaint about the murdering and sacking of two of his serfs.²⁹ The procedure is unique, because the *ispáns* hardly ever had to cope with a case like this personally. It was rather his procurators who were usually sent to the *sedria* to represent the interest of the lord. In the second and the third cases, it was certified by László himself together with the noble judges that *magister* Himfi János paid off certain amount of his liabilities to the widow of another local nobleman called Bede and to her son, István.³⁰ The last recorded case when the *ispán* acted in person at the *sedria* happened when Szécsi Miklós issued a testimony for Pósa László about his protest in 1354.³¹ The difference between this case and the ones mentioned in connection with the Pósa family is that Szécsi was the ban of Szörény, who, as a high dignitary, was absolutely not supposed to carry out the proceedings personally.

Besides the county law courts, the *ispáns* regularly convoked – upon royal order – and presided personally over the so-called general assemblies of the county (*congregatio generalis*). Observing the list of the recorded occasions from Krassó County (see *Table 1*), the practice was the same countrywise, however, general assemblies not presided over by the *ispán* himself were not unprecedented, either. The first document from an assembly was issued by the four noble judges in 1340, however, it is mentioned in the text that having heard certain claims Szeri Pósa, the *ispán* of the county, rose from his seat (*de loco suo tribunali magister Posa de Zer comes dicti comitatus de Karasu consurgendo*) and prohibited the claimer from abusing a land. Two years later, Szeri Pósa issued a surety as a judge, however, in 1343 it was his deputy who presided over the assembly. It is also interesting to see whether those *ispáns* who were dignitaries were present at or absent from the assemblies. During the ispanate of Szécsényi Tamás (1346–49), it was his deputy, Rimai Mihály, who was in charge of this duty, while Lackfi Dénes (1355–60) dealt with the matters appearing at the assemblies himself, even with the less significant ones as well. All in all, the absence of the *ispáns* did not necessarily follow from the fact that the county was headed by a high ranking baron with chief offices. As it could be seen, even

²⁸ For the phenomenon see: Tringli, “Megyék,” 511. and C. Tóth, “Szabolcs megye,” 55–56.

²⁹ 1351: DL 93922.

³⁰ MNL P 1732. Antal Fekete Nagy, *A Temesi bánság oklevéltára* (manuscript) box 1 fol. 289. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 127.) and MNL P 1732. Fekete Nagy Antal: *A Temesi bánság oklevéltára* (manuscript) box 1 fol. 292. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 132.)

³¹ December 18, 1354: DL 91469.

the dignitaries appeared as acting members of the county authorities until the 1360s, however, their presence was not regular, either.

Table 1 – The General County Assemblies in Krassó County

Date	Place	The Case	Source Reference
September 19, 1340	Haram	in the name of Szeri Pósa, the head of Krassó, the four noble judges of the county prohibited János (the son of Gene) from handing over <i>possessio Feyryghaz</i> (Fehéregyház) to the sons of <i>Kemen</i>	DL 91312.
July 4, 1342	Érdsomlyó	Szeri Pósa and the four noble judges of Krassó issued a surety for Pál (the son of Him) about the penalty of a murder committed by the bailiff of Jakab (the son of Mihály)	MNL P 1732. Fekete Nagy Antal: <i>A Temesi bánság oklevéltára</i> (manuscript) box 1 fol. 181. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 84.)
May 15, 1343	Haram	Péter (the son of Loránd), the deputy of Szeri Pósa, recorded the complaint of Himfi János and Benedek (the sons of Pál) against <i>Bratan</i> kenéz who had stolen some money from their <i>officialis</i>	MNL P 1732. Fekete Nagy Antal: <i>A Temesi bánság oklevéltára</i> (manuscript) box 1 fol. 191. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 87.)
before November 22, 1347		Rimai Mihály, the deputy of Szécsényi Tamás, referred to a previous assembly in one of his cases	DL 41063.
June 26, 1348	Haram	Rimai Mihály, the deputy of Szécsényi Tamás, recorded the complaint of Mezősomlyói Mihály against Himfi János	DL 41079.
November 18–21, 1355	Haram	Lackfi Dénes, <i>magister agazonum</i> and the head of Krassó, recorded the complaint of Pósafi Balázs against Jánki Miklós	DL 91483.
October 3–6, 1357	Érdsomlyó	1) Lackfi Dénes, <i>magister agazonum</i> and the head of Krassó, recorded the complaint of Pósafi László against the kenéz of Holmás 2) the county authorities (the <i>ispán</i> and the noble judges) testified together with the noble jurors that Kövespatak donated to Besenyő János has always been under royal possession	1) DL 91506. 2) MNL P 1732. Fekete Nagy Antal: <i>A Temesi bánság oklevéltára</i> (manuscript) box 1 fol. 315. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 16/c/.)

Date	Place	The Case	Source Reference
July 22–30, 1405	nearby Mezősomlyó	1) Ozorai Pipo testified that the deputies of Becse robbed the serfs and six retainers of Berekszői Miklós and János 2) Ozorai Pipo postponed the case between his deputies and two former noble judges of Krassó to the next assembly held in Temesvár	1) DL 29220. 2) DL 57402. = ZsO II. 4069–4071.
August 19–23, 1409	nearby Mezősomlyó	Ozorai Pipo testified an agreement on a recompensation between his deputy, Gyertyánosi Jakab and Dobozi Dán Demeter	DL 53492. = ZsO II. 6996.

To continue with the period afterwards, it is seen how markedly different it was since there is not any written evidence left to the presence of the *ispáns* in Krassó after the 1360s. Analysing the counties in the North-Eastern region, C. Tóth Norbert assessed that by the middle of the Angevin period, (sooner or later depending on local circumstances), the *ispán* disappeared from the county administration, and left the direction of the county court and judicial work to the deputy or deputies.³² Consequently, the change in Krassó County can be explained by this general tendency. On the other hand, the phenomenon in Krassó can most probably be related to the process of the concentration of administration of the “lower parts” which contributed to the shift starting from the mid 1360s.³³ This period falls to the ispanate of Himfi Benedek (Ban of Bulgaria), Opuliai László and Garai Miklós (palatines), whose status explains well their absence from the county affairs. In the early 15th century, however, the practice returned for a while under the ispanate of Ozorai Pipo (1404–26). In 1405 and 1409 he held assemblies for Krassó County, but later he did not appear to deal with judicial issues personally in his counties³⁴, so most probably his presence in the above mentioned cases – especially in the first one – can be connected to the consolidation of the power of Sigismund following the coup against him in 1401–1403.

The Deputies (Alispáns)

In practice, the direction of the county was left to the deputies (*alispáns*), who were initially called *curialis comes* and then *vicecomes*. Their presence in the judicial

³² C. Tóth, “Szabolcs megye,” 141., and C. Tóth, “A nemesi megye,” 408–409.

³³ Engel, “Ozorai Pipo,” 258.

³⁴ Of course Pipo was often present in the „lower parts”, especially in Temesvár, but these visits can mostly be related to his military activities (Engel, “Ozorai Pipo,” 265–266 and Norbert C. Tóth, “Zsigmond király tisztviselőinek itineráriuma I. (Uralkodásának elejétől az 1420-as évekig),” *Századok* 138 (2004): 481–488.

and administrative work of the county reflects to their significant role in the life of the county community. Therefore, the analysis of the careers, the social background and the affiliation of the deputies unquestionably contribute to the better understanding of the personnel and the operation of the county authorities from several aspects. First, the example of two *alispáns* is chosen to show the results of the approach which combines social and family history with institutional history.

In general, the deputies were appointed from among the followers of the *ispán*, therefore, similarly to their lords, they were not always selected from among the local noblemen, either.³⁵ Around 10 of the 51 known deputies in Krassó can still be identified as local landowners or ones from the region of Arad or Temes Counties.³⁶ The number indicates the assumption that the Pósafigs as local *ispáns* appointed most of their deputies from local noblemen³⁷, however, it is difficult to identify precisely all of them. For example, the first three deputies of Szeri Pósa – Pósa (1325), László (1331) and *Bekov* (1342) – are mentioned only once without any reference to their estates or to their family ties. The same can be said about Péter, the son of Loránd (1340–44) and Fejes (*dictus*) Gergely (1345–46) despite the fact that they appear quite regularly in the documents. More can be told about Péter, the son of Him (1349–50) and Bereck, the son of Dénes (1352–53) whose genealogy and affiliation are highlighted by other sources as well.

As far as Péter is concerned, he was one of the chief retainers (*familiars*) of the Pósafig family. His service dates back to 1330 when he acted as a royal man in testifying the introduction of two estates (Küke and Vetelnek) in Krassó County to the Pósafigs. His career continued as procurator at both chief courts (1339, 1343 and 1344) and in local affairs (1344 and 1346). It is also known that he received one third of certain fines as salary and he was entitled *comes* – referring not to an office but to his social status – in 1344.³⁸ As far as his family

³⁵ C. Tóth, “A nemesi megye,” 408–409.

³⁶ For all the data referring to the deputies of Krassó see Engel, “Archontológia, Ispánok – Krassó,” (digital version) and Szaszko, “Krassó megye,” 61–63. The verification of the number will be done in another paper supported by the Bolyai-project.

³⁷ Although Himfi Benedek also had local interests, the list of his *alispáns* cannot be used as a reference in this case since, for instance, his chief retainer, Sárosi János (the son of Péter), the *alispán* of Krassó (1366–67), of Vas (1370) and Temes (1372) originated from Zala County (Engel, “Honor, vár, ispánság,” 116–117.).

³⁸ 1330: DL 91549. – The date of the donation is ambiguous because the text of the transcription preserving the donation itself is fragmented exactly where the year of the donation is given. However, it is mentioned in the transcript that the original donation charter was sealed with the medium sized royal seal of Charles I lost in the campaign against Basarab in 1330 (*quasdam litteras ipsius domini Karoli regis patentes mediocri suo sigillo in partibus Transalpinis casualiter deperdito consignatas*). What is legible from the date is *m^o[...]sy^{mo}* and the deleted word *nono* written above. Considering all above, the donation, hence the act of Péter, can be dated to the

background is concerned, hardly anything is known about it. It is tempting to see Péter as one of the members of the Himfi family³⁹, however, it is highly unlikely that the deputy of Krassó was identical with the brother of Himfi Benedek.⁴⁰ Less is known about Bereck, but the fact that he appeared before the *sedria* at Mezősomlyó in 1340 proves that he resided in Krassó County⁴¹, while the second data about him from the turn of 1342 and 1343 may show his affiliation with the Pósa family as Bereck was one of the nominated royal men for Szeri Pósa to testify the borders of Küke and Vetelnek.⁴² All what we know about the affiliation of royal men⁴³, and the fact that Bereck later became the *alispán* of Krassó during Pósa László, suggest that he had certainly been well known and trusted by the Pósa family earlier, but it does not evidently prove that he also served them as a retainer in the 1340s.⁴⁴

year 1330, 1339: DL 91303, 1343: DL 91333, DL 91336, 1344: DL 100017, DL 91354 (with the title *comes*), 1346: DL 91374.

³⁹ Cosmin Popa-Gorjanu, “Despre familiare și familiaritas în cazul familiei Himfi,” *Apulum* XLIV (2007): 368–369, and Ligia Boldea, “Structuri domeniiale în Banatul medieval de câmpie. Date asupra patrimoniului funciar al unui comite de Caraș din perioada angevină,” *Analele Banatului*, Serie Nouă, Arheologie-Istorie XXI (2013): 244.

⁴⁰ For consideration see the following facts: 1) the beginning of Péter’s service starts in 1330 and it is continuous in the 1340s while Himfi Benedek appears first in 1343 and Himfi Péter in 1347 (for the latter see: Pál Engel, *Középkori magyar genealógia – Him rokonsága Table 1 and 2* [digital version: *Családtörténet, heraldika, honismeret. DVD könyvtár IV.* (Arcanum Digitéka), [Budapest, 2003]), 2) the tasks that Péter was in charge of are not compatible with the social status of the Himfi family in the 1340s (Kornél Szovák, “Meritorum apud Dominum fructus cumulatorum. Megjegyzések a 14. század főúri vallásosságához”, in Péter Tusor, ed., *R. Várkonyi Ágnes Emlékkönyv születésének 70. évfordulója ünnepére* [Budapest, 1998], 80–83 and Richárd Horváth, “Bigámista volt-e Himfi Benedek bolgár bán? Adalékok a Döbrentei Himfi család történetéhez,” *Turul* 83 [2010] 116), and last but not least 3) the way how Péter is referred to in the sources is always Péter, the son of Him (*Heym/Hem/Heem*), while Himfi Benedek and Péter almost always appear as the son of Pál, (who was) the son of Him often together with the phrase *de Remethe* (see the *Index* of the appropriate volumes of *Anjou-kori oklevéltár. Documenta res Hungaricas tempore regum Andegavensium illustrantia*, ed. I–VI. Gyula Kristó, VII. László Blazovich, Lajos Géczi, VIII–IX. László Blazovich, X. László Blazovich, Lajos Géczi, XI–XIII. Tibor Almási, XIV. Tibor Almási–Tamás Kőfalvi, XV. Ildikó Tóth, XVII. Gyula Kristó, XIX. Gyula Kristó, Ferenc Makk, XX. Ferenc Piti, XXIII–XXIV. Ferenc Piti, XXV. Ferenc Sebők, XXVI–XXVII. Ferenc Piti, XXVIII–XXX. Ferenc Piti, XXXIV. Éva Teiszler, XXXVIII. Éva B. Halász. Budapest–Szeged, 1990–2014).

