



Forschungsgruppe "Ungarn im mittelalterlichen Europa"
 Universität Debrecen - Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften

DAS KONZIL VON KONSTANZ UND UNGARN



DAS KONZIL VON KONSTANZ UND UNGARN

Debrecen
 2016

DAS KONZIL VON KONSTANZ UND UNGARN

DAS KONZIL VON KONSTANZ UND UNGARN

Herausgegeben von ATTILA BÁRÁNY
unter Mitarbeit von BALÁZS ANTAL BACSA

Debrecen
2016

MEMORIA HUNGARIAE 1

Herausgegeben von ATTILA BÁRÁNY

Veröffentlichung der "Lendület" Forschungsgruppe
"Ungarn im mittelalterlichen Europa" (LP2014-13/2014)
Universität Debrecen - Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften

Herausgeber: ATTILA BÁRÁNY

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Redaktion, Umschlag, Typographie:
ANETT LAPIS-LOVAS – Járom Kulturális Egyesület

<http://memhung.unideb.hu/>



ISBN 978-963-508-833-1

ISSN 2498-7794

© 2016, "Lendület" Forschungsgruppe "Ungarn im mittelalterlichen Europa"

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung unzulässig und strafbar. Dies gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Printed in Hungary

Druck und Bindung: Kapitális Kft., Debrecen

Managing Director: József Kapusi

Titelbild:

Ungarische Wappen: Ulrich Richental, *Chronik des Constanzer Concils*, c. 1460 (New York Public Library, Spencer Collection Ms. 32. f. 438. (by courtesy of New York Public Library))

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

Vorwort	6
Sándor Csernus: From the Arsenal of Sigismund's Diplomacy: Universalism <i>versus</i> Sovereignty	9
Attila Bárány: Die westlichen (englischen, französischen, burgundischen) Beziehungen des Hauses Luxemburg zwischen 1378 und 1416	33
László Pósán: Der Konflikt zwischen dem Deutschen Orden und dem polnisch-litauischen Staat auf dem Konstanzer Konzil	65
Katalin Prajda: Trade and Diplomacy in pre-Medici Florence. The Case of the Kingdom of Hungary (1349–1434)	85
Péter E. Kovács: Imperia im Imperium. Unterhaltung und Spektakel auf dem Konzil von Konstanz	107
Melina Rokai – Péter Rokay: János Maróti and the Council of Constance	131
Novák Ádám: Die Söhne des Adlermannes. Ein Adelsgeschlecht in der Gefolgschaft König Sigismunds von Ungarn	137
Zsombor Jékely: Armorials and Grants of Arms: Heraldic representation of Hungarian nobles at the time of the Council of Constance	155
Géza Érszegi: Werbőczy and the „bull of Constance”	181
Péter Tusor: The Hungarian Royal Patronage and Supremacy in the Hunyadis' and Jagiellonians' Age	195
Tamás Fedeles: The Apostolic Camera and the Hungarian Church Benefices during the Conciliarist Era	213
Beatrix F. Romhányi: Das Konstanzer Konzil und die Ankunft der Franziskaner-observanz im mittelalterlichen Ungarn	237
Réka Bozzay: Die Peregrination ungarischer Studenten in der Zeit von Sigismund von Luxemburg	251
Abkürzungen / Siglenverzeichnis	276
Liste der Autoren	271
Index	272

Vorwort

„Causa unionis, causa fidei, causa reformationis in capite et membris“: das war der Titel jener Tagung im Bereich der Geschichtswissenschaften, die zwischen 5. und 7. November 2014 in Debrecen veranstaltet worden war, und der folgende Band enthält eine Auswahl dieser Vorträge. Ein Konferenzband in Ungarisch mit größerem Umfang war schon erschienen („*Causa unionis, causa fidei, causa reformationis in capite et membris*“. *Tanulmányok a konstanzi zsinat 600. évfordulója alkalmából*. Debrecen, Printart-Press, 2014.); hier handelt es sich aber nicht nur um bloße Übersetzungen, sondern die überarbeitete und ergänzte Versionen der ungarischen Aufsätze aus dem Band von 2014 werden hier veröffentlicht.

Die Veranstalter der Konferenz, bzw. die Herausgeber dieses Bandes – László Pósán und Attila Bárány – sind die Mitarbeiter des Historischen Instituts an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Debrecen, die zahlreiche Organisationsanlässe hatten. Einerseits, die rege Erforschung des Zeitalters Sigismunds von Luxemburg an dem Historischen Institut der Universität Debrecen: 1997 war eine Tagung unter dem Titel „Sigismund Tagung 1387-1997“ veranstaltet worden, an der sowohl internationale – Jörg. K. Hoensch – als auch ungarische Spitzenforscher – unter anderen Pál Engel und András Kubinyi – teilgenommen hatten (der Tagungsband selbst ist ein paar Jahre später erschienen: *Das Zeitalter König Sigmunds in Ungarn und im Deutschen Reich*. Hrsg. Tilmann Schmidt – Péter Gunst, Debrecen, 2000). Der Herausgeber und die Verfasser des vorliegenden Bandes beschäftigten sich mit den verschiedenen Aspekten des Zeitalters Sigismund, unter anderen mit dem Konzil von Konstanz auch.

Andererseits, die Universität Debrecen hatte die Absicht sich an das Projekt der heutigen deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft anzuschließen („Das Konziljubiläum 2014-2018. *600 Jahre Konstanzer Konzil*“), welches die Erinnerung an das Konzil von Konstanz im Sinn hat. Mit diesem Tagungsband versuchen wir die Ergebnisse der ungarischen Forscher über das Konzil und das Zeitalter König Sigismunds dem internationalen Publikum zugänglich zu machen.

Drittens, an dem Historischen Institut der Universität Debrecen ist eine Forschungsgruppe jahrelang tätig (deren Forscher auch die Teilnehmer der Tagung waren), die sich mit dem Bild und Ort des mittelalterlichen ungarischen Königreiches, und seinen Beziehungen zu den westeuropäischen Ländern befassen. Der Ausgangspunkt dieser Forschungsgruppe war ein Projekt im Rahmen der Forschungsuniversität Debrecen zwischen 2010 und 2012 (*Memoria Regum – Die Erinnerungen und Erinnerungsorte der mittelalterlichen ungarischen*

Könige im Europa). Seit 2014 entwickelte sich dieses Projekt zur „Lendület“-Forschungsgruppe der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Universität Debrecen unter dem Titel „Ungarn im mittelalterlichen Europa“. Diese Forschungsgruppe leistete ihren Beitrag nicht nur in der Verwirklichung des Tagungsbandes, sondern durch die Vorträge der „inneren“ Teilnehmer aus Debrecen, sondern die „äußeren“ Teilnehmer des Projektes (von dem Lehrstuhl für Mittelalterliche Geschichte der Universität Szeged, bzw. dem Historischen Institut der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften).

Wir hatten den Versuch die ungarische Forschungslage des Zeitalters des Konstanzer Konzils und König Sigismunds in einem möglichst breiten Horizont bekannt zu machen. Deswegen erwarteten wir die Vorträge mit den folgenden Schwerpunkten: die Hauptthemen des Konzils (Reform, Konziliarismus und Union); das Konzil als die erste allgemeine „Friedenskonferenz“ des christlich-spätmittelalterlichen Europas; diplomatische Beziehungen; höfische Kultur und Repräsentation. Die Aufsätze folgen diese thematischen Schwerpunkte.

Die Verfasser des Bandes sind die Forscher und Universitätslehrer der bedeutsamsten geschichtswissenschaftlichen Institute und Forschungszentren innerhalb und außerhalb Ungarns. Neben den Mitgliedern der „Lendület“-Forschungsgruppe waren auch das Ungarische Museum für Kunstgewerbe, die Károli-Gáspár-Universität der Ungarischen Reformierten Kirche, das Historische Institut der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, die „Lendület“-Forschungsgruppe „Heilige Krone Ungarns“, die Pázmány-Péter Katholische Universität, die „Lendület“-Forschungsgruppe für Kirchengeschichte der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Pázmány-Péter Katholische Universität, die Universität Pécs, die Universität Szeged und der „Járom“ Kulturverein an der Konferenz vertreten.

Der Band ist zweisprachig, wir haben zwar das Englische in dem Index als Grundsprache benutzt, und die Namen sind auch in den deutschsprachigen Aufsätzen nach dem englischen Sprachgebrauch veröffentlicht. Der Index wurde von Balázs Antal Bacsa zusammengestellt.

Attila Bárány

Lehrstuhl für Geschichte

Universität Debrecen

Universität Debrecen – Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften

„Lendület“ Forschungsgruppe „Ungarn im mittelalterlichen Europa“

<http://memhung.unideb.hu/>

<https://unideb.academia.edu/MagyarorszagakozepkoriEuropaban>

Tamás Fedeles

The Apostolic Camera and the Hungarian Church Benefices during the Conciliarist Era¹

„Post vero tempus scismatis ante traditionem bullarum solvebatur una magna pars et presertim de parte camere, et de reliqua parte recipiebantur obligationes formarum in durissima et cum tot censuris gravissimis, quod pauci fuerunt, quin inciderunt in illas, et cum hoc termini multum breves et importabiles tam pro camera quam pro collegio dominorum cardinalium” – These lines can be read in the French reform proposal which was presented to one of the committees at the Council of Constance.² Besides this proposal, several memoranda dealt with the taxes and rates that had to be paid for different ecclesiastic benefits. This issue proved to be rather important at that time, however it was a delicate question as well. The issue connected to the fees, whose collective designation were annates, was firstly discussed by a reform committee on August 28, 1415.³ The accurate viewpoint, which was outlined by several participants and suggested significant reduction or even the termination of taxes imposed on church benefices, was not supported mainly due to the personal interests of those partakers who received a share from the fees having been collected. As a result of this, the discussion of this issue was postponed until the election of the new pope.⁴ After the payment of the taxes had been left in abeyance at the 25th session of the council,⁵ the way of the payment was repeatedly regulated for the following five years in

¹ In researching for the present paper the author was awarded with Kunó Klebelsberg and János Bolyai Research Scholarship (BO/00234/16/2). This paper was prepared within the framework of the “Apostolic Camera” project of The ‘Impetus’ Church History Research Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Péter Pázmány Catholic University.

² Heinrich Finke, ed., *Acta Concilii Constantiensis I-IV*, (Münster: 1896–1928), II. 594.

³ For the different draft bills and treaties see Finke, *Acta Concilii* II, 673–682, IV. 539–583, 584–636. For the summary of the reform proposals see Philip H. Stump, “The Reform of Papal Taxation at the Council of Constance (1414–1418)”, *Speculum* 64 (1989): 69–105, esp. 84–96. Philip H. Stump, *The Reforms of the Council of Constance (1414–1418)* (Leiden/New York/Köln: 1994), 56–60, 173–205.; Johannes Helmrath, “Theorie und Praxis der Kirchenreform im Spätmittelalter.” *Rottenburger Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte* 11 (1992): 41–70.; Walter Brandmüller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz 1414–1418*, (Paderborn: 1997), II, 84–94.

⁴ Bernhard Hübler, *Die Constanzer Reformation und die Concordate von 1418* (Leipzig: 1867), 84–85. For the most recent comprehensive survey of the strictly speaking sterile disputes see Ágnes Maléth, “Viták a konstanzi zsinaton” [“Debates during the Council of Constance”] *Műhelyszemináriumok dolgozatok* I (2013) 65.

⁵ Elke Freifrau von Boeselager, “Fiat ut petitur. Päpstliche Kurie und deutsche Benefizien im 15. Jahrhundert” (Habilitation diss., Düsseldorf, 1999), 182.

the concordat of 1418 concluded among Pope Martin V (1417–1431) and the representatives of several nations.⁶ Particular rates were listed under the title *de annatis, communibus servitiis et minutis* in the third place among the reforms, which were outlined during the 40th sitting of the council, while the issue of vacant benefices was mentioned in the 16th rank, and finally a decree was only released only about the latter question.⁷

The bull, which was composed on September 19, 1417 for the request of Sigismund, King of Hungary and Holy Roman Emperor (1387–1437) by the cardinals having been participated in the council, includes a rather short and compact standpoint about the taxes connected to the divergent church benefices. According to this, beneficiaries, for whom the monarch and his successors submit an application (*supplicabunt*), can be appointed by the pope without the payment of annates and any further fees (*sine solutione annatarum vel alterius cuiuscunque exactionis*). Furthermore, on the bases of the German nations' model, archbishops had to pay only a reduced amount of money (*moderatas solvant annatas ad instar ceterarum ecclesiarum nationis Germanice*).⁸ By reason of this, the discoverer of the charter established the followings: "The exemption from the payment of the annates and *servitia* meant an important favour granted for the members of the Hungarian clergy, and primarily for its distinguished members. However, in 1417, it did not count as a remarkable phenomenon as it met the exigencies of the era."⁹ The question may come up, whether the orders expressed in the text of the charter actually won acceptance in the following period which was labelled

⁶ For the concerning sections of the concordat, which also valid for the German, Spanish and Italian nations see Hübner, *Die Constanzer*, 181–183, 198–203.

⁷ October 30, 1417: Refomatione fiendae per papam una cum concilio antequam dissolventur. Josef Wohlmuth, "Konzilien des Mittelalters vom ersten Laterankonzil (1123) bis zum Fünften Laterankonzil (1512–1517)," in *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta. Dekrete der ökumenischen Konzilien*, Bd. 2., ed. Giuseppe Alberigo et al. (Paderborn: 2000), 444.

⁸ Mályusz, Elemér, *A konstanzi zsinat és a magyar főkegyúri jog*. [The Council of Constance and the Right of Patronage] (Máriabesnyő–Gödöllő: 2005), 12.

⁹ Mályusz, *A konstanzi zsinat* 16.

as the period of conciliarism.¹⁰ Consequently, in the followings I will survey the duties of the Holy See related to the Hungarian church benefices as well as the technical details of the payments between the ruling of Pope Martin V and Pope Eugene IV (1431–1447).

Tax Burdens of Church Benefices

Incomes of the medieval papacy belong to two larger clusters according to their sources and origins. Incomes arriving directly from the territory of the Holy See belong to the first group which constituted the majority of the incomes of the papacy until the middle of the 13th century. Earnings arriving from the territory of the Western Christianity belong to the second category. Towards the end of the 13th century, this cluster represented the majority of the incomes of the Papal Curia.¹¹ The management of the earnings was carried out approximately during the first 30 years of the 14th century by the central office of the papal administration, namely the Apostolic Camera.¹²

Among the tax categories, which were imposed on the church benefices during the period under survey, altogether two kinds of fees affected the Hungarian clergy: firstly the *servitium* had to be paid by the prelates, while the

¹⁰ The essence of the theory of conciliarism is that the supreme authority is not in the hand of the pope but the power is exercised by the oecumenical council. The theory was based on – among others – the following theses: „*quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus approbari debet*”, as well as: „*maior est auctoritas totius orbis quam urbis alicuius*”. Its fundamental elements can be connected to the names of Marsilius dei Mainardini (de Padua) and William of Ockham, which were elaborated in details at the end of the 14th century by Heinrich von Langenstein (professor in Paris) and Konrad von Gelnhausen. The period begun in 1417 with the decree „*Frequens conciliis generalibus*”, which was composed in Constance and encompassed the decades of the Council of Pavia (1423) as well as the Councils of Basel, Florence, Ferrara and Rome (1431–1445). The era was ended with the resignation of Antipope Felix V (1449). For this in greater detail see Hubert Jedin ed., *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte II.* (Freiburg–Basel–Wien: 1985), 514–515.; Joseph Canning, *A History of Medieval Political Thought 300–1450.* (New York: 2003), 154–161, 174–184; Máté Gárdonyi, “A konstanzi és a bázeli zsinat.” [The Councils of Constance and Basel] *Vigília* 66 (2001): 96–103.

¹¹ For the divergent types of incomes see in greater detail William Edward Lunt, *Papal Revenues in the Middle Ages I–II* (New York: 1934), I, 57–135.; for its short survey in Hungarian language see *Cameralia Documenta Pontificia de Regnis Sacrae Coronae Hungariae (1297–1536)*, I–II. Eds. †József Lukcsics, Péter Tusor, Tamás Fedeles (Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae, 9–10.) (Budapest–Róma: 2014), (Hereinafter: Cameralia) I, XXXI–XXXIX.

¹² For the evolution, development and organisation of the office see Guglielmo Felici, *La Reverenda Camera Apostolica. Studio Storico-Giuridico* (Roma: 1940); Lunt, *Papal Revenues*, 3–56.; Niccolò Del Re, *La Curia Romana. Lineamenti Storico-Giuridici* (Roma: 1970), 295–309.; John E. Weakland, “Administrative and Fiscal Centralization under Pope John XXII, 1316–1334.” *Catholic Historical Review* 54 (1968): 39–54, 285–310. For its short survey in Hungarian language see Cameralia, XXV–XXXI.

annates were imposed on those members of the clergy, who possessed smaller church benefices. The *servitium commune* had to be accomplished from the 13th century in case of the possession of larger episcopal or abbatial benefices which had been jointly donated and confirmed by the pope as well as the Sacred Collage of Cardinals. The annual income of these benefices exceeded the 100 florins. The sum of money, which was paid in, comprised one third of the benefices' first-year income, and it was divided between the pope and the cardinals equally (50–50%). Apart from this, the newly-appointed beneficiaries of the particular territories were bound to pay certain fees (*servitia consueta familiarium domini papae et cardinalium*) for the familiars of the pope and the cardinals as well as for those members of the Papal Curia who were in charge of administrative errands. This payment, which consisted of five different parts (*quinque servitia*), was generally indicated in the tax-books as *servitia minuta* from the beginning of the 15th century.¹³ The order of magnitude of the *servitium commune* was determined with the help of a rough estimate (*communis extimatio*). Apart from this, tax-books, which were prepared by the officials of the Camera, were also available in the course of this period.¹⁴ The amount of the *minuta* was determined by the number of cardinals on the consistory at the time of the donation: the less the number of cardinals in the Papal Curia was, the more money had to be paid.¹⁵ For the illustration of this practice, let us see an example from the surveyed material: one of the well-known and infamous prelate of the Sigismund era, George Lépes had to meet an expense of 1,500 gold florins (or gold Fiorini di Camera) under the pretext of *commune servitium* after his nomination for the head of the Bishopric of Transylvania. From this amount of money, the *Apostolic Camera* and the Sacred College of Cardinals were both entitled to gain 750–750 Forints. As a result of the fact that altogether 15 cardinals were present on the consistory at the time of his nomination, the amount of one *servitium minutum* reached 50 florins (=750:15). This indicates that the Transylvanian bishop had to pay altogether 1,750 florins on the account of *servitium*.

Prelates did not gained their bulls of appointment, until they agreed to (*se obligare*) settle their own nomination fees as well as pay off the debt of their predecessors. This accomplishment could have settled personally, through

¹³ Adrien Clergeac, *La curie et les bénéficiers consistoriaux. Étude sur les communes et menus services, 1300–1600* (Paris: 1911), 1–43; Hermannus Hoberg, *Taxae pro communibus servitiis. Ex libris obligationum ab anno 1295 usque ad annum 1445 confectis (Studii e Testi 144)* (Città del Vaticano: 1949), XI–XII.