⁴¹ MNL P 1732. Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 169. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 77.)

⁴² November 11, 1342 > January 15, 1343: DL 91330.

⁴³ Pál Engel, “Királyi emberek Valkó megyében”, in Csukovits Enikő, ed., *Honor, vár, ispánság. Válogatott tanulmányok*, (Budapest, 2003), 578–599 and Norbert C. Tóth, “Szabolcs megye ismeretlen ispánjai Mátyás király uralkodása idején,” *Szabolcs-szatmár-beregi Szemle* 42 (2007/2): 160.

⁴⁴ Kasza-i Gergely, the subcaptain of Sebes (1350), however, had also been mentioned earlier

The significance of the question of affiliation has been highlighted by recent studies. Since it may reveal lord-retainer relationship, the collection of prosopographical data on the deputies may also contribute to the extension of the list of *ispáns* with those ones who – otherwise – were not mentioned in the sources. At least, the list of C. Tóth Norbert on Szabolcs County from 1461 to 1490 is worth consideration.⁴⁵ However, it has to be noted that – by examining Abaúj County in the second half of the 15th century – Horváth Richárd pointed out that contrary to the suggestions of the previous literature the relationship between the *ispáns* and *alispáns* should not be described automatically as a cross-compliant lord-retainer relationship.⁴⁶ Considering both remarks, the suggested method might be applied to Krassó County as well since two periods need clarification with regards to the identity of the *ispáns*.

The first period is the second half of the 1360s. Engel Pál suggested that the office of Krassó was held by palatine Opuliai László from 1367 to 1372 following Himfi Benedek. Although none of the medieval documents mention the palatine with this title, two arguments should be taken into consideration. Firstly, based on Engel's database of archontology, not only the rotation of certain offices between the same dignitaries/office holders can be captured, but its intended nature as well which indicates a higher probability of the appearance of a person in a given office. It is seen from *Table 2* that Himfi Benedek and Fedémesi Szobonya László exchanged the ispanates of Pozsony and Krassó with Keve one after another while Himfi and Opuliai László also appear to straight follow each other first in Krassó and Keve⁴⁷ and then in the offices of Temes and Vas with Sopron.⁴⁸

as a royal man proceeding in a legal case for Szeri Pósa in 1347 (December 12, 1347: DL 91386). For the Kaszai family see: Szaszko, "Szeri Pósa fiak," (49–50)

⁴⁵ C. Tóth, "Szabolcs megye," 39 and C. Tóth, "Ismeretlen ispánok," 154–163.

⁴⁶ While the Perényi family dominated the ispánate, the deputies were from amongst the retainers of the Szapolyai family (Richárd Horváth, "A Felső Részek kapitánysága a Mátyáskorban," *Századok* 137 (2003): 939).

⁴⁷ Although Himfi had to give up Krassó, he still remained the Ban of Bulgaria, which he held parallel with his brother Himfi Péter and Kórógyi László. However, soon after that, Himfi was compensated with the office of Temes on March 1, 1368 as King Louis the Great (1342–82) decided to depose Kórógyi and appoint Benedek the sole head of Bulgaria together with the castles of Temesvár, Zsidóvár, Sebes, Miháld and Orsova (DF 285837) – see also Engel, "Archontológia: Bárók – Bolgár bán and Várnagyok és várbirtokosok: Miháld, Orsova, Sebes, Temesvár, Zsidóvár". As far as the background of the decision is concerned, it can most probably be related to the concentration of resources and military power in the southern region since the intention to extend Hungarian authority over Bulgaria was on its last legs in these years due to the attacks of the *vajda* of Wallachia (Gyula Kristó, *Az Anjou-kor háborúi*, [Budapest, 1988], 159–160).

⁴⁸ Engel, "Archontológia: Ispánok – Keve, Krassó, Pozsony, Vas, Sopron".

Table 2 – Examples to the Rotation of Offices

The Ispanate of Pozsony	The Ispanates of Krassó and Keve	The Ispanate of Temes	The Ispanates of Vas and Sopron
Himfi Benedek (1362–65)	Fedémesi Szobonya László (1361–65)		
Fedémesi Szobonya László (1365–67)	Himfi Benedek (1365–67)	Himfi Benedek [1368–1369]	[Opuliai László] (1367–69)
Opuliai László (1367–72)	[Opuliai László] (1367–71)	Opuliai László (1369–71)	Himfi Benedek (1369–70)

Next to the intended rotation of dignitaries in offices, the appearance and the operation of the deputies also prove that Opuliai László did hold the office of Krassó. Himfi Benedek was last mentioned as *comes* of Krassó and Keve in May 8, 1367.⁴⁹ It is almost sure that he left the office either in May or in June since in July a new deputy, István (the son of István) presided over the *sedria* of Krassó⁵⁰ while formerly it had been Himfi's trusted man Sárosdi János (the son of Péter).⁵¹ It is suggested by Engel Pál that the next acting deputy in Krassó from June 15, 1368 is identical with a nobleman from Nyitra County called Onori János (the son of István), who was the man of Opuliai László.⁵² Relatively much is known about the cornerstones of his life to prove Engel's hypothesis. Before he became the deputy of Krassó, his daughters, Klára and Margit, were granted the son's rights (*prefectio*) due to the merits and services of János in the campaign in Bulgaria in 1365.⁵³ Following his office holding in Krassó, *magister* János was placed to be the captain of Gimes administered by Opuliai László and he appeared with this title when he satisfied his brother's (Miklós) daughter (*Sebe*) with her *quarta puellarum* in 1373.⁵⁴ Later, the unfortunate death of János was also recorded as he, in 1399, had been slaughtered and beheaded by *Tordamyz-i* László before his dead body was thrown into a well.⁵⁵

Onori János was last mentioned as deputy of Krassó in September 21, 1370, but he most probably left the office with his lord a year later when Opuliai László was removed from Temes upon royal order and was replaced by Himfi

⁴⁹ May 8, 1367: DL 41709. – see also Engel, "Archontológia: Ispánok – Krassó".

⁵⁰ July 29, 1367: DL 91729.

⁵¹ April 8, 1367: DL 41703. – Sárosdi followed his lord to his new offices (see note nr. 37).

⁵² Engel, "Archontológia: Ispánok – Krassó and Várnagyok és várbirtokosok – Gimes".

⁵³ June 22, 1365: DL 5399. – quoted by József Holub, "A középkori fiúsítások," *Turul* 44 (1927/2): 85.

⁵⁴ February 22, 1373: DL 6095 – quoted by Engel, "Archontológia, Várnagyok és várbirtokosok – Gimes".

⁵⁵ October 20, 1411: DL 58860.

Benedek for the second time in November 11, 1371.⁵⁶ Before, however, Onori had to leave, Gáji Csölnök Péter appears to be the deputy at a judicial assembly on 12 May, 1370.⁵⁷ This is the first time when the phenomenon described by Horváth Richárd can be captured in Krassó because *magister* Csölnök Péter⁵⁸ was the retainer of Himfi Benedek as he addressed Himfi as his lord in an undated letter.⁵⁹ What makes the content of this letter even more interesting is the fact that Csölnök Péter uses the title *comes de Crasso* while being the captain of Haram. These references, however, on the dual office holding of the deputies and the appearance of the deputies as *comes* will be discussed later in details.

Besides the second half of the 1360s, the first half of the 1390s also needs clarification with regards to the identity of the *ispáns* as these years mark the least documented period of the county. Since the number of sources is limited, the sole mention of *magister* Demeter (the son of Ernye) as deputy of Krassó in January 22, 1392 falls to an era when the *ispán* is unidentified.⁶⁰ What is known about Demeter is that he is either referred as Farchafalva-i or as Csatár-i – indicating that he resided in Krassó County – and he appears to be the trusted man of the Pósaft family in 1385.⁶¹ It might be tempting to conclude that a member of the Pósafts held the ispanate of Krassó, however, Demeter was only in charge of proceedings of legal cases taken before the palatine court and was never called *familiaris* or *officialis*, which might be a sign of a closer lord-retainer relationship hence an argument for identifying the *ispán* from the Pósafts. Even though Pósaft István (1374–91) was in charge of the ispanate of Csongrád in 1391, and his career could also explain the trust

⁵⁶ September 21, 1370: DL 52175 and November 11, 1371: DF 285841 – quoted by Engel, “Archontológia: Ispánok – Krassó and Temes”.

⁵⁷ May 12, 1370: DL 91759 – the document was issued on the seventh day of the assembly – for the use of terminology see: C. Tóth, “Szabolcs megye,” 117.

⁵⁸ His father, Gáj-i Csölnök (*Chulnuk/Cheulnuk*) most probably came to Krassó County with Szécsényi Tamás, at least he appears as the subcaptain of Galambóc in 1348 (November 6, 1348: DL 91393). He continued a long sue with the Pósafts over the borders of Csatár (Szaskzó, “Szeri Pósaftak,” 38–39). His son, Péter is first mentioned in 1363 (DL 51988). Despite being the man of Himfi Benedek, in 1375 his lord had a quarrel with him as the *officialis* of Péter from Ilonc robbed and heavily hit his man called Bercse-i Kenéz Miklós (DL 52234). In 1381, however, Péter was ordered by Queen Elizabeth to carry out the division of the estates amongst the Himfis to which he had been appointed most probably by the Himfi family members (DL 52359). His career, though, finished as a retainer of the rebellious Horváti János when his estates were confiscated in 1389 (November 9, 1389: DL 7533).

⁵⁹ DL 47886, *magnifico viro magistro Benedicto bano domino suo plurimum bono*.

⁶⁰ Szaskzó, “Krassó megye,” 62 and Engel, “Archontológia: Ispánok – Krassó”.

⁶¹ June 7, 1385: DL 91918, June 26, 1385: DL 91915–16. and DL 91894 – see: Szaskzó, “Szeri Pósaftak,” 54.

of King Sigismund⁶², it is rather unlikely that he should be added to the list of the possible office holders of Krassó.⁶³

With regard to the question of affiliation, it is interesting to see the case of the deputies from 1394. In the work of Pál Engel, Hídvégi László and István (the sons of János) are suggested to be in charge of the office on behalf of Szécsi Frank. However, it is only a hypothesis drawn from the fact that Szécsi was once mentioned in a chancellery note with the title of the Ban of Szörény in 1393 suggesting that he held the ispanate of Krassó and Temes as well.⁶⁴ Luckily, the Hídvégi brothers and other members of the family regularly appear in the sources from the late 13th century. As a consequence, it is possible to reconstruct their family tree and learn a few facts about their career, too, which may also contribute to the identification of their affiliation. What is known about the origin and the family background of the Hídvégis is that the family resided in Vas County and originated from the honourable Herman kindred.⁶⁵ Involvement in the county administration had a long tradition in the family history as both the grandfather (András) and the father (János) of László and István appear to be the deputies of Vas County.⁶⁶ What made the brothers leave their home county to Krassó for a short-term stay and the lord, whom they followed, however, is uncertain. As their father and their uncle called Péter were in the service of Szécsi Miklós in the 1380s⁶⁷, it indicates a close lord-retainer relationship between the Szécsi and the Hídvégi families. So, these facts are pointing towards to say that László and István were brought to the southern borders of Hungary in the retinue of Szécsi Frank. On the other hand, certain signs suggest that the Hídvégis were known by the Himfi family too, however, it has to be noted that this relation most probably developed during or following the service of László and István in Krassó.⁶⁸ To conclude, the evidence which

⁶² Szaszko, "Szeri Pósaíak," 54–56.

⁶³ When Pósaí István was last mentioned in the sources he did not appear with any titles (May 27, 1391: DL 91975). Next time, in June 1392, it is only his widow who is mentioned so István must have died before that date (June 27, 1392: DL 91991), but we cannot make sure whether he was alive in January 1392 when Demeter appeared as the deputy of Krassó.