¹⁴ Emil Göller, *Der Liber Taxarum der päpstlichen Kammer* (Rom: 1905).

¹⁵ For the *servitia minuta* and its distribution see Karl Henrik Karlsson, "Die Berechnungsart der Minuta Servitia" *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 18 (1897): 582–587.

representatives in the Camera, at the collectors and legates having been operated in partibus as well as with the co-operation of the branch establishments of particular banks.¹⁶ Promissory notes (*obligationes*) and receipts made out for the payments (*solutiones*) were precisely booked down by the officials of the Camera.¹⁷

Donations of smaller church benefices (prebends, parishes, chapel- and altar rectorates) were arranged without the confirmation of the Sacred College of Cardinals (*beneficia non consistorialia*), which indicates that it only fell within the competence of the Pope. The newly-appointed beneficiary was obliged to pay in 50% of the annual income of his obtained prebendaryship. The newly evolved tax type, which developed during the 14th century and had to be paid for church benefices, replaced the previously imposed tithe. Due to its official name appearing in the sources (*annata, seu medii fructus primi anni*), this fee is known under the short designation *annata*.¹⁸ As we might have observed it, the collection of this tax had been suspended during the Council of Constance, and after a while Pope Martin V regulated the practice of payment in case of the smaller dutiable benefices at the beginning of his pontification. The lower limit of value, which served as the base of the tax, was fixed in 1389 by Pope Boniface IX (1389–1404).¹⁹ According to his regulation, which was affirmed by Pope Martin V in 1418 as well, the fee had to be paid in, when the annual income of the benefice exceeded 24 gold florins.²⁰ In compliance with the papal bull, annates could not have only been paid in the Camera by the clients, but according to the long-standing practice, it could have been settled at the collectors' offices as well. From 1421 (after the reforms of Pope Martin V), promissory notes concerning the settling of the money were recorded by the collectors in a separate seri-

¹⁶ Hoberg, *Taxae*, XIV–XV.; Markus A. Denzel, "Kurialer Zahlungsverkehr im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert. Servitien- und Annatenzahlungen aus dem Bistum Bamberg," *Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte* 42 (1991) 87.

¹⁷ József Lukcsics, *Középkori pápai adókönyvek* [Mediaeval Papal Tax-Books] (Budapest: 1908), 14–17.

¹⁸ Johann Peter Kirsch, "Die päpstlichen Annaten in Deutschland während des XIV. Jahrhunderts." in *Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte* 9, ed., J.P. Kirsch (Paderborn: 1903) X–XVIII. *Id.*: „Die Annaten und ihre Verwaltung in den zweiten Hälfte des 15. Jahrhunderts" *Historisches Jahrbuch* 9 (1888): 302.; *Annatae e regno Hungaria provenientes* in *Archivo Secretio Vaticano 1421–1536*. Ed. József Körmendy (Budapest: 1990) (A Magyar Országos Levéltár kiadványai, II; Forráskiadványok, 21)

¹⁹ Lunt, *Papal Revenues*, I, 96.

²⁰ „Bullarum apostolicarum duo sunt genera. Unum de beneficiis non consistorialibus et non taxatis in libro camere; et de istis, si valorem annuum viginti quatuor ducatorum excedunt, solvitur annata": François Baix, *La Chambre Apostolique et les Libri Annatarum de Martin V (1417–1431)*. (Bruxelles–Rome: 1947–1960), I, XXXV.

es (*Annatae*) as well.²¹ Similarly to the practice, which was employed in case of the prelates, the Apostolic Camera deposited the bull made up about the donation of the benefice until the new owner of the prebendaryship did not engaged himself to settle the previously-established fee either personally or by an authorised agent.²² The average annual income (*valor annuus*) of the benefices was usually determined by a public esteem.²³ Divergent from the *servitia*, not the amount of the tax to be paid, but the esteemed annual income of the particular benefice was registered. The actual act of the accomplishment was justified by the execution of a receipt. These receipts were copied by the officials of the Camera into a new register titled *Liber quitantiarum* from the beginning of the reigning of Pope Martin V.²⁴

Servitia of the Hungarian Prelates

The papal collection of taxes is clearly provable in Hungary from the 13th century, while the first written document connected to the prelates' payment of *servitium commune* dates back to the beginning of the 14th century.²⁵ During the period, which is examined in this paper, altogether two archiepiscopacy (Esztergom, Kalocsa-Bács) and 12 episcopacy (Bosnia, Csanád/Cenad, Eger, Transylvania, Győr, Nyitra/Nitra, Pécs, Syrmia/Szerém/Srem, Vác, Várad, Veszprém and Zagreb) were bound to pay the *servitium*. Apart from these, two coastal dioceses (Senj, Knin), which were joined to the Hungarian church organisation, as well as four former missionary episcopates (Curtea de Argeş, Bodony/Vidin, Milcovul and Belgrade), which were called titular bishopric during this period of time, had to pay. In addition to this, benefices of the abbots belonging to the more significant Benedictine and Cistercian monasteries were also registered as consistorial stipends. As a result of this fact, they were also bound to pay the *commune servitium*. Among these, we can list five Benedictine (Garáb/Béla, Mănăştur, Pannonhalma, Pécsvárad, Somogyvár), two Cistercian (Toplica, Cikádor) and one Premonstratensian (Csorna) monasteries. The Saint Adrian

²¹ Körmendy, *Annatae*. 27.

²² Béla Mayer, "Pápai bankárok szerepe Magyarországon a középkor végén," [The Role of Papal Financiers in Hungary at the End of the Medieval Period], *Századok* 58 (1924): 652; Körmendy, *Annatae*, 28.

²³ Baix, *La Chambre* I, CXV.

²⁴ Tamás Fedeles, "Az Apostoli Kamara középkori nyugtái," [Mediaeval Receipts of the Apostolic Camera] in: *Magyarország és a római Szentszék. (Források és távlatok.) Tanulmányok Erdő bíboros tiszteletére*, Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae 8. Ed. Péter Tusor, (Budapest-Róma: 2012), 11–25.

²⁵ On April 28, 1302 Stephen Bishop of Kalocsa undertook the payment of 2000 florins and two *servitia consueta*.

Benedictine monastery of Zalavár appeared only once in the pages of the papal tax-books, and its annual income was estimated at 80 florins.²⁶ On the one hand, this amount of money did not reach the lower bound of the taxability. On the other hand, it also fell behind the value of the further Hungarian abbeys. For that very reason, the benefice can be registered among the annates, as the remark (*fuit facta obligatio per modum annate*), which was later attached to the text, indicates it.²⁷ Some years later (1431), it really appeared among the annates with its esteemed annual income of 75 florins.²⁸ In the course of the examined period of time, altogether 58 promissory notes, which bear relations to Hungary, appear in the volumes of the Camera.²⁹

Annual income of the ecclesiastic benefices, which were obliged to pay the *servitium*, were usually ascertained by public esteems. Occasionally, local clergymen were in charge of the survey connected to the income of the benefices under discussion, as it is clearly visible in case of the Pécsvárad Abbey (1438–1439). As the amount of the tax concerning the respective abbey, Bishop Henry of Pécs was requested by the Apostolic Camera and the Sacred Collage of Cardinals to examine the incomes of the institution and send a report to Rome about his results.³⁰ The process was conducted by two delegates of the bishop, namely by George Egerszegi archdeacon of Baranya as well as Jasper Calstropf archdeacon of Regöly in 1439. According to their estimations, annual receipts of the monastery amounted to 1,426 florins, while its expenses reached 1,397 florins.³¹ In the meanwhile, Peter Abbot obliged himself in the Apostolic Camera to pay 150 florins as well as five small *servitium* through his delegate. Although, according to the schedule of fees recorded by the Sacred Collage of Cardinals, fees, which should have been paid out by the abbey, reached as much as 600 florins.³²

²⁶ September 3, 1425: Cameralia, no. 164.

²⁷ It is highly probable that the title of Bishop Andrew deceived the officials of the Camera. However, the monastery of Zalavár appears once in the tax-book, the amount of the *servitium commune* is not indicated in the record. cf. Cameralia, no. 1414.

²⁸ Cameralia, no. 1186.

²⁹ Cameralia, no. 144–205.

³⁰ Archivio Segreto Vaticano [= ASV], Diversa Cameralia [=Div. Cam.] vol. 20, fol. 62v–63r, 129r–v; Iosephus Koller, *Historia episcopatus Quinqueecclesiarum I–VII*. (Pestini–Posonii: 1782–1812), III, 365–366, 373–376.; Cameralia, no. 661.

³¹ ASV Div. Cam. vol. 20, fol. 133v–134v; Koller, *Historia episcopatus*, III, 375–376. For its résumé (with calculations) see Elemér Mályusz, *Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon* [Ecclesiastic Society in the Mediaeval Hungary] (Budapest: 2007), 220.

³² „dictum monasterium remaneat taxatum ad fl. 600, secundum taxam sacri collegii”. Cameralia, no. 188.

Schedules of fees, preserved by the Apostolic Camera and the Camera Collegii, were prepared on the bases of these estimations, which contained the data connected to the consistorial benefices.³³ Several references were made on these in the obligations (*reperitur taxatum*),³⁴ while in the promissory note of Bishop Michael of Bodony, one of the cardinals reported about the amount of the fee.³⁵ The *servitium* of the Benedictine Abbey of Garáb does not appear in the Camera's schedule of fees, (*dicta abbatia sive monasterium taxatum non reperiatur in libris camere*), therefore, the amount of tax, which had to be paid, was stated based on the bull made up about the donation (*secundum expressionem contentam in bulla*) in 1422.³⁶

In connection with the rates of charges, which were displayed in the registers, it is important to highlight that very often the amount of the *servitia* did not altered for centuries. However, the incomes of the bishoprics surely changed during these periods of time.³⁷ Naturally, we have a few examples of the revaluations, which refers to the alternations of the financial situation of the benefices under discussion. In the course of the examined period of time, we are able to witness altogether two meaningful increases in taxes in the case of two Hungarian dioceses. The bishops of Zagreb had to pay 400 florins tax during the 14th century, and this amount of money increased fivefold during the first few decades of the 15th century.³⁸ The new calculation was performed on January 10, 1420, within the frames of the secret consistory.³⁹ John of Albeni was the first prelate in Zagreb, who undertook the payment of altogether 2,000 florins as *commune servitium*.⁴⁰ With relation to the archdiocese of Esztergom, a new evaluation occurred exactly at this time. While prelates had to pay 2,000 florins after their nominations before,⁴¹ from that time, the amount of the *servitium*

³³ Lukcsics, *Pápai adókönyvek*, 5–6., For the tax records concerning the Hungarian benefices see Cameralia, no. 1414.

³⁴ Cameralia, no. 162–163 (1425), 180 (1432), 181–182 (1433), 183 (1435), 184 (1438), 203–204 (1446).

³⁵ „ad quos dicta ecclesia taxata fuit iuxta relationem reverendissimi domni cardinalis, cui commissio facta fuit”: Cameralia, no. 178.

³⁶ Cameralia, no. 155.

³⁷ Göller, *Liber taxarum*, 20–21.

³⁸ E.g. Cameralia, no. 53, 83a, no. 91.

³⁹ „Die decima mensis Ianuarii 1420 in consistorio secreto omnibus dominos cardinalibus approbantibus fuit dicta Zagabriensis ecclesia taxata ad florenos II^{mp}”: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana [=BAV] Chigi H II 32 fol. 122r.; Cameralia, no. 1414.

⁴⁰ Cameralia, no. 153.

⁴¹ Cameralia, no. 3, 12, 18, 41, 59, 70.

communae reached 4,000 florins, which meant that the amount of the tax doubled.⁴² At once, this amount of money was the highest rate of charges among the Hungarian church benefices. The lowest amount, 33 and a third florins was paid by the titular bishoprics of Bodony, Milcovul and Belgrade.

The liability to pay was accomplished by 10 people in person. It can be considered as a general practice, that these people (with the exception of one) were the heads of the titular bishoprics and of those dioceses, whose incomes proved to be rather low (Senj, Syrmia). The exception is John Szászi, the elected bishop of Veszprém, who made a promise personally in the January of 1426 (*personaliter obtulit*) that he would pay 900 florins as well as the half of the *servitia minuta* within six months. He also promised that the rest of the tax would be paid during the following six month.⁴³ The uniqueness of this event is well demonstrated by the fact that prelates charged their delegates every time to settle the taxability of the Bishopric of Veszprém in the course of the whole examined period.⁴⁴ In the background of Szászi's journey to Italy, we definitively have to consider other reasons than the simple accomplishment of the scale of charges. As the vice-chancellor (1419–1426) of King Sigismund, he had to shoulder very much burden connected to the country's government and diplomacy. It is verifiable that he travelled to Venice and after that to Rome as a member of a legation in the autumn of 1425, and this way he had an opportunity to settle the tax which charged his newly-gained benefice.⁴⁵ However, in the overwhelming majority of cases, exactly the procurators, who arrived with notarial documents, made promises in front of the Apostolic Camera.⁴⁶ In altogether 12 cases, one of the employees of the Curia was entrusted with the obligations. Among them, the contribution of Thadeus de Tarvisio is remarkable, as his participation can

⁴² „Strigoniensis in Ungaria florenos IIII^m. De mense Januarii 1420 indictione 13 in consistorio secreto dominus noster taxavit ecclesiam Stragoniensem (sic!) de consensu reverendissimorum dominorum cardinalium.” BAV Chigi H II 32, fol. 105v.

⁴³ Cameralia, no. 166.

⁴⁴ Cameralia, no. 160, 175, 195, 610, 618, 620, 625a, 628, 628a, 633, 633a, 638, 639, 644, 664, 672, 677.

⁴⁵ For the diplomatic journey see Vilmos Fraknói, *Magyarország egyházi és politikai összeköttetései a római Szent-székkal I–III* [The Ecclesiastic and Political Connections between Hungary and the Holy See], (Budapest: 1901–1903), II. 7. However, Fraknói contaminated Szászi with John Uksi provost of Pécs. For the short summary of the two people's career see Tamás Fedeles, *Die personelle Zusammensetzung des Domkapitels zu Fünfkirchen im Spätmittelalter (1354–1526)*, Studia Hungarica, Bd. 51 (Regensburg: 2012), 418–419, 431–434.

⁴⁶ Cameralia, no. 153–154, 157–158, 160–161, 167, 170, 175, 183.

be demonstrated seven times.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, it can be clearly stated, that in the most frequent cases (altogether 18 times) persons possessing prebends in the concrete given or in the neighbouring dioceses were entrusted by the elected prelates. Among them, we have to mention Nicholaus Liptói, provost of Veszprém, who represented not only the prelate of Veszprém but one time he also acted on behalf of the prelate of Győr in the Camera.⁴⁸ There is also a precedent for the practice according to which the person, who travelled to the Apostolic See, accomplished several assignments. At this point, I only mention Andrew, Bishop of Ruskö (*episcopus Rossenensis*), who travelled personally to the Papal Curia in the spring of 1438. On the one hand, he undertook the payment for the prebend of Csanád and he also took the payment of the annates of the Archdeaconry of Krassó upon himself. On the other hand, he made a promise in the names of Peter Bishop of Csanád and Provost Stephen Büki Basó according to which they would assume their debts.⁴⁹ For lack of data, we do not know, whether Andrew spent his time until the end of 1438 in Italy without any interruptions, but he made a similar promise in the name of Peter Abbot of Pécsvárad in the same year in December.⁵⁰

During the examined period of time, Hungarian prelates and monasteries undertook the payment of altogether 68,281 florins. However, occasionally they might have gained partial or complete exemption from the defrayal, as it is clearly visible on the example of Clement Molnári Bishop of Győr. After his nomination to the episcopate, he shouldered the payment of the altogether 800 florins and the five minuta as well as the acquittance of his predecessor's debt.⁵¹ The same day, on March 5, 1418, he was granted an exemption from Pope Martin V and the Sacred College of Cardinals with the help of the application written by Cardinal Branda di Castiglione.⁵² Two months later, in Konstanz, the bishop paid off the whole amount of the four *servitia* through his representative (*pro*

⁴⁷ Cameralia, no. 186–187, 192, 194–195, 201, 203.; Thadeus de Tervisio (Tarvisio) de Ademariis (†1455) magister medicinae, scriptor penitentie (1432–1455), magister registri cancellarie (1439–1455). Thomas Frenz, “Repertorium Officiorum Romanae Curiae.” accessed November 10, 2014, http://www.phil.uni-passau.de/histhw/RORC/littera_T.html,

⁴⁸ Cameralia, no. 145, 160, 175.

⁴⁹ Cameralia, no. 185, 1212–1213.

⁵⁰ Cameralia, no. 188.

⁵¹ Cameralia, no. 145.

⁵² „Martinus [...] papa V [...] vivae vocis oraculo de speciali gratia remisit”; „Franciscus [...] de prefatorum cardinalium consensu et voluntate tenore presentium de speciali gratia remittimus et donamus”: Cameralia, no. 578–579.

totali solutione suorum),⁵³ while in the following year, he paid 400–400 florins both for the Apostolic Camera and for the Sacred College of Cardinals. This means, that he fully met his own requirements.⁵⁴ According to this, the exemption could have concerned the approximately 734 florins debt of the predecessor Bishop John Hédervári.⁵⁵ In the cases of Henry, Bishop of Pécs and John, Bishop of Zagreb, the Sacred College of Cardinals cancelled a certain part of the sum of money to be paid.⁵⁶ Referring to the miserable situation of the Archiepiscopacy of Esztergom, King Sigismund lodged his request in consequence of which the whole amount of the *servitium commune* concerning the diocese was reduced with 25%.⁵⁷ The exemptions meant altogether 5,590 florins. When all of these facts are taken into consideration, it is clearly visible that the total amount of the *servitia* reached 62,690 florins. In the followings, it is worth taking a closer look at the details of the actual payments.

By way of introduction, it has to be mentioned that altogether 120 records remained to our age from the examined period of time, which is more than the double of the commitments. Besides the destruction of the sources, difference can be clearly explained with the fact that the debts were in the most cases paid by instalments. Certain aspects of this process will be discussed in greater details in the followings.

Incomes, realised by the *servitium commune* were distributed between the Apostolic Camera and the Sacred College of Cardinals, while the payments of the *servitia minuta* were divided among the clericals of the two institutions. Naturally, this practice was also reflected in the book-keeping. Both Chambers recorded the payments in separate ledgers (*solutiones*). Furthermore, a supplementary receipt was issued about the particular acts.⁵⁸ This is well demonstrated – among the above-mentioned examples – by the book keeping and the receipts of Clement Molnári, Bishop of Győr, Nicolaus Alcsebi, Bishop of Vác and George Pálóci, Archbishop of Esztergom.⁵⁹

⁵³ Cameralia, no. 580a.

⁵⁴ Cameralia, no. 584–585.

⁵⁵ From the *servitium* that reached 925 florins, he paid by instalments altogether 191 florins, 36 solidi as well as 29 denarii: Cameralia, no. 92, 492, 495, 499.

⁵⁶ „facta sibi remissione de toto residuo de consensu et voluntates dominorum cardinalium”. Cameralia, no. 603–604.