⁶⁴ Engel, "Archontológia: Bárók – Szörényi bán and Ispánok – Krassó, Temes," and Iusztin, "Comite de Timiş," 261.

⁶⁵ Kálmán Baán, "A Hermán nembeli Hídvégiek és örököseik," *Magyar Családtörténeti Szemle* 9 (1943): 1–5 – However, both the family history and the genealogy of the family attached to the study seem to be outdated and need the consideration of revision.

⁶⁶ Engel, "Archontológia: Ispánok – Vas".

⁶⁷ Engel, "Archontológia: Ispánok – Pozsony and Vas".

⁶⁸ In 1411, the descendants of Döbrönteí Himfi Benedek intended to sell their estate called Torvajszentkirály in Vas County to the László and István, but both the Himfi relatives and the Gersei family members protested against this will. As the possession of the Hídvégi family,

would highlight unmistakably the lord-retainer relationship is not sufficient to identify the *ispán* of Krassó in 1394 yet, but the fact that members of the Hídvégi family were in charge of offices on behalf of the Szécsis adds another justification to the engagement of Szécsi Frank in the offices of the southern region.

Leaving the question of affiliation, another issue, the question of the involvement of the deputies in the county administration is to be concerned. Considering the responsibilities of the *alispáns*, they were assigned to do all kinds of tasks by the *ispáns*. Their mostly recorded duties, however, were related to jurisdiction since the county law courts were generally presided over by them, and, as it was highlighted, occasionally it happened that they replaced the *ispán* at the general assembly as well. To show their social reputation, the deputies were called *magisters*⁶⁹, and when the castle of Haram in the 2nd half of the Angevin Era, and later the castle of Érsomlyó in the early 15th century were linked to their office – most probably as remuneration for their service – they owned the titles: the captain of Haram and the captain of Érsomlyó. As far as the duration of their tenure is concerned, some of the deputies were in charge for approximately a year. Ozorai Pipo, for instance, changed his deputies yearly⁷⁰, amongst whom we can find three local noblemen as well⁷¹, while others were employed for a longer period of time, on average, around three years. The longest known tenure is the one of Majosfalvi Miklós' which lasted for five years (see Table 3).

Table 3 – The Longest Tenures of the Deputies of Krassó (selected)

The Name of the Deputy	Dates	The Deputy of ...
Péter (the son of Loránd)	1340. XII. 21. – 1344. III. 11.	Szeri Pósa
Rimai Mihály	1346. XII. 4. – 1349. VI. 25.	Szécsényi Tamás
István (the son of Kupsa Tamás)	1355. IX. 8. – 1358. VIII. 2.	Lackfi Dénes

called Andrásfa, lay next to Torvajszentkirály, their intention could have been to make their estate round (Balázs Zágorkidő-Czigány, "Torvaj, a bakonybéli apátság birtoka," in Attila Bárány, Gábor Dreska, Kornél Szovák, ed., *Arcana tabularii. Tanulmányok Solymosi László tiszteletére*, vol. I. [Budapest-Debrecen, 2014], 467).

⁶⁹ For the connection between the titles and the social status see: P. Engel, "A nemesi társadalom a középkori Ung megyében," *Társadalom- és művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok* 25 (Budapest, 1998): 96–108., and P. Engel, "Nagy Lajos bárói," *Történelmi Szemle* 28 (1985): 401.

⁷⁰ The phenomenon is not a specific regional feature. The regular yearly change of the deputies was common, for instance, in Szabolcs County the 15th century (C. Tóth, "Szabolcs megye," 29 and his note nr. 126.).

⁷¹ Gyertyánosi Csép Jakab (1408–09), Benkefalvi Benke Péter (1409, 1416–18) and Szarvastelki Vaski László (1416–18) (Engel, "Ozorai Pipo," 272; Engel, "Archontológia: Ispánok – Krassó" and Szaszko, "Krassó megye," 63).

The Name of the Deputy	Dates	The Deputy of ...
Besenyői Lőrinc (the son of Domonkos)	1362. IV. 21. – 1364. VIII. 22.	Fedémesi Szobonya László
János (the son of István)	1368. VI. 15. – 1370. IX. 21.	Opuliai László
Csupor Tamás	1379. V. 4. – 1382. IX. 6.	Garai Miklós
Majosfalvi Miklós (the son of Beke)	1396. V. 2. – 1401. V. 5	Csáki and Marcali Miklós
Szerdahelyi Imre (the son of János)	1421. XI. 15. – 1425. VII. 14.	Ozorai Pipo

Concerning the phenomenon when more than one deputy was in charge of the office at the same time – described as dual office holding in the literature –, fewer problems occur if the deputies held the title for the same duration. According to both earlier and recent works, however, it is more difficult to explain why a deputy appears irregularly or only once while the operation of his fellow-deputy is consecutive.⁷² Krassó County is not exceptional from this aspect, either. Gáj-i Csölnök Péter has already appeared as an example, but the deputy whose case can be mentioned first is *Bekov* from 1342, who was the man of Szeri Pósa. While Péter (the son of Loránd) presided over seven *sedrias* in Mezősomlyó (next to the church dedicated to King Saint Stephen) and a general assembly in Haram during a three-and-a-half-year-long period from December 12, 1340 to March 11, 1344⁷³, the name of *Bekov* was only once reported in a prohibition carried out by himself on behalf of Szeri Pósa which was issued by the four noble judges at the *sedria* in Mezősomlyó.⁷⁴ Also, during the uninterrupted, almost three-year long deputy service of István (the son of Tamás) (September 8, 1355– August 2, 1358), another deputy of Lackfi Dénes in Krassó is mentioned judging at a regular county tribunal, namely Péter (the son of Iktári Betlen) (November 23, 1355).⁷⁵ The last known case is from year 1400, when Ivándi Gergely was listed next to Majosfalvi Miklós, whose tenure lasted for five years (see above), as a deputy in a response to King Sigismund in

⁷² With reference to the earlier literature, the question has been raised by C. Tóth Norbert in C. Tóth, “Szabolcs megye,” 31.

⁷³ December 21, 1340: MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 169. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 77); November 29, 1341: MNL P 1732. Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 176. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 79); August 1, 1342: MNL P 1732. Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 182. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 83); August 8, 1342: DL 101899, May 15, 1343: MNL P 1732. Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 191. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 87); November 27, 1343: DL 51261, December 18, 1343: DL 51265, March 11, 1344: DL 51280.

⁷⁴ November 28, 1342: MNL P 1732. Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 185. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 81)

⁷⁵ Engel, “Archontológia: Ispánok – Krassó” and Szasztkó, „Krassó megye,” 62.

which the county authorities reported an accomplished investigation required by the monarch.⁷⁶

What is evident from the four examples is that the dual office holding of the deputies should not be explained with the fact that there was a need for two deputies in counties with two *sedrias* as earlier literature suggested it.⁷⁷ The appearance of co-deputies seems to follow a pattern which is more explicable with the division of administrative duties related to tasks alternating from the regular judiciary duties of the deputies (and/or with some unknown reasons like the possible absence of the regular deputy). At least, the referenced examples from Krassó County seem to support an argument like that. There is a great deal of uncertainty about the case of *Bekov*, but since it is related to an affair in which the *ispán* was involved, his appointment to carry out the prohibition could have served the purpose to avoid the participation of the regular deputy. The case of Péter (the son of Iktár-i Betlen) from 1355, however, seems to exemplify the division of duties or the substitution of the regular deputy in a better way. Although the county authorities issued five documents in the name of István (the son of Tamás) from 1355 to 1358, – all but one related to typical legal matters appearing at county law courts⁷⁸ – once it was not him who was in charge of the duties. What is known for sure is that the *ispán* of the county held a four-day-long general assembly in Haram from Wednesday to Saturday (from 18 to 21 November) in 1355. As it regularly happened at these occasions the county authorities might have also been present, however, their names were not recorded and the document was authenticated by only one seal (now fragmented belonging to Lackfi Dénes).⁷⁹ Two days later, on Monday (23 November) a pledge of an oath followed by an agreement was testified by Péter (the son of Iktár-i Betlen).⁸⁰ Unfortunately, the place was not recorded in this document but some suggestions can be made. It is sure that the letter of Péter was not issued at the regular *sedria* of the county as these were held on Thursdays in this period in both Mezősomlyó and in Haram.⁸¹ With regards to the possible reconstruction of the events it could be said that the noblemen

⁷⁶ November 13, 1400: DL 53094 – The case would not require the assistance of any co-deputies.

⁷⁷ Holub, “Zala megye,” *passim*.

⁷⁸ November 8, 1355: DF 285825 – this case is the exceptional one as the county authorities were asked to clarify the status of one portion of a land and then install it to its new owners; July 14, 1356: DL 91487, August 10, 1357: DL 91504, August 2, 1358: DL 91522, 1358: DL 91530.

⁷⁹ November 21, 1355: DL 91483.

⁸⁰ November 23, 1355: DL 51690.

⁸¹ See Table 8 containing the locality and the days of *sedrias* in the Appendix, as the detailed analysis of the regularity and the operation of the county tribunals in Krassó will be discussed in another paper (compare the incorrect data of Tuesday given in the work of Enikő Csukovits, “Sedriahelyek – megyeszékhelyek a középkorban,” *Történelmi Szemle* 39 [1997]: 382.).

involved in the oath taking most probably visited the general assembly where they must have agreed on Monday to take the oath and finish their dispute, so the county authorities were ordered to stay in Haram to testify the decision of the litigants. The task was done by Péter, who appears as the deputy of Krassó and ‘the captain of Galambóc’, and two noble judges.⁸² Since Galambóc belonged to the authority of the *ispán*, there is nothing surprising in it if Lackfi Dénes ordered his man from this castle to finish the case. The reason why the task was not set for his regular deputy, István (the son of Tamás), who, incidentally, was the captain of Haram, will remain the secret of Lackfi Dénes forever.

The case of Gáji Csölnök Péter also shows similar patterns. While Onori János (the son of István) headed the county authorities at four *sedrias* during 1368, 1369 and 1370⁸³, Csölnök Péter is mentioned only once as a deputy attending the judicial assembly held by Palatine Opuliai László in May 1370.⁸⁴ It is seen that Csölnök Péter was appointed *ad hoc* to be co-deputy for this occasion, however, compared to the previously given case, this time the limited number of sources makes it unable to continue any further inquiry to answer questions like why Opuliai László, who was hitherto the *ispán* of Krassó, chose specifically him instead of his deputy-in-charge, Onori János, or to find the reason why the palatine chose a man from the retainers of Himfi Benedek to this position.⁸⁵

⁸² The document was authenticated with three seals (November 23, 1355: DL 51690). – One of the noblemen involved in the agreement (István, the son of Vörös Domonkos) was from village Gyülvész located in the south of Krassó County which may also indicate that István did visit the general assembly held in Haram (Györffy III, 484.).

⁸³ June 15, 1368: DL 91739, September 13, 1369: DL 52139, July 27, 1370: DL 52161, September 21, 1370: DL 52175.

⁸⁴ The assembly was convoked to eradicate the thieves and robbers of Krassó County hence it included the panel of judges by name: the deputy, the noble judges and the noble jurors present (May 12, 1370: DL 91759 = DL 5860). On the judicial assemblies in the Temesköz region, see Suzana Andea, “The Palatine Assemblies from Timiș and Caraș Counties and the Documents They Issued in the 14th–16th Centuries,” *Transylvanian Review*, XXII, suppl. no. 4 (2013): 265–273 (esp. 271). On the letters of proscription issued at the judicial assemblies in 1370, see Ferenc Piti, “Opuliai László proskribáló oklevele (1370),” in Mária Homoki-Nagy, ed., *Ünnepi kötet Dr. Blazovich László egyetemi tanár 70. születésnapjára*, Acta Universitas Szegediensis. Acta Juridica et Politica vol. LXXV (Szeged, 2013), 553–557 (esp. 556–557). On the names of the noble judges and the elected jurors, see Szaszkó, “Krassó megye,” 65.