⁵⁷ „Quod dictum sacrum collegium dominorum cardinalium preceptis et intellectis calamitatibus et necessitatibus ac aliis incommodis multiplicibus, quibus ecclesia Strigoniensis modernis temporibus gravatur”: Cameralia, no. 617.

⁵⁸ Lukcsics, *Pápai adókönyvek*, 15.

⁵⁹ Cameralia, no. 584–585, 606, 607–608.

Similarly to the promissory notes, prelates had several options for the settling of the assessed tax: they were able to pay either personally, or with the help of procurators, who had previously received a notarially attested deed. Furthermore, they also could employ the services of bank houses. They also were able to pay off their debts at the collectors, who stayed in the country, as well as at the papal legates that saved the newly-nominated prelates the troubles related to the further expenses. Only six prelates travelled to Florence and Rome each of them were prelates possessing smaller church benefices and five of them were titular bishops. At the same time, Bishop Michael of Bodony paid one part of his *servitium* right after the obligation of the Commendator of Zalavár. He paid 8–8 florins to both chambers in equal instalments as well as one *servitium minutum*.⁶⁰ Similarly to the obligations, employees of the Curia appeared on 11 occasions at the payments. Among these occasions, three can be related to the above-mentioned Thadeus de Tarvisio. The middle layer of the ecclesiastical society accomplished several duties as well: Nicolaus Liptói Provost of Veszprém paid five times from the 17 cases.⁶¹ It can be demonstrated during the examined decades that the papal legate working *in partibus* also was involved in the process of the payments. George Pálóci, Archbishop of Esztergom handed over a certain part of his *servitium* (altogether 1,000 florins) to the Cardinal and Papal Legate Branda di Castiglione, who collected grants for the military campaign against the Hussites. Both chambers made out a receipt for the prelate about the payment of 500–500 florins.⁶² In addition to this, John Archbishop of Kalocsa was commanded by the Apostolic Camera to hand over the amount of money, which was the legal due of the Camera, for the papal legate.⁶³ However, prelates employed credits, which were guaranteed by the bank houses, more frequently. During the examined period, bank houses granted credit altogether 53 times for the prelates. Among others, this might be explained by the fact that right after their nominations, they were not in the possession of the earnings of their dioceses which indicates that they needed credits. The budget was particularly charged with the scale of charges, when the newly-nominated prelate had to pay

⁶⁰ Cameralia, no. 178, 648–649.

⁶¹ Special chaplain of Cardinal Branda di Castiglione (1412), administrator of the Diocese of Veszprém (1412), prebend in Veszprém (1413–1438) and Vác (1413–1415), *vicarius in spiritualibus* of the Bishop of Veszprém (1413–1415, 1429, 1437–1438), Provost of Veszprém (1416–1438). Balázs Karlinszky, “A veszprémi nagyprépostok archontológiája (1079–1543), három prépost portréjával” [Archontology of the Grand Provosts of Veszprém (1079–1543), with the Portrait of three Provosts] *Turul* 87 (2014): 93–103.

⁶² Cameralia, no. 614–615. The original receipt made out by the Sacred College of Cardinals: DL 237 317.

⁶³ Cameralia, no. 627.

in the *servitia* of his predecessors as well.⁶⁴ Among the bank houses, the role of the Medici Company is outstanding, as its services were employed by the Hungarian clients on 47 occasions.⁶⁵ This corresponds to the contemporary tendencies, as the Florentine Company proved to be the market leader in connection with the intermediation of the payments and the negotiation of businesses from the beginning of the 15th century until the decline of the institution towards the end of the 15th century.⁶⁶ Hungarian clerics turned to different trading companies in case of the higher sums of money, which is indicated by the remittance of the Abbot of Cikádor, who transferred altogether 18 florins, 25 solidi and 10 denarii (*per manus nobilium virorum Cosme et Laurentii de Medicis et sociorum*) in 1438.⁶⁷

As I have already denoted, instalment paying proved to be a general practice particularly in case of higher rates of taxes. In every occasion, the act of time-payment is indicated in the sources with the following formulas: *pro parte*, *pro complemento* or *pro residuo*. Terms of the payment were determined in six or eight months. The sources reflect that usually the payment in three or four instalments became general. In connection with George Pálóci, Archbishop of Esztergom altogether eight records can be found during the years of 1424 and 1425. Among these entries, six indicate detailed information about the instalments, which had to be redeemed,⁶⁸ while two records put the exemption from the paying in record.⁶⁹ However, this implies only three actual payments, as the act of the paying occurred in these cases towards both of the chambers, which is clearly expressed by the journal-entries of the book-keeping. Taking the 1,000-florins tax reduction into consideration, the prelate should have transferred altogether 4,111 florins. Considerable amount of this money was actually paid in by himself (3,921.5 florins), which was supplemented with further 33 florins that he had to pay for the execution of the charters. The highest amount of money, which was paid in one instalment, can be connected to Denis Jakcs Kusalyi,

⁶⁴ Mayer, "Pápai bankárok", 648–668.

⁶⁵ Cameralia, no. 584–585, 611–613, 657–660, 683–685.

⁶⁶ Raymond Roover, *The Medici Bank. Its Organization, Management, Operations and Decline* (New York–London, 1948). Id., *The Rise and Decline of the Medici Bank, 1397–1494*, (Harvard Studies in Business History, 21), Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1963. The Medici Company also played an essential role in the payment of the taxes related to the church benefices around the entire empire between 1431 and 1475. Arnold Esch, "Überweisungen an die päpstliche Kammer aus den Diözesen des Reiches unter Einschaltung italienischer und deutscher Kaufleute und Bankiers. Regesten der Vatikanischen Archivalien 1431–1475" in *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 78 (1998): 262–387.

⁶⁷ Cameralia, no. 654.

⁶⁸ Cameralia, no. 607–608, 614–615, 622–623.

⁶⁹ Cameralia, no. 616–617.

Bishop of Várad, who transferred 2,249 florins on May 14–15, 1428, through the Medici Company.⁷⁰ Thus, the prelate, who had previously redeemed 63 florins with his payment,⁷¹ settled later the entire amount of money (2,312 florins) as it is indicated in the promissory note. To sum the payments of the examined period up, the following results can be established: Hungarian prelates paid in altogether 26,519 florins as *servitium commune* and 4,149 florins as *servitia minuta* for the Apostolic See. In addition to this, they paid 326.5 florins for the charges of the charters, which were executed during these processes.

In connection with the ratio between the value of the church benefices and the total amount of the *servitia*, we have to take an important alternation into consideration as well. As I have already referred to that the *servitium commune* indicated the third of the first-year income of particular church benefices. However, in the course of the 15th century, we are able to observe several changes, as it is clearly indicated by the increase in taxes, which I have already discussed with relation to the prelacies of Esztergom and Zagreb. Calculations have been made by Norbert C. Tóth previously in connection with the Archdiocese of Esztergom, where the incomes reached 23,552 florins during 1418–1419 i.e. right before the increasing of the fees. This signifies that the amount of the tax, which became doubled, meant only the sixth of the diocese's income. Consequently, it is highly advisable to calculate the annual average incomes of the 15th century prelates with a fivefold multiplier, which is more realistic in this case.⁷²

⁷⁰ Cameralia, no. 636–636a.

⁷¹ Cameralia, no. 631.

⁷² Norbert C. Tóth, “A főpapi székek betöltésének gyakorlata Zsigmond király uralkodása alatt” [Practice connected to the Occupation of Prelacies during the Reign of King Sigismund] *Gazdaság és Társadalom* 4 (2012): Special issue 105, as well as table 117. 1.

Table 1

Servitium Commune of the Consistorial Benefices and their Esteemed Annual Income in Gold Florins (or Gold Fiorini di Camera) (1418–1447)⁷³

	Benefices	<i>Servitium</i>	Income (×3)	Income (×5)	Year
Archdioceses, Bishopsrics	Curtea de Argeș	66 2/3	200	333	1419, 1421
	Bodony (Vidin)	33 1/3	100	166	1432
	Bosnia	200	600	1,000	1427, 1428
	Csanád	900	2,700	4,500	1423, 1438
	Eger	800	2,400	4,000	1425, 1439, 1440, 1446
	Transylvania	1,500	4,500	7,500	1419, 1424, 1427, 1446
	Esztergom	4,000	12,000	20,000	1424, 1440
	Győr	800	2,400	4,000	1418, 1439, 1446
	Kalocsa–Bács	2,000	6,000	10,000	1421, 1424
	Knin	150	450	750	1424, 1439
	Milcovul	33 1/3	100	166	1433
	Belgrade	33 1/3	100	166	1420, 1432
	Nitra	275	825	1,375	1429, 1438
	Pécs	3,300	9,900	16,500	1421, 1446
	Syrmia	100	300	500	1433
	Vác	500	1,500	2,500	1419, 1430, 1438, 1440
	Oradea	2,000	6,000	10,000	1426, 1427, 1435, 1440, 1445
	Veszprém	900	2,700	4,500	1424, 1426, 1428, 1440
	Zagreb	2,000	6,000	10,000	1421, 1438, 1441
	Senj	50	150	250	1419, 1432, 1442, 1443
Monasteries	Cikádor	?	?	?	1438
	Csorna	?	?	?	1441
	Garáb (Béla)	50	150	250	1422
	Mănăstur	?	?	?	1418, 1419
	Pannonhalma	250	750	1,250	1425
	Pécsvár	600	1,800	3,000	1438
	Somogyvár	150	450	750	1427
	Toplica	100	300	500	1425

⁷³ In order to save space, I do not indicate the exact place of the sources, which are easily accessible in the Cameralia. The total amount of the incomes have been rounded off by me. At the monasteries, some brackets are indicated with question marks. In these cases, the obligation have not remained to our age, we know only the amount of the payment. However, these amounts of money are not suitable for the estimation of the total annual income, as we are not aware of the fact, whether every instalments were redeemed or not. These institutions are only included to the table due to the enumeration of the consistorial benefices.

Annates of the Hungarian Benefices

As we have already observed in case of the smaller benefices, which were not donated on the consistory, 50% of the annual income had to be paid for the Apostolic Camera. The lower limit of value of the tax was 24 florins, while the upper limit remained opened, as it is supported with the Hungarian benefices of the examined period.⁷⁴ Benefices under the previously indicated lower limit of value proved to be exempted from the payment of the tax. However, in some cases these instances were documented as well. In connection with the 11 cases occurred in the examined era, this was indicated with the following expression in the *registra: bulla restituta sine obligatione*.⁷⁵ With reference to the Cistercian monastery of Ercsi, the exemption from taxation was justified with the fact that its income was within the measure of the tax (*quia infra taxam*).⁷⁶ Interestingly, a prebend in Szepes, whose income reached only 24 florins according to the estimations, was in spite of the above-mentioned factors still taxable.⁷⁷

Details concerning Hungarian church benefices, which were bound to pay the annates, are easily accessible in print for a quarter of a century as a result of the elaboration of the sources completed by József Körmendy.⁷⁸ The wide gamut of these benefices can be found in the tax-books, i.e. dignitaries and officials of the cathedral and the major collegiate chapters, prebends (94) as well as principals of the major parishes (12), rectors of chapels (1) and altars (3), and superiors of certain monasteries (5). Members of the middle layer of the ecclesiastic society i.e. prebends of the different types of chapters appeared the most frequently (94 times) in the registers. In case of the benefices connected to the monastic orders, we have to face with a certain fluctuation, as it has been indicated with relation to the Abbey of Zalavár. In case of the Benedictine monastic house of Otocsác, a contrasting alternation can be ascertained, as Abbot John had paid the annates in 1146,⁷⁹ while the abbey appeared two decades later among the consistorial benefices.⁸⁰ In the series of *Annatae*, which was registered from 1421, altogether 115 records allude to Hungary concerning the examined period of time. The

⁷⁴ On the bases of the above-mentioned facts, the statement of Johann Peter Kirsch is inaccurate. According to him, the upper limit of value was stated in 100 florins. Cf. J. P. Kirsch, *Die Annaten*, 302.

⁷⁵ Cameralia, no. 1115a, 1151a, 1158a, 1160b-c, 1170, 1170a-b, 1181 (2), 1136.

⁷⁶ Cameralia, no. 1236.

⁷⁷ Cameralia, no. 1160b.

⁷⁸ Körmendy, *Annatae*

⁷⁹ Cameralia, no. 1242.

⁸⁰ Cameralia, no. 243, 246.

first Hungarian data was registered on May 30, 1421, when Matthias Csázmai undertook the payment of the annates connected to a prebendal benefice in Zagreb.⁸¹

As I have already referred to that the value of smaller benefices, which were donated by the pope, was determined by an evaluation. It is important to highlight that promissory notes also refer to these acts. Among the annates, it might have occurred that – similarly to the *servitia* – the exact value of the benefice remained unknown. This can be perfectly illustrated with the example of John, Bishop of Senj, who received the Cistercian monastery of Szentgotthárd from Pope Eugene IV in Bologna in 1438. However, he did not have information about its annual income. Therefore, he made a promise according to which he would inform the Hungarian Chamber within six months about the real value of the benefice (*de vero valore*). He also promised that he would pay the annates of the possession as well.⁸²

Great differences can be observed with regard to the value of the taxable benefices because they move along a scale between 25 and 1,000 florins. The majority of them falls to the cluster, in which the value of the benefices did not reach 100 florins. However, in case of two-thirds of these benefices, we can calculate with incomes, which proved to be exactly 100 florins or higher than that amount. Primarily cathedral chapters and benefices of provosts belonging to major collegiate churches fall to this category. However, we are also able to find rector of the chapel directorate and parishes as well. The income of the benefice of the little-known parish church in Nyúl (diocese of Pécs), which was estimated to 1,000 florins (!) stands pre-eminent among the other Hungarian benefices,⁸³ as it was twice the sum of the provostal benefice of the Virgin Mary Collegiate Chapter in Székesfehérvár⁸⁴ and it exceeded the annual income of several bishoprics. Exactly because of this, the possibility of a slip of the pen might appear at this point.

In the registers, we are able to find two divergent dates, as besides the exact time of the undertaking of the obligation, the place of the dating of the bull about the papal donation (*provisio*) was also indicated. The provisional bull was issued by the Apostolic Camera right after the occurrence of the *obligatio*, which indicated the legal possession of the particular benefice.⁸⁵ In connection with the *annates*, we definitely have to mention the situation when somebody

⁸¹ Cameralia, no. 1095.

⁸² Cameralia, no. 1210.

⁸³ Cameralia, no. 1148.

⁸⁴ Cameralia, no. 1223.

⁸⁵ Körmendy, *Annatae*, 28.

enjoyed his benefice illegally (*fructus male / illicite / injuste / indebite perceptus*), i.e. without his ordination, he enjoyed the benefice *cum cura*, he was under age, he had two or more incompatible benefices in hand etc. In this case, the person in question could solve the problem with a papal dispensation. When a situation similar to this occurred, the pope donated the problematic benefice once again to the person in question (*nova provisio*), which was naturally combined with an obligation for the payment of the annates. According to the general practice, a further sum of money had to be paid as well in case of an illegally enjoyed benefice.⁸⁶ During the examined period of time, beneficiaries had to pay fines in only three cases.⁸⁷

Among the incomes, which were connected to the obligation of the payment of annates, we can find the annuity (*pensio*) of Andrew Benzis Gualdo,⁸⁸ which cost 300 florins. The former prelate of Kalocsa received this annuity from the archiepiscopal refectory, but during this era he appeared as the Bishop of Sion.⁸⁹

In contrast with the consistorial benefices, personal undertaking of the obligation in case of the annates proved to be essential, its ratio reached 38%. Beneficiaries employed altogether 16 times the contribution of the employees of the Curia among the procurators. Among them, we can find Michael Löväldi, prebend of Győr and Veszprém, who was the procurator of the office named *Sacra Poenitenciararia Apostolica*.⁹⁰ He appears altogether four times. He undertook the obligation to the payment two times in the name of two beneficiaries, who originated from Győr.⁹¹ Most frequently (26 cases) we find prebends among the representatives, and the background of this practice might be explained with the relatively large willingness of this layer to the mobilization. Among them, the most effective proved to be Stephen Szerémi precentor of Pécs, who represented his clients altogether four times.⁹²

The value of the benefices indicated in the records reached in our period of time altogether 11,764 florins, and 50% of this amount of money had to be paid in by the possessors. This, supplemented with the 210-florins fine meant altogether 6,092 florins.

⁸⁶ Kirsch, *Die päpstlichen*, XIX.

⁸⁷ Cameralia, no. 1102, 1121, 1151.

⁸⁸ Hans Bellwald, *Erzbischof Andreas dei Benzi von Gualdo. Ein Helfer Kaiser Sigismunds im Grossen Schisma* (Gossau: 1957).

⁸⁹ Cameralia, no. 1188.

⁹⁰ "*Repertorium Officiorum*."

⁹¹ Cameralia, no. 1189, 1200.

⁹² Cameralia, no. 1098–1100, 1124.

As opposed to the recognizances of obligation, only few receipts (34) about the payments remained to our age.⁹³ Similarly to the annates, this phenomenon can be explained in connection with the *quintantia* with the destruction of the sources as well. While the distribution of the records concerning the annates are relatively steady between 1421 and 1440, we do not know any data related to Hungary between the years of 1443 and 1445. In case of the receipts, we cannot find any data related to Hungary between 1441 and 1445. The disappearance of the sources is better indicated in case of these two series of registers as they entirely lack records referring to Hungary during the decades following the examined period of time. The exact date of the last record is October 20, 1446, and the next record appeared only at February 20, 1460.⁹⁴ The exploration of the sources, which were transported to Paris during the reign of Napoleon, slightly modulated this hiatus.⁹⁵ Nevertheless, it cannot be excluded neither that among the beneficiaries several people paid in only a part of their taxes.

Amounts accomplished under the pretext of annates spread between 4 and 270 florins, which could have been settled according to the general practice either in total or in instalments. Although, according to the universal principle, 50% of the first year's income had to be forwarded to the Apostolic Camera, it became a general practice in the examined period that beneficiaries paid in the amount of money in which they agreed to the officials of the Camera (*compositio*). As an example, I mention Albert Kerolti prebend of Csanád, who after his 30 florins worth prebendal status *cum prefata Camera Apostolica ad summam 10 fl. auri de camera composuit*. This indicates us that he only paid the third of the estimated value.⁹⁶ Besides the payment of the aggregate sum of the tax, it was also possible to pay by instalments. However, we have only six examples for the latter situation in

⁹³ Two records does not appear in the collection of Lukcsics from the examined period of time, and due to this, these records are not even included to the volume of the Cameralia. These are the followings: Archivio di Stato di Roma, Camerale I. vol. 1115, fol. 24r (November 15, 1428) and vol. 1122, fol. 29v (February 2, 1446).

⁹⁴ Cameralia, no. 1248–1249.