⁸⁵ The fact that Péter was a local nobleman would not provide an answer to the question since by that time Onori János had been in service for three years in Krassó which surely made him able to get to know the local affairs. It is also have to be omitted from the reasons for Péter’s appointment that he might have represented the interest of his lord (Himfi Benedek) at the assembly as a judge so as to influence the process of the proscription. Having observed the list of the nominated offenders, four serfs of the Himfis can be found in the list (*Bratyzlou [et] Bucha iobagiones magistrorum Benedicti et Petri filiorum Pauli filii Heem in villa Radymlya*

Finally, the so-called three-level administrative system has to be discussed related to the issue of the county administration. The structure of this system is described in the literature with the form of a *comes* – *comes/viccomes* – *subvicecomes/officialis et familiaris* pattern appearing in counties headed by the highest dignitaries.⁸⁶ Indeed, a few deputies from the 14th century are called *comes* instead of *viccomes* when high-rank barons headed Krassó County (Table 4), nevertheless, the fact that Kónyi Miklós and Geresgáli Jakab are mentioned as *familiares et vicecomites* of Szerdahelyi Imre (1421–25), the deputy of Ozorai Pipo in two documents from 1424 proves clearly that the authorities of Krassó also ran the county this way for a brief period of time.⁸⁷ However, at the present stage of the investigation there is no further sign of the appearance of this type of administration in any of the counties governed by Ozorai despite the fact that the “southern parts” were overseen by him for over two decades. Compared to the short duration of the tenures of Ozorai’s office holders in Krassó, the one of Szerdahelyi Imre was the longest amongst his deputies, so this fact might explain the need for the services of *subvicecomites*.

Table 4 – Deputies with the Title ‘Comes’

The Name of the Deputy	The Deputy of ...	Dates	Reference
István (the son of Tamás)	Lackfi Dénes (magister agazonum)	November 8, 1355	DF 285825.
		July 14, 1356	DL 91487.
Gaj-i Csölnök Péter	Himfi Benedek (Ban of Bulgaria)	August 2, [cca. 1370]	DL 47886.
László and István (the sons of Hidvég-i János)	[unknown – supposedly Szécsi Frank (Ban of Szörény)]	February 23, 1394	DL 52827.

The Noble Judges, the (Unum/Duos) Ex Nobis and the Men of the County

Naturally the *alispán* was not alone in sitting in judgment in the law-suits between the local noblemen at the sedria and in carrying out inquisitions and examinations ordered by the central courts. As a matter of fact, noble judges (*iudices nobilium*) were indispensable requisites of a noble county making the “classical” – count, deputy, noble judges – arrangement of the county authorities complete (notwithstanding, the county authorities from the late Angevin period meant the *alispán* and the noble judges). Sharp debates had been

residentes [...] Ratk iobagionem magistri Petri filii Heem in villa Egurzeg residentem and Blasium iobagionem magistri Petri filii Heem in Egurzegh commorantem [Piti, “Proskribáló,” 556–557]).

⁸⁶ Engel, “Archontológia, Ispánok – Bevezetés,” and C. Tóth, “Szabolcs megye,” 42–43.

⁸⁷ December 2, 1424: DL 54411 and 16 December, 1424: DL 54413 – The names of the *subvicecomites* are listed in the latest archontology of the county (Szaskó, “Krassó megye,” 63.).

pursued concerning the origins and functions of the office, but now it seems that the answer has been found: the name derived from the judge's function of helping the *alispán*, that is, according to the contemporary phrase: serving him (*szolgabíró* = servant judge). Until the middle of the 14th century, the office had been assumed by well-to-do local noblemen, and thereafter was increasingly monopolised by noblemen who had only a few serfs or none at all. However, the emergence of the lesser nobility among noble judges seemingly did not affect the respect they enjoyed by the county community.⁸⁸

Similarly to the majority of the Hungarian counties there were four acting noble judges in Krassó County. Compared to the counties in the Temesköz region, their activity and identity have been relatively well – though unevenly – recorded over the course of two centuries as almost 50 of them are known by name.⁸⁹ What is more, all together eleven documents contain the complete list of the noble judges of Krassó. Nine of them are from the first half of the 14th century (from the years of 1340, 1342, 1343, 1345, 1346 and 1349), while two remained from years 1357 and 1370. Complete lists were preserved basically on three occasions in Krassó County: 1) the noble judges were included in the superscription (*intitulatio*) in a regular law-suit⁹⁰, 2) when the *alispán* or the *ispán* of a county was involved in a legal case before the county tribunal, therefore, the name of the *alispán* was left out of the superscription indicating that the county authorities were represented by the noble judges⁹¹, 3) there are also accounts when the names of the noble judges were recorded at the assemblies as nominated members of the panel of judges.⁹²

Interestingly enough, from the 15th century there are no complete lists of noble judges at all. Only seven documents contain at least one or two names of

⁸⁸ Containing references to the earlier literature, especially to the works of Attila Zsoldos, see Tringli, "Megyék," 498–499, 509–510; C. Tóth, "Szabolcs megye," 60–63; and C. Tóth, "A nemesi megye," 408.

⁸⁹ For all references concerning the noble judges see: Szaszkó, "Krassó megye," 65 and the list in the Appendix of this paper. For the small number of the known noble judges from Temes County see Iusztin, "Noble Judges," 254.

⁹⁰ December 21, 1340: MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 169. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 77); May 15, 1343: MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 191. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 87); June 30, 1345: MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 210. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 97).

⁹¹ September 19, 1340: DL 91312, November 28, 1342: MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 185. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 81); March 30, 1346: DL 91368, September 17, 1349: DL 91401, October 1, 1349: DL 91404, October 22, 1349: DL 91408, December 17, 1349: DL 91409.

⁹² June 4, 1342: MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 181. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 84); October 6, 1357: MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 315. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 16/c/); May 12, 1370: DL 91759.

the noble judges. However, this fact does not mean that the number of noble judges was reduced to two in the Era of Sigismund at least until the summer of 1416. This is shown by the fact that some documents issued by the county start with the formula of *vicecomes et quatuor iudices nobilium* of Krassó without giving the exact names of each noble judges.⁹³ In addition to that, other documents preserved four or five traces of former seals belonging to the *alispán* and the four noble judges.⁹⁴ From 1416 onwards until 1439 a change in the number of the noble judges might be registered as the documents issued by the county authorities contain the traces or the fragments of only two or three seals (the *alispán*'s and one or two noble judges'). Nevertheless, it has to be noted that the practice of authentication by two or three seals had already existed before the mentioned period⁹⁵, but from the 1420s it can be counted as a sign of an alteration in the operation of the county authorities in Krassó. (Another phenomenon, the change in the use of the terminology referring to the men of the county from *homo noster* to *homo communis* and/or *virum nobilem* [see in details later] is also pointing towards the presumed modification of the system, which was most probably due to the desolation of the southern regions of the county).⁹⁶

Concerning the tasks, besides jurisdiction, the chief duty of the noble judges was to give testimony.⁹⁷ All the accessible documents issued by the county authorities of Krassó prove that they attended and participated in the inquests generating in the law-suits at the local *sedria* or they conducted on-site investigations upon royal command or upon the order by the highest courts of justice (for instance in prohibitions or in the cases of relocating serfs unlawfully by force). Next to that, they were the ones who were sent to summons the cited persons to appear in the court of law and pledges were also taken before them. It is also known that the noble judges took a significant role in tax-collection⁹⁸, but not any tax registers are available from Krassó County.

From the very beginning of the history of the noble counties, the authorities could always rely on the assistance of certain members of the local community

⁹³ For instance, October 17, 1405: DL 53260; March 20, 1406: DL 53283–84; August 7, 1406: DL 53341; January 7, 1407: DL 53368.

⁹⁴ March 20, 1406: DL 53283–84; February 15, 1416: DL 53879; March 19, 1435: DL 54916 (?); February 7, 1439: DL 55167 (?).

⁹⁵ Selected examples for two seals: September 1, 1387: DL 52558; June 21, 1404: DL 56518; August 29, 1411: DL 53597; December 16, 1424: DL 54413. Selected examples for three seals: September 1, 1387: DL 52559; January 22, 1392: DL 52751; November 13, 1400: DL 53094; October 4, 1438: DL 55146.

⁹⁶ This hypothesis will be discussed in details in a separate paper.

⁹⁷ C. Tóth, "Szabolcs megye," 68–69.

⁹⁸ C. Tóth, "A nemesi megye," 412–413.

to help their work. According to the study of István Kádas, these people can be grouped into three categories on the bases how they are called in the sources.⁹⁹ The largest group is made up of those who were entitled men of the county, which title clearly reflects to their authority and to the scope of their duties, namely, to provide *ad hoc* testimony on behalf of the county authorities or accompany the noble judges in conducting citations, inquisitions or imposing fines. While there were various expressions in use to refer to them (*homo vicecomitis*, *testimonium provinciae*, *homo provinciae*, *nobilis conprovincialis* etc.)¹⁰⁰, the most commonly used and the most widespread phrase for the men of the county in medieval Hungary, including Krassó County as well, was *homo noster*. Based on the comparative analysis of historian Kádas, the scope of operation of these “*homines*” differed in each medieval county, however, the proceedings can be categorised and certain methods of the authorities can be distinguished. Their number and function, for instance, depended on the counties and on the time period. In the north-eastern part of the Hungarian Kingdom these men were sent to do the less important tasks: they inquired in those proceedings which were under the authority of the county (e.g. Szabolcs, Abaúj, Sáros, Zemplén, Szatmár from the 15th century, and Bereg). In other counties, however, it could happen that the men of the county fulfilled their duties as a companion of one of the noble judges in lesser cases (e.g. Nyitra, Zala, Pozsony, Temes in the first half of the 14th century). This practice was more regularly applied in carrying out investigations ordered by either the king or by the chief courts of justice (e.g. Gömör, Tolna, Ugocsa), while in the counties of the Dunántúl the authorities were often complemented and accompanied by a clergyman sent from the *locus credibila* as a testimony.¹⁰¹ As far as Krassó County is concerned, it can be clear from the list provided in the Appendix (Table 9) – let alone a few exceptions from the 1340s – that the men of the county became active in accomplishing inquisitions and prohibitions from the 1360s. Later on, they took over further duties and replaced the noble judges in citations and imposing fines, what is more, they were involved in serf relocation issues as well. The authorities of Krassó also followed the general practice in investigations upon higher orders: in these cases either only the noble judges were in charge of the proceedings like in 1405 Bácskövics-i Borsi (*Borsy dictus*) László, in 1406 and 1407 Keresztes-i László and Szigeti János (once as *ex nobis*), or together with the men of the county, like in 1407 Szigeti János with Szigeti Kis (*Parvus*) Miklós or in 1415 Dávid with the same Miklós. In 1400 and in 1404, though, most probably the men of the county were executing the investigations, as there is no indication of

⁹⁹ Kádas, “Megyei emberek,” 108–113.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 109.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 116–119.

any titlature next to the names of Peszer-i *Chepan* Mihály, Gyalmar-i Miklós (the son of Simon) and Nendraz-i András.¹⁰²

Concerning the question of the men of the county, it has to be noted that all together there are 21 recorded cases when the men sent to the inquiries by the authorities of Krassó were called *homo communis* often with the expression *nobilis vir*. This practice became regular in the 1430s, following the sporadic appearance of this title from 1416, 1421 and 1427 (see the list in the Appendix [Table 9]). In 1416, the county authorities had a typical case to investigate: some wheat of the serfs of Gyürög-i Mihály was stolen and these serfs followed the traces of the thieves to Zalkafalva. It was less typical that the authorities sent the serf (!) of Lőrincfalva-i András called *Obrad* to the inquiry together with a man of the noble judges (*Obrad iobagio Andree filii Mathes de Lewrinchfalua tamquam communis homo unacum homine iudicis nobilium .. fassum extitit*), who, then, reported that the serfs of Zalkafalva had not cooperated with them.¹⁰³ Sending a serf to an investigation, however, never happened again (and before) in the recorded cases.

Since the men of the county had the same scope of authority like the royal men or the men of the palatine/*országbíró/bán/vajda*, it is not surprising to identify them as the neighbours, the relatives or the retainers of either the litigants or of the members of the county authorities.¹⁰⁴ In 1348, for instance, the authorities sent the *famulus* of one of the noble judges for a prohibition.¹⁰⁵ The involvement of Gegusfalva-i Péter in a case on behalf of the Pósafts was also not accidental as he was one of the neighbours of them¹⁰⁶, while Helimba-i István (the son of Bodó) acting as man of the county for the Himfis in 1344 appears to be nominated as a royal man for them in 1357.¹⁰⁷ It is also apparent that we can identify trustworthy members of the community in Krassó as members of the same noble families were often entrusted with duties related to the work of

¹⁰² See all the references in the Appendix (Table 9).

¹⁰³ January 27, 1416: DL 92477.

¹⁰⁴ Norbert C. Tóth, "Hiteleshely és a királyi különös jelenlét," *Századok* 135 (2001): 411, and Norbert C. Tóth, "Adatok a megyék és a hiteleshelyek közötti viszonyra a 14. és 15. században," *Századok* 136 (2002): 358–359.

¹⁰⁵ November 6, 1348: DL 91393.