⁹⁵ Remigius Ritzler, "Die Verschleppung der Päpstlichen Archive nach Paris unter Napoleon I. und deren Rückführung nach Rom in den Jahren 1815 bis 1817," *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 6 (1962–1963): 144–190. – *Archives de l'Ancien Régime Monuments Ecclésiastiques Séries* placed in the L fond of the French National Archives preserved altogether 30 volumes of *Annatae* és *Quintantiae* in the files titles *Documents de la Camera Apostolica* (1434–1563). Christiane Schuchard, "Bemerkungen zu den päpstlichen Registerbänden des 15. und frühen 16. Jahrhunderts in Paris," *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 75 (1995): 553–573. For his detailed itinerary see Eugène-Martin Chabot, *Épaves des Archives Vaticanes laissées à Paris en 1817. Inventaire et extrait*, (Paris: 1823) ANF CARAN 246Mi/1 (microfilm), as well as *Archives du Vatican. Bulles et brefs. Répertoire numéroté* par H.-Fr. Delaborde et A. Coulon, [Paris,] 1896–1909.

⁹⁶ Cameralia, no. 1129 and 1136.

the course of the examined period. Among these, I find it important to highlight the example of George Berzeviczy, Bishop of Nyitra, who as the commendator of the Abbey of Zobor, paid only 120 florins (*pro parte*) after his benefice, which had been previously evaluated to 300 florins.⁹⁷ In connection with the paying off his 20-florins debt the sources does not contain any pieces of information.

In accordance with the *servitia*, deadlines of the payments were also indicated in the promissory notes related to the annates. Either the negligence or the considerable overspending meant that the beneficiary could have been sanctioned. Stephen Tárnokházi, prebend of Kalocsa undertook in June, 1422 that he would pay in the tax, which was (over)due after his benefice, within eight months.⁹⁸ Still, because of the fact that he exceeded the deadline of the payment with more than one year, he asked for an exemption at the end of the following year (in December), which he managed to receive (*ob moram non debito tempore facte solutionis annate sive mediorum fructuum primi anni dicti lectoratus*). Right after this, he paid altogether 12 florins to the Camera Apostolica through his representative.⁹⁹

As opposed to the undertaking of the obligations, personal administration in case of the payments can be observed seven times. Among the procurators, we find the colleagues of the Curia altogether eight times. In the remaining cases, beneficiaries of the local churches accomplished their obligation concerning the payment through prebends and parish priests. Beneficiaries employed the services of a bank house only once.¹⁰⁰

With regard to the paid in amounts, we gain rather low values, i.e. during the examined period only 1,528 florins were sent to the Camera. This, supplemented with the fines, which were inflicted upon the illegally enjoyed benefices as well as with the tax connected to the execution of charters reached only 1,783 florins. This meant only 29% of the undertaken obligations (naturally the charges connected to the charters were reduced).

⁹⁷ Cameralia, no. 1183 and 1185.

⁹⁸ Cameralia, no. 1123.

⁹⁹ Cameralia, no. 1134–1135.

¹⁰⁰ Cameralia, no. 1145.

Table 2

Estimated Annual Income and *Annata* with Relation to the Prelates of Monasteries, Cathedral Chapters and Major Collegiate Chapters (1418–1447)

	Benefice	Income	<i>Annata</i> ¹⁰¹	Years
Provost's Dignity	Collegiate Chapter of Arad	190	(95)	1446
	Cathedral Chapter of Bosnia	60	(30)	1428
	Collegiate Chapter of Buda	350	(175)	1426
	Cathedral Chapter of Čazma	60, 70	35	1428, 1437–1438
	Cathedral Chapter of Fehér- vár (Virgin Mary)	500	210, 270	1439, 1446
	Cathedral Chapter of Győr	300, 360	(150, 180)	1431
	Collegiate Chapter of Pápoc	150	(75)	1439
	Cathedral Chapter of Pécs	300, 150, 500	200, 130	1429, 1430, 1432, 1437, 1446
	Cathedral Chapter of Vác	70	(35)	1433
	Cathedral Chapter of Veszprém	250, 190	(125, 95)	1440, 1446
Monasteries	Abbot of Ercsi	15	(7,5)	1440
	Provost of Jasov	100	(50)	1422
	Abbot of Zalavár	75	(37,5)	1431
	Abbot of Zobor	300	(150)	1430

¹⁰¹ Where accurate and exact data are available about the total amount of the paid-in tax, the amounts are indicated in the table without brackets. Amounts recorded in the brackets correspond to the general practice i.e. 50%. The sources can be easily checked in the second volume of the *Cameralia*, based on the years which are also indicated in the table.

Summary

During the ruling time of Pope Martin V and Pope Eugene IV, Hungarian clergymen undertook the payment of altogether 68,782 florins. As opposed to this, they only sent 32,778 florins to the *Camera Apostolica* either personally or through their representatives. It is clearly visible that this is less than 50% of the amount, which had been previously undertaken in the promissory notes.¹⁰² After all, we are searching for the answers to two questions: On the one hand, it would be important to know why the gap between the undertakings and the accomplishment of the obligations became rather wide? On the other hand, how and to what did this overburden the Hungarian ecclesiastic society?

In my opinion, the explanation for the first question might have been given by the quality of the relationship between Sigismund of Luxemburg King of Hungary and the Apostolic See. It is not accidental that I have highlighted his royal status in Hungary. As a Hungarian king, he was able to enforce his decisions in terms of the filling up of the church benefices and in connection with the taxes of the Holy See. The evidence of the above-mentioned statement is supported by the previously quoted passage of the charter of Constance. Although it is clearly visible on the bases of the previous survey that neither the moderate payment of the taxes related to the archdioceses,¹⁰³ nor the exemption of the beneficiaries, who had been submitted by the king and donated by the pope himself became asserted. Still the king proved to be capable of the realisation of the well-developed theory of the right of the Royal Supremacy (*ius supremi patronatus*) in the course of the filling up of the particular pontifical and prebendal benefices,¹⁰⁴ a certain kind of *modus vivendi* can be experienced between the monarch and the Curia related to the payment of the annates and the *servitia*. This is entirely reinforced by the growing importance of the Kingdom of Hungary in the series of fights against the non-Christians. This is also signified by the composition

¹⁰² Expenses might have meant a higher amount, as the fees, which had to be paid for the procurators in case of their commissions as well as the charges generated through the transfers of money increased the burdens as well. However, we do not have any information related to these issues.

¹⁰³ It has to be noted that the German concordat does not contain any references regarding the lowering of the fees. Cf. Hübler: *Die Constanzer*, 181–183.

¹⁰⁴ For this see Mályusz, *A konstanzi zsinat* [*The Council of Constance*]; Péter Tusor, “Az egyházi javadalmak betöltése Magyarországon a XV–XVI. században. A magyar királyi főkegyúri jog” [The investment of church benefices in Hungary during the 15th and 16th centuries. The Royal Supremacy of the Hungarian King] in *Memoriae tradere. Tanulmányok és írások Török József hatvanadik születésnapjára*. Ed. Ádám Füzes and László Legeza, (Budapest: 2006.) 357–378.; Péter Tusor and Gábor Nemes ed., *Consistorialia Documenta Pontificia de Regnis Sacrae Coronae Hungariae 1426–1605*. (Budapest–Rome: 2011), XXXIX.

in the “Bull of Constance”, according to which the country, which is situated at the frontier zone of the non-Christian’s land, is the bastion as well as the shield of Christianity (*regnum Hungarie in confinio infidelium constitutum quasi quoddam propugnaculum et clipeus Cristianitatis*). It is also essential to mention that these wording became a top towards the second half of the 15th century.¹⁰⁵ The construction works related to the defence line against the Ottoman Empire in the southern part of the country consumed masses of money, which the king tried to finance from – among others – the earnings received from the aimed technical vacancy of the pontifical dignities.¹⁰⁶ In the northern regions of the country, we have to highlight the military campaigns against the Hussites, which proved to be the common objective of King Sigismund and the papacy. Therefore, the monarch was able to achieve his aim according to which the previously-determined fees were reduced.¹⁰⁷

With regard to the charges related to the papal taxes, which burdened the church benefices, we can ascertain that the annual average of the payments during the examined period of time almost reached 1100 florins. This sum does not seem to be rather high not even at the first sight, mainly if we take the annual income of the major prelatures into consideration. It is a direct consequence of this that the payment of the *servitia* and the annates would not have caused any particular endeavours, but the members of the Hungarian clergy was also burdened by other expenses i.e. expenditures connected to the military preparedness. Prelates had to provide banderia with arms, which proved to be rather expensive. On the other hand, chapters as well as several religious orders had to pay the war-tax for the king from 1397. The value of this, which surpassed 11, 000 gulden,¹⁰⁸ is tenfold of the amount of money that had to be annually transferred to the Camera Apostolica.

¹⁰⁵ Mályusz, *A konstanzi zsinat*. For the exhaustive discussion of this issue see Paul Srodecki, *Antemurale Christianitatis. Zur Genese der Bollwerksrhetorik im östlichen Mitteleuropa an der Schwelle vom Mittelalter zur Frühen Neuzeit*. (Husum: 2015).

¹⁰⁶ For this see C. Tóth, *A főpapi székek betöltése*, passim.

¹⁰⁷ The reduction of the *servitium* of Archbishop Pálóci was approved by the pope and the Sacred College of Cardinals as well due to the supplication of Sigismund. *Cameralia*, no. 616–617. During the following era, both the exemption and the reduction of the fees to be paid became general practices. The reason for this can be sought in the possible military campaign of the Ottoman troops. For this see *Cameralia*, no. 240, 725, 731–732, 743.

¹⁰⁸ Norbert C. Tóth, Bálint Lakatos and Gábor Mikó, “A pozsonyi prépost és a káptalan viszálya (1421–1425). A szentszéki bíráskodás Magyarországon – a pozsonyi káptalan szervezete és működése a XV. század elején” [“Quarrel between the Provost and the Chapter of Pressburg (1421–1425). Jurisdiction of the Holy See in Hungary – Organisation and Functioning of the Chapter of Pressburg”], *Subsidia ad historiam medii aevi Hungariae inquirendam*, 3) Budapest: 2014. 179–202, particularly 194.