¹⁰⁶ October 22, 1349: DL 91408, the possession of Gegusfalva was adjacent to the village of the Pósafts called Fark (*Kozmafalva*) (Györffy III. 483). The same relation can be identified between the Himfis and Kilián (the son of *Poraz*) when the latter was ordered to install two third of the possession called Bodorfalva to Himfi László in 1321 (May 17, 1321: MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 79. [Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 39.]). Kilián's possession called Kopajt was adjacent to Bodorfalva (Györffy III, 487, 492).

¹⁰⁷ March 11, 1344: DL 51280; February 11, 1357: MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 310. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 139)

the county authorities (see *Table 5*).¹⁰⁸ There are examples where both the father and his son(s) were respected (e.g. the Kopajt-i and the Tejed-i), in other cases the siblings were in charge of these tasks (e.g. the Gegusfalva-i and the Bajla-i), and examples to the involvement of relatives can also be found with the notification that the same reference to the residence does not always indicate family relationship among the lesser nobility (e.g. the Tejed-i, Fehéregyház-i, Bajla-i, Helimba-i and Györög-i families).

Table 5 – The Trustworthy Members of the Noble Community in Krassó

Family	Noble judge	Unum ex nobis	Men of the county	Noble juror
Kopajt-i	Márk (the son of Kilián) (1342, 1343, 1345, 1346) Miklós (1347)		Kilián [1319–1325] Miklós (the son of Kilián) (1343)	
Gegusfalva-i	István (the son of Gegus) (1340, 1349, 1350)	Lukács (the son of Gegus) (1360)	Péter (the son of Gegus) (1349)	István (1357) Péter (1370)
Tejed-i	Vajda Imre (1342, 1343)	György (the son of Imre) (1357) Mihály (the son of Tejedi Dénes) (1358)		
Fehéregyház-i	Mihály (the son of Péter) (1370)	Mihály (the son of Kemen) (1355)		Mihály (the son of Kemen) (1357)
Bajla-i		László and János (the sons of Pető) (1355) Miklós (the son of Mihály) (1355)	László and János (the sons of Pető) (1362)	
Halimba-i	Imre (the son of János) (1370)	Mihály and László (the sons of Miklós) (1387)		István (the son of Bodó) (1357)
Györög-i	Miklós (1424)	László (the son of Him) (1360) Miklós (1422)	László (1360) Márk (1396, 1412)	

As far as the *homines communes* from the 1430s are concerned, many of

¹⁰⁸ A list similar to this one was made in Szabolcs County (see C. Tóth, “Szabolcs megye,” 65–66).

them appear as procurators for the Himfi family (see *Table 6*). Members of the Bilicei family were regularly in charge of investigations initiated by the Himfis, while it is known about Egresi Bodor Mihály, who actively participated in the administrative life of the county, that he was the *officialis* of Ankó, the widow of Himfi Imre.¹⁰⁹

Table 6 – Homo Communis and Procurators

Name	Man of the County or <i>Homo Communis</i>	Procurator
Toma István	1430	Oct. 28, 1430. (DL 54724.)
Bilicei Bertalan	1431	May 14, 1435. (DL 54928.)
Bilicei Bereck	1433, 1436, 1437	March 16, 1437. (DL 55073.) April 13, 1437. (DL 55121.) June 8, 1439. (DL 44253.)
Csákány Miklós	1433, 1437	Oct. 28, 1430. (DL 54724.), May 14, 1435. (DL 54928.) March 16, 1437. (DL 55073.)
Bodor Mihály (the son of Egresi Péter)	1433, April 27, 1437., July 20, 1437., Sept. 14, 1437. [without year: DL 47931.]	Oct. 28, 1430. (DL 54724.), Nov. 30, 1434. (DL 54902.) March 16, 1437. (DL 55073.) April 13, 1437. (DL 55121.)
Bilicei Miklós	1435, April 27, 1437., July 20, 1437., Sept. 14, 1437	March 16, 1437. (DL 55073.) April 13, 1437. (DL 55121.)
Jenői László (the son of Lukács)	1433	May 14, 1435. (DL 54928.) ? March 16, 1437. (DL 55073.) ¹
Nendraz-i László (the son of Lukács)	March 16, 1437.	Oct. 28, 1430. (DL 54724.), May 14, 1435. (DL 54928.) ? March 16, 1437. (DL 55073.) ¹
Torma János	March 5, 1435.	Oct. 28, 1430. (DL 54724.)
Craguli János (the son of János)	April 13, 1437.	May 14, 1435. (DL 54928.) April 13, 1437. (DL 55121.)

¹ It is not sure which László (Jenő-i or Nendraz-i) is meant by the notary as his landed possession is not indicated in the source.

With reference to the social background of these men, it can be said that similarly to other counties the noble judges and the men accompanying them were recruited from the lesser but not the poorest strata of the nobility.¹¹⁰ It did not mean, though, that sometimes the duties could not have been done by more prestigious noblemen, for instance in 1342, when Magyar István was

¹⁰⁹ July 20, 1437: DL 55097.

¹¹⁰ C. Tóth, "Szabolcs megye," 67.

in charge of a prohibition for Himfi Pál.¹¹¹ It is not known for sure, but the Himfis might have intended to put an emphasis on their claim with sending the relative of Magyar Pál (the captain of Gimes), who, otherwise, was their neighbours as well.¹¹² A century later, in 1433, Jobus László was listed amongst the investigators with the title: captain of Kövesd (hence he was the man of the Macedónia-i family).¹¹³ All in all, despite belonging to the lesser nobility the men of the county enjoyed local prestige and relations.

The second group includes those noblemen who conducted inquiries bearing the seal of the authorities, which indicated greater credibility for the mission. According to the studies on the topic, this practice was relatively common in certain periods of time in Abaúj, Gömör, Bereg, Ugocsa, Szatmár, Szabolcs, Tolna and Temes Counties.¹¹⁴ In Krassó, however, there is only one account from 1367 which mentions that the investigation was conducted by a nobleman submitting the seal of the county authorities. Pál, the *kenez* of Or, lodged a complaint against Balázs, the son of Pósa, in which he lamented that the men of Balázs had broken into his house and robbed it. The investigation – carried out by *Urusnuk-i Mihály* (*Michaellem nobilem de Urusnuk unum ex nobis cum nostro sigillo*) –, however, clarified that the men of Balázs had only retaken those sheep which had been taken earlier to Or by *Rad*, one of the serfs of Balázs from *possessio Zinis*, who had secretly and illegally left to Or but then returned to the possession of Balázs.¹¹⁵

The third group is made up of those people commissioned to carry out inquests whose name is followed by the syntagm (*unum/duos*) *ex nobis*. According to the studies of C. Tóth Norbert, Kádas István and Iusztin Zoltán, the use of these expressions obviously indicates a more formal relationship existing between the person and the county authorities than the men of the county had with the latter. However, the dangers of the automatic identification of the persons referred to as (*unum/duos*) *ex nobis* with noble judges have also

¹¹¹ August 1, 1342: MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 182. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 83)

¹¹² István was most probably the son of Tamás, who was known to be the brother of Magyar Pál in 1331 (MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 118. [Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 58/b]. He and his descendants resided in Krassó County which is known from the fact that the family was named after the possession called Ermény donated to Magyar Pál in 1323 (DL 40432). Magyar István also held offices: he was the subcaptain of Gimes in 1339 and the captain of Tihany in 1346 (Engel, "Archontológia, Várnagyok és várbirtokosok – Gimes, Tihany").

¹¹³ August 1, 1433: DL 54819.

¹¹⁴ Kádas, "Megyei emberek," 109–110; C. Tóth, "Szabolcs megye," 68–69; Iusztin, "Noble Judges," 258, 261–262.

¹¹⁵ July 29, 1367: DL 91729.

been pointed out by them.¹¹⁶ All together there are sixteen documents which mention at least one person as (*unum/duos*) *ex nobis* in Krassó County. The first appearance of such men in 1355 (see below) highlights some of those factors which should be taken into consideration before the extension of the list of noble judges with those men who appear with these formulas.

April 30, 1355:	Bajlai László (the son of Pető) <i>unum ex nobis</i> (DL 91475.)
September 3, 1355:	Bak Péter and Jakab <i>iudices nobilium</i> (DL 51674.)
November 8, 1355:	Bak Péter, Fejéregyházi Mihály, Bajlai László, Bajlai János (the sons of Pető) and Bajlai Miklós (the son of Mihály) <i>ex nobis</i> (DF 285825.)
In 1362:	Bajlai László and Bajlai János <i>homo noster</i> (DL 51964–65.)

What can be deduced from these facts? From 1355 two of the noble judges are known by name: Bak Péter and Jakab who testified a pledge of an estate at the sedria of Haram. In November, to a certain extent related to the above mentioned pledge, the county authority sent five men from among themselves (*ex nobis*) to clarify the status, then install a portion of village Gyülvész as *quarta puellarum*. Can we identify any of the listed persons as noble judges? As far as Bak Péter is concerned, the answer is obvious since he was the noble judge two months earlier, but what about the rest of the participants? No matter how tempting it is to see that the county authorities sent all four noble judges together with a man of the county to do the task, the answer would be no to the question. First, unless the election of noble judges in Krassó happened in the autumn, it is very unlikely that the other noble judge, Jakab was replaced during September and October. Therefore, it is better not to consider the rest of the participants to be noble judges. The regular appearance of Bajlai László and János in matters related to the county authorities supports rather their trustworthy status in the local noble community than the fact that they were noble judges.¹¹⁷

Referring to the conclusions drawn from the examples of various counties, the (*unum* or *duos*) *ex nobis* formula did not always expose automatically the noblemen's status as judges. Examining the other cases when the notaries of Krassó County indicated (*unum* or *duos*) *ex nobis* next to the names of the empowered men, it can be concluded that very few of them can be added to the

¹¹⁶ Kádas, "Megyei emberek," 110–113; C. Tóth, "Szabolcs megye," 58; Iusztin, "Noble Judges," 256.

¹¹⁷ Iusztin Zoltán investigating the noble judges in Temes County, however, suggested that the regular participation of a person in the county affairs may indicate a noble judge status (Iusztin, "Noble Judges," 258).

list of noble judges. In 1360, both Györög-i László and (Gegusfalva-i) Lukács were mentioned as *unus ex nobis homo noster* indicating that they were not noble judges, which is proved by the fact that few months later the same László was simply called *homo noster*. Similarly to the latter we can read in a report of an investigation from 1407 that (Szigeti) János (the son of Miklós), a noble judge and Szigeti Kis Miklós *ex nobis* were in charge of the enquiry. In 1415, however, Dávid, the noble judge and *unum ex nobis* was accompanied by the same Miklós, whose title was omitted this time. Less can be said about Zerye (the son of Hazen *nobilis ex nobis* – 1357), Mihály (the son of Tejed-i Dénes *unum ex nobis* – 1358), Varány-i Farkas Péter (*unum ex nobis* – 1358), János (the son of Gergely) and László (the son of Csernőci Jakab *ex nobis* – 1364), Csákány Domonkos (*unum ex nobis* – 1375), Mihály and László (the sons of Miklós *unum ex nobis* – 1387) who were in charge of the proceedings only once and whose family ties or landed possessions give no further hints either about their status or their operation.¹¹⁸

Given that some of the noble judges appear with the *comes* appellative, which shows a somewhat more esteemed social status within the noble society, it may also indicate that the men *ex nobis* referenced with this title could be included among the members of the county law court.¹¹⁹ In Krassó County, the first known noble judges, János and Miklós were entitled *comes*, later judges Csire Péter (1350) and Bugrud-i Jakab (the son of Jakab) (1374) were mentioned with this title. In 1352 and in 1357, however, the county authorities empowered two men with the *comes* appellative, but not the noble judges. First, it was Tövissed-i Paznad, a man of the county (*comitem Paznad de Tyvissed hominem nostrum*), then it was Máté (*comitem Matheum filium Pauli de Mych*) together with Zerye (the son of Hazen) *bonos nobiles ex nobis* who were sent to investigate certain complaints.¹²⁰ As far as it is known, Tövissed was a significant village in the county with a market¹²¹, therefore, its possessor is thought to be a respected member of the noble community of Krassó, which may explain the use of the *comes* title in this context. As for Máté and Zerye, the phrase *bonos nobiles ex nobis* might emphasise their not well-known noble status suggesting that they were descendants of families with *kenezian* origin.¹²² To

¹¹⁸ See all the references in the Appendix (Table 9).

¹¹⁹ Iusztin, "Noble Judges," 257.

¹²⁰ See all the references in the Appendix (Table 9).

¹²¹ Györffy III, 497.

¹²² This hypothesis is based on the following facts: 1) *Mych* is probably identical with village Mikcs (*Mychk*) mentioned in law suit in 1436, as one of its possessors, *Mychk-i* János (the son of Lőrinc), occupied some parts of Sándorpataka and attached these parts to his possession called Uróc (*Wrocz*). Three noblemen from Mikcs were also listed amongst the nominated royal

conclude, neither Tövissed-i Paznad, nor Mych-i Máté would be added to the list of the noble judges of Krassó despite the fact that the notary used the *comes* appellative.

From the set of data below, however, it is quite evident that the years of operation of Szigeti János as a noble judge can be extended. He was twice mentioned with this title, though, not consecutively. His third appearance as *nobilem ex nobis* between the two may imply that he held the office of *iudex nobilium* in 1406 as well. Another fact that supports the suggestion is the nature of the task he was asked to do. It was an order from the *országbíró* to inquire a complaint. As it was mentioned earlier, such cases were often investigated by the noble judges, though not exclusively, as other examples from Krassó show that.

May 5, 1401:	Szigeti János <i>iudex nobilium</i> (DL 53112.)
March 20, 1406:	Szigeti János <i>nobilem ex nobis</i> (DL 53284.)
August 20, 1407:	Szigeti János <i>iudex nobilium</i> (DL 53389.)
August 29, 1411:	Szigeti János (without titles, considered as <i>homo noster</i>) (DL 53597.)

Alongside the “classical” – count, deputy, noble judges – arrangement of the county authorities, other offices existed as well, for instance, the county notary, although, he was rarely mentioned in the sources, actually in Krassó not at all. As many of the charters issued by the county authorities refer to the role of the noble jurors (*iurati assessores*), more is known about these ad-hoc-elected nobles, who are proved to have participated in the work of the *sedrias* and the assemblies (known by name in Krassó County from 1357 and 1370).¹²³ It is important not to mix the noble jurors with the institution of elected jurors (*electi iurati assessores*) officially set up in 1486, although the latter took almost the same charges: they took part in the judicial work of the county courts and

men (Miklós, László and János) (November 25, 1436: DL 55050). Suggesting from the villages mentioned in the source, Mikcs can be located to the district of castle Illyéd, consequently to a region populated by lots of *kenezian* families, some of whom were ennobled (Pesty, Krassó, vol. II/2, 34–35, 156, 226–227). 2) The names of both *Zerye* and his father, *Hazen* suggest the non Hungarian origin of the family, which rather indicate a *kenezian* status. It is very likely that the person called *Hosyn* mentioned in a case in 1349, in which he and his officialis called *Rugas* were prohibited from the illegal use of the forests of the Pósafts in village *Warofolua* (February 19, 1349: DL 91399), is identical with the father of *Zerye*. Three decades later, another nobleman called Tejed-i Farkas is mentioned as the son of *Hazyn* (May 17, 1380: DL 91871; as deceased – June 7, 1385: DL 91915). Although the late appearance of Farkas makes it a bit uncertain whether his father was the same as *Zerye*’s, it can be considered that the family reached the noble status by possessing parts in Tejed in South-Krassó.

¹²³ Szaszko, “Krassó megye,” 65.

carried out other occasional commissions (connected with tax collection and county affairs).¹²⁴

Having examined the groups of people involved in the work of the county authorities, the duration of the office of the noble judges is to be discussed to see whether it provided a career or not. Although the post of noble judge was less and less attractive (from the point of view that the judges were recruited from the lesser nobility), it can be observed all over the country that the persons who did assume the office functioned for several years and sometimes for more than a decade.¹²⁵ Taking the example of Péter (the son of Domonkos), who was in charge for 9 years almost consecutively, and other noble judges listed in *Table 7* it can be assumed that the regular practice followed by the noble community of Krassó was similar to the above mentioned pattern. It is also apparent, though the data are mostly available from the 1340s and 1350s in Krassó County, that in terms of its personnel, the office had become stable and changes were made only slowly and gradually.¹²⁶ Both the noble judges, the *ex nobis* and the men of the county enjoyed local prestige and relations, consequently, it can be observed that certain families became the trustworthy members of the local nobility (see *Table 5*). Due to the limited number of the sources, most of them seem to operate for a short period of time, but as the example of István (the son of Gegus) proves it, the community could return to its trustworthy members after several years, so it could have happened with others as well.

Table 7 – The Duration of the Office Holding of the Noble Judges in Krassó County

Name	Family/Locality	Years in the office	Duration (years)
Péter (the son of Domonkos)	Gyalmár	1341, 1342, 1343, 1345, 1346, 1348, 1349, 1350, 1353	9
Csire Péter (the son of Boksa)	Csatár	1342, 1343, 1349, 1350	4
Bak Péter		1345, 1348, 1355, 1357	4
Márk (the son of Kilián)	Perdej	1342, 1343, 1345, 1346	4
István (the son of Gegus)	Gegusfalva	1340, 1349, 1350	3
Vajda Imre	Tejed	1342, 1343	2
András (the son of Péter)		1345, 1346	2
János (the son of Miklós)	Sziget	1401, 1406, 1407	3

¹²⁴ C. Tóth, “Szabolcs megye,” 71–75 and C. Tóth, “A nemesi megye,” 410.

¹²⁵ C. Tóth, “Szabolcs megye,” 64–65; C. Tóth, “A nemesi megye,” 409.

¹²⁶ Szaszko, “Krassó megye,” 64–65, and see also the data in the Appendix (Table 9) of the present study. The phenomenon is described as a trend existing countrywide in the Era of Sigismund (C. Tóth, “Szabolcs megye,” 64–65).

Name	Family/Locality	Years in the office	Duration (years)
László (the son of Pető)	Keresztes	1406, 1407	2
Miklós	Györög	1422, 1424	2

Besides becoming the retainer of a lord in the framework of the *familiaritas*, serving the county authorities as a noble judge also afforded an equally respected and a relatively desired career for the members of the lesser nobility, not least because it provided a certain amount of income. The nature of their duties also makes it reasonable that their office required an unaffiliated status, however, this hypothesis can be challenged. Knowing that the social network of medieval noble society was strongly linked both horizontally (e.g. through possessions and family ties) and vertically (e.g. through *familiaritas* and other forms of services), it seems very unlikely for the noble judges to be unaffected by such arrangement. While the possible affiliation of the men of the county with the litigants is more evident (as it has been highlighted in several studies)¹²⁷, the same issue has not been investigated with regard to noble judges. It is difficult to distinguish why noble judges (or the relatives of them) occasionally appear as nominated royal men for specific lords. At least, it raises the question whether such noble judges acted as retainers of these lords, so their office holding was affiliated, or they happened to become royal men simply because they were the trustworthy and well-known members of the community, consequently, their activity was unaffiliated and it cannot be described within the framework of lord-retainer relationship.

The limited number of sources in Krassó will not make us able to answer directly these questions, but the analysis of the social network of better documented counties will hopefully contribute to it. The exact cases are from the most documented period of Krassó County (the first half of the 14th century) when the archives of both the Himfi and the Pósaí families are available providing satisfactory amount of data to examine the issue. With regard to the Himfi family, in 1331 the nominated royal men for them were Miklós (the son of Simon) – the one who carried out the investigation upon royal order with the men sent from the chapter of Csanád – and another Miklós (the son of *Mayos*)¹²⁸ of whom the first is most probably identical with the noble judge of Krassó from 1330. In 1333, he was listed again – together with Szakállas (*Zakalas dictus*) Pál – for Himfi Pál upon royal order to inquire about the abuse

¹²⁷ See note nr. 104 and Kádas, “Megyei emberek,” 119–121.

¹²⁸ August 15, 1331 > October 26, 1331: MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 119 and 122. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 57)

of village Remete.¹²⁹ Ordas (*dictus*) Miklós – one of the noble judges in 1349 – also appeared twice as nominated royal man for the Himfis in 1334 and in 1345.¹³⁰ As for the Pósa family, at the end of 1342, Szeri Pósa claimed to separate his possessions called Küke and Vetelnek from the neighbouring lands with establishing new bounds around his estates. All together there were three nominated royal men for him to testify the borders: one of them was Bereck (the son of Dénes) (see earlier), the other one was one of the acting noble judges of Krassó, namely Vajda (*dictus*) Imre, and finally Miklós (the son of Ivanka) – who actually testified the borders with the man sent from the chapter of Arad in 1343¹³¹ –, whose brother Márk was also the member of the county authorities in 1340. In addition to that, the son of Imre, called Máté, acted as one of the *probi viri* in a border dispute between Pósa János and Jánki Miklós in 1349. A year later he installed the Pósa family to possession Fark (Kozmafalva) and in 1354 it was Máté again who carried out an inquiry to the protest of the Pósa family against Jánki Miklós.¹³² Knowing these facts, it is not surprising if we find the brother of Máté, called György being in charge of another inquisition as man of the county for the Pósa family in 1357, and what is more, he appears as royal man for Pósa László in 1358, too.¹³³ Interestingly enough, the aforementioned Ordas Miklós acted as a procurator for the Pósa family as well when he represented Balázs (the son of Pósa) at the court of the *országbíró* in 1360.¹³⁴

At this moment, these cases are the ones from Krassó County which may unfold specific interconnecting relations between the local lords from the noble elite¹³⁵ and the noble judges. Some facts are pointing towards a more direct affiliation (the cases of the Himfis), however, most of the given data rather prove that the noble judges (or their relatives) happened to be in charge of such duties because on the one hand, they knew well the legal cases between the litigants since they were neighbours, but on the other hand, their trustworthy status could also have been taken into consideration when they were chosen to act as royal men.

¹²⁹ August 20, 1333: DL 40649.

¹³⁰ March 23, 1334: MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 132. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 66), February 23, 1345: MNL P 1732, Fekete, *Temesi bánság*, box 1 fol. 208. (Batth. Miscell. Heimiana Nr. 99)

¹³¹ November 11, 1342 > January 15, 1343: DL 91330.

¹³² October 22, 1349: DL 91408; November 30, 1350: DL 91421; February 28: 1354 > April 19, 1354: DL 91462.

¹³³ July 13, 1357: DL 91491; December 2, 1358: DL 91528.

¹³⁴ May 10, 1360: DL 91549.

¹³⁵ For the term 'noble elite' see Tamás Pálosfalvi, *The Noble Elite in the Country of Körös (Križevci) 1400–1526* [Magyar Történelmi Emlékek. Értekezések] (Budapest, 2014), 7–8, 401–414.

Summary

The main objectives of the paper were to get an insight into the operation of the county authorities of Krassó through its personnel and to compare it with the findings of the literature. For this, the participants of all levels of the county administration were included in the analysis: the already existing lists of the *ispáns*, the deputies and of the noble judges have now been extended by the men called *ex nobis* and the men of the county. First, the prestige of being the head of Krassó was examined to see whether it had any impact on the administration of the county. It can be stated that it was the first half of the 14th century when the *ispáns* were the most regularly present in person in their offices and their absence did not necessarily follow from the fact that they were often high ranking dignitaries. However, from the 1360s the *ispáns* disappeared from the county administration leaving the direction of the county court and judicial work to the deputy or deputies similarly to the general tendency prevailing in medieval Hungary. In the second part of the paper, the operation of the county was discussed from a socio-historical aspect focusing on the careers and the affiliation of some deputies. In this chapter, firstly, the method of revealing lord-retainer relationships was adopted in order to make attempts to clarify the identity of certain *ispáns* (more successfully in the case of palatine Opuliai László, less fruitfully in the case of the *ispáns* in the 1390s). In addition to that it was also intended to draw a more vivid and lively image about the office holders of Krassó through their careers. This aim was borne in mind during the discussion of the involvement of the deputies in the county administration while considering features like duties, titles, the length of the tenure, the dual office holding – the existence of co-deputies, and the three-level administrative system. Last but not least, the question of “the indispensable requisites” of the noble counties (the noble judges) was revised including those men – the men called *ex nobis* and the men of the county – who accompanied and/or replaced them in their duties. The classification of these people not only enabled us to make remarks on the changes that took place in the county administration or to see whether the list of the noble judges could be extended or not, but it also allowed us to make suggestions about the dynamics of the noble community, for instance by recognising the trustworthy members of the county and by identifying their social status as well. With reference to the latter, the analysis of these groups included a new aspect of investigation which was focusing on the affiliation of the noble judges. Although the issue has remained undecided – since the sources from Krassó County do not provide satisfactory number of evidence –, it may offer an additional facet of research in order that the operation of the county authorities can be understood in a better way.

APPENDIX

The Archontology of Krassó County (1319–1439)¹³⁶**Kacsics nb. Simon** (1319–1325)

Balázs [1319] IX 1. – 1325. IX. 15.

Szeri Pósa (1325–46)

1346. XI. 25. e.

Pósa 1325. IX. 15.

László 1331. VIII. 27.

Péter (the son of Loránd) 1340. XII. 21. – 1344. III. 11.

Beke (*Bekov*) 1342. XI. 28.

Fejes Gergely mg. 1345. VI. 30. – 1346. VII. 20.

Szécsényi Tamás (1346–49)

Rimai Mihály mg., captain of Haram 1346. XII. 4. – 1349. VI. 25. (Himfi 225/114.)

János (the son of Szeri Pósa) (1349–50)

Péter (the son of Him) mg. 1349. IX. 26. – 1350. I. 14.

Szeri Pósa (second time, 1350–52)

1352. XI. 8.

László (the son of Szeri Pósa) ([135]1–53)

Bereck (the son of Dénes) 1352. X. 18. – 1353. IV. 25.

[István (the son of Szeri Pósa)] (1353)

1353. XI. 22.

Szécsi Miklós (1354–55)

Miklós mg. 1355. IV. 16. – 1355. IV. 30.

¹³⁶ This simplified archontology contains the list of *ispáns* (in bold) and the deputies of Krassó County without any references on *cursus honorum* and sources. For these references see the work of Pál Engel (Engel, “Archontológia, Ispánok – Krassó megye”) and the study of Elek Szasztkó (Szasztkó, “Krassó megye,” 61–63), however, two exceptions were made. Source references can be found for deputies Rimai Mihály and Gyertyánosi Csep Jakab as these data provide additional information compared to the previous publications. The purpose of the present list is to avoid disambiguation of *ispáns* and deputies caused by some unfortunate typographical mistakes in the study of Elek Szasztkó.

Lackfi Dénes (1355–60)

István (the son of Kupsa Tamás); mg., comes, captain of Haram 1355. IX. 8. – 1358. VIII. 2.

Péter (the son of Iktári Betlen) mg., captain of Galambóc 1355. XI. 23.

István (the son of Lőrinc) mg., captain of Haram, the *ispán* of Keve 1359. XII. 12. – 1360. VI. 11.

László (the son of János); mg., captain of Haram 1360. VIII. 27.

Fedémesi Szobonya László (1361–65)

(Besenyői) Lőrinc (the son of Domokos) mg., captain of Haram 1362. IV. 21. – 1364. VIII. 22.

Himfi Benedek (1365–67)

Sárosdi János (the son of Péter) mg., captain of Haram 1367. IV. 8.

Gáji Péter (the son of Csölnök) mg., captain of Haram [without year] VIII. 2. (as comes)

[Oppelni László nádor] (1367–71)

István (the son of István); mg., captain of Haram 1367. VII. 29.

(Onori) János (the son of István) mg., captain of Haram 1368. VI. 15. – 1370. IX. 21.

Gáji Péter (the son of Csölnök) mg., captain of Haram 1370. V. 12.

[Himfi Benedek (másodszor)] (1371–75)

Miklós (the son of Himfi Pál) mg., captain of Haram 1374. VIII. 17. – 1375. VII. 21.

[Garai Miklós] (1375–86)

Monchlow mg., captain of Haram 1376. III. 8.

Csupor (*dictus*) Tamás mg. 1379. V. 4. – 1382. IX. 6.

[Losonci László, ifj. and Losonci István] (1386–88)

(Majosfalvi) Miklós (the son of Majos) 1387. IX. 1. – 1387. IX. 30.

Kórógyi István (1389)

[unknown] (1389–1394)

Demeter (the son of Ernye/Irineus) mg. 1392. I. 22.

László és István (the sons of Hídvégi János) with the title comes 1394. II. 23.

Csáki Miklós and Marcali Miklós (1394–1402)

(Majosfalvi) Miklós (the son of Beke) 1396. V. 2. – 1401. V. 5.

Ivándi Gergely 1400. XI. 13.

[Kórógyi Fülöp and Alsáni János the *ispáns* of Temes] (1404)

(Dobszai) Benedek (the son of Egyed) mg., captain of Érsmlyó 1404. IV. 12. – 1404. VII. 19.

Bardus László mg., captain of Érsmlyó 1404. IV. 12.

(Bekefalvi) Jakab (the son of Beke) captain of Érsmlyó 1404. VII. 19. – 1404. X. 25.

Ozorai Pipo (1404–26)

Csapi Pál and Töli Bálint 1405. VII. 30. – 1406. III. 20.

(Derecskei) Pál (the son of Lőrinc) mg. 1406. X. 30. – 1407. VIII. 20.

Gyertyánosi Csép Jakab mg. 1408. XI. 24.¹³⁷ – 1409. VIII. 23.

(Benkefalvi) Benke Péter mg., captain of Haram 1409. XII. 21.

Szanai Jurga mg. 1411. VI. 6. – 1411. VIII. 29.

Kopácsi Fodor László mg. 1412. V. 21. – 1412. XI. 12.

Ábeli Jakab 1415. VI. 22.

Benkefalvi Benke Péter mg. (second time) and (Szarvastelki) Vaski László mg. 1416. I. 27. – 1418. X. 22.

Mekcsei (*de Mixe*) Imre (the son of Péter) 1421. IV. 26.

Szerdahelyi Imre (the son of János) mg. 1421. XI. 15. – 1425. VII. 14.

his (sub)vicecomites: Kónyi Mikós és Geresgáli Jakab 1424. XII. 2 – 1424. XII. 16.

Harapki Botos András and Harapki Botos László (1427)

1427. XI. 8.

Tallóci Matkó (1429–35)

(benkefalvi) Benke Miklós 1430. IX. 16. – 1431. VIII. 18.

Tallóci Frank (1429–38)

Csamai Ördög Domokos 1433. VIII. 1.

Dóci Mihály 1435. III. 5. – 1435. V. 14.

¹³⁷ He has already been mentioned as captain of Érsmlyó in April 29, 1408 (DL 53415.)

(Szarvastelki) Vaski Tamás 1436. XII. 15. – 1437. VII. 20.
 Remetei Himfi Miklós and Frank 1437. IX. 14. – 1438. II. 22.
 Dobozi János 1438. X. 4.
 Szentlászlói Balázs 1438. X. 4. – 1439. II. 7.
 (Keresztesi) Sáfár Simon 1438. X. 4. – 1439. II. 7.
 Perdői István 1439. II. 7.

[**Hunyadi János**] (1441–56)

Pocsaji László (vice)comes, (vice)comes of Temes 1453. VII. 13.

Table 8 – The Locality of the Sedrias

The Angevin Era (1301–1387)	Mezősomlyó (nearby the church of King Saint Stephen) – Thursday (1331–1353) Szerdahely – Thursday (1354–1357) Mezősomlyó – Saturday (1364–1382; 1387)	Haram – Thursday (1343–1380)
The Era of Sigismund (1387–1437)	Mezősomlyó – Saturday (1392; 1400–1439)	Omor – Monday (1394) Gatály – Tuesday (1396) Hám – Monday (1416)

Table 9 – The Complete List of the Noble Judges, the Ex Nobis and the Men of the County

Noble Judges	Ex Nobis	Men of the County	Date	Place	Trace of the record
			1319. III. 9.		DL 50668.
János (comes), Miklós (comes)		Kilián	[1319–1325]		DL 60117. = Krassó III. 8/5–6.
			1325. IX. 15.		Himfi 48/99.
Miklós (the son of Simon)			1330. VII. 4.		DL 91246.
István (the son of Gegus), Márk (the son of Ivánka), Vajk (magister), Vörös (<i>Rufus</i>) Kozma			1340. IX. 19.	Haram – general assembly	DL 91312.
			1340. XII. 21.	Mezősomlyó	Himfi 77/169.
Péter (the son of Domonkos), Dénes (the son of Miklós)		Miklós (the son of Márton)	1341. XI. 29.	nearby the church of King Saint Stephen (Mezősomlyó)	Himfi 79/176.
Péter (the son of Domonkos), Márk (the son of Kilián), Vajda Imre, Csire Péter			1342. VI. 4.	Érsomlyó – general assembly	Himfi 84/181.
Péter (the son of Domonkos), Márk (the son of Kilián)		Magyar István	1342. VIII. 1.	nearby the church of King Saint Stephen (Mezősomlyó)	Himfi 83/182.
			1342. VIII. 8.	nearby the church of King Saint Stephen (Mezősomlyó)	DL 101899.
Péter (the son of Domonkos), Dénes (the son of Miklós), (volt) Vajda Imre, Péter (the son of Boksa)			1342. XI. 28.	nearby the church of King Saint Stephen (Mezősomlyó)	Himfi 81/185.

Noble Judges	Ex Nobis	Men of the County	Date	Place	Trace of the record
Péter (the son of Domonkos), Márk (the son of Kilián), Vajda Imre, Csire Péter			1343. V. 15.	Haram	Himfi 87/191.
		Miklós (the son of Kilián)	1343. XI.27.	nearby the church of King Saint Stephen (Mezősomlyó)	DL 51261.
		János (the son of Csépan)	1343. XII.18.	nearby the church of King Saint Stephen (Mezősomlyó)	DL 51265.
		István (the son of Bodó)	1344. III. 11.	nearby the church of King Saint Stephen (Mezősomlyó)	DL 51280.
András (the son of Péter), Péter (the son of Domonkos), Bak Péter, Márk (the son of Kilián)			1345. VI. 30.	Haram	Himfi 97/210.
András (the son of Péter), Péter (the son of Domonkos), Lukács (the son of Miklós), Márk (the son of Kilián)			1346. III. 30.	Haram	DL 91368.
Péter (the son of Domonkos), András (the son of Márk)			1346. VI. 29.	nearby the church of King Saint Stephen (Mezősomlyó)	DL 41015.
			1346. VII. 20.	nearby the church of King Saint Stephen (Mezősomlyó)	DL 41016.

Noble Judges	<i>Ex Nobis</i>	Men of the County	Date	Place	Trace of the record
Lukács (the son of Lőrinc), Miklós (the son of Kilián)			1347. VIII. 27.		DL 91381.
Lukács (the son of Miklós), Jakab (the son of András)			1347. XI. 22.	Haram	DL 41063.
Péter (the son of Domonkos)			1348. VI. 26.		Himfi 113/246., DL 41093.
		The <i>famulus</i> of one of the noble judges	1348. XI. 6.	Haram	DL 91393.
Bak Péter		Kisarasnoki István (the son of Tamás)	1348. XII. 11.	Haram	DL 91397.
		Péter (the son of Gegus)	1349. II. 19.	Haram	DL 91399.
Péter (the son of Domonkos), Ordas Miklós			[1349.] VII. 4.	Mezősomlyó	Himfi 257.
Csire Péter, István (the son of Gegus), Péter (the son of Domonkos), Ordas Miklós			1349. IX. 17.	Haram	DL 91401.
		András (the son of Benedek)	1349. X. 1.	Haram	DL 91404.
		Péter (the son of Gegus)	1349. X. 22.	Haram	DL 91408.
			1349. XII. 17.	Haram	DL 91409.
Csire Péter (comes), István (the son of Gegus)			1350. I. 14.	Haram	DL 91411.
		Tövissedi Paznand (comes)	1352. X. 18.	nearby the church of King Saint Stephen (Mezősomlyó)	Himfi 125/285.

Noble Judges	Ex Nobis	Men of the County	Date	Place	Trace of the record
Péter (the son of Domonkos)			1353. IV. 1.	Mezősomlyó	Himfi 132/292.
			1353. IV. 25.	nearby the church of King Saint Stephen (Mezősomlyó)	DL 41203.
			1354. XII. 18.	Szerdahely – general assembly	DL 91469.
		Fekete (Niger) János	1355. IV. 16.	Haram	DL 91474.
	<i>László (the son of Bajlai Pető) (unum ex nobis)</i>		1355. IV. 30.	Haram	DL 91475.
Bak Péter, Jakab			1355. IX. 3.	Haram	DL 51674. = Krassó III. 25/29.
	<i>Bak Péter, Fejéregyházi Mihály (the son of Kemen), László és János (the sons of Bajlai Pető), Bajlai Miklós (the son of Mihály) (ex nobis)</i>		1355. XI. 8.		DF 285825. = Krassó III. 26.
	<i>Máté (comes) (the son of Micsi Pál), Zerye (the son of Hazen) (nobiles ex nobis)</i>		1357. VII. 13.	Szerdahely	DL 91491.
	<i>György (the son of Vajda Imre) (unum ex nobis)</i>		1357. VIII. 10.	Haram	DL 91504.

Noble Judges	Ex Nobis	Men of the County	Date	Place	Trace of the record
Bak Péter, [...]choh Jakab, János (the son of Balázs), Miklós (the son of András)			[1357. X. 6.]	Érsomlyó – general assembly	Himfi 16c/315.
	<i>Mihály (the son of Tejedi Dénes) (unum [ex nobis])</i>		1358.		DL 91530.
	Varányi Farkas Péter (unum ex nobis)		1358. VIII. 2.		DL 91522.
	<i>László (the son of Gyürögi Hem) (unus ex nobis homo noster)</i>		1360. VI. 11.	Haram	DL 91551.
	<i>Lukács (the son of Gegus) (unus ex nobis homo noster)</i>		1360. VI. 11.	Haram	DL 91552.
		(Gyürögi) László (the son of Heem)	1360.VIII.27.		DL 91561.
		Sági László	1362.V.26.	Haram	DL 51963.
		Bajlai János (the son of Pető)	1362.V.26.	Haram	DL 51964.
		Bajlai László (the son of Pető)	1362.VI.09.	Haram	DL 51965.
		Mihály (the son of P[éter])	1362.XI.17.	Haram	DL 51978.
		Farkasfalvi Miklós (the son of Bertalan)	1363.VI.29.	Haram	DL 51988.

Noble Judges	Ex Nobis	Men of the County	Date	Place	Trace of the record
		Szakadági Benedek (the son of Péter)	1364.V.04.	Mezősomlyó	DL 52018.
	<i>János (the son of Gergely), László (the son of Csernőci Jakab) (ex nobis)</i>		1364.VI.29.	Mezősomlyó	Himfi 374. = Krassó III. 48/64.o.
		Tamás	1364.VII.30.	nearby Mezősomlyó	DL 41583.
	Arasnoki Mihály (Michaellem nob-ilem de Urusnuk unum ex nobis cum nostro sigillo)		1367.VII.29.	Haram	DL 91729.
Halimbai Imre (the son of János), Vörös György, Tejedi Simon (the son of Him), Fejéregyházi Mihály (the son of Péter)			1370. V. 12.	nearby Mezősomlyó – palatine assembly	(DL 91759., DL 5860. = Krassó III. 71/96–99.)
		Kisteleki Tamás (the son of Miklós)	1370.VII.27.	Mezősomlyó	DL 52161.
		Szakadági Benedek (the son of Péter)	1370.IX.21.	Mezősomlyó	DL 52175.
		Kis (Parvus) György (the son of Dubjai László)	1374.VIII.17.	Haram	DL 52227.
Bugrudi Jakab (comes) (the son of Jakab)			1374. VIII. 31.	Haram	(DL 52231. = Krassó III. 85/126–127.)

Noble Judges	<i>Ex Nobis</i>	Men of the County	Date	Place	Trace of the record
	Chakan (dictus) Domonkos (unum ex nobis)		1375.VII.21.	Mezősomlyó	DL 52234.
		Mihály (the son of János)	1376.III.08.	Mezősomlyó	DL 52235.
		Mihály (the son of János)	1376.III.08.	Mezősomlyó	DL 52236.
		Hegyesi Mihály (the son of Miklós)	1381.III.16.	Mezősomlyó	DL 52358.
		Dobravicaí Péter (the son of Farkas)	1382.V.10.	Mezősomlyó	DL 52421.
		(Dobravicaí) Péter (the son of Farkas)	1382.V.10.	Mezősomlyó	DL 52420.
	<i>Mihály (the son of Halimbai Miklós) (unum ex nobis)</i>		1387.IX.01.	Mezősomlyó	DL 52559.
	<i>László (the son of Halimbai Miklós) (unum ex nobis)</i>		1387.IX.30.	Mezősomlyó	DL 52561.
		Gugteleki László (the son of János)	1392.I.22.	Mezősomlyó	DL 52751.
		Gyürögi Márk	1394.II.23.	Omor	DL 52827.
		Jenői Jakab	1396.V.02.	Gatály	DL 52935.
		Chakan (dictus) Mihály	1396.VI.13.	Gatály	DL 52943.
		Peszeri László	1396.VI.27.	Gatály	DL 52944.

Noble Judges	Ex Nobis	Men of the County	Date	Place	Trace of the record
		Peszeri [Che]pan (dictus) Mihály Gyalmár-i Miklós (the son of Simon)	1400.XI.13.	Mezősomlyó	DL 53094.
Partasi Miklós (the son of Simon), Szigeti János (the son of Miklós)			1401. V. 5.	Visegrád	DL 53112. = Krassó III. 154/241–242.
		Nendrazi András	1404.X.25.	Mezősomlyó	DL 53222.
Báctővisi Borsi (<i>Borsy dic- tus</i>) László			1405. X. 17.	Mezősomlyó	DL 53260. = Krassó III. 166/251–252.
Keresztesi László (the son of Pető)			1406. III. 20.	Mezősomlyó	DL 53283. = Krassó III. 167/252–253.
	<i>Szigeti János (the son of Miklós) (nobilem ex nobis)</i>		1406. III. 20.	Mezősomlyó	DL 53284.
		Sama-i János (the son of László)	1406.VIII.07.	Mezősomlyó	DL 53341.
Keresztesi László (the son of Pető)			1407. I. 8.	Mezősomlyó	(DL 53368. = Krassó III. 173/ 260–261.)
(Szigeti/Keresztesi) János (the son of Miklós)		Szigeti Kis (Parvus) Miklós (<i>ex nobis</i>)	1407.VIII.20.	Mezősomlyó	DL 53389. = Krassó III. 175/261–262
		Badadi Mátyás és Szigeti János (the son of Miklós)	1411.VIII.29.	Mezősomlyó	DL 53597.

Noble Judges	Ex Nobis	Men of the County	Date	Place	Trace of the record
		Gyürögi Márk and László (the son of Pető)	1412.XI.12.	Mezősomlyó	DL 43184.
Dávid		Szigeti Kis (Parvus) Miklós	1415.VI.22.	Mezősomlyó	DL 53843. = Krassó III. 192/280–281.
		Obrad (homo communis) and the man of the noble judge	1416.I.27.	Hám	DL 92477.
		Jakab (the son of Beke) and Torma Egyed	1416.VII.11.	Mezősomlyó	DL 53903.
	Csépán Mihály (<i>unum ex nobis</i>)	Peszeri László	1416.VIII.01.	Mezősomlyó	DL 53904.
		András (the son of Majos)	1418.VI.04.	Mezősomlyó	DL 54017.
		Majosfalvi Majs	1418.VI.04.	Mezősomlyó	DL 54020.
		Terjéni Demeter (homo communis)	1421.IV.26.	Mezősomlyó	DL 54159.
Györögi Miklós (<i>iudicem nobilium unum ex nobis</i>)		Fodor János and Peszeri Domonkos	1422.XII.19.	Mezősomlyó	DL 54273.
Györögi Miklós, Szigeti Fekete István			1424. XII. 2.	Mezősomlyó	DL 54411. = Krassó III. 215/308.
		András (the son of Majos)	1424.XII.16.	Mezősomlyó	DL 54413. = Krassó III. 216/308–309.
		Chakan Balázs és Gyalmári Simon	1427.V.24	Mezősomlyó	DL 54566.

Noble Judges	Ex Nobis	Men of the County	Date	Place	Trace of the record
		Székási Lőrinc (nobilem virum)	1427.XI.08.	Mezősomlyó	DL 54581.
		Toma István (virum nobilem)	1430.IX.16.	Mezősomlyó	DL 54720.
		Bilicei Bertalan (homo communis) and Bilicei András (homo communis)	1431.IV.28.	Mezősomlyó	DL 54747.
		Kengyeltói Tamás, Jenői László (the son of Lukács), Chakan Miklós, Jenői János (the son of György), Bilicei Bereck, Egresi Bodor Mihály és Jobus László (the captain of Kövesd)	1433.VIII.01.	Mezősomlyó	DL 54819.
		Torma János (virum nobilem)	1435.III.05.	Mezősomlyó	DL 54913.
		Bilicei Miklós	1435.III.05.	Mezősomlyó	DL 54914.
		Bilicei Bereck (homo communis)	1436.XII.15.	Mezősomlyó	DL 55059.
		Chakan Miklós and Nendrazi László	1437.III.16.	Mezősomlyó	DL 55074.

Noble Judges	<i>Ex Nobis</i>	Men of the County	Date	Place	Trace of the record
		Craguli János (the son of János) (homo communis)	1437.IV.13.	Mezősomlyó	DL 55078.
		Egresi Bodor Mihály és Bilicei Miklós (viros nobiles)	1437.IV.27.	Mezősomlyó	DL 55084.
		Bilicei Miklós (homo communis)	1437.VII.20.	Mezősomlyó	DL 55097.
		Bilicei Miklós (homo communis) and Egresi Bodor Mihály (homo communis)	1437.VII.20.	Mezősomlyó	DL 55098.
		Omori Chelnek Miklós (virum nobilem)	1437.IX.14.	Mezősomlyó	DL 55100.
		Bilicei Miklós (homo communis), Bilicei Bereck (homo communis) and Egresi Bodor Mihály (homo communis)	1437.IX.14.	Mezősomlyó	DL 55101.
		Bilicei Miklós (homo communis)	1437.X.12.	Mezősomlyó	DL 55102.
		<i>Tygván</i> Péter (homo communis)	1437.X.26.	Mezősomlyó	DL 55104.
		Egresi Bodor Mihály	[without year]		DL 47931.

**DINCOLO DE ARHONDOLOGIA COMITATULUI CARAȘ
(REFLECȚII ASUPRA ACTIVITĂȚII OFICIALILOR ȘI A
AUTORITĂȚILOR COMITATENSE ÎN CARAȘ)**

Rezumat

Obiectivele principale ale prezentului studiu vizează realizarea unei introspecții privind activitatea autorităților comitatense în Caraș, prin prisma personalului, și compararea acesteia cu datele oferite de bibliografia subiectului. Au fost incluși în analiză, în acest scop, participanții de la toate nivelele administrației comitatului: lista deja existentă a comiților, a vicecomiților și a juzilor nobiliari a fost extinsă acum cu cea a celor numiți *ex nobis* și cu oamenii comitatului. În primul rând, a fost examinat prestigiul de a fi conducătorul comitatului Caraș, pentru a se vedea dacă acesta a avut vreun impact în administrarea comitatului. Se poate afirma că în prima jumătate a secolului al XIV-lea a fost consemnată prezența cea mai regulată a comiților, în persoană, la cancelariile lor, iar absența lor nu a rezultat, cu necesitate, din faptul că ar fi fost demnitari cu un rang mai înalt. Totuși, începând cu anii 1360, comiții dispar din administrația comitatului, lăsând conducerea curții comitatense și activitatea juridică vicecomitelui sau vicecomiților, asemenea tendinței generale de evoluție a lucrurilor în Ungaria medievală. În cea de a doua parte a studiului, activitatea comitatului este discutată din punct de vedere socio-istoric, analiza concentrându-se pe cariera și asocierea unora dintre oficiali. În primul rând, în acest capitol a fost adoptată metoda revelării relației stăpân – slujbaş pentru a încerca clarificarea identității unora dintre comiți (cu un succes evident în cazul palatinului Opuliei László, cu unul mai redus în cazul comiților din anii 1390). În completare, s-a intenționat și realizarea unei imagini cât mai vivace și vii privind funcționarii comitatului, prin prisma carierei lor. Acest scop ni s-a relevat în cursul analizei implicării vicecomiților în administrația comitatului, pe măsură ce am luat în calcul câteva elemente, precum datorie, titluri, durata exercitării funcției, deținerea funcțiilor în coparticipare, respectiv, sistemul administrativ tri-stratificat. Ultima, dar nu cea de pe urmă problemă, cea a „indispensabilelor cerințe” ale juzilor nobiliari a fost revizuită incluzând aici și acei oameni numiți *ex nobis*, precum și oamenii comitatului – cei care îi însoțeau sau îi înlocuiau pe aceștia în îndeplinirea sarcinilor lor. Clasificarea acestor oameni nu doar că ne-a permis să remarcăm schimbările care au avut loc în administrația comitatului sau să vedem în ce măsură lista juzilor nobiliari ar putea să fie, sau nu, extinsă, ci a contribuit și la a emite sugestii privind dinamica nobilimii, prin recunoașterea, de exemplu, a membrilor merituosi ai comitatului și, deopotrivă, prin identificarea statului lor social. Deși studiul rămâne indecis – atât timp cât sursele din comitatul Caraș nu oferă un număr satisfăcător de probe –, el poate oferi o fațetă adițională cercetării în scopul unei mai bune înțelegeri a activității autorităților comitatului.