Abkürzungen / Siglenverzeichnis

ANF	Archives nationales (France), Paris
ASF	Archivio di Stato di Firenze
ASF	Archivio Segreto Vaticano
BAV	Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana
Cameralia	<i>Cameralia Documenta Pontificia de Regnis Sacrae Coronae Hungariae (1297–1536)</i> . I-II. Eds. †József Lukacsics – Péter Tusor – Tamás Fedeles. <i>Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae</i> , 9–10. (Budapest – Roma: Gondolat, 2014)
Consistorialia	<i>Consistorialia Documenta Pontificia de Regnis Sacrae Coronae Hungariae (1426–1605)</i> . Eds. Péter Tusor – Gábor Nemes. <i>Collectanea Vaticana Hungariae</i> , I. 7. (Budapest – Roma: Gondolat, 2011.)
DF	Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, Országos Levéltár, Diplomatikai Fényképgyűjtemény
DL	Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, Országos Levéltár, Diplomatikai Levéltár
DMA	<i>Dictionnaire du Moyen Âge</i> , edited by Claude Gauvard – Alain De Libera – Michel Zink (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2002)
Eubel, <i>Hierarchia</i>	Conrad Eubel et al., <i>Hierarchia catholica medii aevi, sive Summorum Pontificum, S. R. E. cardinalium, ecclesiarum antistitum series ab anno 1198 usque ad annum perducta e documenta tabularii praesertim Vaticani collecta, digesta</i> , I-III (Monasterii: Sumptibus et Typis Librariae Regensbergianae, 1913–23)
Finke, ACC	<i>Acta concilii Constanciensis</i> I-IV. Hrsg. Heinrich Finke – Johannes Hollnsteiner – Hermann Heimpel (Münster: Regensbergsche Buchhandlung, 1896–1928.)
Fraknói, <i>Relationes oratorum</i>	<i>Relationes oratorum pontificiorum. Magyarországi pápai követek jelentései 1524–1526</i> . (Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia. Vatikáni Magyar Okirattár, Series 2, t. 1.) (Budapest, 1884 [2001])

Index	<i>Index actorum Romanorum pontificum ab Innocentio III ad Martinum V electum</i> (Citta del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1975-2003.) [I-III. Bernard Barbiche: <i>Les actes pontificaux originaux des Archives Nationales de Paris</i> . Citta del Vaticano, 1975-1982; IV. Brigide Schwarz: <i>Die Originale von Papsturkunden in Niedersachsen</i> . Citta del Vaticano 1988; V. P. N. R. Zutshi: <i>Original Papal letters in England 1305-1415</i> . Citta del Vaticano 1990.; VI/1-2. Tilmann Schmidt: <i>Die Originale der Papsturkunden in Baden-Württemberg 1198-1417</i> . 1. Teil: 1198-1341, 2. Teil: 1343-1417. Citta del Vaticano, 1993.; VII. Tilmann Schmidt: <i>Die Originale der Papsturkunden in Norddeutschland (Bremen, Hamburg, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Schleswig-Holstein) 1199-1415</i> . Citta del Vaticano, 2003.]
Itineraria	<i>Királyok és királynék itineráriumai, 1382–1438. Itineraria regum et reginarum</i> (1382-1438), Ed. †Pál Engel – Norbert C. Tóth. <i>Subsidia ad historiam medii aevi Hungariae inquirendam</i> , 1. (Budapest: MTA, 2005)
Katona, <i>Historia critica</i>	Stephanus Katona, <i>Historia critica regum Hungariae I–XLII</i> (Pestini–Posonii–Cassoviae–Claudiopoli–Budae: 1779–1813)
Kerler, DRTA	<i>Deutsche Reichstagsakten unter Kaiser Sigmund</i> . Abth. 1-3. (1410-1431) Hrsg. von Dietrich Kerler. (München: Oldenbourg/Cotta – Gotha: Perthea, 1878-1887) [<i>Deutsche Reichstagsakten</i> . Ältere Reihe. <i>Deutsche Reichstagsakten unter Kaiser Sigmund</i> . Abth. 1-6. Hrsg. von Hermann Herre – Dietrich Kerler – Gustav Beckmann (München: Oldenbourg/Cotta, 1878 – Gotha: Perthea, 1906.)]
MHH	<i>Monumenta Hungariae Heraldica. Magyar czimeres emlékek I–III</i> . [Hungarian armorial relics] Eds. László Fejérpataky (I–II) – Antal Áldásy (III) (Budapest, MTA: 1901, 1902, 1926)
MNL OL OBA	Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, Országos Levéltár Ordensbriefarchiv, Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin

- PRO Public Record Office / The National Archives (TNA),
Kew, Surrey, England
- RI *Regesta Imperii* XI. 1-2. *Die Urkunden Kaiser Sigmunds*
(1410-1437). hrsg. von Johann Friedrich Böhmer;
verzeichnet von Wilhelm Altmann (Innsbruck: Wagner,
1896-1900.)
- Richental,
Chronik Ulrich von Richental, *Chronik des Konstanzer Konzils*
1414–1418. Hrsg. Thomas Martin Buck. Konstanzer
Geschichts- und Rechtsquellen, herausgegeben von
Stadtarchiv Konstanz, 41. (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2011.)
- Rymer, Foedera* Rymer, Thomas, *Foedera, conventiones, literae, et cujuscunque*
generis acta publica inter reges Angliae. I-XX. London, 1704-
35. [London Edn]; Haag, 1739-45. I-X. [Haag Edn]
- Sigismundus
Cat. *Sigismundus Rex et Imperator. Kunst und Kultur*
zur Zeit Sigismunds von Luxemburg, 1387–1437.
Ausstellungskatalog. Ed. Imre Takács. (Budapest-
Luxembourg: Philipp von Zabern, 2006)
- Skorka,
Eberhard
Windecke Renáta Skorka, *Eberhard Windecke emlékirata Zsigmond*
királyról és koráról. (Budapest: História-MTA, 2008)
- Theiner, *Vetera*
monumenta
Slavorum *Vetera monumenta Slavorum meridionalium historiam*
illustrantia maximam partem nondum edita ex Tabulariis
Vaticanis deprompta collecta ac serie chornologica disposita. I:
Ab Innocentio PP. III. usque ad Paulum PP. III. (1198–1549).
II: A Clemente VII. usque ad Pium VII. (1524–1800) cum
additamentis saec. XIII. et XIV. Ed. Augustinus Theiner
(Romae – Zagrabiae: 1863–1875)
- Wolkenstein Die Lieder Oswalds von Wolkenstein. Text der Ausgabe
von K. K. Klein (unter Mitwirkung von Walter Weiß
und Notburga Wolf), in der Fassung der 3. Auflage
(von Hans Moser, Norbert Richard Wolf und Notburga
Wolf), Tübingen, 1987. Hrsg. von Sieglinde Hartmann
– Ulrich Müller. (Digitalisiert von von Bettina Hathey,
im Auftrag der an der Universität Salzburg situierten
„Mittelhochdeutschen Begriffsdatenbank“/ MHDBDB“
und der Oswald von Wolkenstein-Gesellschaft.) [[http://](http://www.wolkenstein-gesellschaft.com/texte_oswald.php)
www.wolkenstein-gesellschaft.com/texte_oswald.php]

- Zsigmond Kat. *Művészet Zsigmond király korában.* I–II. Eds. László Beke – Ernő Marosi – Tünde Wehli (Budapest, MTA Művészettörténeti Kutató Csoport, 1987)
- ZsO *Zsigmondkori Oklevéltár.* (Budapest: MTA – NML, 1951–2013) I–II/2. (1387–1410) Ed. Elemér Mályusz. III–VII. (1411–1420) Ed. Iván Borsa. 1993–2001.; VIII–IX. (1421–1422) Eds. I. Borsa – Norbert C. Tóth. 2003–2004.; X. (1423) Ed. N. C. Tóth. 2007.; XI. (1424) Eds. N. C. Tóth – Tibor Neumann. 2009.; XII. (1425) Eds. N. C. Tóth – Bálint Lakatos. 2013. (A MOL kiadványai II., Forráskiadványok 1., 3., 4., 22., 25., 27., 32., 37., 39., 41., 43., 49.; 52)

Liste der Autoren

Attila Bárány („Lendület“ Forschungsgruppe „Ungarn im mittelalterlichen Europa“, Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften – Universität Debrecen)

Réka Bozzay (Universität Debrecen)

Sándor Csernus (Universität Szeged – „Lendület“ Forschungsgruppe „Ungarn im mittelalterlichen Europa“, Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften)

Péter E. Kovács (Forschungszentrum der Philosophische Wissenschaften, Institut für Geschichte, Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften – „Lendület“ Forschungsgruppe „Ungarn im mittelalterlichen Europa“)

Géza Érszegi (Eötvös-Loránd-Universität, Budapest)

Tamás Fedeles (Universität Pécs)

Zsombor Jékely (Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Budapest – Károli-Gáspár-Universität der ungarischen Reformierten Kirche, Budapest)

Ádám Novák („Lendület“ Forschungsgruppe „Ungarn im mittelalterlichen Europa“, Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften – Universität Debrecen)

László Pósan (Universität Debrecen – „Lendület“ Forschungsgruppe „Ungarn im mittelalterlichen Europa“, Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften)

Katalin Prajda (Universität Chicago – Forschungszentrum der Philosophische Wissenschaften, Institut für Geschichte, Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften)

Melina Rokay (Universität Belgrad)

Péter Rokay (Universität Novi Sad)

Beatrix F. Romhányi (Károli-Gáspár-Universität der ungarischen Reformierten Kirche, Budapest)

Péter Tusor (Katolische-Péter-Pázmány-Universität, Piliscsaba – „Lendület“ Forschungsgruppe Kirchengeschichte, Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften)