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INTRODUCTION

0.1. THE CHOICE OF TOPIC AND THE RELEVANCE OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT

The primary goal of this dissertation is to reveal the major characteristics of the history of the Hospital of St. John in Hungary from its appearance in the mid-twelfth century up to the end of the Angevin rulership (1387). The starting point of the research is obvious, but the choice of the end dates was suggested by the fundamental changes which took place from the last decade of the fourteenth century. These changes concerned not only the Order of the Hospital as an ecclesiastical body but also the structure of the Hungarian society as a whole at the beginning of the reign of King Sigismund of Luxembourg (1387-1437).

Present-day scholarly needs spring from the enormous hiatus in research on (medieval) church history after the Second World War because scholars of the period adopted a different agenda. This dearth of research affected particularly studies on the military-religious orders and this situation is demonstrated by the fact that the last scholarly Hungarian monograph on the Templars was published in 1912 (by Ferenc Patek) and on the Hospitallers in 1925-1928 (by Ede Reiszig). A few articles and some popular works have come out since then, but these were backed by no new research on primary sources. Croatian scholars, primarily Lelja Dobronić, made several attempts in the 1980s to correct the arrears of many decades of work, but in the end she failed in several respects. Besides various misunderstandings originating either from Reiszig or lying with herself, one of the fundamental problems with her work is that she drew a one-sided picture on the Order. She studied the activity of the Order in the region of present-day Croatia, which is only one half of the former Hungarian-Slavonian priory of the Hospital (which covered present-day Hungary, Croatia, Romania, and partly Slovenia). Undoubtedly, the territorial distribution of the preceptories indicates a certain preference for Slavonia from the fourteenth century onwards, but it is still unhistorical to approach this issue according to the borders of modern states. Similar research problems arose in the case of other religious orders and it turned out that only detailed, critical research can
resolve fundamental questions such as the actual numbers of houses of religious orders in medieval Hungary.

One problem with the early monographs (from Georgius Pray to Ede Reiszig) is that they do not meet modern scholarly standards, although many scientific works (especially source editions) have stood the test of time. Re-thinking the questions about the Hospitallers is motivated by the fact that the exploitation of new sources and using new methods may yield more exact and reliable results, which will eventually channel the students of the field towards contemporary international standards. Accordingly, the thorough revision of Ede Reiszig’s work on the Hospitallers in Hungary is not barely justified by the period of eight decades that have elapsed so far. The historiography of the Hospitallers has also been burdened with a serious conceptual problem for a long time. In contrast to the Western European context, Hungarian -- and many Central European -- (Latin) written sources often use the term crucifer instead of the appropriate frater hospitalis, miles Templi, conceivably with reference to the cross depicted on their habits. This led to confusion, as many scholars treated the houses and the landed properties of other orders of similar status (e.g., the Order of St. Anthony, the Order of the Holy Spirit, and so on) as belonging to the Hospital, and vice versa. On the basis of this perception and by a close reading of primary sources as well as by the clarification of the notions and denominations applied in the primary sources, Karl-Georg Boroviczény, a German hematologist of Hungarian origin discovered or, in fact, singled out (in the late 1960s), a formerly unknown religious institution, the Order of Hospitaller Canons Regular of St. Stephen, founded by the Hungarian King Géza II around the mid-twelfth century. The members of this order were also called cruciferi in contemporary sources -- they even used this expression in the inscriptions of their own charters -- but they had nothing in common with either the crusaders or with the Hospital of St. John. Mainstream Hungarian scholarship accepted Boroviczeny’s ideas but has failed to draw the necessary conclusions, namely, that the history (settling down, presence, activity, role) of the Hospitallers in the Hungarian kingdom should be fundamentally reconsidered.

Partly on the initiative of Karl-Georg Boroviczény, I began my own research on the Hospitallers settled in this part of Latin Christendom. The basis of my doctoral research is a
database of primary sources which is the outcome of a survey of thousands of published and unpublished charters. Besides the source editions, I consulted primarily the medieval holdings of the National Archives of Hungary and I also collected relevant materials from the archives and libraries in Sopron, Zagreb, Zadar, Paris, Poitiers, and London. In addition, one of the most important phases of the collecting procedure was the research conducted in the central archives of the Hospital, presently kept in Malta. I managed to research both its microfilm copy in the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library (Collegeville, USA) and the original collection which is deposited in the National Library of Malta (Valletta). In terms of numbers: 1,200 charters were utilized in some way during the analysis, out of which some 950 documents pertain directly or indirectly to the history of the Hospital.

This dissertation is rather positivist in nature, but the portrayed premises noted above demanded the rigorous observance of the old imperative: ad fontes. As a conscious methodological decision, I trust that only a work grounded in positivism can establish a solid basis for further discussion of various problems/questions raised by modern scholarship. That is, the clear determination of the corpus of primary sources had to be the first step toward providing a satisfactory basis for re-constructing the history of the Hospital in medieval Hungary. It should be emphasized that the sources at my disposal are inadequate for an entire reconstruction. Moreover, begrudging the situation of Western scholars of the field, I have to acknowledge that on the basis of the primary sources at my disposal numerous areas of the life of the Priory cannot be the subject of investigation. Thus, the choice of topics here at times does not reflect current historiographical trends but has been done under duress. The reader has to settle for the mere possibility of raising questions or applying analogies instead of reconstructing intensive contours. One has to be careful with the application of analogies, since, in the absence of a solid and palpable basis, the analogies easily can mislead us by muting regional characteristics or deviances. I intend to maintain a certain equilibrium during the presentation and evaluation of the research presented. For instance, most of the written sources produced by the kingdom's central governmental organs vanished from a considerable part of the country during the 150 years of Turkish occupation. The extent of the destruction of the sources will never be fully known to scholars and it is difficult for Western
researchers to understand its gravity. This loss of records concerns not only the number of the
sources, but the fact that almost entire types of documents were lost, such as official or private
letters sent to the Hungarian kings, many drafts of legal documents, accounts of the magister
tawarnicorum or, later, of the Master of the Treasury.

In addition to this, I am fully aware (and have tried to act accordingly) that there are
different themes in the (re)writing of the history of the Hospitaller Hungarian-Slavonian
Priory. As a direct consequence of this state of research, the core of this dissertation aims at
reconstructing the history of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory. Nonetheless, while analyzing
and evaluating the facts and train of events, I will also endeavor to reflect upon both the
overall history of the Hospital and on several aspects of Hungarian society from the twelfth
through the fourteenth century. This approach is a prerequisite for exploiting recent
achievements of mainstream contemporary scholarship focusing on the history of the Order as
well as new fields of interest concerning Hungarian social history. As for the former, it is
important to emphasize that the last three decades have seen an enormous advance in research
projects launched on the history of the Hospitallers. Hungarian scholarship, however, still
seems to overlook the new trends and results in that field (admittedly, tribute should be paid
to the exceptions). This can be explained by the language barrier and the often irksome
procedure in the accession of recent publications. This dissertation will attempt to correct
arrears in research partly by briefly surveying relevant mainstream ideas as well by pointing
out the links between the Hungarian Priory and the Order as a network of priories and
preceptories. In addition, an attempt will be made to present and evaluate all of the specific
activities of the Order as well as the local characteristics of the Priory.

As for Hungarian historiography, it is noteworthy that manifest progress can be seen in
the perception of Hungarian history in general as well as various fields of social history
during the last quarter of the twentieth century. Fundamental changes can be observed in
regard to the interpretation of the turn of the thirteenth century and the Angevin period as a
whole. This change concerns not only social but also economic history and the history of
religious ideas, which altogether requires a different approach in many respects.
More and more is known about the different social layers and their correlation with each other and their relation to royal power than about. The interrelation between the possession of strongholds and the power attributed to their holders is much more transparent, especially with regard to the aristocracy, both lay and ecclesiastic. Similarly, results discovered in the course of the investigation of the lower layers of the society, such as conditional nobles or tenant peasants, may facilitate the interpretation of the Hospitallers’ local acts and behavior. Certainly, the renaissance of institutional history should also be noted, in the first instance, research projects focusing on a particular Hungarian legal entity -- the place of authentication (locus credibilis). In the case of all possible points of intersection I aim at creating a background of mainstream scholarly thoughts against which the activity/role of the Hospitallers can be more accurately judged. The present thesis, however, does not undertake the burden of terminating scholarly debates lying outside the central topic of the Hospitallers, even though it attempts to contribute to the resolution of unsettled problems. Nor have I presumed to conduct missing basic research in several areas, but I try to point out the fields which still await extensive unearthing of primary sources.

0.2. THE STRUCTURE
The elaboration of the dissertation aims at reflecting the research situation described above. The thesis targets a three-fold overall objective: (1) a critical confrontation of the research issues in the international scholarship and Hungarian research, including the situation with sources; (2) to establish the “backbone” of the Order’s history including the reconstruction of the network of the administrative units; (3) to present several topics which show important characteristics of the Hospitallers when the sources at our disposal allow us to perform the discussion in adequate depth. In addition, these are the themes which can be regarded as indicators of regional characteristics, thus making them suitable for comparative research with international scholarship.

Accordingly, Chapter I presents the historiography of both international and regional studies on the Hospital. Besides its being a mandatory element of such a genre, it has a particular significance in this case since Western and Eastern readers rarely have appropriate
information concerning publications of the “far side”. A similar statement can be formulated concerning the short presentation of the overall history of the Order in Chapter II. It is not only an indispensable element of such a reconstruction, but it also provides an opportunity for readers to grasp basic, reliable information about the Order with special emphasis on its structure. Experts may skip this part of the dissertation, but it will be useful for those who have hitherto relied upon a picture of the Hospital deduced from outdated and often awkward summaries. The overall approach of the dissertation embraces a three-fold correlation of the general and regional history of the Order with the political, social, and ecclesiastical history of medieval Hungary.

Chapters III and IV constitute the historical “backbone” of the history of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory from the mid-twelfth century up to the 1380s. These chapters embrace the questions of the settling of the brethren, the spread and distribution of the preceptories through time (illustrated on maps), the aftermath of the dissolution of the Templars, and the local characteristics of the order. Chapter V is prosopographical in nature and the most international unit of the dissertation. Thus, it expresses the international and centralized nature of the Order and sheds some light on the mobility of the major officials of the Order. Continuing down this path, Chapter VI is a repertory aiming at an institutional reconstruction of the preceptories primarily through a survey of their personnel. Its basic form is a catalogue with microhistories of the preceptories of the Priory.

Due to their significance, two circles of questions are discussed in separate chapters. Since one of the original and long-lasting purposes of the administrative units of the Order was their fund-raising activity, the estate management of the Priory is presented alone (Chapter VII). Similarly, the unique activity of the Hospitallers in medieval Hungary in serving as places of authentication (loca credibilia) in the administration of private legal affairs, along with the use of seals in the priory, rendered in a separate chapter (Chapter VIII).

The dissertation closes with conclusions and a bibliography of the works cited in the thesis. To facilitate the explication of my ideas and results I have attached various appendices to the main corpus of the dissertation. The first is the list of the primary sources (archive
number/signature, date, issuer, form of existence, place of publication and/or calendar). The table contains a reduced amount of information since it aims to facilitate the access/retrieval of the documents and not present the full apparatus criticus of the sources. For the time being, the complete list is available in a computerized database and publication of any substantial part of the present work will contain a CD-ROM attachment. For the same purpose, a Diplomatarium is to be found in the Appendix. It is chiefly a selection of unpublished primary sources. In addition, there are also charters which have already been edited but contain serious mistakes or extensive omissions. In some cases I have incorporated important texts which were edited in publications not easily accessible for potential readers. There are also a few documents to which I made many references in the text of the dissertation, therefore I found useful to put the whole text at the reader’s disposal. For the time being, the Diplomatarium has a rather illustrative function as I inserted into the text of the dissertation all those passages which required (extensive) literal citation.

An integral part of Chapter VIII is a catalogue of the seals used by the Hungarian Priory in the period under query and even beyond. There are also some comparative visual materials included in Appendix C; while Appendices D and E contain additional tables and figures referring to and elucidating different parts of the dissertation. The opus concludes with a gazetteer which lists the toponyms cited throughout the dissertation in alphabetical order.

Summing up, the objective of this dissertation is (1) to produce a basic work on the Hospitallers in medieval Hungary based on the most comprehensive source base possible; (2) to survey the correlations among the overall and regional history of the Hospital along with relevant segments of the history of the Hungarian kingdom. Last but not least, I present conclusions on the role played by the Hospitallers in Hungary and on their perceptible interaction with the social environment of medieval Hungary in the period under query.
CHAPTER I
AN INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE HOSPITAL

1.1. CURRENT TRENDS IN INTERNATIONAL HISTORIOGRAPHY (1967 TO 2003)

An overview of the historiography of the Hospital is remarkable. This survey cannot be casual; it is better to enumerate the most important trends of scholarship that played a significant role in the foundation of the research, which will serve as a basis for this dissertation. Accordingly, the present summary does not aim at integrating all the studies that were ever written or make any reference to the history of the Hospital. This decision is strengthened by the fact that a conference held in Teruel (Spain) in 2001 took as its overall objective to summarize the results and trends of mainstream scholarship of the last half century.¹

This survey is perhaps arbitrary from many points of view. First, only those works will be taken into account which manifestly studied the history of the Hospital. It is not among the purposes here to mention all those who studied primarily the history of the crusades or the Latin East and while publishing nonetheless important articles made references to the history of the Order.² In addition, the choice of the starting point is also arbitrary to some extent: the landmark monograph³ of Jonathan Riley-Smith in 1967, which is outstanding not only in British historiography but also world-wide. It would be an overstatement to interpret that moment as a breakthrough owing to at least two phenomena. Partly because the present-day doyen of the studies of the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Hospital, Anthony Luttrell,

¹Medio siglo de estudios sobre las Cruzadas y las Órdenes militares, 1951-2001. Universidad de Zaragoza, Facultad de Huesca (Spain). The proceedings of the conference are forthcoming.

²It can easily be monitored from the Bulletins of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East (SSCLE) from 1981.

began to publish his works as early as the 1950s and these have proved to be as important as
those of the recently famed Riley-Smith. Especially since Luttrell made an extensive use of
archival resources while one of the most remarkable characteristics (and most striking
imperfection) of Riley-Smith’s work is that he based his study exclusively on published
sources, although he did incorporate all the available resources of his time. Simultaneously
with their activity, German scholarship gained merit in this field through the works of Walter
Gerd Rödel and the series of studies of Berthold Waldstein-Wartenberg which also started
around that time. Certainly, the volume of studies edited by Adam Wienand can also be
mentioned, although Wienand’s merits are restricted to editorial work since he was not a
historian. Nor it should be overlooked that a renaissance of auxiliary tools such as
bibliographies took place in these years, partly as a continuation of earlier projects, as in the
work of Joseph Mizzi concerning the Hospital or by others with reference to other military-
religious orders or to the crusades. This new track resulted in both reprints of former studies
and grand new compilations.

4Anthony Luttrell, “Venice and the Hospitallers of Rhodes in the 14th century,” Papers of the British

5See his recent festschrift: Marcus Bull, and Norman Housley, ed., The Experience of Crusading I:
Western Approaches; Jonathan Phillips, and Peter Edbury, ed., The Experience of Crusading II: Defining the

6Walter Gerd Rödel, Das Grosspriorat Deutschland des Johanniter-Ordens im Übergang von Mittelalter
der Reformations, an Hand der Generalvisitationenberichte von 1494/95 und 1540/41 (Cologne: Wienand Verlag,
1966; 2d ed.: 1972).

7Berthold Waldstein-Wartenberg, Rechtsgeschichte des Malteserordens (Wien-München: Herold, 1969);


9Ferdinand de Hellwald, Bibliographie méthodique de l’Ordre Souverain de St. Jean de Jérusalem
(Rome, 1985); Ettore Rossi, Aggiunta alla Bibliographie méthodique de l’Ordre Souverain de St. Jean de
Jérusalem de F. de Hellwald, (Rome: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1924); Joseph Mizzi, “A Bibliography of
the Order of St. John of Jerusalem (1925-1969),” in The Order of St. John in Malta: XIII Council of Europe

Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1966); Heinrich Neu, ed., Bibliographie des Templer-Ordens, 1927-1965 (Bonn:
Ordens bis 1959, Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des Deutschen Ordens 3 (Bonn-Godesberg: Verlag
Wissenschaftliches Archiv, 1975), 120-154; Hans Eberhard Mayer, Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge
Not completely independent from these trends, but following somewhat dissimilar premises, research on the history of the Hospital got another impetus in the 1980s. The reason for this is rooted in the fact that the establishment of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East (SSCLE) in 1980 gave scholars a wider view of ongoing projects which also targeted the military-religious orders. These partly concerned the role played by the Hospital in the Latin East as well as the European provinces. The studies published incorporated both synthetic works which surveyed the entirety of a given period\textsuperscript{11} and also those which concerned particular topics, for instance, the archeological surveys of Denys Pringle or the studies of James Brundage approaching from the angle of canon law.\textsuperscript{12} At the same time, the number of regional studies increased: Michael Gervers and Helen Nicholson published important works on the British Isles; from France, the studies of Jean Glénisson, Jean-Marc Roger, Noël Coulet, Benoît Beaucage, and Michel Miguet should be mentioned; in Italy, besides Francesco Tommassi, many scholars have “left their cards” in the historiography of the last two decades;\textsuperscript{13} from Flanders, the scholarly achievements of Johanna Maria van Winter and Johannes A. Mol are to be listed while, in Germany, the activity of Rudolf Hiestand, Hans Eberhard Mayer, Karl Borchardt and Jürgen Sarnowsky are remarkable as far international scholarship is concerned. Moreover, the published works can be grouped thematically, which reveals more about the major trends of recent research projects. Accordingly, it is worth emphasizing that there is palpable progress in the field of source editions owing to the activity of Rudolf Hiestand, Michael Gervers, and Maria van Winter as well as, more recently, Jürgen Sarnowsky. Many deficiencies remain to be made

\textsuperscript{11}For instance, the monograph of Riley-Smith for the period between 1050 and 1310, which, unlike its title, contains important data concerning the European provinces of the Order. See Note 3.

\textsuperscript{12}For instance, James Brundage, “The Lawyers of the Military Orders,” in MO1, 346-357.

\textsuperscript{13}Pier Carlo Begotti, Renato Bordone, Giampaolo Cagnin, Benvenuto Castellarin, Roberto Greci, Annibale Ilari, Josepha Costa Restagno, etc. In general it can be stated that from a professional point of view some of them produced an unsteady output, but the regional studies are still the most intensive in Italy. For the works not listed here, see the notes of the dissertation and the WORKS CITED. See also Zsolt Hunyadi, “A Bibliography of the Crusades and the Military Orders,” in Expanding the Frontiers, 501-589.
up, however, for example, the publication of the central archives of the Hospital with reference to the Order, presently kept in Malta, as well as charters -- first of all those issued in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries -- in the collections of European archives.

Other relevant directions of investigation are embodied in comparative studies and those studies aimed at the theoretical basis of the topic. In this regard, besides Riley-Smith and Luttrell, the works of Kaspar Elm, Alan Forey, Rudolf Hiestand, and Helen Nicholson should be highlighted. They earned remarkable merit in the process, which resulted in the autonomous status of research pertaining to the Hospital; that is, it became detached from the crusading studies even if there are manifold relations between the two areas. One of the ostensive signs was the launch of the quadrennial conference series at Clerkenwell (London) in 1992, which assemble to muster results in this field. In the course of these meetings many studies have been presented which, besides their own values and importance, prompted others to launch new projects. Without the need for entirety, the following scholars should be noted: Benjamin Z. Kedar, Luis Garcia-Guijarro Ramos, Susan Edgington, Anne-Marie Legras, Marie-Luise Favreau-Lilie, Tore Nyberg, Timothy S. Miller, Keith V. Sinclair, Theresa M. Vann, and Henry Sire. Some of them focused on the economic activity of the Hospital in the Levant while others concentrated on the European provinces and their preceptories, the exemptions of the Order, and comparative investigations. Certainly, the subject of these studies was usually one segment of the history of the Order and rarely aimed at the thorough analysis of extensive issues. It was, however, enough to initiate new projects or to have an impact on the choice of topic of the “new generation” of the field: Elena Bellomo, Judith

14 Access to the sources is facilitated by a microfilm copy of the collection which is now deposited in the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library (Collegeville, USA); by the same token a research center was also founded (Malta Study Center).

15 The Museum of St. John (St John’s Gate) under the auspices of the London Centre for the Study of the Crusades.

16 Sire as a journalist wrote a monograph which, despite all its deficiencies and imperfections, played an important role in the popularization of the history of the Hospital.

Some scholars among those listed above managed to look over the Iron Curtain which, in the meantime, ceased to divide groups of scholars from East and West. They did a great deal to reinforce the point that many regions (and countries) located east of the Elbe River once formed parts of Latin Christendom and as such they should be taken into account during research projects of this nature. First of all, it should be emphasized that Borchardt and Luttrell have worked on the history of the Province of Alamania and related topics. Their work has been augmented by that of Waldstein-Wartenberg, and their results have


contributed a great deal to the research conducted in this region. In addition, the studies appearing in Western publications about territories behind the former Iron Curtain showed Eastern scholars that few scholarly works which meet modern scholarly standards are available concerning these regions in Western languages. Lacking such material, Western scholars had to rely upon outdated studies for a long time. Hereby should stand just some typical examples: Concerning the Hungarian-Slavonian priory, which incorporated areas from the modern states of Hungary, Croatia, Romania and Slovenia, most academics knew and used the French “summary” of the monograph of Ede Reiszig\(^2\) -- full of erroneous and unfounded ideas -- until very recently. Several studies were published by the middle of the 1980s focusing on the Slavonian part of the priory, but as they were published in Croatian they did not have an impact on Western historiography. Seemingly there was a better knowledge of the priory of Poland since a monograph was published in English around the end of the 1960s.\(^2\) Modern Polish scholarship, however, harshly criticized the reliability of this work.\(^2\) Perhaps Czech historiography was in the most favorable situation owing to the fact that starting with the 1970 edition of Wienand there was a continuity in publishing studies about the Bohemian and Moravian Hospitallers in German. Libor Jan and a growing number of his colleagues and students are among the followers of this tradition of publishing in Western languages. A closer look of studies concerning the Hungarian-Slavonian priory follows.

### 1.2. Regional historiography: Hospitallers in Hungary

I do not intend to reconstruct the historiography of the Hospital in its entirety as did Ede Reiszig in his articles from the late nineteenth century onwards as well as in his two-volume


\(^{29}\)Cf. Maria Starnawska, Między Jerozolimą a Łukowem. Zakony krzyżowe na ziemiach polskich w średniowieczu (Between Jerusalem and Łuków. Military-religious orders in Medieval Poland) (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG, 1999), 47.
monograph. Admittedly, the work was published in Hungarian, but the relevant part amounts to a few pages which can be used without a profound knowledge of Hungarian; the problematic points, however, will be discussed in detail below.

Late nineteenth-century research on the military-religious orders was facilitated by the simultaneous formation of the medieval collection of the later National Archives of Hungary, and by the more and more extensive source editions that began in the first third of the nineteenth century. The common feature of these works -- i.e. pre-war titles -- is that most of them are full of conceptual problems and misunderstandings. In contrast to the Western European situation, Hungarian -- and many Central European (Latin) written sources very often use the term crucifer instead of the appropriate frater hospitalis, miles Templi, conceivably with reference to the cross depicted on their habits. This led to confusion: many scholars treated the houses and the landed properties of other orders, for instance the Order of St. Anthony or the Order of the Holy Spirit, as belonging to the Hospital or the Temple, and vice versa. In addition, there was no attempt to analyze the nuclei of these orders through their administrative units, that is, the preceptories, which certainly led further distortions.

---


32 Maria Starnawska, “Crusade Orders on Polish Lands during the Middle Ages: A daptation in a Peripheral Environment,” Quaestiones Mediæ Aevi Novaæ 2 (1997): 121-142; As mirrored in the title of the article, this phenomenon still leads to misunderstandings or misinterpretations, even if the author presents her ideas in a way which meets modern scholarly standards.
In addition to the crucifer-problem, which caused plenty of misinterpretations in (East) Central Europe, Hungarian scholarship had to face another serious problem. The first study on the history of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory was compiled by John Tomkó Marvanich (1609), but owing to its unreliable nature “modern” scholarship regards the decrees of the synod of Nagyszombat in 1629 as the starting point for general surveys. This source, which was also utilized by Reiszig, includes two lists of ecclesiae et conventus which the researchers attributed to the Hospital with no effort at source criticism. Since the Order virtually did not function in Hungary at that time, the office of the prior became titular, thus the compiler of the list perhaps tried to ground future claims and he/they listed many more houses than ever (co)existed in the priory. No scholar took notice of this until the late 1960s, when Karl-Georg Boroviczény, a German hematologist of Hungarian origin (not accidentally, a modern Maltese “knight”) began to study the history of the military orders in the medieval Kingdom of Hungary. He compiled an annotated bibliography in 1970 and wrote a study which was presented in Hungary in 1974 but was published much later. Boroviczény’s work proved to be very important. First of all, he reinforced the demand for new research projects concerning the military-religious orders. Moreover, his survey aimed at collecting all the primary written sources published up to the end of the 1960s. By the close reading of primary sources and by the clarification of the notions and denominations applied in these charters, Boroviczény discovered or, in fact, singled out, a hitherto unknown religious institution, the Order of Hospitaller Canons Regular of St. Stephen, founded by the

---


34Acta et decreta Synodi Diocesanae Strigoniensis (Posonii, 1629), 113. The source is known from Ecclesiae et conventus cruciferorum s. Ioannis Jerosolimitani, ex actis synodi Pazmanianae, University Library (Budapest, Hungary) Historia ecclesiastica Ab 72/2. (Collegii Tyrnav. s. Jesu, 1763) (no foliation is indicated in the source).


Hungarian King Géza II around the mid-twelfth century. The members of this order were also called cruciferi in contemporary sources -- they even used this expression in the inscriptions of their own charters -- but they had nothing common with either the crusaders or with the Hospital of St. John. As a matter of curiosity, the situation is that although Boroviczény used the work of Reiszig he did not notice that a “second list” submitted to the synod of Nagyszombat (1629) is in practical terms the bull of Pope Urban III of 1187, in which he brought the Order of St. Stephen under papal protection and listed its dependencies. For the time being it is an unsolved puzzle why Esztergom, the leading Stephanite house, was added to the “homogenous” Hospitaller list of preceptories. According to Boroviczény, the number of houses and possessions of the Stephanites dwindled by the 1440s and their possessions, similar to those of the Templars, were taken over by the Hospital. Despite this theory, these entities, with some minor exceptions, did not appear in the source materials pertaining to the Hospitallers; thus, further research is needed to clarify this point. However, I disagree with Boroviczény on the usability of the rest of Reiszig’s ideas, that is, after the removal of the Stephanite materials from the corpus. Many elements of his concept were biased sources, including those belonging to the canons regular; by changing the fundamentals, the “superstructure” should also be altered. This requirement also concerns other fields of historical studies, particularly church history.

The ideas of Boroviczény, however, have been neglected and disregarded in Hungary for almost two decades -- basically for two major reasons. First of all, he lived in Germany, which made it difficult to keep “daily contact” with mainstream Hungarian scholarship. However, his not being a professional historian proved to be the most problematic issue. Most Hungarian historians refused his ideas merely because he was an enthusiastic amateur. The reception of his suggestions has fundamentally changed after the watershed of the early 1990s. Nonetheless, it seems appropriate to make an overview of the few studies published on the Hospitallers in the Carpathian basin.

37 Boroviczény, “Cruciferi Sancti Regis Stephani,” 9-13. Boroviczény, however, did not realize that most likely it was the Jesuits who merged the Stephanites into the story.

Concerning the state of research in the case of the Hospitallers, first of all a strong trend can be observed in the historiography on behalf of members of the modern Maltese/Johanniter Orders. Following Ede Reiszig’s scholarly achievements of the 1920s, several works have been published since 1959 by Miklós István Tóth, Karl-Georg Boroviczény, Martin von Walterskirchen, Antal Radvánszky and Szabolcs de Vajay. All these works were published in Western European countries, thus they had no wide and prompt impact on Hungarian studies. The only exception that seems to reflect these works is a popular monograph by Imre Marjai published in 1990. On the other hand, these studies -- published in Hungarian or German -- were usually summaries of former secondary works and thus yielded no “brand-new” results.

Since the possessions of the dissolved Templars were taken over by the Hospital, the scholarly literature concerning their activity and preceptories also needs to be taken into account. The first post-war study of the Templars that meets modern scholarly standards was published in the journal of the Zadar division of the Yugoslav (present-day Croatian) Academy of Sciences, which in 1971 dedicated an entire volume to Vrana (Croatia), the medieval headquarters of the Templars and later that of the Hospitallers on the Dalmatian coast. In addition to minor studies from the 1980s, the Croatian Lelja Dobronić published


43 Szabolcs de Vajay, A johannita lovagrend tagjai [The members of the Order of the Hospital] (Munich: Obedientia Brandenburgensis, 1987).

44 Imre Marjai, A kereszt és a kard lovagjai. (A máltai lovagrend) [The Knights of the Cross and the Sword. (The Knights of Malta)] (Budapest: Új Nap, 1990).

several articles and two monographs on the military-religious orders in present-day Croatia, including the Hospitallers as well. She might have corrected the errors and imperfections of the nineteenth-century authors or that of Reiszig, but she almost completely ignored Hungarian sources,\footnote{Besides the charters edited by Smičiklas (et al.), she hardly used any source publication other than György Fejér's collection. Cf. Marko Kostrenčić, and Tadija Smičiklas, ed., Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae ac Slavoniae. Diplomatiki zbornik kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije, 18 vols. (Zagreb: JAZU-HAZU, 1904-1998); Georgius Fejér, ed., Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis, 11 vols. (Buda, 1829-1844); See also the work of Željko Tomčić who mostly based his ideas on the studies of Dobronić: Željko Tomčić, “Fortifications of Orders of Knights in Medieval Croatia,” in Leszek Kajzer, and Henryk Paner, ed. Castrum Bene: Castle and Church, vol. 5 (Gdańsk: Muzeum Archaeologiczne w Gdańsku, 1996), 201-218. There are, however, also recent and more reliable works from Croatia on this topic: Neven Budak, “Ivan od Palizne, prior vranski, vitez sv. Ivana” [John of Palisna, prior of Vrana, Hospitaller knight] Historijski Zbornik 42 (1989): 57-70; idem, “John of Palisna, the Hospitaller Prior of Vrana,” in Expanding the Frontiers, 283-290.} that is the written sources preserved or published in Hungary. Also, she applied and combined unverifiable archeological ideas, thus further confusing the picture of the Hungarian-Slavonian province of the Templars. When evaluating her work it is worth noting that she was the first scholar from the region who consulted the central archives of the Hospital (presently kept in Malta) from the perspective of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory of the Order. Slovenian scholars have also studied the Hospitallers in their region during the last two decades (Joze Mlinarič and Miha Kosi),\footnote{Joze Mlinarič, “Malteška komenda na Polzeli,” [Hospitaller Commandery at Polzel/Palzela/Heilenstein] Kronika 28 (1980), 161-171; idem, “M elje in njegova malteška komenda od 12. stoletja do leta 1803” [M elje and its Hospitaller Commandery from the twelfth century to 1803] Casopis za zgodovino in narodopisje n.s. 16 (1980): 217-238; Joze Mlinarič, “Malteški red na Slovenskem,” [The Order of the Hospital in Slovenia] in Edo Škulj, ed. Glavarjev simpozij v Rimu (Celje: M horjeva družba, 1999), 17-25; Miha Kosi, “The Age of the Crusades in the South-East of the Empire (Between the Alps and the Adriatic),” in Expanding the Frontiers, 123-166.} but they mostly relied on Dobronić’s achievements and ideas.

Simultaneously with the studies of Dobronić, Hungarian lay scholarship also “discovered” the importance of the topic at the end of the 1970s. The work of László Hárting and Károly Kozák\(^{49}\) aimed at providing a modern summary for a wider audience, though Kozák’s work of 1982 explicitly targeted the scientific world, as it was published in the Hungarian Acta Archaeologica in French.\(^{50}\) As an archeologist, he combined different historical and art historical ideas without any sort of source criticism in his “catalogue.” Although he mentioned the canons regular of St. Stephen, quoting Boroviczény’s idea, he completely confused the data referring to the different orders. Along with the Slovak Alexander Ruttkay\(^{51}\) he opened quite a problematic chapter in the historiography of the Hospital in this region. On an art historical and archeological basis they built up theses which not only made Reiszig’s ideas linger (and mediated them towards other disciplines), but these ideas were contradictory themselves.

Nonetheless, it would be unjust to omit that the last three decades also yielded works which meet modern scholarly standards and thus provide substantial help to this doctoral project. Two of them especially concern sources of research. First, the calendars published by Géza Érszegi should be mentioned.\(^{52}\) The private archives (conservatorium privatum) of the Székesfehérvár Hospital preceptory escaped from the Turkish occupation first to Nagyszombat and it was later moved to Pozsony (Bratislava), where scholars had access to it for many decades. They could also consult the eighteenth-century Jesuit copies which were brought to Budapest upon the move of the University. Finally, owing to an interstate


agreement, the Hospitaller archives were acquired by the National Archives of Hungary at the end of the 1960s, and, as an archivist, Érszegi made calendars out of the charters. Although he only published the calendars of those charters having reference to Fejér County, the rest can be found in the National Archives attached to the Collectio Antemohacisiana as an auxiliary tool.

At least three aspects of the works of Pál Engel should be accentuated. First, he improved knowledge of the priors of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory in the course of the compilation of his archontology. He also collected important data in connection with the estates of the Order, with special regard to Slavonia, during the compilation of his posthumously published digital map. Last but not least, Engel was the first Hungarian scholar who conducted research in the central archives of the Hospital in Malta. Although his activity should be regarded a sondage, its importance was that he suggested continuing the search for hungarica materials among the records of the central administration. With his active backing I conducted archival research in two phases which altogether took fourteen weeks. It proved to be crucial not only for the discovery of new documents but it was also a chance for monitoring the machinery of the central administration by wading through the cartularies of the Rhodian period. The experience helped me a great deal in understanding the function of the Order as a whole, which is, hopefully, perceivable in the following thesis.

Briefly summarizing the above, I am of the opinion that there are various arguments for “re-writing” Reiszig’s history of the Hospitallers settled in the medieval kingdom of Hungary. The surveys accomplished during the course of the last eight decades have unearthed a remarkable number of sources which alone demand rethinking several issues. Especially, since I am privileged to base my ideas on the largest number of primary sources


since Reiszig. Nevertheless, much more can be concluded both directly and indirectly. Since the “discovery” of the Stephanites, the history of the Hospital in Hungary has not been revised, although the framework has changed. On the other hand, Hungarian scholarship has always been characterized by a certain “negligence” of mainstream international studies, which was particularly disadvantageous in the case of a highly centralized order like the Hospital. Most of the brethren arrived from abroad and conceivably returned to remote places. Most of the decisions concerning the priory were made far from the confines of the Hungarian kingdom.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{56}Cf. the papers published in the Expanding of Frontiers.
CHAPTER II
THE ORDER: HISTORY, STRUCTURE, CHARACTERISTICS

The present short overview does not pretend to substitute for any of the recent studies on the history of the Hospital. Those who are interested in any particular segment of the history of the Order should consult modern monographs and articles published extensively during the last decades. However, many scholars of medieval studies have fallen back upon totally misleading, awkward and outdated theories concerning military-religious orders. Central European scholarship has been particularly vulnerable in this respect, as presented in CHAPTER I. Therefore, it seems necessary to provide an overview for those readers who have had no access to reliable studies which meet modern scholarly standards. This aperçu should be regarded as a set of guidelines for the better understanding of the major part of the thesis.

2.1. FROM JERUSALEM TO RHODES

The origins of a military-religious Order under the spiritual patronage of St. John can be sought in a pilgrim-hospital which was founded in Jerusalem by the 1080s. Around this time, some merchants from the southern Italian Amalfi were permitted to establish a hospice south of the Holy Sepulchre for the reception of pilgrims from the West. The hospice, dedicated to St. John the Baptist, was founded for the care of the poor and it functioned under the auspices of Santa Maria della Latina, a Benedictine monastery established by “Latins.” The early community was led by a certain Gerard as custos pauperum, most likely of Italian or Provençal origin.

---


The foundations of a “network” of European hospices began parallel to the preparations for the First Crusade and the hospice founded in Jerusalem became the head of this circle around the beginning of the twelfth century. On the basis of a recent theory, it was not accidental that the Jerusalem hospital next to the Santa Maria della Latina played a central role. Accordingly, the separation from the monastery was not spontaneous but was carried out on the basis of the idea of Pope Urban II prior to the crusade, with the active contribution of Daibert, Archbishop of Pisa and later Patriarch of Jerusalem.59 One of the most important milestones on the path of the community towards becoming an order was the success of the First Crusade with special regard to the Christian conquest of Jerusalem. The significance of the hospice was manifestly raised by the increasing number of pilgrims visiting the holy places. Owing to this unforeseen boom, the “conglomerate” of hospitals received estates as gifts promoting such charitable activity. Effective and profitable estate management soon required a better organized establishment. The forming institution was brought under papal protection by the Pie postulatio voluntatis bull of Pope Paschalis II in 1113,60 permitting the brothers to elect their superior after the death of Gerard. Thus, after his death, Raymond du Puy directed the fraternity and he provided it with a rule based on the Rule of St. Augustine, which set a more flexible lifestyle than its Benedictine counterpart.61 The Regula lays down a

---


framework for the life of the brethren in its nineteen chapters. It regulated service at the altar; alms-raising and charitable activity; different manners of punishment; the service for deceased brothers; and the wearing of the cross. A parallel can be drawn with the Latin Rule of the Templars, which was not suitable for regulating all the scenes of the everyday life of the brethren either. Thus the Hospitallers -- similar to the Templar’s French Rule which consisted of more than 680 passages by 1267 -- completed the basic principles with papal legislation, statutes enacted at the chapters general, case law (esgarts), and customs (usances) of the Order.

With an increase in the number of gifts received by the Hospital, its monasteries and hospitals appeared along the pilgrim routes across Europe as well as at seaports. The basic objective of the overall organization of the Order was to finance its activity in the Holy Land from the profit raised in its European preceptories. The Hospital gradually became militarized, which was palpable by the 1160s at the latest. Therefore, it is important to emphasize that the Hospital was founded not as a military order although it altered its character during the first half of the twelfth century. This new pursuit did not extinguish the importance of the Jerusalem hospital, which was enlarged in 1156. Besides the statutes of Master Roger des Moulins in 1182, the actual charitable activity of the brethren may be

---


63 Curzon, La Règle du Temple, ii-iii.


66 The shift in the basic attitude of the Order was so radical as the papal curia warned its “beloved sons” in the 1170s that their primary duty was the service of the poor. Cf. Riley-Smith, Hospitallers, 37.
estimated through a recently identified description which was most likely made between 1182 and 1187.\textsuperscript{67} An anonymous German pilgrim recorded his personal impressions by narrating that the Hospital took each needy person except lepers, irrespective of their status and gender, moreover “pagans -- that is, Muslims -- and Jews were admitted to the hospital.”\textsuperscript{68}

One should not conclude, however, that the European hospitals of the Order performed the same function as that in Jerusalem. These institutions were mainly run as guest-houses (xenones, xenodochia) which were at the disposal of the pilgrims exhausted on the interminably long road leading to their sacred targets. Nor can it be argued that the Jerusalem hospital stood at the top of contemporary medicine. Much more expertise can be observed either in the Arabic hospitals or in the Byzantine Pantocrator hospital.\textsuperscript{69} All these are of much less importance, however, if we keep in view Jonathan Riley-Smith’s apt remark that pilgrims went to Jerusalem not to be healed but to die.\textsuperscript{70} As of 1187, the chance for winning martyrdom undoubtedly increased in the Holy Land. After the fall of Jerusalem in 1187, similarly to the Templars, the Hospital moved its headquarters to the recently recaptured Acre in 1191, where the Order had run a hospital since 1155. The Acre hospital played a central role in the Order’s activity for a century even though it was not exclusive since the chapters general were not held regularly in Acre until 1262. For instance, the “second rule” of the Hospital was enacted in the castle of Margat (Marqab) in 1206.\textsuperscript{71} The dual character of the Hospital was mirrored in the Hospitaller compound in Acre since it still displayed the preference of care for the poor and pilgrims. Not completely surprising, however, is that the

\textsuperscript{67}For the edition of the text, see Benjamin Z. Kedar, “A Twelfth-Century Description of the Jerusalem Hospital: Appendix,” in M O 2, 13-26.

\textsuperscript{68}Kedar, “A Twelfth-Century Description of the Jerusalem Hospital,” 6-7; see also Susan Edgington, “Medical Care in the Hospital of St. John in Jerusalem,” in M O 2, 27-33.


\textsuperscript{71}Riley-Smith, The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem, 120-121.
peak of activity in Acre coincided with the end game which resulted in the loss of the Holy Land in 1291.

The first station of the retreat was Cyprus, where the Hospital moved its headquarters. It seems that the brethren began to establish a new hospital in Limassol, but they soon followed to the island of Rhodes by the end of the first decade of the fourteenth century. Nonetheless, Cyprus remained an important interest of the Hospital since sugar production made this preceptory one of the richest among the administrative units of the Order. Although at first sight it seems that the Hospitallers appeared in both Cyprus and Rhodes (and finally in Malta) as colonizers, their situation was rather special since they did not exploit the resources and manpower of the islands. On the contrary, they made grandiose investments (on the spot) based on the revenues raised by the priories of the Order all over Europe.

After the conclusive conquest of Rhodes, the Hospital faced hard times. The acquisition of the possessions of the dissolved Templars plunged the Order into a serious financial crisis. Finally the brethren managed to overcome this unexpected situation, but it was a painstaking process and required remarkable structural changes in the hierarchy of the administrative units. In addition, the Hospital claimed new overall objectives as a military-religious order in order to avoid the fate of the Templars. As a result of harsh papal prompting, this renewed attitude concerned a more active participation in the crusading movement. Accordingly, from the mid-fourteenth century the Hospital joined several enterprises against the infidel on both land and sea against the new rising power in the eastern Mediterranean and the Balkans: the Ottoman Turks. The increasing role of the costly passagia in the activity of the Order ran into difficulties during the Great Schism of 1378, which divided the Hospital for a long time.74 The Order, however, rode out the many hardships, which was manifest in the freezing of

---


gifts, the increasing intervention of secular powers, and the relaxation of discipline towards the end of the fourteenth century.

2.2. The Structure of the Order: From Membra to the Convent

The hierarchical structure of the Hospital took shape in the course of the first two centuries of its existence. The nucleus of the territorial organization of the Order was the preceptory or commandery (preceptorium or baiulia), headed by a preceptor/commander or baiulivus. The preceptory was an administrative and economic unit which incorporated the houses, hospitals, castles, and their dependencies (membra, camerae, grangiae). Accordingly, a ‘preceptory’ is not on the same level of the hierarchy as a ‘house’ (domus). There might have been preceptors who simultaneously administered several houses, and vice versa, there were preceptories without domus, that is, a hospital (hospicium, hospitale) or a castle (castrum) could form an administrative unit with the estates belonging to it.

The European administrative units of the Hospital were administered by preceptors who had been appointed either for lifetime or for a set time, usually five to ten years, by the chapter general or the Master. In the early period of the Hospital, it occurred at times that the custos of the preceptory managed the estates, while, from the fourteenth century onwards, it became more frequent that seculars were commissioned with the governance of the goods of a preceptory. A part of the incomes raised by the brethren of the administrative units had to be collected by the preceptor and to be sent -- through the prior or the grand preceptor -- to the headquarters of the Order, that is, to the place where the leadership (conventus) had its

---

75See Chapter VII.

76For the most recent studies on the topic, see La Commanderie. For example, see Anthony Luttrell, “The Finances of the Commander in the Hospital after 1306,” in La Commanderie, 279.


residence. The preceptor made the payments towards the “Receiver General in the West” at the chapter general under different titles: responsiones, arreragia or debita, tallia or taxa, mortuaria, vacantia, spolia, iocalia, passagia, elemosina, and pitantia.\footnote{James E. Nisbet. “Treasury Records of the Knights of St. John in Rhodes,” Melita Historica 2 (1957): 95-104.} Regarding their amount, the most significant was the responsio, to which a reference was made as early as the twelfth century Rule of the Hospital.\footnote{§6 “… de omnibus obedientiis tertiam partem de pane et vino et de omni nutrimento magister suscipiat; et si superaverit, hoc quod alius fuerit ad helemosinam conjungat, et Jerosolimis cum suo scripto pauperibus mitat” Homonnai-Hunyadi, “Regula Hospitalis,” 177.} Later, typically from the fourteenth century onwards, the responsio was not fixed at one third of the incomes but became a pre-agreed sum of money\footnote{Cf. Anthony Luttrell, “The Hospitallers’ Western Accounts, 1373/4 and 1374/5,” Camden Miscellany 30 (1990): 1-21; idem, “The Hospitallers in Hungary before 1418: Problems and Sources,” in Expanding the Frontiers, 270.} which was often collected by seculars, for instance by Venetian merchants or agents of Florentine banks.\footnote{AOM 316, fol. 234r-v; AOM 320, fol. 50v-51r. See also Anthony Luttrell, “Venice and the Hospitallers of Rhodes in the 14th century,” Papers of the British School at Rome 26 (1958): 199; Luttrell, “The Hospitallers’ Western Accounts,” 4.}

The preceptories were embraced by the priories (prioratus). This structural element was an important novelty of the twelfth-century monastic reform: the priory was to be a “bridge” in the relationships between single preceptories and the remote headquarters in the cases of both the Hospital and the Templars.\footnote{Jonathan Riley-Smith, “The Origins of the Commandery in the Temple and Hospital,” in La Commanderie, 9.} The later history of the military-religious orders proves that their success was a consequence of strong centralization in the structure. On a regional basis, a new ad hoc phenomenon -- grand preceptories -- came into being during the thirteenth century; and in the second half of the century the langues or tongues (linguae) were organized.\footnote{Riley-Smith, Hospitallers, 76; The “langues” (linguae) were the following: Provincia: Priories of St. Gilles and Toulouse (by the first third of the fourteenth century they were divided into grand priories); Francia: Priories of France, Aquitaine, and Champagne; Alvernia: Priory of Auvèrnge; Alamanía: Priories of Germany, Bohemia (and Poland), and Dacia (Scandinavia); Anglia: Priories of England (Scotland and Wales), and Ireland; Aragonía: Priories of Navarre, Catalonia, and Amposta; Castellana: Priories of Castile-León and Portugal; Italia: Priories of Lombardy, Venice, Pisa, Rome, Capua, Barletta, Messina and the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory (from the mid-fourteenth century also known as Priory of Vrana). Some scholars have listed the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory among the priories of the Alamanía, it was not the case until 1604, despite the many efforts of...}
turn of the twelfth century the priory had something in common with the Bohemian branch of the Order.\textsuperscript{85} Thereafter, the priory functioned separately until the establishment of the langues; from the mid-thirteenth century it appeared in the sources as the Hungarian-Slavonian priory, led by priors of foreign origin.\textsuperscript{86} From the beginning of the fourteenth century, the Hungarian branch “joined” the Langue of Italy and the priory was alternately headed by Italian and Provençal priors.\textsuperscript{87}

The members of the Order were integrated into the above hierarchy. As an additional element of this novelty, the brothers belonged to the Hospital not “in general” but were ordered to be linked to a preceptory where they had their stagia,\textsuperscript{88} which they only could leave under certain circumstances, for instance, with the permission of their superiors. The fully professed members (fratres professi) took the religious vows of poverty, obedience, and chastity. These brothers were grouped into the three classes of the Order: knights (milites),\textsuperscript{89} servants (fratres servientes or sariantes),\textsuperscript{90} and priests or chaplains (fratres presbyteri or capellani). Contrary to a still widely accepted opinion, the backbone of the brethren -- as proved by recent scholarly studies -- had no Aristocratic origin but mostly came from the petty nobility or were barely free members of the society.\textsuperscript{91} Thus, proofs of nobility were

\textsuperscript{85}Reiszig 1: 27; Zsolt Hunyadi “A johanniták a középkori Magyarországon: az első évtizedek,” [Hospitallers in the medieval kingdom of Hungary: the first decades],” in Sarolta Homonnai, Ferenc Piti, and Ildikó Tóth, ed., Tanulmányok a középkori magyar történelméről. Az I. Medievisztikai PhD-konferencia előadásai (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Múhely, 1999), 32.


\textsuperscript{87}Cf. AOM 347, fol. 51\textsuperscript{v}. See in \textsuperscript{c}hapter \textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{88}Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller, 80.

\textsuperscript{89}19 November 1358, AOM 316, fol. 258\textsuperscript{v}. Partly edited in Pál Engel, “14. századi magyar vonatkozású iratok a johannita lovagrend máltai levéltárából,” [Fourteenth-century documents from the Archives of the Order of St. John in Malta with reference to Hungary] Történelmi Szemle 39 (1997): 116; See in \textsuperscript{A}ppendix \textsuperscript{B} no. 43.

\textsuperscript{90}20 March 1366, AOM 319, fol. 235\textsuperscript{v}. See in \textsuperscript{A}ppendix \textsuperscript{B} no. 44.

\textsuperscript{91}Anthony Luttrell, “The Hospitallers of Rhodes: Prospectives, Problems, Possibilities,” in Joseph Fleckenstein, and Mannfred Hellmann, eds., Die Geistlichen Ritterorden Europas, Vorträge und Forschungen
chiefly required from the recruits from the fourteenth century onwards when the Convent tried to introduce different restrictions in order to limit the number personnel of the preceptories.\textsuperscript{92} The confratres and consorores, however, formed a different group of the Order since they lived and served in the houses of the Hospital without taking a monastic vow. Unlike this group of serving people, the donati, who offered generous gifts, did not live in the bond of brotherhood; they only took the habit of the Hospital upon their death and the churches of the Order served as their burial places. As will be shown throughout the dissertation, there are examples of all classes of the Order in the Hungarian-Slavonian priory.

Last but not least, the exemptions of the Hospital consummated by 1154 should be considered; these caused conflicts with both the clergy and the secular world for many decades. The most important privileges granted to the Hospital are contained in the bulls\textsuperscript{93} of popes Paschal II, Innocent II, Anastasius IV. According to the aperçu of Dominic Selwood, one of the most striking characteristic features of these papal privileges is that Hospitallers tried to overtake the Templars in the course of their similar activity.\textsuperscript{94} Even without a thorough analysis, the following points can be accented: the Pie postulatio voluntatis\textsuperscript{95} (1113) of Paschal II exempted the Hospital from the payment of tithes, but did not release it from the jurisdiction of the bishop. The first relevant bull of Pope Innocent II (Ad hoc nos in 1135)\textsuperscript{96} decreed that they were released from the bishop’s authority; they could not be


\textsuperscript{94}Selwood, The Knights of the Cloister, 75.

\textsuperscript{95}Hiestand, Papsturkunden für Templer und Johanniter, 2: 194-197.

\textsuperscript{96}Ibid. 206-208.
excommunicated by the bishop and their churches could not be placed under interdict. In the course of a general interdict the Hospital was permitted to continue its service provided that the doors of the churches remained shut and the bells mute. The second bull of Innocent II, Christiane fidei religio (1137)\textsuperscript{97} authorized the Order to establish churches and burial-grounds and the brethren were allowed to use the graveyard even during interdicts. The third bull, Quam amabilis Deo (1139)\textsuperscript{98} -- which is not accidentally reminiscent of the Omne datum optimum given to the Templars -- called upon the bishop to further the alms and gifts for the Hospital in reward for which one seventh of the penitence of the benefactor would be released. In 1154, Pope Anastasius IV repromulgated the Christiane fidei religio\textsuperscript{99} and he augmented its content: the Order was authorized to have its own priests. This probably confirmed a long existing situation; nevertheless, it was an important step in the series of exemptions, since by this token the priests of the Hospital were not subject to the bishop.

Certainly, there are many minor points in the history of the Order which should be taken into account during the survey of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory. At each such point the necessary orientation and comparisons will be provided in the chapter concerned.

\textsuperscript{97} Ibid. 104-135.

\textsuperscript{98} Ibid. 137-162.

\textsuperscript{99} Cartulaire no. 226.
3.1. IN PRINCIPIO... : THE TWELFTH CENTURY

The early history of the Order in Hungary raises several distinct questions. The circumstances surrounding the establishment of the preceptories in this part of Europe exemplify the context of the Order as a whole. The intentions of rulers or members of the ruling dynasty towards the Order and the support they provided; the aims and attitudes in regional politics; and regional characteristics all had impacts on the establishment of preceptories.

Scholars usually refer to a private donation of 1135 to support the proposition that the relationship between the Hospital and the Hungarian kingdom started in the Holy Land. The deed describes the purchase of a house in Jerusalem for 440 bezants by a Hungarian woman called Petronella who wanted to render it as a hospital “of her own nation.” The significance of the purchase is that the master of the Hospital, Raymond du Puy is listed among the witnesses of the transaction.\(^{100}\)

The arrival of the Hospitallers in the Hungarian kingdom can be traced back to the middle of the twelfth century, contemporaneous with the settling of the Order in the neighboring Austria and Bohemia.\(^{101}\) The evidence suggests that its settling had nothing to do with the armies of the Second Crusade marching through the region, as traditionally argued by mainstream Hungarian historiography. According to this view some of the knights from

---


the armies of King Louis VII and Conrad III stopped in the realm and formed the nucleus of the first Hospitaller community.\textsuperscript{102} There are several reasons to question this interpretation. One of the most important issues is, as mentioned in the introductory chapter, that although the militarization of the Hospital started in the 1130s, until the 1160s the great majority of the brethren were not engaged in active military roles.\textsuperscript{103} The militarization of the Order did not become evident until 1187 in most parts of Europe, when the community founded to care for the poor was transformed into a military-religious order.\textsuperscript{104} Some scholars have noted that early charters related to the Hospital recorded service for the poor and the needy more often than for the pilgrims or for the defence of the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{105} Therefore much more importance should be attributed to the charitable intention of Queen Euphrosyne (b.1130-†c.1193)\textsuperscript{106} than to King Géza II (1142-1162) in the call or settling of the Hospital in Hungary. Moreover, the role played by the Church should not be neglected, since Archbishop Martirius of Esztergom (1151-1157), first in rank in the Hungarian Church, initiated the establishment of the first preceptory of the Hospitallers in Székesfehérvár (Alba Regia). It was clearly not his first deed of caritas, for he is also known to have founded an episcopal hospital dedicated to St. James in Eger while acting as bishop there.\textsuperscript{107}

No foundation charter of the first preceptory is known, so the chain of events as well as


\textsuperscript{103}About the militarization of the Hospital, see Chapter II


\textsuperscript{105}Luttrell, “Earliest Hospitallers,” 41.

\textsuperscript{106}Euphrosyne was the sister of Grand Duke Isyaslav of Kiev who married King Géza II in 1146.

\textsuperscript{107}Károly Kozák, "Constructions dans la Hongrie des XII-XV e siècles des ordres de chevalerie et d'Hospitaliers et leur influence," Acta Archaeologica 34 (1982): 112; According to György Györffy, the hospice was mentioned only from the 1240s. ÁMF 3: 85.
the motivations behind it must be reconstructed from later sources. The first monastery was
founded in one of the centers in medium regni, that is in one of the secular and sacral centers
of the kingdom, just outside the walls of Székesfehérvár.\textsuperscript{108} According to a charter of 1193, it
was Archbishop Martirius himself who founded the Székesfehérvár monastery but he was
unable to finish it.\textsuperscript{109} The same charter states that it was Queen Euphrosyne who finished the
building of the monastery (monasterium ... complevit) and granted the Hospital numerous
landed properties. It is not known, however, when the building was finished and its church
consecrated or when the queen made her grant to the monastery, but this gift later proved to
be of fundamental importance. The queen was imprisoned in the castle of Barancs and she
was eventually forced out from the kingdom around 1186.\textsuperscript{110} Via Byzantium, she made a
pilgrimage to Jerusalem where, according to her daughter, she took the habit of the
Hospital.\textsuperscript{111} She died around 1193 in the St. Sava monastery and was buried in St.
Theodosios-lavra, but eventually, according to a charter of 1272,\textsuperscript{112} her body was brought
back to Hungary and buried, not accidentally, in the church of the Székesfehérvár preceptory.
Accordingly, taking into account the death of Martirius and the exile of Euphrosyne, the
completion of the Székesfehérvár preceptory can be dated between 1157 and 1186.

This chronological reconstruction is reinforced by the fact that Euphrosyne’s devotion
is emphasized in other documents pertaining to the Hospitallers settled in the region. One of
the most informative sources is the charter of 1186 reporting the intention of Princess

\textsuperscript{108} Cf. Lajos B. Kumorovitz, “Buda (és Pest) ‘fővárossá’ alakulásának kezdetei,” [The beginnings of the

\textsuperscript{109} “… Martirius vir honestatis eximie Strigoniensis ecclesie archiepiscopus primos in prefata ecclesia
lapides posuit, et iam fere medietatem usque perdixit morte perventus consummare non potuit.” Dl. 27. Győrffy
ÁkO 93-96; Fejérvári CD 2: 283-290; MÉS 1: 142-47; RA no. 155; Cartulaire no. 936.

\textsuperscript{110} Gyula Forster, ed., III. Béla magyar király emlékezete, [Memory of King Béla III of Hungary]
(Budapest, 1900), 32.

\textsuperscript{111} “... habitum postmodum religionis suscepit...” Fejérvári CD 2: 230; Antonius Boczek, et al., eds., Codex
diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae, 15 vols. (Olomuc-Brunae, 1836-1903), 1: 316; Cartulaire no. 770; cf.
József Török, and László Legeza, Máltaiak. Szerzetesrendek a Kárpát-medencében [The Maltese Order.

\textsuperscript{112} Fejérvári CD 2: 184, 5/1: 211-214; 11/1: 67-69, RA no. 2182.
Elisabeth, daughter of Géza II and Euphrosyne, on the occasion of a grant to the Hospital:113
“... sequens vestigia Eufrosine matris mee, que domum hospitalis semper dilexit et promovit,
... eandem domum amare et amplificare pro modulo meo cepi...” Elisabeth’s husband, Prince
Frederick of Bohemia, made frequent grants to the Order, and he also referred several times
to his wife; for instance, in 1183114 and 1185:115 ... dedi ergo ei ecclesiam cum consensu et
petitione uxoris mee. In addition, the donation in 1185 was witnessed by Elisabeth herself. It
is worth noting that the chain of events prior to 1187 was exclusively concerned with caritas
and was neither directly nor indirectly linked to military activity. For a good while the ideas
and overall goals of the Order remained unchanged.

In addition to the dynastic links between Bohemia and Hungary in the 1180s, the Order
provided additional layers in the relationship between the two kingdoms. One of them was
embodied by the first known leader of the Hungarian “province,” a certain Martin, who had
been the provost of Prague.116 He was sent from the Holy Land and it seems safe to assume
that the leadership of the Order counted on his knowledge of the region and perhaps on his
network of acquaintances for his new charge. Another link can be reconstructed on the basis
of the bulls of Popes Célestin VII and Célestin III, issued in 1188 and 1192 respectively.117
Accordingly, a Bohemian noble knight (nobilis vir ... miles de Boemia) -- in the charter
referred to with P sigla -- bequeathed all his possessions to the Bohemian Hospitallers upon
his entering the Order. Imitating this devotion, his wife, his mother, his aunt, and his
granddaughter also joined the Hospital in Bohemia. This nobleman found his martyrdom in
the Holy Land, perhaps at the Horns of Hattin. After his death, his mother incited a revolt

---

113Fejér CD 2: 230; Codex diplomaticus et epistolarius Moraviae 1: 316; Cartulaire no. 770.
114Codex diplomaticus et epistolarius Moraviae 1: 307; Cartulaire no. 650.
115Codex diplomaticus et epistolarius Moraviae 1: 313; Cartulaire no. 718.
116For details, see Chapter V.
(London: Hope & Co; 1852) 4: xxxi; Cartulaire nos. 861, 921. See also Berthold Waldstein-Wartenberg, “Die
Borchardt, “Military Orders in East Central Europe: The First Hundred Y ears,” in Michel Balard, ed. Autour de
la première croisade, Actes de Colloque de la Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East.
among her sisters in the convent and replaced the leaders of the house appointed by the prior of Bohemia with another one assigned by laics. Soon thereafter she pretended to have obtained a license and left for a pilgrimage to the Holy Land in order to serve God “closer” by. On her way she stopped in Hungary where she -- along with her son or even at his instigation -- raised a claim against her former Hospitaller convent by reclaiming the grants of his late son had given both to the Hospitallers and the canons of the Holy Sepulchre.\(^{118}\)

Royal support, nonetheless, was of fundamental importance ab ovo for the fortunes of the Hospital in the region. Support started with Queen Euphrosyne, continued with her daughters, Elisabeth and Marguerite,\(^{119}\) and with her son Béla III (1172-1196). Béla (as Prince Alexios), gave the Master of the Hospital 10,000 bezants to purchase land -- reserving the usufruct under certain conditions -- in the vicinity of Jerusalem in the first half of 1170.\(^{120}\)

In the same source, Gilbert d’Assailly informed Béla that they had managed to buy appropriate possessions in the town of Acre. Two decades later, in 1193, King Béla III confirmed his mother’s grant to the Hospital’s first preceptory in Hungary.\(^{121}\) Though his deed resembled Prince Frederick’s confirmation of all former donations in Bohemia in 1186,\(^{122}\) there is no evidence that he otherwise promoted the Hospitallers during his reign.

This observation runs counter to the belief that the reign of Béla III was the Order’s the first period of prosperity in Hungary, which is based on the fact that it was during this period that

\(^{118}\)Cartulaire nos. 861.

\(^{119}\)Marguerite bequeathed her dowry to the Hospitallers in Hungary which they have not received as it was retained by her son, Andrónico. The brethren turned to the Curia expressing their complaint. Fejér CD 3/1: 56-57; MonWesp 1: 17; Cartulaire no. 1302; Mór Wertner, Az Árpádok családi története [A History of the Árpáds] (Nagy-Becskerek, 1892), 351-352.


\(^{121}\)Fejér CD 2: 288; Cartulaire no. 936; MES 1: 142-147.

\(^{122}\)Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae 1, 317.
the idea of crusading first became rooted in the upper layers of Hungarian society.\textsuperscript{123} Undoubtedly, this was the first time that Hungary took up a semi-active role in the crusades by sending troops with Frederick Barbarossa. Moreover, not long before his death, Béla III himself took a crusader vow, which he bequeathed to his younger son, Andrew (the later Andrew II). Yet, Béla’s first donation in 1170 took place before the manifest crisis in the Latin East and when he confirmed the grant made by his mother, Euphrosyne, he clearly set the aim of his contribution: ad sustentationem pauperum, quibus prefata domus [Székesfehérvár] necessaria cotidiana subministrat.\textsuperscript{124} That is, there is no evidence linking the crusading ideal to the Order at this point. The founding of new preceptories came to a halt for almost half a century. This phenomenon may not be due solely to the attitude of Béla III. In order to make a reliable judgment, the grant confirmed in 1193 should be examined more closely.

Owing to royal support, the convent of Székesfehérvár became not only the first preceptory in Hungary, but became the “head” of several membra which were later organized into preceptories in the Trans-Danubian region during the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{125} Important conclusions can be drawn by reconstructing the network of possessions of the Hospital in Hungary and by locating its estates: First, the majority of possessions were located at or in the proximity of the major roads of the Trans-Danubian region (marked on the map -- and their alternatives -- with grey lines): e.g., Győr-Fehérvár-Földvár-Mohács, Fehérvár-Somogyvár-Segesd-Zákány.\textsuperscript{126}


\textsuperscript{124} Dl. 27. Györffy ÁkO, 93-96; Fejér CD 2: 283-290; MES 1: 142-147; RA no. 155; Cartulaire no. 936.

\textsuperscript{125} At Aracsa, Gyánt, Újudvar, Csurgó and Varasd (Bonyhádvarasd).

MAP 1. Possessions of the grant of Queen Euphrosyne confirmed by King Béla III in 1193


The remaining estates lay close to the Danube and Drava rivers, which also served as basic

---

127 At several points we disagree with the former identifications of the toponyms appearing on the list thus we indicated our localizations on the above map. Cf. Gyorffy A KÖ 93-96; József Mikos, “A fehérvári keresztesek 1193. évi okelele mint magyar nyelvemlék,” [The charter of 1193 as a Hungarian linguistic record received by the Crusaders of Székesfehérvár] Magyar Nyelv 31 (1935): 152-167, 243-258, 288-309; A M F, passim; C sánh, passim; Pál Engel, ed; Magyarország a középkor végén [Hungary in the later Middle Ages] CD-ROM (Budapest: MTA TTI-Térinfo, 2001); Török-Legeza, Máltaiak, inner covers -- on the basis of the manuscript of Levente Hervay.
routes of transportation. It is hard to believe that this distribution was accidental even though it is impossible to identify the individuals responsible for these decisions. It is doubtful that Queen Euphrosyne’s donation was invested with a concern for logistics as the apparent guiding principle in the Order’s expansion. It is more likely that either the local or the regional (if not the overall) superior(s) of the Hospital must be inferred in the background, perhaps on the occasion of one of the master’s visitations starting in the mid-twelfth century.128 The Order faced the same problem as the majority of the ecclesiastical institutions and private landowners in the kingdom: the difficulty of administering widely scattered estates.129

Three additional establishments, which were not dependencies of Székesfehérvár, have been identified as preceptories from the second half of the twelfth century. The first of these, in 1166, was given with funds from a rare private donation and consisted of three predial lands and a church dedicated to St. Peter in Zala County: fratribus iherosolomitanis pro remedio anime mee ... supradicti fraters et sancti pauperes hospitalis domus.130 Like contemporaneous grants that the Order received all over Europe, the charter mentions the poor and not the defenders of the Holy Land, even if it is known that in certain regions the number of “pro defensione sancte terre” donations increased remarkably in the middle of the twelfth century.131 Since no preceptory dedicated to St. Peter is known from later sources it is worth dwelling on this issue. Lacking primary sources on the topic, we are restricted to making analogies. There were two ways for a religious order to establish itself in a new region. One way was that the Order received landed properties and created the basic administrative machinery needed for the management of the estates, which eventually developed to facilitate further expansion, but resulted in a widely dispersed network of


130 Fejér CD 2: 174-175; Cartulaire no. 368; HO 7: 1-2.

estates. The other way, typical for Hungary in the fourteenth century, was that the Order concentrated its estates by purchasing or exchanging land for estates located in remote places. The Hospital was not the only religious order that did not transform all its land donations into monastic sites, even in such an “ideal” situation as that above: the grant of a manor and an adjacent church. For a time it may have been reasonable to administer building complexes of different functions (stables, oratories, etc.) from an adjacent -- or sometimes even remote -- preceptory, which may explain why these associated buildings rarely appear in the sources. It is also likely that the Hospitallers did not transform all the churches into conventual houses (domos conventuales), but only exercised patronage over them. It is widely accepted that even if Hospitallers were ready to settle in towns -- since one of their original activities was closely related to urban space -- they still required rural sites, which were the source of income regardless of whether the revenues were sent to Jerusalem, Acre, Rhodes, Avignon or Naples. Therefore, the importance of “mere” landed properties should not be underestimated in the overall machinery of the Order.

The second hospital was located at Boisce on the Dalmatian coast. It is only known from a papal bull addressed to Matheo rectori et fratribus cruciferariis (sic!) hospitalis Sancti Petri Boisce. Since this papal bull and a charter from 1217 are the only extant documents,

---


137 Selwood, The Knights of the Cloister, 71; See also Karl Borchardt, “Urban commanderies in Germany,” in La Commanderie, 297-304.

138 The above observations are strikingly outdated for international readership yet it is to emphasize that national historiography still tends to hold on to such expectations.

139 ÁUO 6: 149.
Boisce may have belonged to the Templars\textsuperscript{140} or perhaps was run by another hospitaller or military religious order which the crucifer expression referred to.\textsuperscript{141} In 1247 Béla IV granted the Severin region to the Order,\textsuperscript{142} which included the city of Scardona on the Dalmatian coast and the king emphasized that the purpose of the donation was to facilitate the Order’s maritime travel. This implies that they did not have direct access to the sea before 1247. By the second half of the fourteenth century, Boisce was held by the Hospitallers in the aftermath of their acquisition of the Templars’ properties.\textsuperscript{143}

The existence of a third hospital in Pécs (Baranya county) has been deduced from the appearance in a charter of a certain Gilbert magister hospitalis as a witness of a transaction in 1181.\textsuperscript{144} There are no additional grounds for proving that it belonged to the Hospital either at that time or later. Apparently it was an episcopal hospital. This interpretation is reinforced by a charter of 1217, when the hospitaller master of Pécs witnessed a transaction between the bishop and the canons of the cathedral chapter of Pécs; this indicates that the hospital was under episcopal auspices.\textsuperscript{145} Thus, a certain woman, named Froa, made a grant to this hospital\textsuperscript{146} and not to the Order of the Hospital, though she later changed her mind and revoked the donation.\textsuperscript{147}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{140} ÁUO 6: 390-391; There is a charter proving that the Templars had a house in Boisce which might have been identical with the mentioned one. Pontius de Cruce stayed in casa nostra in San Pietro de Boischie in 1217. Smičiklas 3: 165.
\item \textsuperscript{141} Nowadays it is much easier to argue that the Templars also ran hospitals even though it was not their primarily activity ever. See, for instance M alcobm Barber, and Keith Bate, The Templars: selected sources translated and annotated, M anchester M edieval Sources Series (M anchester and New Y ork: M anchester University Press, 2002), 127-128.
\item \textsuperscript{142} Fejéř CD 4/1: 447-454; Cartulaire no. 2445; Augustinus Theiner, ed. V etera M onumenta Historica H ungariam Sacram Illustrantia, 1216-1352, 2 vols. (Romæ, 1859-1860), 1: 208.
\item \textsuperscript{143} Fejéř CD 9/5: 496-497; Smičiklas 16: 190.
\item \textsuperscript{144} Forster, III. Béla emlékezete, 345.
\item \textsuperscript{145} ÁUO 11: 153-154; László K oszta, A pécsi székeskáptalan hiteleshelyi tevékenysége (1214-1353) [The Pécs cathedral chapter as a place of authentication, 1214-1353] (Pécs: Pécs története A lapítvány, 1998), 16, 183.
\item \textsuperscript{146} As has been thought by many scholars so far. Gyula K Kristó, and Ferenc Makk, ed., III. Béla emlékezete [M emory of K ing Béla III] ([Budapest]: Helikon, 1981), 107, 194; Gábor Nagy, ed., M agyar középkor. Az államalapítástól M ohácsig (F orrásgyűjtemény) [M edieval Hungary. F rom the foundation of the state until M ohács. (Sources)] (Budapest: K önyves K álmán-Node, 1995), 170-171.
\item \textsuperscript{147} Forster, III. Béla, 245-246.
\end{itemize}
3.2. Prosperity: The Thirteenth Century

There is no evidence proving that the older son of Béla III, King Emeric (1196-1204) promoted the Hospital in any respect either in Hungary or at an international level. Moreover, he deferred the Hungarian participation in the crusades, which did not further papal-Hungarian relations. Thus the development of the Hospital temporarily slowed in the kingdom, or it reached a phase that is less visible through the investigation of the written sources. Since it is seriously doubtful that the hospital in Luba\textsuperscript{148} belonged to the Hospitallers in the first half of the thirteenth century, it appears that after the middle of the twelfth century it was 1215 or 1216 before new Hospitaller houses/churches can be found in the sources.\textsuperscript{149} The data taken from the end of the first quarter of the century clearly, however, show that whereas royal support stopped for a while, the settling process and the organization of the administrative system went on unbroken. This can be confirmed by two facts. First,

\textsuperscript{148}Fejér CD 7/5: 166-170; Smičiklas 3: 50-52.

\textsuperscript{149}Cartulaire nos. 1438, 1463; Fejér CD 3/1: 179-180.
preceptories (Esztergom, Szirák, Tolmács) which had not been listed among the possessions of the grant in 1193 appear on the “map” of the first half of the thirteenth century. Admittedly, the most profitable land administration was perhaps still arranged from one of the existing Hospitaller properties. Second, like the overall European situation the Hospitallers fought hard for the tithes (decima) from their lands from the very end of the twelfth century well into the second half of the thirteenth century. In some bishoprics this fight lasted up to the first half of the fourteenth century. Since this issue will be investigated in detail in another chapter, it is sufficient to mention here that their basic exemptions were secured by twelfth-century papal bulls, primarily up to 1154. Nonetheless, the Hospitallers in Hungary -- like priories of the Hospital in Europe -- enforced their rights for tithes step by step against the local bishops and/or abbots. Tracing this struggle is informative about possessions in the bishopric of Győr, presumably including the antecedents of the preceptories of Sopron and Győr, which appeared later. Unfortunately, it is not yet known whether the Hospitallers -- those reprimanded by the pope for not paying the bucket tax (chybriones) on their vineyards in 1213 -- had both houses and possessions in the bishopric of Pécs or merely rented (as extraneus tenants) vineyards in that region. They were only released from this taxation in 1238. It is certain that the Hospitaller church at Kesztelc appeared in 1216 and the preceptory at Ar(a)csa in 1226, located in the Archdeaconry of Tolna in the bishopric of Pécs and the latter preceptory was part of the grant of 1193.

---


151See, for instance, Giles Constable, Monastic tithes from their origins to the twelfth century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), especially Chapter 3.

152Fejér CD 3/1: 99-100.

153DRMH ser. 1, 1: 100.

154Fejér CD 3/1: 141-142.

155Fejér CD 4/1: 104-111, 9/5: 153; Smičiklas 4: 48-50; MES 1: 326; RA no. 637.

156Fejér CD 3/1: 179; Cartulaire no. 1463.

157PRT 1: 672-673; MonWes 1: 70; MES 1: 260, 278; AUO 1: 222-223.
The contest for tithes ran with alternating success of the parties concerned. During the course of the debate, Pope Innocent III explained to the Hospitalers of Hungary -- in a meticulously elaborated way -- that the grant of Queen Euphrosyne and its confirmation by her son did not automatically include the tithes of the donated lands since that could not be granted by secular persons.\footnote{Cartulaire no. 1438.} As a sort of reply from 1216 onwards, at least in the case of the membra of Székesfehérvár, the Hospitalers referred to the praescriptio, namely permanent peaceful tenure.\footnote{Fejér CD 3/1: 228-230; PRT 1: 164, 638-639; ÁUO 6: 377-379; MonWesp 1: 36-37; Cartulaire no. 1472; MES 1: 210;} This solution, however, did not exempt them from fighting the bishops and abbots concerned one by one.

In addition to church tithes, from the beginning of the reign of King Andrew II (1205-1235) royal backing gave a renewed impetus to the Order, augmented by new forms of support. A letter of privilege issued by Andrew II in 1207 for the canons regular of the Holy Sepulchre -- granting them seven villages -- expresses that … eadem septem villarum cessimimus in perpetuum gaudere libertate qua faventer ville templariorum et hospitalariorum.\footnote{Fejér 3/1: 42; Smičiklas 3: 72.} Thereafter one of the most substantial groups of grant was the different forms of secular liberties, immunities, and exemptions. Like his father, under the influence of the crusading idea Andrew II made grants not only to the Hospitalers settled in Hungary. During his stay on the Holy Land during the Fifth Crusade he made, or better to say, promised a grant to the “transmarine” Hospitalers as well. The Order quickly had it confirmed by Honorius III in 1218.\footnote{Theiner 1: 14-18; ÁUO 1: 156-158; Cartulaire nos. 1613-1616.} It seems certain that the Hospitalers seized the area between the rivers Drava and Sava,\footnote{Tibor Ráslai, “Johanniták a középkori Somogy megyében,” [The Knights of St. John in the medieval Somogy county] Somogy (1986): 80.} however, it is unlikely that the castles of Crac des Chevaliers and Margat (Marqab) ever received the revenues from the salt of Szalacs or the sum of 1,000 marks for guarding the king during his return from Syria as promised by
Andrew II. Having returned home, the king found his kingdom in a disappointing condition and complained to the pope that fifteen years would not be enough to reorganize public order in his country.\textsuperscript{163} It is not yet clear whether this was a shift in attitude or a real obstacle in fulfilling his promises. Although the king renewed his grant in 1225,\textsuperscript{164} it is probable that he never accomplished it. Pope Alexander IV admonished Andrew’s son Béla IV (1235-1270) to redeem his father’s promise made in the Holy Land or else he was expected to appear before the Holy See.\textsuperscript{165} These were important grants for the Order partly because they were not one-time gifts, but steady “incomes” in cash\textsuperscript{166} and not in kind. The latter would not have been directly suitable for the needs of the Order in Palestine. Moreover, besides its regular nature, this gift also included various exemptions: the Hospitallers were permitted to sell salt within the borders of the kingdom up to the River Drava; only judges delegated by the king had jurisdiction over their tenants;\textsuperscript{167} they were exempted from providing hospitality (descensus), and from paying royal taxes (liberi denarii, pondera, etc.).\textsuperscript{168} Andrew’s benevolence did not cease later, either. In 1233, the famous Concord of Bereg decreed that the Hospital was entitled to four timinus of salt.\textsuperscript{169} Moreover, the king stated that he would reimburse the Hospital (and the churches of Bács and Kalocsa) for salt from the Szeged storehouses for 10

\textsuperscript{163}Fejér CD 3/1: 250-254; Theiner 1: 20-21; RA no. 355.

\textsuperscript{164}Cartulaire no. 1803.

\textsuperscript{165}Fejér CD 4/2: 466-469, 504-506; ÁUO 2: 301-303; Theiner 1: 236-238; Cartulaire nos. 2896, 2920; MES 1: 454.

\textsuperscript{166}In return the king vindicated the confrater status although it was closer to that of the donor: “nos equidem huius sacrati collegii non tantum caritatis affectu, verum etiam numero participare volentes, et ut eorum ita nos communicaremur consortio, et mereremur orationum et beneficiorum participes fieri, confraternitati eorum ita nos asstrinximus devote, ut tam nos quam successores nostri pro redemptione animarum predecessorum nostrorum, et nostrarum singulis annis predicte domui in obsequio pauperum ... conferremus.” Theiner 1: 14-15; ÁUO 1: 156-157; Cartulaire no. 1614; Béla IV confirmed a part of the grant in 1238.

\textsuperscript{167}E. g. in 1331: “Magister Jacobus, comes capelle domini regis et iudex populi regii per Hungariam.” Fejér CD 8/7: 233-234.

\textsuperscript{168}DRMH ser. 1, 1: 139-148.

\textsuperscript{169}Hospitale Jerosolomitanum cum omnibus suis de Hungaria quatuor timinos de talibus salibus quales habet monasterium de Egrus. Fejér CD 3/2: 319-326; MES 1: 292-297; Zsigmond Jákó, ed. Erdélyi okmánytár. Codex diplomaticus Transylvaniae 1023-1300 (Budapest: A kadémiai Kiadó, 1997), 176-177. 1 timinus equals to 10,000 cubes.
marks per vessel, unlike many other churches which were reimbursed only 8 marks per vessel.\textsuperscript{170}

Another sign of change as far grants were concerned was that, similarly to western Europe,\textsuperscript{171} the king required service from the Order in return for his generous help. Before his armed pilgrimage to the Holy Land he sent the Hospitaller prior to Venice to prepare for his embarkation in the late summer of 1217.\textsuperscript{172} After his return from Syria, he asked the pope to commission the Hospitallers and the Templars to guard his son, sent to Armenia in 1219.\textsuperscript{173} Soon, Andrew II left one copy -- out of the seven -- of the well-known Golden Bull of 1222 in the custody of the Hospital and the Temple respectively.\textsuperscript{174} In 1232, he sent Raimbaud of Voczon, the Hungarian-Slavonian prior, as his legate to Rome, and in 1235 he agreed that the Hospitallers, the Templars, and the Bishop of Pécs were to be commissioned to administer the dowry of his daughter Yolanda, who married the Aragonese king.\textsuperscript{175}

The beginning of the reign of King Béla IV, Andrew’s son, proved to be a “cooler” period for the Hospitallers in Hungary. The new king started his “restoration of properties” policy prior to the beginning of his rulership, that is, while still reigning as rex iunior, and he continued it as crowned ruler. According to the extant sources, which report both the complaints of the Order and the papal reprimand (1236),\textsuperscript{176} Hospitaller lands were also involved in the harsh policy of Béla IV. It was little consolation that the king’s policy was not


\textsuperscript{172}Fejér CD 7/4: 73; ÁU O 6: 380-383.

\textsuperscript{173}Fejér CD 3/1: 250-254; Theiner 1: 20-21; RA no. 355.

\textsuperscript{174}Fejér 3/1: 374-381; MES 1: 235.

\textsuperscript{175}Theiner 1: 133; Cartulaire no. 2119; RA no. 537.

directed against either the Hospital or the Church in general. It was against all those who had benefited “beyond measure” from royal gifts during the reign of his father. Béla IV’s overall goal was to restore the dwindled royal demesne, a consequence of the “new policy” (novae institutiones) introduced by his father two decades earlier.\footnote{Gyula Kristó, Die Arpaden Dynastie: Die Geschichte Ungarns von 895 bis 1301 (Budapest: Corvina, 1993), 178-179; Pál Engel, The Realm of St. Stephen: A History of Medieval Hungary 895-1526 (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2001), 91-93.}

Either the dynastic tradition expressed towards the Hospital or the papal reprimand made Béla IV change his mind profoundly; he soon began to favor the Hospitallers. In January 1238, he “penitently” restored the confiscated goods,\footnote{It turns out from the charter that Béla IV formerly also confiscated the possessions of the Order originating from private grants!} moreover, he significantly grafted them to new ones.\footnote{Fejér CD 4/1: 104-111; 9/5: 153; Smičiklas 4: 48-50; MES 1: 326; RA no. 637.} The significance of these grants may lie in the fact that some of these new landed properties were located in the Trans-Drava region (in Valkó, Pozsega and Varasd counties). The map of preceptories in the thirteenth century (MAP 3) shows that this situation would have facilitated the organization of new administrative units in the region. It was not necessarily adaptable for the nuclei of the grant those to be found in other regions of the kingdom. In part, the Hospitallers planted their feet on different areas within the “closer” borders of the realm (Arad, Sopron and Győr counties) and they also managed to enlarge their power in formerly established territories (Fejér, Somogy and Zala counties). They also received new exemptions (from the decima porcorum) and immunities (from tolls, for example) ad usum pauperii ultra mare. In addition, the Order was granted baths in Győr and in Esztergom in order to facilitate their “original” activity. The latter was established as balneum commune by Anna,\footnote{Anne (Agnes) of Antiochia.} the grand-mother of Béla IV and it was the grandson who gave it to the Hospital secundum normam et libertatem a predecessoribus nostris. Béla IV’s grant was commensurable with that of his grandfather Béla III, which he even enlarged several months later by exempting the Order from the tax (cybriones) to be paid on their vineyards. The importance of these privileges is signalled by the fact that thereafter neither
Béla IV nor his successors (the later Arpadians and the Angevins) on the Hungarian throne supported the Hospital in Hungary to this extent. Several reasons might explain this situation in the long-run, which will be discussed below, but for the time being there was a palpable cause: the Mongol invasion in 1241-1242.

What sort of military support the Hospital provided to Béla IV during the Mongol invasion is still unknown. It is likely that the report of Master Rogerius -- in its present-day known form -- is not completely reliable as it reads: ...rex Béla marittimis de partibus per cruciferos de insula Rodi ... de recessu Tartarorum in Hungariam venit. Other contemporary sources, however, indicate the participation of the Hospitallers in the chain of events. Béla IV complained in his letter to the pope, most likely in 1247, that at the appearance of the Mongol menace he received help a nullo christianorum Europe principe, nisi a domo Hospitalis iherosolimitani, cuius fratres ad requisitionem nostram nuper arma sumpserunt contra paganos. Scholars must infer how this poetic view related to reality. What is sure is that the Hospitallers accompanied the king escaping from the Mongols down to Trau on the Dalmatian coast. This is indicated by two indirect pieces of information.

---


182 Rogerii carmen miserabile,” in Emericus Szentpétery, ed., Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum, 2 vols. (Budapest: MTT, 1937-1938; reprint: Budapest: Nap Kiadó, 1999), 1: 596. It is a clear anachronism to associate the Hospitallers with Rhodes in the mid-thirteenth century thus it is an obvious interpolation of a later hand. It was also noted by László Juhász, the editor of the text. It cannot be ruled out, however, that in the “original” version merely crusíeros referred to the Hospitallers. See also Peter Jackson, “The Crusade against the Mongols (1241),” Journal of Ecclesiastical History 42 (1991): 16-17.


The corroborating formula of the first extant charter (1243) of the Székesfehérvár preceptory as a place of authentication reads: *proprium sigillum nostrum erat in maritima propter metum tartarorum* that is, the personnel of the preceptory took away the common seal and perhaps their archives (*conservatorium*).\(^{186}\) Another charter states that Raimbaud of Voczon, the Hungarian-Slavonian prior, was still in Trau in November 1243, because he witnessed a transaction.\(^{187}\) This may illuminate why the Order appointed a general proctor in the person of a canon of the Buda collegiate chapter.\(^{188}\) As for the original question, the Order must have played some kind of military role\(^{189}\) since the king -- perhaps remembering his father’s plans for the Teutonic Order in the Barcaság between 1211 and 1225\(^{190}\) -- wanted to have them as defenders of the south-eastern frontiers of the kingdom from the Mongols as late as the summer of 1247. Béla IV tried to settle the Hospitallers in the region called Severin as far as the River Olt. According to a letter issued in November 1247, the Hospital partially occupied it: *quos [fratres] iam partim collocavimus in loco magis suspecto, videlicet in confinio Cumanorum ultra Danubium et Bulgarorum.*\(^{191}\) However, it is still obscure why the Order left the region shortly afterwards (after 1250)\(^{192}\) wrecking in this way the king’s defensive


\(^{187}\) "Testes sunt Rambaldus preceptor domus Hospitalis per totam Hungariam ..." Smičiklas 4: 205-206.

\(^{188}\) See Chapter V.


\(^{191}\) Fejér CD 4/1: 447-454; Jakó, *Codex diplomaticus Transsylvaniae*, 191; Cartulaire no. 2445; RA no. 853.

\(^{192}\) Pope Innocent IV confirmed Béla IV’s grant in 1250. Fejér CD 4/2: 75-76; Theiner 1: 208-211; Jakó, *Codex diplomaticus Transsylvaniae*, 195.
plans. It is worth emphasizing that it was not a genuine grant, but rather a concession for seizing and populating the region and it included the usual exemptions for would-be settlers. It looks like a contract as it clearly sets out the military obligations of the Order; where and how many armed men they were expected to provide in case of an attack against the kingdom. The Hospitallers were to station one hundred knights in armor in case of action by pagans, Bulgars, and schismatics; fifty knights were to be stationed in Pozsony, Moson, Sopron, Vasvár and Újvár or other places against Christian invaders; while against the Mongols they were to provide sixty knights for the defence of the frontiers.\textsuperscript{193} Some scholars tend to regard this as a manifest military role played by the Hospital, although it is not clear from the wording of the charter whether the brethren themselves were expected to take up arms or whether they were supposed to pay mercenaries. Nonetheless, the bull of Pope Innocent IV -- unusual in European practice -- granted to both the Hospitallers and those who joined them fighting against the Mongols in Hungary the same indulgence granted to the crusaders who won martyrdom against the infidel in the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{194}

Taking this situation into account, the period of prosperity for the Hospital in Hungary was rather the first half of the thirteenth century than the last quarter of the twelfth century. Owing to the almost exclusive royal support, data are extant concerning almost a dozen administrative units (domus, membra) around the mid-thirteenth century, although it is not known how many preceptories they formed exactly: Székesfehérvár, Kesztelc, Csurgó, Szirák, Aracsa, Esztergom (Holy Cross), Újudvar, Tolmács, Dada, Sopron and perhaps Győr. Four of them appeared on the map of the grant of 1193.

There are several indicators of the increasing significance of the Hospital’s pursuits in Hungary. It was the beginning of the activity of some of the preceptories (Székesfehérvár, Újudvar) as places of authentication (loca credibilia).\textsuperscript{195} It was also the moment when the

\textsuperscript{193}For comparison, see the case of Charles of Anjou with the Hospital in 1262. Selwood, The Knights of the Cloister, 109.

\textsuperscript{194}Fejér CD 4/1: 465-467; Theiner 1: 206; ÁUO 2: 205-206; Cartulaire no. 2477. About the importance of the indulgence, see Luttrell, “The Hospitaller Province of Alamania,” 29.

\textsuperscript{195}Zsolt Hunyadi, “The Locus Credibilis in Hungarian Hospitaller Commanderies,” in La Commanderie, 285-296. See also Chapter VIII.
Hungarian-Slavonian prior informed the Curia that it was hard to keep silentium during their meals propter multitudinem hospitum confluentium. The preceptories were visited in great numbers, although it is not known whether they were indeed pilgrims en route to holy places. Pope Innocent IV excused the Hospitallers in Hungary from the obligation of silentium in 1252 with the reservation that in illis domibus, que conventuales existunt.\textsuperscript{196} This implicitly strengthens the interpretation that there was a clear distinction behind this wording. Those preceptories which were organized for the administration of land exploitation were not suitable for receiving pilgrims and thus were not established along the pilgrims' roads nor had they any healing or nursing activity.\textsuperscript{197}

In the light of later events, the Hospital in Hungary reached its zenith in the Arpadian period and a shift can be detected thereafter, partly manifested in the change of the attitude of Béla IV in the second half of the thirteenth century. It may have been partly due to the unforeseen abandonment of the Severin region by the Hospitallers but, as a general phenomenon, the king returned to his former policy of the confiscation and restoration of former royal lands. Thus the Order was not only deprived of such royal support, but Béla IV also attempted to introduce some sort of restrictions concerning private grants to military orders, including the Hospital. All these were in line with the general European trend, namely that the number of gifts received by most religious orders decreased from the mid-thirteenth century onwards.\textsuperscript{198}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{196}Fejér CD 4/2: 126-127; Theiner 1: 212; Cartulaire no. 2589.
\item \textsuperscript{197}Selwood, The Knights of the Cloister, 111-114.
\item \textsuperscript{198}Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller, 51; Alan Forey, “Recruitment to the military orders (12th to mid-14th century),” Viator 17 (1986): 169.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
The increase of the preceptories did not cease, which can be explained by at least two factors. First, the Hospital managed to organize more administrative units on the basis of the already existing dependencies, since the overall goal was still to create the most profitable administrative network of houses. Second, it should not be overlooked that pragmatic literacy enjoyed an increasing importance in this period, and one of the palpable signs is the rising number of charters.

These above facts, then, may distort our view of the development of the Hospital in Hungary. As also noted by Karl Borchardt, in many instances we hear about preceptories not at their foundation or establishment but rather at the time of the first debates concerning landed properties and tithes.

Accordingly, one should be very cautious in evaluating the estimation according to

---


200 Borchardt, “Military Orders in East Central Europe,” 249.
which there were approximately eighteen preceptories in the kingdom of Hungary in the second half of the thirteenth century. Some of their preceptors gathered together in Csurgó for the first known provincial chapter in 1275.\textsuperscript{201}

A new trend in the location of the administrative units is that new foundations appeared in the Trans-Drava region: at Dopsin, Pakrac, Béla (Bela) and Čiče well before the acquisition of the Templars’ properties. A new house was also established in Transylvania, in Torda. On the other hand, a number of houses had disappeared from the sources by the very end of the thirteenth century; these were at Kesztelc, Aracsa, Szirák, Tolmács, Szomolya, and the short-lived Torda. Three of these had been organized from the Esztergom preceptory during the first third of the thirteenth century, that is, it was most likely a consequence of a reorganization. This is supported by several membra appearing in later sources as mere possessions.

The last and least important “chapter” of royal support in the course of the Arpadian period took place during the reign of Stephen V (1270-1272).\textsuperscript{202} Thereafter, royal benevolence dried up for a long time. Certainly, many points might be marshalled to explain this: the losses in the Holy Land and the decline in the general reputation of military-religious orders; the escalation of the power of provincial lords (petty kings) in Hungary, and the serious fall of royal power during the reign of Ladislas IV (1272-1290) and Andrew III (1290-1301).\textsuperscript{203} Undoubtedly, the Church was one of the greatest losers of this period in many respects. The radical turn came as late as the consolidation of the reign of the Angevin Charles Robert, by the end of the second decade of the fourteenth century,\textsuperscript{204} which coincided with the aftermath of the fall of the Templars.

3.3. Regional Characteristics

\textsuperscript{201}ÁUO 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Smičiklas 6: 137-138.

\textsuperscript{202}See Chapter V.

\textsuperscript{203}Kristó, Die Arpaden Dynastie, 253-257; Engel, The Realm of St. Stephen, 107-111.

The royal support discussed above was of fundamental importance and shows not only the role played by the successive members of the Arpadian dynasty but refers indirectly to a particular regional characteristic: the almost complete lack and secondary importance of private donations.\textsuperscript{205} The reason for this is largely apparent for the Hungarian reader, but its full explanation would exceed the limits of this dissertation as this phenomenon concerned most of the religious orders ever settled in Hungary.

For a better understanding of the “keep away” attitude of Hungarian landowners and potential donors, the peculiar legal and social situation must be taken into account. One of the most striking features of contemporary Hungarian society was the lack of feudal institutions and relationships. By the second half of the thirteenth century the major part of the realm was held -- naturally besides by the king -- by upper or lesser noble kindreds as alodial hereditary landed properties. These estates had no requirements of military or any other service and they were handed down unconditionally.\textsuperscript{206} Moreover, primogeniture, an important element of medieval Western society, was not the custom in Hungary. On the contrary, according to the constraint of aviticitas,\textsuperscript{207} landed property was inherited by those paternal descendants of the kindred’s ancestor who had been granted the land. They were called divisional kinsmen (fratres condivisionales) indicating the right of their descendants to raise claims to the properties of the other lineages of the kindred. Each member of the family needed the consent of the rest of the kindred (or in the absence of that royal approval) in order to be allowed to grant away any piece of the commonly held landed property.\textsuperscript{208} Thus, in the thirteenth century, besides the considerable royal donations, most of the generous subjects of the realm

\textsuperscript{205}One of the exceptions was the gift of Tolmács by Palatine Denis in 1239; Df.280246. The Templars received more private gifts until 1235 (Fejér CD 4/1: 146). Cf. Balázs Stossek, “A templomosok Magyarországon,” [The Templars in Hungary] in József Laszlovszky, Judit Majorossy, and József Zsengellér, eds., A magyar keresztes háború: Magyarország és a Szentföld, keresztesek és lovagrendek (Budapest, 2003; manuscript).


\textsuperscript{207}Cf. the decree of 1351. See D R M H ser 1, 2: 11.

were widows and nobles without heirs. In addition, during the first half of the same century (1230-1251), several kindreds purchased back landed properties which had been granted away to the military-religious orders by widows of extinct lineages. Moreover, Béla IV’s restoration policy concerning landed properties did not further the process of mortmain in the kingdom: by providing consent to last wills, he restricted the size of donations.

As will be shown in the following chapter, the governing system of the fourteenth century was not conductive to beneficial activity either, since most of the landed properties were possessed as honores. They were assigned to someone only for the period of office-holding, so the duration of ownership was dependent on royal decision (with such an expression: durante beneplacito). Therefore, the temporal governor of the estates was not allowed to alienate them.

Naturally, the benevolence of the potential private donor may have decreased by the fact that alike the Cistercians -- but unlike the Benedictines -- the strongly centralized nature of the military-religious orders let minimal sphere of intervention for the benefactors and patrons into the life of the Order. The situation of the singular houses was somewhat different since at times through a reasonable sum of entrance fee local kindreds might have exercised influence on particular preceptories. This is, however, not a self-sufficient argument since in Western Europe, where the crusading tradition was deeply rooted into certain social layers, private donation remained essential for the Hospital, at least until the

---

210 Cf. Nicholson, Templars, Hospitallers, 68.
211 Fejér CD 4/2: 377; 4/3: 44.
end of the thirteenth century. The lack of “benevolence” heavily affected the personnel of single preceptories, especially in the houses of the priory of Alamania where the recruits were expected to provide a reasonable contribution (elemosina) upon their entrance.

Summing up, it can be stated that the Hungarian-Slavonian priory might have been successful in accomplishing some of the overall goals of the Hospital: caring for the poor and the needy (i.e. pilgrims) as well as raising and channelling money for and to the Holy Land. Channeling recruits, however, if not a failure was certainly not the most effective activity of the brethren of the preceptories in the Hungarian kingdom. From the point of view of the ruling dynasty, the effective support of the Hospital changed through time. Peaks can be observed subsequent to the settling of the Order, in the second half of the twelfth century, and in the second quarter of the thirteenth century. In the first quarter and second half of the thirteenth century, the Order was confined to those grants and privileges that it had received previously. This could have been due partly to objective reasons: the actual (international and local) political situation, the emergence of new religious orders, profound social changes, and so on. It was also, however, on account of the disappointment of the ruler, who failed in his plan to use the Hospital as a military force to defend the frontiers of the kingdom from the infidel. The decreasing royal favor was not replaced by private donations, which was due to the peculiar social environment -- manifest in customary law -- and the fact that the idea of crusading and the support of the military-religious orders still did not have deep roots in the Hungarian society.

---

215 See Chapter VI.


217 Thus we have reservations concerning the idea of Dominic Selwood who stated that unlike the Cistercians, the military orders chiefly recruited locally. Selwood, The Knights of the Cloister, 116. For the personnel of the singular preceptories, see Chapter VI. Cf. Romhányi, “The Role of the Cistercians in Hungary,” 198-199.


Continuing the history of the Order after the Arpadian period, the frameworks and borders of a basically narrative presentation have already been constructed from the point of view of its contents as well as its methodology. Unlike the previous chapter, which had to start ab ovo, here the major trends in the history of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory which became visible in the previous chapter can be continued. The choice of the turn of the thirteenth century (the dates of the Arpadian and Angevin periods) as the turning point of the chapters was in a way arbitrary. Nonetheless, at least two factors may have resulted in profound changes in historiography based on written sources during the survey of the fourteenth century. First, partly concerning other research as well, there is an increasing number of primary sources at our disposal for any sort of reconstruction or analysis. This phenomenon can be explained by the accessions of charters and by the fact that destruction of sources is in inverse ratio to the time that has elapsed since their emergence. Another factor, however, makes circumstances somewhat unbalanced. During the last decades two monumental projects have been launched aiming at the publication of fourteenth and fifteenth-century sources: the publications of the charters of the Angevin period (1301-1387) and the Sigismund era (1387-1437). At the present time the first project embraces the period between 1301 and 1340,\textsuperscript{220} while the second covers written sources from 1387 to 1421.\textsuperscript{221} Unfortunately, these enterprises gave up the long lasting tradition of publishing charters in extenso; instead the reader finds short extracts of thousands of documents.


Owing to the time-frame of this dissertation, the volumes of the Angevin charters are of primary importance\textsuperscript{222} and the editors of the series also made it possible to consult hitherto unpublished volumes. Accordingly, there is a unique abundance of sources which did not characterize either the Arpadian period or the last third of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{223} Speaking in numbers: in contrast to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (c. 1150-1301), where approximately 310 charters were consulted, for the analysis of the circa 80 years of the Angevin period more than 650 documents were utilized. At first the situation seems ideal; there is no need to repeat the annoyingly serious loss of sources -- at least in comparison with many parts of Western Europe -- since even if there were fewer sources at scholars' disposal it would be feasible to investigate some matters. Parallel to the development of my research, however, I had to face great difficulties which made me reappraise the conditions. The reason behind this is not the number of the sources but rather their nature. As will be seen in \textbf{Chapter VIII}, at least one third of the approximately 650 charters are documents that were issued by Hospitaller preceptories as places of authentication. Undoubtedly these charters are important for analyzing the activities of the preceptories involved in pragmatic literacy. Similarly, these sources are indispensable for reconstructing the personnel of the houses or that of the ecclesiastical institution as a whole. At the same time, however, parallel to the increase of such primary sources, the amount of exploitable data manifestly decreases, partly owing to the higher proportion of letters patent and close. These charters usually contain no reference to the personnel of the houses (series diginitatum).\textsuperscript{224} By close reading of the rest of the charters one realizes that the “informational value” of the documents is quite uneven. This

\textsuperscript{222}However, we also could utilize the Sigismund-chartulary in many respects.

\textsuperscript{223}The in extenso edition of the charters from the Angevin period ends up at 1359. Thus, up to 1387, we had to rely upon scattered source publications, and, certainly, the medieval collection of the National Archives of Hungary. Imre Nagy, and Gyula Tasnádi Nagy, ed. Anjoukori Okmánytár. Codex diplomaticus Hungaricus Andegavensis, 7 vols. (Budapest, 1878-1920); György Rácz, ed., A középkori Magyarország levéltári forrásainak adatbázisa (DL-DF 4.2) [Database of Archival Documents of Medieval Hungary] CD-ROM edition (Budapest: Arcanum, 2003).

phenomenon is due again to the changes in the role of written pieces of evidence as well as their function. More and more members of the basically “oral” society required their business agreements, rights acquired, and duties written down. This change, in general, may lead towards a fortunate position for the scholar in the field, but one has to become reconciled with the fact that the more charters are at our disposal, proportionally, the less information is contained by each document. This is especially the case compared to the charters issued in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. From the beginning of the fourteenth century, dozens of charters report legal procedures, but the majority of these documents can be regarded “informative” only from the point of view of procedural law. These certificates relate the launch and the subsequent phases of legal procedures, but quite often they merely announce that due to the absence of one of the parties involved (or his representatives) the session had to be postponed (again). Thus, even though there are dozens of charters pertaining the history of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory or to connections between it and the central administration of the Order in the fourteenth century, these still form an inadequate basis for the analysis of the Angevin period. Certainly, these sources are crucial for the identification of the brethren, the reconstruction of their tenure, and the itinerary of the officials of the priory. In summary, however, only one third of the total number of charters helps in surveying and analyzing the fourteenth-century history of the Hospital in Hungary. The number of documents utilized for this chapter is also reduced by the fact that the higher officials and the estate management of the priory are discussed in separate chapters.\textsuperscript{225} Accordingly, the average of the documentation is not as high as one would expect based on the general knowledge of the sources that have survived from this period.

4.1. Consolidation, Templars, Crisis

Despite the situation outlined above there are certainly several angles from which some light can be shed on fourteenth-century events at the Hungarian-Slavonian priory. The continuation of the chain of events of the Arpadian period is complex not only owing to the

\textsuperscript{225}See Chapter V and VII respectively. Certainly, in case of certain issues some temporal overlaps can be observed.
lack (or lower “informative value”) of sources. As is emphasized in the chapter dealing with
the priors and vice priors, there is a hiatus in the (almost) linear increase of sources related to
Hospitallers. This informational “vacuum” is not the consequence of the loss of sources since
it turns out that even the Master of the Hospital did not have adequate information about the
Priory. The Hungarian-Slavonian priory was still governed by priors of unknown origin,
conceivably foreign. It is not known, however, how far this was interrelated with the
emergence of the situation in which the landed properties of the Priory were disturbed by the
great magnates (petty kings) at the turn of the thirteenth century.

Moreover, after the fall of the Holy Land, the Order as a whole also faced a profound
crisis, which might have accelerated the effects of regional problems. Local circumstances
were normalized parallel to the international arena, perhaps not completely independently. In
1309-1310 the Hospitallers seized Rhodes and planted their feet there for more than two
centuries by establishing the foundations of a future “Ordenstaat.” Simultaneously, the long-
lasting consolidation of royal power started with the triple coronation (1301, 1309, 1310) of
the Angevin King Charles (Robert) I (1301-1342). It is not clear what role the Hospitallers
played in this process but there is no doubt that there was pressure on behalf of Pope
Boniface VIII for the support of the Angevin claimant against the Bohemian Wenceslas.
The Battle of Rozgony (1312) provides another piece of information. According to the
chronicle, after the royal standard-bearer was killed the king continued to fight under the
standard of certain cruciferi who -- at that time -- might have been either the Hospitallers
or the canons regular of St. Stephen, that is, the Stephanites.

---

226 Smičiklas 8: 59-60.
227 Although there is only one extant source from 1307 reporting such disturbance. Theiner 1: 422; MES 2: 580; AOkl 2: 122.
228 Pál Engel, “Az ország újraegyesítése. I. Károly küzdelmei az oligarchák ellen (1310-1323),” [The
reunion of the country. The struggle of Charles I against the oligarchs (1310-1323)] in Pál Engel, Honor, vár,
ispánság. Válogatott tanulmányok, ed. Enikő Csukovits (Budapest: Osiris, 2003), 320-408; See also Gyula
Kristó, “I. Károly király harcai a tartományurak ellen,” [The struggles of Charles I against the oligarchs]
229 Theiner 1: 401-402; AOkl 1: 220.
230 “… Gurke sub vexillo regis vexillarius existens occisus est: rex sub vexillo cruciferorum pugnavit…”
The evaluation of the consolidation period is complicated since, like other European priories, one of the main concerns of the Hospitallers was to acquire the properties of the dissolved Templars. Unfortunately, unlike legal procedures, our knowledge of the take-over process is rather limited. It is undisputed that the former Templar goods were sequestrated, in part by the king himself.\textsuperscript{231} It is also known that both the local clergy and lay aristocracy were informed about the synodal/papal decisions concerning the possessions held until then by the Order of the Temple.\textsuperscript{232} It is also likely that, besides the preceptories and landed properties, the Hospitallers took over the Templar archives, since some of them survived in the private archives of the Székesfehérvár Hospitaller preceptory.\textsuperscript{233} On the other hand, virtually nothing is known about the very process of this acquisition. It is conceivable that during the trial the Templars were given a probationary period during which they (and their dependencies and goods) were under certain auspices.\textsuperscript{234} The precariousness of their status was reflected in a charter of King Charles I, issued in 1310. The ruler gave the former Templar estate of Našice to a certain Alexander with the following warranty: if the Templars received a pardon from the Holy See, or the Roman Curia gave the Templar properties to other ecclesiastical establishments then the king would reimburse Alexander by an exchange which would be on a par with the original gift.\textsuperscript{235} Since the Templar preceptory of Našice together with its estates


\textsuperscript{232}Pope Clement V invited the archbishop of Kalocsa and the bishops of Zagreb and Transylvania to come to the Council of Vienne. Smičiklas 8: 207-213; A O kl 2: 184. According to Patek, no representative of the Hungarian clergy attended the council. Patek, A magyarországi templárius rend felbomlása, 14-15.

\textsuperscript{233}Hospitaller preceptory of Székesfehérvár, M O L., Section Q 398; Dl.106104, Dl.106105, Dl.106110, Dl.106537, Dl.107879. These charters -- with no exception -- are papal bulls.

\textsuperscript{234}See Note 231.

\textsuperscript{235}A O 1: 210-212; A O kl 2: 414-415; M E S 2: 628-629; Smičiklas 8: 263-264.
was taken over by the Hospital it is quite probable that Alexander applied for this
reimbursement at the royal court.

The most problematic point in this respect is that no comprehensive study meeting
modern scholarly standards is available on the history of the Templars in Hungary (including
the dissolution of the Order). Since useful and reliable comprehensive local studies are
lacking, this dissertation cannot undertake this task as the mere application of international
analogies often misleads scholars on the eastern edge of Latin Christendom. Relying upon
Hospitaller sources it seems that (most of) the former Templar preceptories were taken over
by the Hospitaller priory between 1314 and c.1340: Hresno, Gora, Dubica, Našice,
Božjakovina, Szentlőrinc, Vrana, Bő, Keresztény, Ivanec and Lešnik. Moreover, another
administrative unit, located in Syrmium, can be listed among the above preceptories, which
included several houses led by a certain Adam. In addition, most likely this was the period
when the Hospitallers acquired the temporal lordship from the Templars over the County of
Dubica, which itself made the Trans-Drava region significant for the Hospital. Dubica was
the center of Dubica county and thus the seat of the comes comitatus. In the thirteenth
century, lordship over the county, and thus the title of comes comitatus, was given to the

---

236 See the above mentioned work of Patek, and Frigyes Pesty, “A templáriusok Magyarországon,” [The

237 There are promising attempts as for Central Europe is concerned: Josip Kolanović, “Vrana i
na Slovenskem [Knights Templar in Slovenia] (Ljubljana: Zveza zgodovinskih društev Slovenija, 1995); Karl
Borchardt, “Military Orders in East Central Europe: The First Hundred Years,” in Michel Balard, ed., Autour de
la première Croisade, Actes de Colloque de la Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East,
Expanding the Frontiers, 233-244; Libor Jan, “Templari Češkovicích,” [The Templars in Češkovic] Studia
Possessions des Templiers en Hongrie,” in Expanding the Frontiers, 245-251; Lelja Dobronić, Templari i
Ivanović u Hrvatskoj [Templars and Hospitallers in Croatia] Bibliotheca Povjesnica (Zagreb: Dom i Svijet,
2002); Baláz Stossek, “A templomosok Magyarországon,” [The Templars in Hungary] in József Laszlovszky,
Judit Majrossy, and József Zsengellér, ed., A magyar keresztes háború: Magyarország és a Szentföld,
keresztesek és lovagrendek (Budapest, 2003; manuscript), 4.

238 A recent research registered fourteen Templar commanderies and some forty dependencies in

239 “... consensu... fratris Adam preceptoris domorum de Syrmi...”, and “... asensu... fratris Adam
preceptoris domorum Sirmie...” A O 1: 376, 389-390.

240 Present-day Croatia and Bosnia.
Templars. After the dissolution of the Temple, the Hospitallers “inherited” the lordship and thereafter the prior himself bore the title. His representative was the župan (comes terrestris) who often acted together with the Hospitaller preceptor of Dubica. Supposedly, these changes took place in the first half of this period.

The same methodological problem arises here as in connection with the foundation of Hospitaller preceptories: the first mention of an administrative unit or its dependencies does not necessarily mean the date of the foundation (here: the take-over) of that establishment. Yet, all theories have to be based on what was found in the sources, even though relevant analogies and cautious extrapolations are of some help. One should handle the supposed enrichment of the Hospital after the acquisition of the Templar properties accordingly. International scholars have already drawn attention to the fact that although the reception of the Templar goods might have proven profitable in the long run, first it was a costly project which soon entailed a serious financial crisis in the Order. Namely, the new situation required a complete rearrangement of the administrative system, not to mention those areas where the Hospital needed the help of advocates, which proved to be an expensive process.

---


242Thallóczy-Horváth, Alsó-Szlavónia, 59, 62-63, 82-83; Fejér CD 9/3: 185-186; 9/7: 178-179; Smiciklas 12: 651, 13: 4-5; See also Df.257974, Df.258481.

243See also, for instance, DI.3316, DI.33581, Péter Kóta, Középkori oklevelek Vas megyei levéltárakban I. Regeszták a vasvári káptalan levéléről, (1130) 1212-1526 [Medieval charters in the Archives of County Vas. 1. Calendars of the charters of the Vaspár chapter] V as megyei levéltári füzetek 8 (Szombathyel: Vas Megyei Levéltár, 1997), 48; Thallóczy-Horváth, Alsó-Szlavónia, 38; Fejér CD 9/2: 709, 9/7: 174; HO 1: 219.

244Borchardt, “Military Orders in East Central Europe,” 249.


It is an important question, as with other European priories of the Order, what role the ruler played during the transfer of Templar goods. Lacking adequate source materials not much can be added to the former conjectures. If the Hospitallers rendered effective service during the consolidation it is likely that royal policy was supportive during the acquisition process. However, one cannot overlook the fact that in 1317 or 1318 Charles I supported his relative, Prince Miesco of Beuthen, in the succession to the Hungarian-Slavonian prior’s seat against Filippo de Gragnana, the candidate of the Hospital, or better to say, of Pope John XXII, which led to some discord. Moreover, it was a hard period for both the Hungarian king and the Hospital. Charles I still struggled with the provincial potentates, and the “Slavonian war,” with serious losses, proved to be lengthy. It cannot be ruled out that this

---


249 See Chapter V.
situation, and/or the absence of a legal prior, led Pope John XXII to commission the Archbishop of Kalocsa to order judges for the custody of the goods of the Hospitallers.\textsuperscript{250} The main problem the Hospital had to face, however, was a general and profound financial crisis. Despite the growing number of leasings of Hospitaller lands,\textsuperscript{251} the brethren could not raise enough income to cover the ever-increasing expenses. Supposedly, the priory failed to rearrange the administrative units quickly enough and this primarily concerned Slavonia where the majority of the former Templar preceptories and their dependencies were located.\textsuperscript{252} In 1322, the Hungarian-Slavonian brethren received papal authorization to alienate their properties (if it were unavoidable) in order to discharge their liabilities,\textsuperscript{253} though the local Hospitallers still preferred leasing. The priory delegated brothers to conduct a survey, which by 1326\textsuperscript{254} had identified the land that they found the most profitable for leasing to laics. In addition, they exchanged lands with the king in 1328\textsuperscript{255} in order to facilitate their land administration in Slavonia. In the meantime, the debates over tithing of the Arpadian period recrudesced in the 1320s and lasted until the mid-fourteenth century.

Difficulties proved to be ceaseless for the time being. Although Charles I had settled accounts with the petty kings by 1322-1323,\textsuperscript{256} Vrana -- the former Templar headquarters now held by the Hospitallers -- was besieged by the Croatians (crohati) in 1328 (or just before). Owing to the help of laics, the resident brethren survived, but the fortification and the building complex bore serious losses.\textsuperscript{257} In addition to the turmoil or because of it, one of the leaseholders of the Priory organized a conspiracy, mobilizing even the tenant peasants of the

\textsuperscript{250} Registres de Jean XXII, no. 10462; AO kl 5: 232.

\textsuperscript{251} See Chapter VII.


\textsuperscript{253} Theiner 1: 485-486; Registres de Jean XXII, nos. 16591, 16602; AO kl 6: 306.

\textsuperscript{254} Dl.106115, Df.258480, AO kl 10: 111-112.

\textsuperscript{255} Smičiklas 9: 380-381; AO kl 12: 55.

\textsuperscript{256} See Note 228.

\textsuperscript{257} Fejér CD 8/3: 341-343; AO kl 12: 146.
Consequently, there were many tasks for the prior, Filippo de Gragnana, who visited the priory annually.

At first glance it seems that a somewhat quieter period began in 1330. This is, however, deceptive as it is ascribable to the lack of sources and, chiefly, to the fact that the Priory was vacant for five years. It was retained by the Master of the Hospital at the chapter general held in Montpellier. Perhaps this was the reason for the negligence of the leaseholders of the Priory concerning their payments. Unfortunately, the growing number of charters still does not allow scholars to establish general statements and extrapolations. It is not even a situation when we could make a more profound dip into the fourteenth-century history of the Hospital than we could for the Arpadian period. This statement, however, should be evaluated with at least two constraints. First, due to the circumstances outlined above concerning the sources, pieces of information gathered from the charters can only be applied to the history of the Priory indirectly. It does not invalidate their value but it is worth emphasizing that these are not all deeds, but at times deductions. The other consideration is a methodological one. In scholarly circles it is a commonplace that the legal sources at our disposal often attest a moment not from the peaceful, everyday life of the Order but rather the deviances. Being legal/decretal sources in nature, doubtless the contents of these documents were less (if at all) exposed to the intentions of their authors in comparison, for instance, with narrative sources. On the other hand, it would be an overstatement to suggest that Hospitallers were always involved in interminable debates over landed properties.

This attitude may affect the disciplinary conditions, too. Assuredly, Pope Benedict XII lists, in 1337, sins committed by a Hospitaller brother, Giovanni de Camporiano, who had a stagia at Vrana. It was most probably not typical behavior for a Hospitaller brother to take

---

258 Df.257974, Df.258481.
259 See Chapter V.
260 E.g., Fejér CD 8/4: 129-130.
off the habit of his order, take an assumed name and marry, and to commit other transgressions, not even if it is known that he served the Order with his Italian fellow brothers far from his homeland, under the leadership of a Provençal prior. At the same time, the opposite also cannot be assumed. It is unlikely that the Hungarian-Slavonian priory functioned as a “place of punishment,” even though there are two examples which may imply such a function at first sight. In 1348, Dieudonné of Gozon confined François Furoni, who served the Order in Southern Italy, to Hungary by ordering the Hungarian prior to render him a stagia. As it turns out from the charters, the brother, who fell into the sin of sodomy, was sent to such a remote place because the efforts to reform him had failed. The target of the “exile,” however, was not a medieval “Siberia” where life conditions were more austere than in other parts of Europe. Simply, the Master and the council of the prud’hommes sent François to a distant place, far from the scene of his sins, but a place where he could stay together with his Provençal fellow brothers (countrymen). There is nothing unique in this solution since all that happened was in accordance with the observance of the Hospitaller Rule. This was probably also the case with the Castilian Pedro de Ortíz de Salzedo, who had to leave (pro stagia moraturum) his post on the island of Kos in 1351 because he killed a slave. According to the original mandate issued on 10 June 1351, he was supposed to leave

262In 1328, the preceptor of Vrana was a certain Nicolò de Camporiano (Fejér CD 8/3: 341-343; A Okl 12: 146) and the notary of Philippo de Gragnana, in 1329, was Phylippus filius condam S bona fidei notarii de Camporgiano imperialis auctoritate notarius et scriba supradicti domini prioris et fratrum suprascriptorum. Df.257974, Df.258481.


264A OM 317, fol. 211”“.

265See CHAP TER V.


for the Priory of Hungary, but on 5 July another order was given by the Master (de novo deliberavimus) which directed him to the preceptory of Carasco (Karystos). In order to make the final decision congruent with the records of the central administration, the scribe lined through the name of the Hungarian priory in the charter of 10 June and superscripted: ad preceptoriam Carasco. The reason for the drawing a parallel with the above case of the Provençal brother is that a certain Gwylerm de Alcaniz (Alcañiz?), supposedly of Aragonese origin, served the Hospital in Hungary from at least 1350 until as late as 1376. Thus it is not to be ruled out that the Master (or the Convent) again sent a brother to his "compatriot(s)" residing in the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory. This theory can be confirmed by an act in 1365-1366 when Pedro Ortiz finally was assigned to a preceptory in Hungary. Unfortunately, neither the records of the central administration, nor the Hungarian charters provide information about which preceptory he stayed at. In summary, it can be stated that those foreign members of the Order who were sent to Hungary did not find there a reformatory settlement even though it was regarded as a penalty for their sins.

4.2. THE FIGHT AGAINST THE INFIDEL AND FELLOW CHRISTIANS

In connection with the survey of the Arpadian period, the discussion addressed the much-debated question of the role played by the Hospital in Hungary with regard to the fight against the infidel as well as its other military-defensive functions. According to the sources, as partly mentioned above, in the first third of the fourteenth century the Hospitallers took up arms not against the infidel but against the enemies of the king or in favor of their own

268 AOM 318, fol. 210v. See APPENDIX B no. 39.

269 See CHAPTER VI.

270 Although both of them were from Spain, they “originally” belonged to different Langues (Castile and Aragon). However, for the time being, it cannot be ruled out that Gwylerm came from the Priory of Messina. Cf. “... baiulia Alcanii et Trapani prioratus... Messane,” in 1347, AOM 317, fol. 224r-226r.

properties (1312, 1319-1320, 1328). The Hospitallers also ceased to fight against the infidel in other parts of Europe after 1320. The tangible break-through took place in 1334, when the Hospital showed the inclination to play an active role in the crusading movement again. The importance of the Order’s attitude was emphasized by Anthony Luttrell who pointed out that this moment can be regarded as a turning point in the overall history of the Hospital.  

This apparent change, however, did not convince either the public or the papal curia. As for the first, (both royal and private) land donations virtually ceased in the fourteenth century. The series of secular privileges also faltered in Hungary during the reign of Charles I. It would be irrational to expect private gifts, which were infrequent even in the Arpadian period, to be given to an Order which was gradually losing its popularity. At the same time, papal discontent was manifest. In 1342, Pope Clement VI threatened to replace the Hospital with a newly founded military-religious order, if they were still reluctant to make efforts against the Turks in the framework of a crusade. Perhaps alarmed by the papal reprimand, the Hungarian prior made an effort to contribute to this international endeavor. Several decades after the dissolution of the Templars, the precedent created by the decision against the Templars was felt to still be a threat to the Hospitallers. Either the explicit denunciation or wise foresight motivated the Hospital; the idea of “fighting for the faith” again came to characterize the activity of the Order.

The calls to fight against the Turks also reached Hungary and the Hospitallers stationed here, but this was already another period: the reign of Louis I (the Great) (1342-1382). Although the new ruler also belonged to the Angevin dynasty it was the beginning of a new

---


era in many respects, which also brought changes to the life of the Priory. These changes became manifest during the wars against Venice and the Kingdom of Naples.\textsuperscript{275}

The war against Venice was a peculiar triangular situation among Venice, Louis I, and the Hospital in a rivalry for the Dalmatian coast.\textsuperscript{276} In July 1345 the Hungarian prior obtained the permission of the Venetians to acquire roars \textit{apud Jadram} (sc. Zara/Zadar in Dalmatia) and to export them to the Master of the Hospital (most likely to Rhodes) on a ship he hired from Venice, with the condition that \textit{ipse Prior teneatur facere venire contra litteras a dicto Magistro, quomodo dicti remi illuc sint conducti}.\textsuperscript{277} By the time the transaction was made, war broke out for the Dalmatian coastal area, including Zara.\textsuperscript{278} In connection with the impending war, a decision of the Venetian government should be noted. It turns out that the Venetians thought that they were on the same side as the Hungarian Hospitallers. This misbelief was based on the fact that the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory belonged to the Italian Langue and thus it was linked to the Priory of Venice.\textsuperscript{279} These assumed “good relations” were soon spoiled, when the Croatian Mladen Subić (III) -- who had been a citizen of Venice since 1343\textsuperscript{280} -- was prompted by the Venetians to besiege Vrana during the winter of 1345.\textsuperscript{281} Without adequate sources, it cannot be reconstructed whether the Hungarian prior

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{275} As for the Neapolitan wars are concerned, King Louis I encroached to the autonomy of the Priory (and that of the Order) by, most likely, giving the prior title to the infamous Montreal du Bar, also known as Frà Moriale. Reiszeg, 1: 100-112; Cf. István Miskolczy, \textit{Magyar-olasz összeköttetések az Anjouk korában. Magyarnapolói kapcsolatok [Hungarian-Italian relations in the Angevin period. Hungarian-Neapolitan relations]} (Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1937), 250, 252; see also in \textit{CHAPTER V}.

\textsuperscript{276} Kristó, \textit{Az Anjou-kor háborúi}, 97-115; Engel, \textit{The Realm of St. Stephen}, 161-162.


\textsuperscript{278} Zara was under Hungarian control in 1311-1312, 1345-1346 and in the period of 1357-1401. Zsuzsa Teke, “Zára,” in \textit{KMTL}, 741.

\textsuperscript{279} See the personnel between 1340 and 1344 in \textit{CHAPTER VI}.


\textsuperscript{281} Wenzel, \textit{Acta extera} 2: 124. “...Et multum miramur, quod id nobis non significarunt, maxime quia dicitur nobis, quod dictus locus Vrane tenetur per Hospitalarios qui sunt intimi et devoti nostri domini. Et aliiqui suspicantur quod forte dicti Hospitalarii illum locum tenent in feudum a regibus Hungarie. Et ideo volentes de hoc plenius informari, mandamus eis, quod nobis ordinate significent, quomodo hoc factum se habuit, et de cetero a damnificatione dicti loci se abtineant, nisi talis causa et culpa ipsorum de Vrana precessisset seu precederet, propter quam haberent procedere contra eos.”
\end{footnotesize}
Pierre Cornuti (1335-1348) or his lieutenant Giovanni Latini of Perugia made any escape arrangements, or whether any of them stayed in Vrana during the siege. King Louis I, led his army to Zara against Venice, but he suffered an unexpected fiasco in 1346, which he wanted to repair quickly.\textsuperscript{282} The “reply” had to be, however, postponed, since in the meantime Prince Andrew, the younger brother of Louis, was assassinated in Naples and the main orientation of Hungarian foreign policy was immediately diverted. Thus, much less attention was paid to the report sent by the Hungarian-Slavonian viceprior, Baudoin Cornuti (1348-1374), to Nicholas of Lendva, warden of Slavonia, concerning the military preparations of the Venetians against Zara in the spring of 1348.\textsuperscript{283} By that time Pierre Cornuti was away from Hungary, although it is not known whether he left for Rhodes or if he ever arrived there. The affair with Venice in the coastal areas was ended in 1358 by the Treaty of Zara, which in a certain respect terminated the debate concerning this region not only among the secular parties but also concerning the role played by the Hospital. The Hungarian-Slavonian prior was among the witnesses on behalf of the Hungarian king,\textsuperscript{284} while the head of the Priory of Venice, Napoleone de Tibertis, witnessed the oath of the Venetian party in San Marco in the same year.\textsuperscript{285}

Turning back to the fight against the infidel, it can be observed that although the leadership of the Order conceivably made efforts to involve the Hungarian Hospitallers the local brethren seemed to follow the policy of the Hungarian ruler. The presentation of King Louis I’s anti-Turkish policy would exceed the framework of the present dissertation, but it is worth summarizing its major characteristics very briefly. The apparent distortion (oversimplification) here is related to the necessity for brevity. As shown above, during the first decade and a half there were no weighty concerns in connection with the Turks. This does not

\textsuperscript{282}Kristó, Az Anjou-kor háborúi, 97-115.


\textsuperscript{285}Wenzel, Acta extera, 2: 513-518.
mean that Louis I did plan or even wage war against the infidel. In this period, for the king, the “infidel” meant the heathen Lithuanians and the fight against them established his fame as rex bellator, athleta domini, and zelator fidei christianae. He received these titles “officially” from Pope Innocent VI in 1356. These struggles, nonetheless, did not involve the Hospital, as opposed to the Teutonic Order. Similarly, the first tangible steps of Louis I in the above regard did not concern the Hospitallers in the 1360s either. The goal of the royal policy was that instead of real military activity against the Turks he tried to impede Turkish expansion into the Balkans by shaping buffer zones under Hungarian control. As Ferenc Szakály pointed out, the problem was not with Louis I’s plans but rather with their implementation.286 On the other hand, Western scholars have charged the rex bellator with the abuse of religious enthusiasm and misuse of financial support. Louis I used the subsidy for his own purposes of expansion by pretending to make efforts to uproot the heresy spreading in the Balkans.287 Popes from Clement VI to Gregory XI prevailed upon the Hungarian ruler -- either by bringing pressure to bear on him or by feather-bedding288 -- to be a determinant figure of a passagium generale. It was not until 1373 that the Hungarian “army” first met at the terra ferma in Venice where the doge, with the help of Turkish archers, defeated the troops of the Voivode of Transylvania.289 At the beginning of the 1370s, Pope Gregory XI used all the means in his power to induce Louis I to fight against the infidel. Instead, the king turned against Venice in 1372-1373, allying with Padua.290 In addition, a disagreement arose among Louis I, the pope, and the Hospital concerning the succession of the Hungarian prior in 1373.


288 E.g., Theiner 1: 658, 697-698.


However, Baudion Cornuti was still in office! This was not the only factor which hindered Louis I from providing effective help, but it certainly made diplomatic relations more tense than before. Eventually, the pope seemed to lose hope concerning the participation of the Hungarian ruler in a land crusade. Gregory XI again began to prefer the organization of a naval force in which the Hospitallers had a share. He called the Order in December 1375 to recruit a contingent of more than 400 knights including one and a half dozen Hospitallers from the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory. It is obscure, however, whether they played an active role, that is, they took part in any passagium at all. All that is known is that Hesso Schlegelholtz, preceptor of Rottweil and Freiburg-im-Breisgau, was sent to Hungary to advance the crusading movement, but finally he failed to reconcile the quarrel between the pope and Louis I over the succession of the Hungarian-Slavonian prior. Thus the cooperation was cancelled. Perhaps it was due to the above situation that King Louis I did not scourge the local Hospitallers for fighting against the infidel. Especially because the menace of the Turks was so far from the frontiers of Hungary in the first half of his rule, and this issue did not belong to the mainstream of Hungarian foreign policy.

It should not be ruled out that Hungarian Hospitallers took part in the crusading movement by joining a passagium one by one or in smaller groups. According to a recently discovered letter from Rhodes, Hungarians served in the army of King Peter I of Cyprus at the siege of Antalya in 1361. In this letter, James of Panyit mentions that he had received news from Hungary thus it is likely that there were other Hungarians arriving in Rhodes. From 1351 at the latest, there was a hospice of the Hungarian prior(y) at their disposal.

291 See Chapter V.


295 For the hospicium, see AOM 318, fol. 229v. See in Appendix B no. 37.
Moreover, Ede Reiszig explained Prior Baudoin’s long absence from the priory with the fact that he left for Rhodes in July 1364 and came back as late as the beginning of 1370. It is very difficult to confirm Reiszig’s idea as he referred to the exact date of the charter of 1364 but, unusual for him, he did not give the signature or the shelf-mark of the charter of Louis I in which he found this information.\textsuperscript{296} Neither the inventory of the National Archives of Hungary\textsuperscript{297} nor do the source publications contain any charter of Louis I issued on 24 July 1364. Not even the central administration of the Order recorded the presence of Baudoin on Rhodes. It is much easier to refute this idea with the help of other extant written sources. According to a charter issued in February 1365, Baudoin stayed in the County of Dubica when he -- as the Count of Dubica -- exempted the folk of the Pauline monastery of Dubica from various forms of taxation.\textsuperscript{298} He also appeared in Slavonia at the end of May 1367 when he issued a charter at the preceptory of Pakrac.\textsuperscript{299} Admittedly, there are several hiatuses in his prioral itinerary (24 June 1361-12 February 1365 and 22 May 1367-12 December 1371), not including the one suggested by Reiszig. This could be explained by reasons of a different nature, although the possibility of the fight against the Turks should not be ruled out entirely.

Last but not least the name of a certain Barraxius de Barrax should be mentioned, who applied for ancianitas\textsuperscript{300} in 1392.\textsuperscript{301} According to the charter of the Master of the Order, Barraxius -- who was most likely of Provençal origin\textsuperscript{302} -- accompanied Raymond de Beaumont not only to the Priory of Hungary but etiam partes alias cismarinas se contulerit in eis residens. It is hopeless to reconstruct either the exact pursuits of Barraxius in Hungary or

\textsuperscript{296} Reiszig 1: 116-117.

\textsuperscript{297} Rácz, A középkori Magyarország levéltári forrásainak adatbázisa.

\textsuperscript{298} Lajos Thallóczy, and Sándor Horváth ed., Alsó-Szlavóniai okmánytár (Dubica, Orbász és Szana vármegyék). Codex diplomaticus partium regno Hungariae adnexarum (Comitatuum Dubica, Orbász et Szana) 1244-1718 (Budapest, 1912), 82-83.

\textsuperscript{299} D1.8617.

\textsuperscript{300} A sort of seniority in case of assignments or appointments of the Hospitaller officials.

\textsuperscript{301} AOM 325, fol. 61r-62r. See APPENDIX B, no. 75.

whether he was provided a stagia at any of the local preceptories. Nonetheless, the fact that he appealed for ancianitas implies that as a senior brother he served the Order as miles. Admittedly, the mentioned charter was issued subsequent to the period under query, but due to the fact that Raymond de Beaumont acted as prior between 1374 and 1381, in a certain respect up to 1384 it is quite probable that his compatriot stayed in the Hungarian-Slavonian priory and went to partes alias cismarinas, for instance, to fight the infidel at the same time.

Passing on the last quarter of the fourteenth century, it should be emphasised that the Great Schism created a peculiar situation from 1378 onwards in the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory. As opposed to the prevailing conception of the scholarly literature I believe -- as it will be argued soon -- that the Hungarian priory, like the Bohemian priory, became divided. One party, led by John of Palisna, followed Pope Clement VII in Avignon for a good while and being so, the scismaticus Heredia. The other side, headed by the Provençal Raymond de Beaumont, obeyed, like King Louis I, the Roman Urban VI and thus became adherents of the antimaster, the Neapolitan Riccardo Caracciolo. The peculiarity of the whole situation is well demonstrated by the case of the preceptory of Dubica.

Owing to this situation, events became confused and an irreversible process began: the proposals of the central government were less and less observed in the Hungarian-Slavonian priory. Approaching from a different angle, it seems that a cleavage took place in the leadership of the priory which, for a long time, led to ill-omened precedent. With the

---

303 See Chapter V.

304 During the priorship of Raymond, in 1376, two other Hospitallers turned up with unknown origin: "Philippus de Czamana magister domorum, Blvsnis magister domorum." I failed to identify their affiliation in Hungary; Df.230580.


307 See in Chapter VI.
appearance of John of Palisna, the actual person of the prior became a political issue for decades. In evaluating his deeds, besides his complex personality, the contemporary historico-political situation should be taken into account. Thus, the anarchical period of the interregnum, that is, the years between the death of Louis I (1382) and the succession of Sigismund (1387), should be surveyed briefly from the point of view of both Palisna and the Order/Priory.\(^{308}\)

Palisna bore the title of the Prior of Vrana at least from 1379 when the brethren of the Székesfehérvár preceptory styled him this way.\(^{309}\) Nonetheless, Juan Fernandez Heredia confirmed him “officially” as late as July 1382,\(^{310}\) which was ratified at the general assembly held in March 1383.\(^{311}\) The rise of Palisna was rapid and he soon obtained very important licences from the Master. This would have secured a good career in the Order, nonetheless, John found himself in the middle of the turmoil of internal politics following the death of King Louis I (10 September 1382). Palisna (first) revolted against the queens in autumn 1383. The exact reasons for his rebellion are not known: whether he objected to female rule\(^{312}\) or wanted to gain power in southern Hungary. Szilárd Süttő’s apt remark is quite convincing, emphasizing that there was no sign of John having any political relations in the country or abroad, in this case, with the Angevin Charles of Durazzo. The likelihood of this is decreased by the fact that at the beginning of his priorship he flirted with the Avignonese party. Nonetheless, he was “officially” deposed from the prioral office and after the surrender of Vrana he found shelter for a while at the court of Bosnian King Tvrtko. For governance of the goods of the priory, ecclesiastical gubernatores were immediately appointed by Queen

\(^{308}\) For other details pertaining to the question of priors and vicepriors, see CHAPTER V.

\(^{309}\) DI.7550.


\(^{311}\) AOM 322, fol. 251r-252r. APPENDIX B no. 60.

\(^{312}\) Kukuljević, “Priorat vranski,” 68-69; Neven Budak, “John of Palisna, the Hospitaller Prior of Vrana,” in Expanding the Frontiers, 286; Süttő, Anjou-Magyarország alkonya, 46.
Mary, and by the autumn of 1384 Raymond de Beaumont returned to Hungary and apparently acted as legal prior. At the same time, the Romanist Riccardo Caracciolo began to assign preceptors to Hungarian preceptories. It was a peculiar situation since, despite the schism, they practically stood on the same side. By the beginning of 1381, Raymond was in the service of Charles of Durazzo, the same person whom he and Palisna had fought together, allied with Padua in 1372. Charles was invited to the Hungarian throne in August 1385 and was crowned at the end of the same year as Charles (Parvus) II. It has to be noted here that Palisna did not play an active role in the making of the king. The “merit” was of the Horvats’ party. The ambitious Hungarian could have availed himself of the opportunity to ensure the prioral seat for decades during the rule of the Angevin Charles, but events turned in a new direction by the outrage against Charles of Durazzo in February 1386 and finally by his death later that month. Certainly, the “Angevin party” brooded over schemes of vengeance and this impetus floated Palisna among the immediate adherents in the spring of 1386. He joined the rebellion and perhaps even mobilized Hospitaller troops in July 1386, when they attacked the queens and the palatine on their way to Gora. They imprisoned the former and killed the latter. Although it is certain that Palisna did not take part in the later strangulation of the queen mother (November 1386), he was clearly an outlaw from this time onwards. He was not in immediate danger of arrest, especially, since the rioters were still strong enough in Slavonia as to outface the troops of the new claimant, Sigismund of Luxembourg. Thus, for instance, while Sigismund began to destroy the resistance of the rebellion, John of Palisna was besieging Darnóc (Slatinski Drenovac) in January 1387. Two
months later Sigismund was crowned and took further steps to consolidate his power: with arms and promises.

These events soon made the priory disjointed, although Riccardo Caracciolo did not notice any serious disorder in the Hungarian-Slavonian priory in the summer of 1386.\(^{319}\) The reason is quite obvious: the escalation of events began a few weeks after his last news about the priory, but he still knew more than the Avignonese “party” as all connections were broken with the defection of Palisna to the Angevin “side.” Nonetheless, the former prior was aware of the fact that the events did not serve his secure future. All his possessions had been confiscated by Queen Mary in September 1387,\(^{320}\) and a couple of weeks later one of the most powerful supporters of Sigismund, Albert, a member of the Losonci kindred, turned up as prior elect.\(^{321}\)

In a first approximation, there is nothing striking in the phenomenon that a ruler openly intervened for his own appointee, especially not after King Louis I’s intervention in favor of Frà Moriale and Raymond de Beaumont.\(^{322}\) The difficulty arose from the fact that in the case of Sigismund it became a general attitude towards the Hospitaller prior(y) by the reinterpretation of the concept of ius patronatus or that of collatio. In addition, like the properties of other ecclesiastical establishments, he often kept the prior seat vacant and appointed secular governors to collect the revenues of the priory.\(^{323}\) With regard to the Hungarian-Slavonian priory, it was a turning point since locals were appointed as priors from this time onwards, irrespective of whether they were adherents of the actual ruler or not. It did not, however, result in the settling of the discord with the Convent of the Hospital, not even after the termination of the Great Schism. The grounds and reasons are much more

---

\(^{319}\) AOM 281, f. 86v, 92v, 93v. See Appendix B nos. 72-74.

\(^{320}\) Smičiklas 17: 87.

\(^{321}\) Fejér CD 10/1: 394.

\(^{322}\) See in Chapter V.

complex than the scholarly literature has mirrored them so far. Nevertheless, these are outside of the time frames of this study.

4.3. PRECEPTORIES, HEADQUARTERS

MAP 5. Preceptories of the Hungarian–Slavonian priory, 1350-c.1387

Similarly to the above portrayed situation, there are more tangible data about the administrative units of the Priory in the second half of the fourteenth century. Concerning the preceptories it is striking that the majority of the former Templar houses had disappeared by the last quarter of the century. The first step of this long process might have been the rearrangement of the houses and their dependencies (membra). Soon these units appeared as dependencies of other preceptories and finally of the Priory. Such an overall realignment was a general European phenomenon in this period; other priories also had to rearrange their domus and membra in order to achieve more profitable financial conditions.324 It can be

regarded a typical change that in the fourteenth century priories cut down the number of preceptories as well as numbers of resident brethren. The Order was under pressure to raise the efficiency of its money-making activity either by taking new brothers or by rearranging the administrative units. It seems that it was not a prefigured, coherently managed process. During the “rearrangements” in the second half of the fourteenth century some short-lived preceptories turned up in the sources, for instance, Mostanica and Fadd, which were originally landed properties of the Priory and belonged to another preceptory.

As in the early period of the Order in Hungary, after a while these dependencies became “autonomous” administrative units. Nonetheless, the second half of the fourteenth century saw approximately two dozen preceptories, fortifications and/or their dependencies but the most of them had disappeared by the last quarter of the century. At the time of the death of Louis I in 1382, there were some fifteen administrative units of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory. Most of them were located in the Trans-Drava region even though the Székesfehérvár preceptory, one of the largest and of the most important, still functioned in the middle of the realm.

In connection with the above shift of balance towards the south, the gradual change in the role of Vrana, the former Templar headquarters, can be observed from the mid-fourteenth century onwards. By this time Vrana had become a determinant preceptory of the Hospitaller priory, which was most likely based on its politico-strategic situation on the Dalmatian coast. The significance of Vrana was mirrored in the title of the Hungarian-Slavonian priors from this time: prior (et) prioratus Ungarie seu Aurane. However, it is still not unequivocal that Vrana was the sole seat/headquarters of the Hospitaller priory. It is quite rare if not unknown in the practice of the Order that the priories appointed a domus or castrum as their “exclusive” center even if there were major preceptories of major or a determinant role: domus sive preceptoria principalis. The Hungarian-Slavonian priors held

---

325 See Chapter VI.


their seat in different preceptories: Gyánt, Béla, Pakrac, Csurgó, Gora, and Vrana. For instance, Pierre Cornuti stayed for a while in both Pakrac and Csurgó.\textsuperscript{328} The measure of significance could also be which preceptory gives the deputy, the actual vice- or lieutenant prior. In this respect, besides the preceptors of Székesfehérvár, the role played by the castellan of Béla or the preceptor of Csurgó and Újudvar should be accentuated as they turned up in such offices from time to time during the period investigated.\textsuperscript{329}


\textsuperscript{329} See CHAPTER VI.
CHAPTER V
OFFICIALS OF THE HUNGARIAN-SLAVONIAN PRIORY

From the end of the twelfth century until the last quarter of the fourteenth century the majority of the high officials of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory came from abroad. Because of the scattered nature of the sources, it is hard to reconstruct even the milestones in the career of the priors who held their office before the beginning of the fourteenth century. As a consequence, there is not enough information for evaluating the role of the activity in this region with regard to the overall career of a given Hospitaller official. Also due to the shortage of data it is impossible to determine the average time a prior spent in office.\textsuperscript{330} It is apparent, however, that from the fourteenth century onwards the priors and lieutenant priors spent more and more time in their offices. In the case of the Cornutis, for instance, Hungary proved to be the last known station in their careers. One should not overlook the fact that even if the priorship of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory was not a significant one compared to Western priories, the actual prior was regarded as belonging to the circle of prelati, the highest level of ecclesiastical hierarchy in the realm. How prestigious it was for Italian and/or Provençal priors, especially having left the confines of the country of their origin, can only be inferred.

In order to reconstruct a more or less complete history of a religious order one of the most elementary tasks is to compile the archontology of the Order, that is, the list of high officials of a given period. The Order’s archontology is important since the Hospital was an international and strongly centralized military-religious order. In order to make the

\footnote{\textsuperscript{330}For calculations in the Priory of St. Gilles, see Henry J. Sire, The Knights of Malta (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), 104-105.}
archontology representative it should be investigated either from the point of view of the priories of the Order or of vertical mobility in the Order.331

The international character of the Hospital and its French dominance have been well known for many decades among scholars. However, as opposed to the research concerning the central administration of the Order, for a long time there were few comparative investigations focusing on its regional units. This phenomenon especially concerns the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory. György Pray began the work, which was followed by contributions by Frigyes Pesty, Ivan Kukuljević, Ede Reiszig, Lelja Dobronić and Pál Engel, who each compiled the archontology of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory for a different time-span.332 They unearthed a great deal of information although their products are not free of mistakes, confusion, and, in many instances, are incomplete even for short periods. Although most of the historians who ever touched upon this issue noted the foreign origin of the officials of the Priory, they made little effort to identify these Hospitallers.333 However, in analyzing and evaluating single members of the Order it is of importance, where they came from; when and for what purposes they left the Hungarian kingdom provided that they were ever here at all; and what sort of other offices they held formerly and/or simultaneously in the Priory or abroad. This is a hypothetical list of questions and after having examined the sources it is certain that they cannot all be answered.


333The most problematic identifications are the ones by L. Dobronić.
With the help of recently published studies of scholars working in this field, notably that of Anthony Luttrell and Karl Borchardt, much more is known about the twelfth to fourteenth century officials of the Hospital in Central Europe. Luttrell’s and Borchardt’s works are essential for reconstructing the list of high officials of the Priory. However, in connection with the titles and offices, as mentioned in the introductory chapter, even established scholars in the field emphasize that in the early period of the Hospital it is difficult to distinguish between the different titles and denominations appearing in the sources (preceptor, magnus/maior preceptor, magister, summus magister, prior, procurator, etc.) and the exact competence or power which was attached to any of these. Their competence varied by region and through time. \(^{334}\) It requires a thorough analysis and comparative investigation to reconstruct the titulature of the Order and one should bear in mind that the scribes of the charters or the narrative texts were not always consistent in registering or indicating someone’s appropriate title. \(^{335}\)

5.1. The Arpadian Period
The territorial structure of the Order in this region, which later became the basis of the priory, began to take shape in the 1180s, not much later than in the Holy Land or Western Europe. \(^{336}\) At that time the middle level of the hierarchy within the Hospital -- which included the preceptories in a region -- had not yet crystallized. A charter of 1186 names the officer in charge of the Hungarian and Bohemian territories in the following way: “Martinus quondam


\(^{337}\) See Chapter II.
Accordingly, Martin, the former provost of Prague, had authority over those territories which had not yet been integrated into or assigned to any other already existing priory. Anthony Luttrell noted that Martin was sent to the region from the Holy Land around 1183, although his origin is still obscure. Fortunately, Martin, unlike many other contemporaneous dramatis personae of the early period, did not disappear for a while: he was present at the general chapter of the Order held in Margat in 1188, and a year later he attached his seal as preceptor hospitalis to the charter of Prince Otto (Conrad Ota) of Bohemia. It is not clear, however, what his title referred to exactly since he was followed by Bernard as prior Boemie on the list of the sealers of the charter. According to Karl Borchardt, this Bernard might have been the brother who played some role in the grant of Béla III (Alexios) given to the Order in the first half of 1170. The question of these offices has become more puzzling since Libor Jan recently rediscovered a letter of 1193 in which the Master of the Hospital addressed Martin as prior in Ungaria while informing him that mortuus est persecutor noster Saladinus. Since there is another extant letter with the same content, presently kept in Paris,
that was sent to Guillame de Villiers, the magister ultramarinus it is likely that both of them were copies of a circular letter sent out to European priors advertising the “good news.”

The earliest references to officials appear in the first quarter of the thirteenth century, there are innominated Hungarian priors recorded in charters, for instance, in 1208 and in 1222, while a certain R (or B) Hospitaller proctor in Hungaria was listed in 1216. Similar to contemporary European usage, several denotations of the procurator title can be reconstructed. In the early decades it may have referred to the superiors of the preceptories but later it was also applied to lieutenants, deputies, visitors and, from time to time, the same title was used for officials ordered for particular cases (procurator in hac causa). In 1217 a prior appears in the sources abbreviated with a P sigla. This was none other than the prior sent by Andrew II to Venice to negotiate the purchase of ships for the king’s journey to the Holy Land. For the time being, he cannot be identified with certainty, but a charter of 1216 was witnessed by, among others, Pethe as "magister hospitalis domus". He has been identified in the literature as the preceptor of the Győr preceptory. This remains uncertain, however. The first mention of the Győr preceptory occurs much later and the eschatocol of the charter does not refer to him this way. In addition, although this data is relatively early, from the titulature used so far it seems the expression magister meant provincial leader, while the single preceptories were headed by preceptors or commanders. If the usage was consistent to any extent then the mentioned magister was the prior of the Hungarian Priory at that time whose name was abbreviated as P in the charter of Andrew II in 1217. Nonetheless, from the list of the higher dignitaries of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory it is clear that the inversion

\[343\] Cartulaire no. 945.

\[344\] Fejér CD 3/1: 56-57; MonWesp 1: 17; Cartulaire no. 1302.


\[346\] PRT 1: 164, 638; ÁUO 6: 377-379; MonWesp 1: 36-37; Cartulaire no. 1472.

\[347\] ÁUO 6: 380-383; Cartulaire no. 1605.

\[348\] ... hoc autem factum est in presenitia... et Pethe magistri hospitalis Domus... ÁUO 1: 139-140.

\[349\] Reiszig 2: 61, 69 and others on the basis of his work.

\[350\] See Table 1 at the end of this chapter.
of titles can be observed up to the last third of the thirteenth century. That is, the preceptor title could refer to provincial leaders as well as preceptors of individual houses.

The second quarter of the century saw two identifiable officials. A certain Johannes was named in a charter as magnus magister in 1226, although the circumscription of his seal attached to the same charter names him as prior. 351 Another official, a procurator was registered in the previous year, abbreviated as R, who is perhaps identical with Raimbaud of Voczon. 352 He reappears under various titles in the sources between 1232 and 1254. At the present stage of research both John’s and Raimbaud’s origins are indefinable. Raybaud, however, identifies Raimbaud as originating from Beauson (Provence) and suspects that he might have been the preceptor of Dua Lamec. 353 According to Raybaud, Raimbaud acted as visitator in the Priory of St. Gilles in 1246. It is likely that he stayed abroad for a while since no Hungarian source records him in Hungary between 1244 and 1247. On the other hand, the charter issued on 2 June 1247 reports long lasting negotiations between the king and Raimbaud, which would have required the permanent presence of the prior. This may, however, only have been a literary topos.

Raimbaud’s possible foreign origin may explain his mobility as he was an active figure of the second quarter of the thirteenth century. He acted as a deputy of King Andrew II (1205-1235) in Rome in 1232, 354 and also played an important role several times as judge delegate of the Holy See in Hungary in 1237 and 1238. Although the Hungarian ruler did not complain to the pope -- except more than a decade later because of the abandonment of the Severin region -- he was not always satisfied with the activity of Raimbaud and eventually the Holy See entrusted someone else for inquests. Nonetheless, from 1247 onwards

351 S. PRIORIS VNGARIE HOSPITALIS. For the Hospitaller seals, see APPENDIX C; PRT 1: 672-673; M onWesp 1: 70; M ES 1: 260, 278; Á UO 1: 222-223.


Raimbaud’s stature outgrew the confines of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory. He was appointed grand preceptor (of certain parts of the West) in 1246 or 1247 the latest as evidenced by the charter of 2 June 1247, issued by Béla IV, named him as magnus preceptor in partibus cismarinis.\(^{355}\) Between 1250 and 1254 he is referred to in the sources as the grand preceptor (maior preceptor) of Italy, Hungary and, at times, Austria\(^{356}\) or as magister domorum per Hungariam et Italiam.\(^{357}\) According to Karl Borchardt this solution was hammered out by the grand priory of Alamania absolutely on purpose to establish a grand preceptory in Central Europe in order to reconcile the Stauf house with the papacy.\(^{358}\)

October 1254 is the last mention of Raimbaud, when he conveyed a piece of land from the Order to the bishop of Zagreb.\(^{359}\) Although there is no title given to his name, another charter concerning the same transaction addressed him as Hungarian-Slavonian prior in the spring of 1255.\(^{360}\) Since he died before the second charter was issued it is likely that the scribe was not aware of his exact title. In the course of Raimbaud’s priorship an interlude took place. A certain Ambrose, canon of the Buda collegiate chapter, acted as general proctor and deputy master of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory in 1243, immediately after the Mongol invasion.\(^{361}\) He was the first and, for a long time, the only high official presumably of Hungarian origin. This anomaly may be explained by the extraordinary situation caused by the Mongols. The same charter lists a certain Miko de Buxunio as magister provincialis. Reiszig identified him as Miko of Bekcsehely (Somogy County) by deriving the ‘Bekcsehely’

---

\(^{355}\) Fejér CD 4/1, 447-454; Cartulaire no. 2445; Theiner 1: 208.


\(^{357}\) Fejér CD 4/2: 62-64; Cartulaire no. 2526.


\(^{359}\) Fejér CD 4/2: 224; Á UO 11: 395; Cartulaire no. 2694; RA no. 1016; Smičiklas 4: 570-571.

\(^{360}\) A H, NRA fasc. 1531, nr. 13. Litt. reg. 2092.

from Buxunium, a rather unconvincing derivation. It might only have been a slip of the pen since the charter is a transcription of the royal chancery in 1248\textsuperscript{362} and the original text might have contained Rembaldus de Voczon. The possibility of this identification was first raised by Joseph Delaville Le Roulx\textsuperscript{363} and it is certainly strengthened by the similarity of the forms ‘Voczon’ -- ‘Beauson’. When the charter was issued Raimbaud remained in the coastal area, thus the Priory appointed Ambrosius as deputy master and proctor of the priory.

According to the monographer of the Order in Hungary\textsuperscript{364}, the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory was headed by a certain Jordan in the course of the late 1250s. It is doubtful, however, that he was a Hospitaller, since there are no contemporary sources proving that he ever belonged to the Order. Just the opposite can be concluded on the basis of a charter issued by King Béla IV in 1259, reporting that Raimbaud was immediately succeeded by Arnold as major preceptor.\textsuperscript{365} It is likely that Ede Reiszig and his followers regarded Jordan, the Templar master of the Hungarian Priory between 1256 and 1258, as a Hospitaller.\textsuperscript{366} It is clear, however, that Arnold led the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory in 1259, and it is quite probable that he had occupied the office from 1255 onwards.\textsuperscript{367}

Arnold was succeeded by a certain Ferrustan of unknown origin at the latest in 1262.\textsuperscript{368} We know virtually nothing about him except that he was in Hungary; he appeared personally before the cathedral chapter of Várad accompanied by three of his fellow brothers in 1262, when they alienated two pieces of landed property of the Priory. Two Frenchmen succeeded

\textsuperscript{362}ÁUO 7: 144-145.


\textsuperscript{364}Reiszig, 1: 68; 2: 164.

\textsuperscript{365}Fejér CD 4/2: 492-495; ÁUO 9: 456-457; Cartulaire no. 2932; Smičiklas 5: 135-136.

\textsuperscript{366}E.g., Smičiklas, Suppl. 1: 206-208.

\textsuperscript{367}Fejér CD 4/2: 492-495; ÁUO 11: 456-457; Smičiklas 5: 135-136; Cartulaire no. 2932; RA no. 1221.

him as high officials: Pons de Fayn (1267-1276) from Auvergne and in 1275 his lieutenant, Hugo Boraldy, also from France. There is a hiatus between the offices of Ferrustan and Pons de Fayn. All that is known about it is that the grand preceptor of the German, Hungarian, Bohemian, Polish, and Scandinavian priories was the German Heinrich von Fürstenberg (1266). This fact, however, suggests that one of the above persons was in charge of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory. A somewhat similar situation occurred in 1279, when Hermann Brunshorn acted as the grand (summus) preceptor of the Austrian, Bohemian, Moravian, Polish, and Hungarian priories and a year later was named as lieutenant master (gerensque vices summi magistri). The activity of Pons de Fayn also remains unknown except for three events that can be connected to his activity as prior of Hungary. First, in 1267, he was invited by Baldwin II, the exiled Latin Emperor, to join him with warriors he was supposed to bring “for the service of God and the Empire.” Baudoin promised him (or anyone else coming in his name) to restore the Hospitalier lands once owned in the Empire. The second event relates to King Stephen V (1270-1272) who exempted the Székesfehérvár preceptory and its folk upon the request of Pons de Fayn. Thus in 1259

369Cf. Luttrell, “The Hospitaller Province of Alamania,” 29; Alan Forey, “The Military Orders and Holy War against Christians in the thirteenth century,” English Historical Review 104 (1989): 3. Cf. Raymundus de Fayno ... prioratus Alvernie, in 1332; AOM 280, fol. 27; fol. 42. frater Artandus de Fayno ... de linga Alvernie, in 1337, and ... frayre Artant de Fayn ... de linga [!] Alvernie, in 1344; AOM 280, fol. 42, 52; ... Raynauo de Fayno prior Alvernie, in 1347 and 1348, AOM 317, fol. 41, 43-44.

370ÁUO 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Smičiklas 6: 137.


372Cartulaire nos. 3692, 3729. A c c o r d i n g to recent research, the origin of Hermann Brunshorn is to be sought in the region around the Rhine and the Moselle. Cf. Borchardt “The Hospitaliers, Bohemia and the Empire,” 211; See also, Wienand, Der Johanniter-Orden, 612; Jan, “Die Würdenträger der geistlichen Ritterorden,” 293.


Pons de Fayn may have been the former preceptor of Székesfehérvár,\textsuperscript{375} which was one of the most significant preceptories of the priory. The third event was the convocation of the first known provincial chapter of the Priory in Csurgó in 1275.\textsuperscript{376} The last piece of information about his activity comes from 1276, when Pons de Fayn was commissioned by the Angevin King Charles I of Naples to disembark at Brindisi. According to the report of Prince Charles of Salerno, Pons fulfilled the mandate.\textsuperscript{377} Perhaps it was due to his mobility that he required a lieutenant in the Priory in the person of Hugo Boraldy. He was supposed to stay longer or to appear more often in the kingdom as he was also the preceptor of Csurgó and Újudvar. It is also conceivable that he is identical with another Hugo who was lieutenant prior in 1278 and at the same time the preceptor of Pakrac.\textsuperscript{378}

5.2. The Provençal--Italian rotation

The transition between the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries still saw Hungarian-Slavonian priors of foreign, admittedly non-identifiable origin: Guylerm (1293), Albert de Reuellis (1294-?1299),\textsuperscript{379} John of Priuostin (1299), Constantius (1304), Oliver (1306), and Loquetus (\textasciitilde Lucchetus) Busque (1312-1314). Presumably some of them arrived from Italy or governed the Priory from Italy. Guylerm was viceprior and the preceptor of Bela and he surely acted as the lieutenant of the prior while confirming the exemptions of the dwellers in the village Čiče. Albert, although he was prior, did not attend the Chapter General of the Order held in

\textsuperscript{375}HO 6: 100-101. Péter Kóta, Középkori okelelek Vas megyei levéltárakban I. Regeszták a vasvári káptalan levéltárának okeleveiről, (1130) 1212-1526 [Medieval charters in the Archives of County Vas. 1. Calendars of the charters of the Vasvár chapter] Vas megyei levéltári füzetek 8 (Szombathely: Vas Megyei Levéltár, 1997), 16-17. See also \textsc{Chapter VI}.

\textsuperscript{376}ÁUO 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Smičiklas 6: 137-138.


\textsuperscript{379}Cf. ...Igitur preceptoriam nostram de Boseriis prioratus nostri Alvernie vacantem presentaliter per obitum fratris Alberti Revellii. (20 August 1347), AOM 317, fol. 41'.
Nor it is known for how long he acted as prior, but he no longer held that title by the summer of 1299 when his lieutenant, John of Priuostin, reported him as dead. The Master of the Hospital, Guillaume de Villaret, complained from Cyprus to Frà Loquetus Busque in 1303 that he had no news about the Priory of Hungary, where Albert de Reuellis was formerly prior. No information is extant about the period between 1299 and 1303, even whether there was a prior heading the Hungarian Priory at all. It is known, however, that a certain Constantius became the prior by 1304 and stayed in the preceptory of Bela in Slavonia as he farmed out one of the landed properties of the Order. Knowing the customs of the Order in the fourteenth century, it is conceivable that the transaction took place in the course of a provincial chapter or at least in the presence of four preceptors. Two years later a certain Oliver acted in the interests of the Priory, and a year later he turned to the Holy See to complain that the brethren suffered from molestations both to their persons and goods. Thereafter, there is no mention in the sources of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory, which is frustrating since scholars are eager to know about the context of the dissolution of the Templars and the fate of their properties. As with other European countries, the acquisition of the goods of the former milites Templi by the Hospital proved to be a time-consuming and costly process, since it dragged for decades after the decision of the Council of Vienne.

The decrees of the council were also sent to Hungary, both to the clerics and laity, and

---


381 Smičiklas 7: 341-342.

382 Smičiklas 8: 59-60.

383 Smičiklas 8: 74.


385 Theiner 1: 422; MES 2: 580.


387 See the copies of Nuper in concilio bull of Clement V sent to the Hungarian prelati and barones; AOM 10, nos. 70-71; APPENDIX B, nos. 6-7.
subsequently more than a dozen of former Templar preceptories were taken over by the Hungarian-Slavonian priory. Its most palpable sign was that Loquetus (~Lucchetus) Busque -- who had set eyes on the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory at very beginning of the fourteenth century and finally seized it by 1312 -- had his residence in Dubica, in the former Templar preceptory. The preceptors present at Dubica also headed former Templar administrative units.

Concerning the origins of the officials of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory, the situation became more transparent with the consolidation of the rulership of the Neapolitan Angevin King Charles Robert (1301-1342). At least two dozen Hospitallers of Italian origin can be identified in Hungary between 1315 and the 1340s. Most remarkable among them are perhaps the Italian Gragnanas: Rolando (1315) and Filippo de Gragnana (1317-1329), who acted as priors, while Francesco (1319-1320) and Girardo de Gragnana (1321-1322, 1326-1328) were lieutenants and proctors in the Priory. The last representative of the Gragnana “clan” was Pietro in 1329, who acted as preceptor of several Hungarian preceptories. I used to share Anthony Luttrell’s opinion concerning the origin of the Gragnanas as they were said to come from northern Tuscany, from the Garfagnana region. However, so far no unequivocal source has come to light proving that the members of the Gragnana kin group came from Tuscany. With the help of a charter from 1294 one may trace another path that leads to the Priory of Venice, to no other person than Engherrand de Gragnana, Prior of

---

388 See also Chapter IV.
389 For the brethren of lesser rank, see Chapter VI.
390 AO 1: 376, 389-390.
391 AO 1: 514-515; Fejér CD 8/3: 341; Smičíklas 8: 556-559; Dl. 34297.
393 Df. 257974; Df. 258481; Pietro was the nephew of Filippo. See Fejér CD 8/3: 147-149; A Okl 10: 146-147; Reisz 1: 94.
395 Smičíklas 7: 171-172.
Venice, one of the very first Gragnanas who made his “fortune” as a Hospitaller. In the charter he is named as Angeran de Grignano and so it is more probable that his origin is to be sought in the Italian Friuli, which formed a part of the Priory of Venice, than in the “remote” Garfagnana region. This charter of 1294 is the first known written evidence that one of the Gragnanas had an intermediate relationship with Hungary.

This identification of their origin is strengthened by the activity of Rolando de Grignana in Hungary in 1315, who appeared in Friuli just before this time and was named as Hospitaller brother in the preceptory of Sacile. Moreover, Francesco de Gragnana, who acted as the Hungarian-Slavonian lieutenant prior, also returned to Sacile where he was preceptor between 1322-1349. Obviously it is important to survey the way they obtained...
their offices; whether they only bore their titles or in fact stayed in Hungary or at least regularly visited its preceptories, or merely regarded it as a source of revenues to be gathered from time to time. As for Rolando de Gragnana, it is certain that he spent some time in Hungary because this is recorded in a charter which reported a provincial chapter where the prior farmed out pieces of landed properties of the Priory with the consent of the preceptors present.\footnote{AO 1: 376, 389-390.} In one occasion the predial nobles of the Order promised that they would provide hospitality (descensus) for two days for Rolando if he were to travel to Transylvania and during the return trip as well.\footnote{Otherwise, based on quid pro quo, they would pay cash to Cistercian Abbot Guillerm of Bélakút. AO 1: 389-390.} During his short period in office his lieutenants are unknown, which implicitly indicates that Filippo stayed in his Priory for longer. Supposedly, Pope John XXII was satisfied with his activity, or the lobby of the Gragnanas was strong enough\footnote{During the extraordinary situation after the deposition of the Master of the Hospital. Cf. Anthony Luttrell, “The Hospitallers at Rhodes, 1306-1421,” in Kenneth M. Setton, ed., A History of the Crusades, vol. 3 (University of Wisconsin Press: Madison, 1975), 288; idem, “Gli Ospitalieri di San Giovanni di Gerusalemme dal continente alle isole,” in Hospitaller State, II 88.} to convince him to appoint Filippo de Gragnana as the prior of Rome and Hungary in July 1317. By this token the pope fixed the tax at 8,000 florins to be collected and submitted by the new prior.\footnote{Registres de Jean XXII, no. 4454; Cf. Borchardt, “The Hospitallers, Bohemia, and the Empire,” 224. The only information about him before his appointment was that he stayed in Rhodes in 1312. Sebastiano Pauli, Codice diplomatico del Sacro militare Ordine Gerosolimitano, oggi di Malta, 2 vols. (Lucca: Salvatore i Giandomenico Marescanoli, 1733-1737), 2: 36-40; See also CHAPTER VII.} The pope also commissioned him to convert the properties of the dissolved Templars into the Hospital.\footnote{... convertendorum in satisfactionem debitorum hujusmodi, necnon administr. bonorum quae fuerunt quond. militiae templi Jerosolimitan. Registres de Jean XXII, no. 4454.} The seisin of the Priory was, however, complicated as it has been occupied by Duke Miesco of Beuthen, who acted as the prior of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory -- according to a charter issued by Pope John XXII.\footnote{Registres de Jean XXII, no. 6549.} Moreover, as it turned out from a second letter of the pope sent in May 1318, Filippo was already acting as the Hungarian prior, even if it is not clear what the pope exactly meant by this, but it did not hinder the
claimant of the Priory from usurping the title.\textsuperscript{406} According to later sources extant in Hungary, Filippo stayed in Rome and Perugia while the claimant of Polish origin usurped the Order’s goods.\textsuperscript{407} Miesco undoubtedly was a member of the Order and was still named as crucifer in 1328 when he was coercively “elected” bishop of Nyitra.\textsuperscript{408} The basis for his boldness was in part that he was related to Charles Robert through his marriage and in part that he was backed by his uncle Boleslaw, who became the primate of Hungary in 1321.

Despite the above controversy, Filippo arrived at his Priory in the spring of 1320 at the latest, and headed the provincial chapter held in Gyánt at the feast of St. George. The charter recording this fact and the usual business of leasing lands of the Order also provides some valuable pieces of information. It turns out that the Priory suffered serious losses caused by the sons of Henry of Kőszeg, most probably Peter and John, who were well known provincial lords (petty kings) for their frequent violent trespasses in the region. During the “Slavonian war” they occupied the castle of the Order in Bela, which was partly due to the imprudence of the Hospitaller castellan.\textsuperscript{409} In addition, it also came to light that Filippo had been informed about the events partly by letters he had received from his lieutenant, Francesco de Gragnana, and also from reports by the brethren who visited him in Italy.\textsuperscript{410} Accordingly, this was the way he kept in contact with his Priory before 1320 and most likely it was so thereafter as


\textsuperscript{407}Smičiklas 8: 556-559.


\textsuperscript{410}... hec omnia ad nostram notitiam plenius et pluries devenerunt, tam per litteras prefati fratris Francisci tunc in Hungaria locum nostrum tenentis, quam ex relatione plurium fratrum nostrorum et aliorum qui venerunt ad nos et predicta nobis vive vocis oraculo asseruerunt. Smičiklas 8: 557. For the communication between the prior and his lieutenants, see an undated letter from the collection of the MOL (Dl.106196). The archivists dated the letter (issued on 15 January) to 1380-1382, but on the reverse of the charter it is indicated that it has been sent to Donat, viceprior of Hungary thus it should be re-dated to 1350-1371.
well. It is apparent from his schematic itinerary that he visited the Priory once a year, usually around the end of May, as he had some other commitments in other priories he led simultaneously. There was no preceptory he might have preferred against the others during his stays, that is, there was no exclusive center or headquarters of the Priory at that time.

In his absence the affairs of the Priory were administered by lieutenants: the above mentioned Francesco and Girardo de Gragnana as well as by Marco de Bologna. At times the prior also sent his chaplain as his representative to the place of a given affair. Girardo as viceprior, for instance, personally came to the royal court, held in Temesvár, in December 1322, when he came to a compromise in front of the king with those who had seriously damaged the properties of the priory. In addition, as he made quite a long trip to Temesvár, he also had the king confirm (sc. to transcribe) some of the privileges that had major importance for the Order. This implies that the Priory had a sort of central archives

---


412before 1320 Rome and Perugia -- 24 April 1320 Gyánt -- 9 April 1321 Posega -- after 29 November 1323 Našice -- 21 February 1324 Hungary (?) -- 29 May 1324 Zagreb -- before 1 July 1325 he left Hungary -- 1325 Hungary (?) -- 22 May 1326 Pakrac -- 3 June 1327 Gora -- 26 May 1328 Vrana -- 25 November 1329 Csurgo. For the respective charters, see APPENDIX A.


416Dl.2337.

417AO 2: 55-56; Smičiklas 9: 97-98.

418Wagner 3: 137; Fejér CD 8/2: 362-363, 543-545.
to which the lieutenant prior had access. Filippo de Gragnana acted the same way in 1324. Because of the replacement of the royal seal, formerly sealed charters, for instance the privilege of Andrew II of 1217, lost their validity and thus were supposed to be reconfirmed and resealed. HAVING met Charles Robert, Filippo did not leave the kingdom promptly but went to Slavonia to heal the breach that had arisen between the Priory and the cathedral chapter of Zagreb over the non-payment of tithes. Both parties seemed to be ready for compromise, but as is apparent from later sources, the conflict lasted at least for another quarter of a century.

Strangely enough, Filippo de Gragnana was not present at one of the most important events of his priorship. Like the Order as a whole in the first third of the fourteenth century, the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory was affected by financial crisis. Thus, with the approval of Pope John X X II in 1322 the preceptors appointed a committee to investigate which landed properties were the most suitable for alienation or leasing. The committee worked hard for years and finally it announced a decision at the provincial chapter, headed by Girardo de Gragnana, held at Pakrac on the feast of St. George in 1326. The timing, nonetheless, is quite strange since Filippo, although often absent, arrived in Pakrac in a month’s time, but the brethren did not wait for him. Most likely Girardo was an intimate of Filippo or had been authorized by the prior either in general or in this particular case.

Filippo was present, however, at the provincial chapter held at Vrana in May 1328, which proved to be a noteworthy moment for the priory. At that time a Croatian army...
(crohati) -- led by a powerful petty king, Mladen Subić -- besieged Vrana in order to destroy it. Filippo de Gragnana and the brethren\textsuperscript{426} present at Vrana, including the viceprior Girardo de Gragnana as well as their fellows, defended the preceptory but suffered serious losses. The attackers burnt down the houses and damaged the livestock of the preceptory. It is worth noting that this is the first document that reported Vrana, the former Templar headquarters taken over by the Hospital, meaning that the Hospitallers were in control by 1328.\textsuperscript{427}

Filippo's next and last appearance in the Hungarian kingdom was no less adventuresome. In the course of the provincial chapter held in Csurgó in 1329 the prior gave gifts to those who had provided him help recently by leasing the lands of the priory. Now, however, the enemy was not a provincial lord but one of the predials of the Order who organized a conspiracy, mobilizing even the tenant peasants of the Priory against the prior and managing to harm the autonomy of the Order by appointing a new preceptor at Pakrac.\textsuperscript{428}

Another interesting feature of this particular charter is that it contains one of the most complete lists of the preceptors of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory. Moreover, it turns out from this source that the lieutenant of Filippo was a certain Orbizanus de Lucca and not Pietro de Gragnana, who otherwise was also present at the provincial chapter. This was, by the way, the first time when the Hospitaller prior bore the title of the Count of Dubica that he had inherited from the Templars.\textsuperscript{429}

According to this situation, the Italians replaced the French leadership at the turn of the thirteenth century. It is still not unequivocally certain, however, whether this was in connection with the new ruling dynasty or with the fact that the neighboring territory of Friuli, the Istrian peninsula also belonged to the Priory of Venice\textsuperscript{430} and could act as an

\textsuperscript{426}Interestingly, among other Italians, Francesco de Gragnana also stayed at Vrana.

\textsuperscript{427}Fejér CD 8/3: 341-343.

\textsuperscript{428}...veniendo contra nos personaliter arceriis *L* offendendi nos et faciendo etiam conspiracionem et coniurationem cum iobagionibus in nostrum prejudicium atque dampnum et etiam non modicam verecundiam hospitalis et dicendo similiter preceptori qui tunc erat in Pocriza. Df.257974, Df.258481.

\textsuperscript{429}See Chapter VIII.

\textsuperscript{430}Cf. AOM 280, fol. 66*-68*.
intermediator towards nearby Hungary. This may be exemplified by John of Pula from the
Istrian peninsula, who was the preceptor of Újudvar in 1326 and of Bela in 1329,\(^{431}\) and the
above mentioned interlude by Duke Miesco in 1318 who most likely was backed by Charles
Robert, in a way, against the Gragnanas.

Thereafter the local sources abruptly become silent for a couple of years
notwithstanding the increasing number of charters issued by Hospitaller preceptories as
places of authentication.\(^{432}\) After the “masterhood” of the Gragnanas, in 1330 the Master of
the Hospital retained the Priory and its incomes, although the reason for this is not known.\(^{433}\)
In 1335, the same Master, Helion de Villeneuve, appointed the Provençal Pierre [Peyre] Cornuti for five years,\(^{434}\) which he renewed in 1340 for another period.\(^{435}\) Helion and/or the
Convent presumably was satisfied with the activity of Pierre since the Provençal prior was in
office as late as 1348. One of the extant reports of the 1338 investigation conducted in the
Priory of St. Gilles may help to identify Pierre Cornuti; the report on Lardiers lists Pierre and
Raybaud Cornuti among the donati of the preceptory.\(^{436}\) Moreover, at the same time a third
Cornuti, Hugo, had a stagia in the adjacent preceptory of Manosque and before that time he
also belonged to Lardiers.\(^{437}\) Their appearances in Provence as well as in Hungary were not

\(^{431}\) Df.257974; Df.258481.

\(^{432}\) See Chapter VIII.


\(^{435}\) Cf. AOM 280, fol. 45-46.


\(^{437}\) Successive prefati dominus magister conventus et capitulum deliberacione congrua precedente infracriptis fratibus tamquam dignis et benemeritis ad vitam eorum concessunt confirmaverunt baiulias infracriptas, videlicet [...] fratri Hugoni Cornuti baiuliam Americarum et Lardayreti; AOM 280, fol. 34. See also Beaucage, Visites générales, 369; AOM 280, fol. 34. There is data about another Cornuti from the region
accidental in the view of the fact that in 1338 among the brethren of Lardiers one can find Fulco Rocafolii, who, two years later acted as the lieutenant of Pierre Cornuti in Hungary.\footnote{Beaucage, Visites générales, 382; Smie\'ciklas 10: 555-557; A Okl 24: 163.}

Moreover, Jacobus de Roderterio, who was listed among the donati of Lardiers, became the preceptor of a Hungarian preceptory before/\textit{by} 1350.\footnote{Smi\'ecklas 11: 566-567.} The Provençal origin of the high officials of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory may explain the unique situation that happened in 1348. The Master, Dieudonné of Gozon, confined François Furoni, the former preceptor of Santo Stefano di Monopoli\footnote{A OM 317, fol. 211\textsuperscript{r}. It is not certain that Pierre Cornuti was alive at that time since the last charter that (indirectly) reported him acting was issued on 10 February 1348. (Smi\'ciklas 11: 438-441). See also Tipton, “The 1330 Chapter General,” 301-308.} who had fallen into the sin of sodomy, to Hungary by asking the prior to provide him with a stagia. Although before his condemned activity he had served the Order in Southern Italy, he was originally from Provence, thus a compatriot of the Cornutis.\footnote{Cf. Pierre Furoni also acted as preceptor in Provence: A OM 317, fol. 15\textsuperscript{r}; Beaucage, Visites générales, 2, 426, 588; See also Anthony Luttrell, “Le origini della precettoria capitolare di Santo Stefano di Monopoli,” in Fasano della storia: Dei cavalieri di Malta in Puglia. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Fasano, 14-15-16 maggio 1998 (Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 2001), 98; idem, “Change and Conflict,” 194; For the charters concerned, see APPENDIX A. Dieudonné of Gozon surely had an idea concerning the penance of the brethren as he himself was deprived of his habit prior to his mastership. See Eric Brockman, “Rhodes of the Knights. Topographical and Political Aspects,” Annales de l’Ordre Souverain Militaire de Malte (1965): 9.}

Pierre Cornuti, who was appointed in September 1335, arrived in Hungary in the autumn of 1336 at the latest and headed the first provincial chapter at the beginning of 1336 in the castle of the Order at Bela. As opposed to Filippo de Gragnana, it is very difficult to reconstruct the itinerary of Pierre Cornuti. This is not due chiefly to the lack of sources since the increase of charters was continuous, but it was rather the outcome of the new policy of Cornuti concerning the governance of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory. In part, he visited the Priory roughly triennially,\footnote{6 December 1336 Bela -- 9 December 1339 Csurgó -- 31 May 1340 Vrana -- 8 August 1344 Pakrac -- 24 April 1345 Szenta -- 1 September 1347 Buda. The respective charters, see in APPENDIX A.} thus even the provincial chapters were convoked and headed by
his lieutenants, for instance by the above-mentioned Fulco Roccafolii, who was at the same
time the preceptor of Sopron.\textsuperscript{443} It was Pierre who introduced a grand new custom in his
priory, following the progressive arrangement already practiced in Western Europe, namely
to assign laics to the administration of the Priory’s possessions in the hope of a more
profitable exploitation of landed properties or other goods.\textsuperscript{444} There were other changes to be
observed. For instance, it seems that from this period onwards different lieutenants at times
managed the territories of the Priory south and north of the Drava River were managed. This
is implied by the fact that Pierre Cornuti appointed the former viceprior of Dalmatia and
Corbavia as the viceprior of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory as well as his single lieutenant in
1340.\textsuperscript{445} The actual preceptor of the Székesfehérvár preceptory, as the viceprior of the
Hungarian-Slavonian priory, often acted\textsuperscript{446} on behalf of the preceptories north of the Drava
River, from 1349.\textsuperscript{447}

Another Provençal, Baudoin Cornuti, was appointed prior by October of the same year,
who acted as viceprior after February 1348. Nonetheless -- partly as a consequence of the
campaigns of Louis I (1342-1382) in Naples -- there was an infelicitous event preceding the
priorship of Baudoin Cornuti (1348-1374). The Hungarian ruler gave the Priory to the
infamous condottiere, the Provençal Montreal du Bar, also known as Frà Moriale,\textsuperscript{448} who was
executed for his actions in Rome in 1354.\textsuperscript{449} His peculiar role is reflected in the clauses of a

\textsuperscript{443}Smičiklas 10: 555-557.

\textsuperscript{444}Cf. Anthony Luttrell, “The Economy of the Fourteenth-Century Aragonese Hospital,” Estudis

\textsuperscript{445}Smičiklas 10: 555-557.

\textsuperscript{446}E.g., Fejér CD 9/7: 153; Dl.106134; Fejér CD 8/2: 588.

\textsuperscript{447}E.g., Fejér CD 9/2: 566, 582-584; 9/3: 123-125; Dl.106134; Dl.106135;

\textsuperscript{448}Reiszig, 1: 100-102; Raybaud, Histoire des Grands Prieurs, 1: 311-315.

\textsuperscript{449}Reiszig, 1: 100-112; Cf. István Miskolczy, Magyar-olasz összeköttetések az Anjouk korában. Magyar-
nápolyi kapcsolatok [Hungarian-Italian relations in the A ngevin period. Hungarian-Neapolitan relations]
(Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1937), 250, 252; Cf. Leone Gessi, “Fra Moriale,” Rivista del Sovrano Ordine
Militare di Malta 2 (1938/3): 13-23; Dupuy, Shops, Souls, and the Administration, 106-114; Attila Bárány, “The
Communion of English and Hungarian Mercenaries,” in Klára Papp and János Barta, ed., The First Millennium
of Hungary in Europe (Debrecen: Debrecen University Press, 2002), 129.
series of charters from the previous year reporting that a part of the archives as well as the seal of the Priory had been taken away by the rebellious Montreal, who alienated many goods of the Priory with the help of its seal. Therefore, Baudoin convinced the king to invalidate the charters issued by Moriale alienating the goods of the Priory and by May 1353 he used the new seal of the Priory in Dubica. His priorship was unforgettable, though officially it was short as he was soon deprived of his title. Baudoin Cornuti became lieutenant prior in the spring of 1348 and from the autumn of the same year until 1374 he bore the title of prior without interruption.

According to the reconstructed itinerary of Baudoin, he visited his province annually and along with the preceptors gathered together he made arrangements concerning the term leases of the lands. After 1360 he arrived in Hungary less frequently for visitation, thus most details of his otherwise long-lasting priorship remain obscure. Supposedly he was in a good relationship with the king since he often appeared in the royal court and he was the first prior to enjoy the honor after a lengthy period of a lack of royal support. He was also among those who made a vow on behalf of Louis I on the occasion of the Treaty of Zara in February 1358 by which token a reasonable part of the Dalmatian coast was recaptured by Hungary. Officially Baudoin Cornuti bore the title of prior until his death in the spring of

450 Smičíklas 12: 165-167.
451 According to the charter the provincial chapter (generalis congregatio) was held on 12 April.
452 Smičíklas 11: 444-445; Barabás, Teleki család oklevéláraba, 84-87.
453 DL.106127 (Fejér CD 9/7: 153); DL.106134.
454 16 January 1350 Vrana -- 14 February 1352 Buda -- 12 April 1353 Dubica -- 18 May 1353 Gora -- 23 October 1355 Visegrád -- 4-5 March 1357 Visegrád -- 25 May 1357 Dubica -- 20 January-18 February 1358 Zadar -- 7 February 1359 Visegrád -- 12 September 1360 Pakrac -- 24 June 1361 Dubica -- 12 February 1365 in comitatu Dubicensi -- 22 May 1367 -- 12 December 1371 Vrana -- 31 October 1373 Visegrád? A charter issued on 8 November 1370 reported Baudoin to be present in Vrana but we are convinced that it is a corrupted eighteenth-century copy of the charter of 12 December 1371. For the respective charters see Appendix A.
455 See Chapter IV.
456 For more details, see Chapter IV.
457 Wenzel, Acta extera 2: 508-510. At that time he perhaps spent a longer period together with the king. AO 7: 12-13.
but his last known act on behalf of the Order was in October 1373. The postlude of his priorship proved to be no less problematic. Until its detailed investigation, it is worth noting that he chiefly worked together with one lieutenant during his long priorship: with Donat, the preceptor of Székesfehérvár from 1349 until his death in 1371. He was originally the preceptor of Székesfehérvár, Esztergom, and Gyánt as well as the keeper (custos) at Székesfehérvár. Donat acted for Baudoin and for the Priory in almost all debates concerning landed properties in lawsuits processed against or in favor of the priory. However, it seems from the sources -- argumentum ex silentio -- that he had no say in the matters of the Priory and thus -- unlike the former custom -- he did not celebrate provincial chapters either. Immediately after his death a certain Albert took the office of viceprior. Although after the death of Donat he bore the preceptorship of Székesfehérvár until 1377, his identification is uncertain. Nonetheless, we suspect that Albert is identical with the officer who headed several preceptories from 1357 onwards. His short office as lieutenant prior came to an end in May 1374, when he acted on behalf of the late Baudoin Cornuti. In the meantime, however, another ambitious claimant made preparations for his arrival, which eventually took place in 1373. This was the Provençal Raymond de Beaumont (de Bellomonte), who named himself viceprior in April 1373 -- although Albert might have been the senior officer -- and the former had been the preceptor of Csurgó and Újudvar since 1366. Since there was no other Cornuti queuing for the prior’s office, the question of succession in theory was open in the summer of 1374. Actually, on an international level the debate had started at least a year and a half earlier, in part, far from the borders of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory.

One of the key figures of the controversy was King Louis I, who again interfered with the affairs of the Order. He wanted another Provençal prior to be the head of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory in the person of Raymond de Beaumont. Pope Gregory XI, however,

\[458\]The charter of James of Szepes, royal judge, reported him dead by the beginning of May. Dl.6204.
\[459\]For more details, see CHAPTHER V I.
\[460\]Dl.5498. See APPENDIX B no. 47.
\[461\]Fejér CD 9/4: 523-524.
wanted to give the Priory to another Provençal, no less an influential Hospitaller than Bertrand Flotte, but the Master eventually gave it to Giovanni Rivara, Prior of Venice.\textsuperscript{462} The king objected to both candidates by referring to the agreement of the langues of Italy and Provence enacted in November 1373, when Baudoin had still been an active prior.\textsuperscript{463} According to this agreement, in the case of the first vacancy it was the Master who had the right to appoint the Hungarian prior, while subsequently they would be elected alternately from the langues of Italy and Provence.\textsuperscript{464} Disregarding the papal intervention, the seat of the prior was given to Raymond de Beaumont, who occupied his office by the beginning of September 1374 when he celebrated the provincial chapter in Csurgó where he felt himself “at home.”\textsuperscript{465} Closely contemporaneous sources, however, reported that the Priory was still vacant.\textsuperscript{466} Moreover, even the pope did not regard the debate as settled satisfactorily. Gregory XI sent a letter to Louis I in December 1374 in which he clearly contradicted the procedure of


\textsuperscript{463} Theiner 2: 197; Luttrell, “The Hospitallers in Hungary,” 275; Dl.6203; Dl.6204; Fejér CD 9/7: 347-356. See also Luttrell, “The Italian Hospitallers at Rhodes: 1437-1462,” 214; idem, “Change and Conflict,” 198.

\textsuperscript{464} 22 November 1373 (1427) AOM 347, fol. 51v. See APPENDIX B no. 51. It seems that -- disregarding the period of the schism -- the agreement was in operation well into the fifteenth century. See: AOM 348, fol. 128. Cf. R. Valentinii, “Un capitolo generale degli Ospitalieri di S. Giovanni tenuto in Vaticano nel 1446,” Archivio Storico di Malta 7 (1936): 134-135; For the period of the rivalry, see Delaville Le Roux, Les Hospitaliers à Rhodes, 71-72, 150, 174-175, 197, 335-336; Luttrell, “The Hospitallers at Rhodes, 304; idem, “Change and Conflict,” 188.

\textsuperscript{465} Cf. Fejér CD 9/4: 614-616; Kukuljević, “Priorat Vranski,” 60-61; Raymond even seemed to refer to the role of the king by mentioning the provincial chapter: Quod cum nos ex speciali commissione Serenissimi principis Domini Ludovici dei gratia regis Hungarie, Polonie, Dalmatie, etc. domini nostri vigore litterarum suarum nobis collatatur universus predialibus, vasallis, et officialibus sub iurisdictione nostri prioratus existentibus in festo nativitatis B. Virginis publica forensi proclamacione facta in villa nostra Chorgo capitulum generale celeb rassemus et universa iura litteraria predialium nostorum. It should be noted, irrespective of Louis’ hidden or manifest objectives, that Raymond answered to the expectations of the Order than, for instance, Giovanni Rivara. A according to the statutes of the Order of 1344 those could be appointed as priors who had been members of the Order for at least twenty years and out of it they spent five in the given priory. AOM 280, fol. 47. Cf. Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller, 72.

\textsuperscript{466} Dl.6235.
the Hungarian king, that is, the appointment of the Hospitaller prior on the basis of ius patronatus. On the contrary, went on the pope, it belonged to him and the Master of the Hospital. Accordingly, he regarded Raymond as the usurper of the goods of the Priory and of the private properties (in practice, the spolia) of the late Baudoin, which he had seized hold of. The papal opposition did not cease, because it turns out from the letter of July 1375 that Louis I -- with the bitter memory of his previous wars with Venice -- feared Giovanni Rivara because of his Venetian origin. Pope Gregory XI assured him that Rivara was from Piemont, but it still did not change the fact that Raymond remained in his office as prior, in part owing to the fact that the pope’s attention turned towards the anti-Turkish preparations. Raymond held this office until 1381. He returned for a short while in November 1384, but it is remarkable that there is no other sign -- except the very beginning of his office -- that he stayed in the Hungarian kingdom for long periods of time. All the affairs of the Priory were conducted by his lieutenant, Arnold de Beaumont, who also took over the preceptories of Csurgó and Újudvar from Raymond in May 1375. De Beaumont had most likely left the kingdom by that time, perhaps owing to the harsh controversy that had arisen over his succession.

---


470 Theiner 2: 155-156; Delaville Le Roulx, Les Hospitaliers á Rhodes, 188; Reiszig 1: 120.

471 Df.258488; Delaville Le Roulx, Les Hospitaliers á Rhodes, 198.

472 Fejér CD 10/2: 179 (Dl.7111). See also Jenő Házi, Sopron középkori egyháztörténete [The medieval church history of Sopron] (Sopron: Székely és Tsa, 1939), 136.


474 E.g., Fejér CD 9/5: 68-69; 9/7: 374-376; Dl.6299; Borsa, “A somogyi konvent oklevelei,” 25; Dl.6363; Df.233327.
decades prevailed -- similar to the Italian Gragnanas or the Provençal Cornutis\textsuperscript{475} -- of commissioning the administration of the goods of the Priory to Raymond instead of a “perfect stranger”.

The Great Schism created a peculiar situation in the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory from 1378 on.\textsuperscript{476} According to the sources, the Priory became divided. The acting prior, the Provençal Beaumont, became an adherent of Urban VI\textsuperscript{477} but an ambitious Hungarian Hospitaller, John of Palisna (1379-1383,\textsuperscript{478} 1386/7-1391/2), ingratiated himself with Juan Fernandez Heredia, the legitimate master of the Hospital, and through him was an adherent of Clement VII.\textsuperscript{479} He bore the title of the Hungarian-Slavonian prior as early as 1379\textsuperscript{480} although he was officially appointed only in 1382.\textsuperscript{481} Nonetheless, as legitimate prior, despite the explicit request of the Master, he did not attend the general assembly held in Valence-sur-Rhône the following year,\textsuperscript{482} perhaps because he was already hindered by the active role he

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{475}During the schism, a third Cornuti, Gérard played a significant role in the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory between 1384 and 1386. Following the Roman obedience and besides his being the preceptor of Gora and Dubica, he became the procurator of the Priory in 1386. AOM 281, fol. 92', 93'.

\textsuperscript{476}For the general situation, see Anthony Luttrell, “Sugar and Schism: The Hospitallers in Cyprus from 1378 to 1386,” in Hospitaller State, IV 159-166.


\textsuperscript{478}Fejér CD 10/1: 135; Pray, Dissertatio historico-critica de Prioratu Auranae, 22-23; Elemér Mályusz, “A szlavóniai és horvátországi középkori pálos kolostorok oklevelei az Országos Levéltárban,” Levéltári Közlemények 8 (1930) 66-67.

\textsuperscript{479}To make the story more complicated, it should be noted that the opposite sides were not always untraversable for the players of the game. By the time of the “second” rebellion of Palisna, he became the supporter of the Angevin rule in Hungary and he became an adherent of Charles of Durazzo. On the other hand, Pope Clement VII intervened on behalf of Raymond of Beaumont in 1379 even though he was a Romanist.

\textsuperscript{480}Dl.7550.

\textsuperscript{481}AOM 322, fol. 251’. See APPENDIX B no. 58. In 1379, efforts were made to appoint Raymond de Beaumont the Prior of Lombardy but he was still bearing the title of the Hungarian prior in 1381. Cf. Luttrell, “The Hospitallers in Hungary before 1418,” 275.

\textsuperscript{482}AOM 322, fol. 251'-252'. APPENDIX B no. 60.
played in the struggles for the Hungarian throne or - according to the mandate of Heredia\textsuperscript{483} - he began to regain all those properties which had been alienated pluribus et diversis personis secularibus et ecclesiasticis in perpetuum et ad tempus. On the contrary, Palisna launched one of the largest pledge (impignoratio) in the history of the Priory by impawning the estates of Újudvar to the sons of John of Kanisa for 4,000 florins in 1382.\textsuperscript{484} He even obtained the permission of Queen Mary to the business. Palisna was also permitted to accept recruits to the Order\textsuperscript{485} and to erect castles on both the estates of the Priory as well as on his own lands.\textsuperscript{486} With the latter, however, he latently harmed royal rights. From this time onwards, Heredia\textsuperscript{487} and the anti-master Riccardo Caracciolo alternately assigned preceptors to Hungarian preceptories, although there is no sign of responsiones or other dues paid to any of the parties.\textsuperscript{488}

After the rebellion of John of Palisna against the queens, events apparently accelerated.\textsuperscript{489} Palisna has been deposed by October 1383 and simultaneously, Paul Horvath,\textsuperscript{490} Bishop of Zagreb was appointed as the gubernator of the goods of the Priory and acted so at least until next January. By 1384 Raymond de Beaumont was again prior, that is,

\textsuperscript{483}AOM 322, fol. 251\textsuperscript{v}. \textsc{Appendix} B no. 59.

\textsuperscript{484}Fejér CD 9/7: 467-469.

\textsuperscript{485}Five-five brothers: “… quinque nobiles etc. in frateres milites religionis et in frateres servientes viros quinque...” AOM 322, fol. 252\textsuperscript{v}. Lelja Dobroni, Viteški redovi. Templari i Ivanoci u Hrvatskoj [Knightly Orders. Templars and Hospitallers in Croatia] (Zagreb: Kršcanska Sadašnjost, 1984), 172 reads incorrectly: frateres sarientes.

\textsuperscript{486}AOM 322, fol. 252\textsuperscript{v}; Dobroni, Viteški redovi, 174. “... in territorio vestri patrimonii et religionis nostre ipsius prioratus pro securitate vestra et subditorum nostrorum et religionis terras, castra seu fortalicia unum seu plura.”

\textsuperscript{487}AOM 322, fol. 253\textsuperscript{v}; Dobroni, Viteški redovi, 170-171. \textsc{Appendix} B no. 67.


\textsuperscript{489}Fejér CD 10/1: 135.

\textsuperscript{490}He was a determinant member of the kindred which later played a leading role in the uprisal against the queens.
the Romanist “party” countervailed, and Riccardo Caracciolo assigned Arnold de Beaumont and Baudoin de Monte Iustino to several Hungarian preceptories for ten years. Szilárd Süttő raised the idea that the return of Raymond might have been in connection with the raising Francophile attitude of the Hungarian court. Irrespective whether or not was there any raising Francophile attitude, the (ab)use of the Provençal Raymond de Beaumont’s presence would have been absurd. He not only obeyed to Pope Urban VI -- and thus belonged to the Romanist party -- but he personally served Charles of Durazzo in 1381 as his lieutenant.

The next spring saw another prior in office: the Hungarian John of Hédervár who originally was the master of the canons regular of St. Stephen (sc. the Stephanites) at Budafelhéviz. By the summer of 1386 he had been the bishop elect of Győr and by that time he most probably resigned from the priorship since by April 1386 Vrana disappeared from his title. He was most likely a canon regular of the Order of St. Stephen but there is no sign that he acted as the lieutenant of another Hospitaller, Ranforsatus de Castellana, who bore the title two months later, in September. The contemporaneous activity of Ranforsatus

---

491 Baudoin arrived to Hungary (to Zara) in November at the latest (Dl.7111). In a year time, the appointed preceptor of Dubica was a certain Lucas, adherent of Palisna, who might have been identical with the deputy prior since 1379. Fejér CD 10/1: 130-131; Imre Nagy, et al., ed., Zala vármegye története. Oklevéltár, 1024-1490 [A history of Zala County. Charters] 2 vols. (Budapest, 1886-1890), 2: 208-209.

492 Süttő, Anjou-Magyarország alkonya, 136-137.

493 Áldásy, A nyugot nagy egyházsakadás, 411.


496 Dl.42350.

497 AOM 24. no. 11.
implies that he was appointed by Heredia, though he could not enjoy the incomes of the Priory for long because Caracciolo assigned Gérard Cornuti, an adherent of the Romanists, as the procurator of the Priory of Vrana on 15 June 1386. The piquancy of the situation is that three weeks earlier, on 23 May, Caracciolo referred to John of Palisna as the gubernator of the Priory in a charter dated in Genova. It was perhaps an “acknowledgement” towards Palisna who, by that time, joined the Horvath kindred who were supporter of Neapoletan Angevin rulership in Hungary. Gérard Cornuti’s appointment, however, did not hinder Palisna to usurp the prior title until his death in 1391 even though he was outlawed owing to the imprisonment of the queens in the summer of 1386. The reason for his behavior is provided by the fact that formally neither Heredia nor the pope deprived him of the priorship. Palisna’s deeds still await a thorough analysis. Here the emphasis is on the fact that he was a prominent figure in the long process in which native Hungarian Hospitallers played a more and more determinant role.

Summing up, it is worth noting that the vertical mobility of the high officials was dwarfed by the horizontal one. The office-bearers of local origin could not reach as high as the prioral seat even after having served the Order for decades. In this respect, the Priory of Bohemia operated differently as there one can find priors of local origin from the 1320s. The first exception was John of Palisna, whose rise to such heights was due to his uncommon

---

499 Cf. AOM 321, fol. 95v-96r; 324, fol. 40v; 325, fol. 41r, 59v; 326, fol. 45v; 327, fol. 127v; 328, fol. 41v-42v; 329, fol. 31r-32r.

500 AOM 281, fol. 92v.

501 Hungarian sources did not record Palisna again as prior before 28 January 1387. Fejér CD 10/1: 375.

502 Engel, Magyarország világi archontológiája, 1: 81; Neven Budak, “John of Palisna, the Hospitaller Prior of Vrana,” in Expanding the Frontiers, 286.

503 Budak aptly debates Dobronic’s idea about the deposition of Palisna which virtually never took place. Budak, “John of Palisna, the Hospitaller Prior of Vrana,” 290.


ambitions and extraordinary constellations both in the secular and ecclesiastic spheres. From the fifteenth century onwards, when it was more common to find Hungarian-Slavonian priors of local origin, the decisive factor facilitating their rise was royal favor. A symptomatic example is Albert of Nagymihály, who was a well-known adherent of King Sigismund (1387-1437) while the latter had good relationship with the Master of the Hospital, Philibert de Naillac. This was a less characteristic feature during the reign of Louis I, who interfered with the affairs of the Order by giving the Priory to his adherents and thus harmed the rights of both the pope and the Master. Nonetheless, both of them would have probably reconciled this extent of interference considering the situation in the fifteenth century. It gradually became semi-regular that the Hungarian ruler appointed his own prior even against that of the Master, or the king kept the Priory vacant and secular governors (gubernatores) collected its revenues for their own benefit or for that of the royal chamber. Thus it is hardly surprising that the revenues of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory rarely reached the headquarters of the Order; even if they were sent by the priors they were often only symbolic sums of money.

Table 1. Hospitaller officials of Hungarian-Slavonian Priory, 1186-1387

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office or title</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1186-1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. (or R.)</td>
<td>procurator</td>
<td>1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pethe</td>
<td>master</td>
<td>1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P[ethe?]</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>procurator</td>
<td>1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. (or B)</td>
<td>procurator</td>
<td>1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>master</td>
<td>1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raimbaud de Voczon</td>
<td>master, grand preceptor, prior</td>
<td>1232-1254 (1255?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miko de Buxunio (?)</td>
<td>master (?)</td>
<td>1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>lieutenant master (Canon of Buda)</td>
<td>1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>grand preceptor</td>
<td>(1255)-1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrustan</td>
<td>master</td>
<td>1262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich von Fürstenberg</td>
<td>grand preceptor</td>
<td>1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pons de Fay</td>
<td>master</td>
<td>1267-1276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

505 E.g., AOM 340, fol. 158v-159, fol. 167v; AOM 341, fol. 162v.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office or title</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hugo Boraldy</td>
<td>lieutenant master</td>
<td>1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo</td>
<td>lieutenant master</td>
<td>1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermann Brunshorn</td>
<td>grand preceptor</td>
<td>1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermann Brunshorn</td>
<td>lieutenant master</td>
<td>1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guylerm</td>
<td>lieutenant master</td>
<td>1293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert de Reuelli</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1294?-1299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John de Priuostin</td>
<td>procurator</td>
<td>1299?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantus</td>
<td>master</td>
<td>1304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>master</td>
<td>1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loquetus (Busque)</td>
<td>master</td>
<td>1312-1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolando de Gragnana</td>
<td>master</td>
<td>1315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filippo de Gragnana</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1317-1329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miesco</td>
<td>claimant of the priory</td>
<td>1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco de Gragnana</td>
<td>procurator</td>
<td>1319-1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girardo de Gragnana</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1321?-1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco de Bologna</td>
<td>procurator</td>
<td>1325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girardo de Gragnana</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1326-1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbizanus de Lucca</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Cornuti</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1335-1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulco Rocafohili</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Latini de Perugia</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1344-1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baudoin Cornuti</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal du Bar (Frà Moriale)</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1348-1350?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baudoin Cornuti</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1348-April 1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donat</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1349-1371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1371-1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond de Beaumont</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Rivara</td>
<td>prior elect</td>
<td>1373-1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Cornuti</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1335-1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulco Rocafohili</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Latini de Perugia</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1344-1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baudoin Cornuti</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal du Bar (Frà Moriale)</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1348-1350?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baudoin Cornuti</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1348-April 1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donat</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1349-1371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1371-1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond de Beaumont</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Rivara</td>
<td>prior elect</td>
<td>1373-1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1330-1335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond de Beaumont</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>Sept 1374-1381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold de Beaumont</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1374-1378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Palisna (first time)</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1379-1383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>lieutenant prior</td>
<td>1379-1385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond de Beaumont</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>Nov 1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Palisna (second time)</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Hédervár</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>April 1385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Budafelhévíz</td>
<td>tutor (bonorum prioratus Aurane)</td>
<td>July 1385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranforsatus de Castellana</td>
<td>prior</td>
<td>Sept 1385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Cornuti</td>
<td>procurator</td>
<td>1386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Palisna (second time)</td>
<td>prior (gubernator)</td>
<td>1386/7-1391/1392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert of Losonc</td>
<td>prior (elect)</td>
<td>Oct 1387-1389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VI
THE PRECEPTORIES AND THEIR PERSONNEL

6.1. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Just as in the archontology of a modern reconstruction of the history of an Order, the mustering of the administrative units of the Priory should not be eliminated. In this respect, one can follow a more trodden path compared to the reconstructed archontology of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory. The necessity for an overview of the preceptories is based on a characteristic feature of the Hospitalers: The nucleus of the hierarchical structure of the Order was the preceptory, which was basically an economic unit.\(^{506}\) The dependencies of a particular Priory were administered in the framework of a preceptory. Accordingly, the network of preceptories should be reconstructed instead of the houses (domus) as this would be misleading in many respects. Studies concerning the history of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory\(^{507}\) have totally disregarded the results of contemporary international scholarship and have thus been on the wrong track for a long time. In addition, in the time of Ede Reiszig the compilation of the history of a military-religious order followed a clearly different pattern from modern approaches,\(^{508}\) which was in a way a constraint on him to think exclusively in terms of houses and estates. He certainly noted that certain domus appeared in different “constellations” with others, that is, they were regrouped from time to time. He failed, 

---

\(^{506}\) La Commanderie, passim, and particularly Michael Gervers, “The Commandery as an economic unit in England,” in La Commanderie, 259.


\(^{508}\) Borrowing from the world of computing, it can be compared to the modern “object-oriented programming;” compared to our case, modern reconstructions can be called “problem-oriented.”
however, to differentiate clearly between the notion/level of the ‘preceptory’ and the domus as representing different levels of the hierarchy of the Order. Any estimation or extrapolation would be misleading if it were based on the dependencies (membra) instead of the preceptories. Moreover, Hungarian scholarship has two additional handicaps, as mentioned several times: 1) the serious lack of sources, 2) the Stephanite problem. It is difficult not to affix all problems to the lack of sources, but it should be noted that we cannot provide satisfactory answers to several questions, notwithstanding the fact that there are many we cannot even raise. None of the reports of the well known papal investigations (1338, 1373) is extant concerning the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory. In this respect the difficulty is caused not only by the lack of sources but also by the fact that the preservation of the extant ones is uneven. The only Hospitaller archives which have come down to us are the private archives of the Székesfehérvár preceptory, thus we know much more about this particular unit than the others. However, it is likely that this archive incorporates charters which had originally been kept in the registrum/scrinia of other preceptories that perished before the mid-sixteenth century. There are several documents in the present-day stock which clearly pertain to preceptories other than Székesfehérvár. On the other hand, one of the most serious errors of former theories is that they were based on sources including those pertaining to the canons regular of St. Stephen and not the Hospitallers. This misled scholars and resulted in false conclusions, which thus need a thorough revision. Therefore, it is worth enumerating what sort of characteristics of the preceptories should be surveyed in the course of such research.

First the administrative units should be investigated and the most important features should be highlighted. The dependencies of the preceptories (membra, camerae) should be identified: house(s), cloister, church, chapel(s), hospice, castles, baths, estates and their

---

509 For the period of c. 1150-1387 it contains more than 200 documents.


511 Some scholars maintain that the “camerae [functioned] like the granges of other orders.” See, for instance, Roberta Gilchrist, Contemplation and Action: The Other Monasticism (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1995), 69. At times, it seems that the Order also used such terminology. Cf. the
belongings (e.g., cultivated and uncultivated lands, forests, mills, butcheries, toll-places), and the status of the given administrative unit (e.g., camera prioralis or magistralis, preceptory of grace) should be determined. Certainly, these dependencies should be monitored from a chronological point of view, that is, their first appearance and their disappearance should be determined as well as the reasons for the latter. Ascertainment of the reorganization of the dependencies/preceptories also can be of importance. This procedure will be accomplished for more than three dozen membra which were administered in the Priory during some 230 years, even though it is almost impossible to determine the exact number of preceptories at any particular moment of time. At most we can estimate the number of houses, castles, and hospitals run by the brethren, as done by Anthony Luttrel for the Priory of Venice or by Karl Borchardt for Alamania. Long periods remain uncovered, thus the survey looks similar to piecing together a puzzle when we are aware well in advance that many pieces are lost; even if we find some 200 pieces belonging to “blue sky” we do not know more about the scene/landscape depicted in the picture.

Second, besides the above there are many features of the personnel of the preceptories to be surveyed: complement, age, origin, social status (noble/ignoble, petty noble/aristocrat), standing/status in the Order (knight, sergeant, priest), and their numbers. The officials of the preceptories (preceptor, prior, custos, lector, etc.) also need to be investigated, including their activities. In this respect there are numerous problems. First, due to the remarkably scattered sources it is impossible to make complete prosopographical reconstructions. Moreover, as will be shown -- similar to the officials of the Priory -- the majority of the dignitaries of the preceptories were of foreign origin for most of the period under query.

wording of an appointment in 1384: “... teque gubernatorem et rectorem in dictis membris seu granciam constituiimus...” AOM 280, fol. 17.


However, as the personnel of the preceptories were less often in the limelight of publicity it is much more difficult to get to know their past records or later careers in cases when they left their offices behind. Moreover, the personnel of the preceptories have been recorded chiefly with their first names in Latin form, thus often making it necessary to guess the origin of the brothers. Therefore, it is risky to ascertain the local origin of the brethren with the most common Christian names which may refer to locals. Conditions are also burdened by the phenomenon that many preceptors were not resident brothers towards the second half of the fourteenth century and a part of the brethren permanently (ex officio) lived outside the preceptory.\footnote{Helen Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2001), 80.}

The situation is more complex owing to the fact that the Hospitallers did not follow the monastic lifestyle. Recruits entering the Order were assigned to a particular preceptory in one of the priories by receiving a stagia or served the Order in its center or in the Convent. However, the horizontal mobility of these officials was relatively high, as mirrored in the short tenure or high fluctuation in numbers of preceptors. It was also frequent that some of the brethren did not stay in the center of the preceptory but at one of the dependencies:\footnote{Cf. Borchardt, “Urban commanderies in Germany,” 298.} in a castle as castellan, at a manor controlling husbandry, in a parish church as priest or serving in a hospital. This type of management put serious constraints on the vita communis, which was often reduced to reunions of the brethren on Sundays when they gathered together for the Mass and the conventual chapters to follow.\footnote{Cf. Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller, 72.} In this matter, third, the question of communal life and liturgy cannot be investigated here. It has only been possible to apply analogies such as stating that the Hospitallers in Hungary followed the canonical ordo and not the monastic one.\footnote{Anthony Luttrell, “Spiritual Life of the Hospitallers of Rhodes,” in Zenon Hubert Nowak, ed., Die Spiritualität der Ritterorden im Mittelalter, Ordines Militares -- Colloquia Torunensia Historica 7 (Toruń: Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika, 1993), 80.}

Undoubtedly the set of parameters listed above could be applied from a methodological point of view, but accomplishing it is hopeless. On the basis of available sources only a very
fragmented picture can be reconstructed. Several topics cannot even be raised, and there are others that can be touched on, but without providing satisfactory answers. In sum, the compiled repertory aims at an institutional reconstruction through the composition and survey of the personnel of the preceptories. In the course of the investigation, on the basis of my research, I provide a criticism of the prevailing theories, chiefly originating from Ede Reiszig, the monographer of the Order. Before a detailed presentation of the administrative units it is worth dwelling on some general observations which may concern many or all preceptories.

The appearance and spread of the preceptories have already been partly presented in Chapter III and IV with the help of maps of their distribution in the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory. Thus some of their basic characteristics have been described. For instance, the question of settling down in the realm was discussed; during this process the Order might have taken efforts to establish its houses on or in the proximity of pilgrims’ routes. Its successful settlement, however, depended on objective factors such as where the donor had a piece of land to give to the Hospital. The importance of the first royal donation around the mid-twelfth century was also shown and how its confirmation proved to be crucial for the formation of the Priory. It also profoundly influenced the first and major preceptories which appeared before the mid-thirteenth century. Not reckoning with the Esztergom—Szomolya—Szirák—Tolmács circle, until the Mongol invasion houses and churches appeared mainly around the estates received from Queen Euphrosyne and their confirmation by her son, King Béla III in 1193.\(^{518}\) The explanation seems quite obvious: the “adjacent” estates determined or at least implied the establishment and the possible circle of dependencies of the future preceptory. This partly marked the period after the Mongol invasion. The appearance of the preceptories south of the Drava River was on account of the second “great” royal gift which the Order received in 1238. This was followed by settling in Slavonia, which was clearly referred to in the name of the Priory by that time: prioratus Ungarie et Sclavonie.

Another important issue which should be touched upon is the question of castles and fortifications in the Priory. The defensive-military function of the Hospitallers settled in the

\(^{518}\)Fejér CD 2: 288; Cartulaire no. 936; MES 1: 142-147.
Carpathian basin was also mentioned in Chapter III and IV. In this respect the question of the organization of the preceptories should also be raised: How was it manifested in the establishment of dependencies and building complexes? On the basis of my research and critical survey, I found that the prevailing theory concerning the Hospitaller properties is rather highly colored. In the Árpadian period, only two castles which clearly belonged to the Order can be shown to have existed. Both of them might have been built just after the Mongol invasion. The first castle was located near Pakrac, but the first information about it is from the Angevin period. The second, somewhat more problematic, castle was situated at the southern corner of Margitsziget, if what King Béla IV formulated in his letter to Pope Innocent IV is accepted, that Béla -- due to fear of the return of the Mongols -- had had castles built along the line of the Danube River before c. 1247. It is not known, however, where these fortifications were situated, although scholarly literature seems to identify the one built on Margitsziget. The king also states in the letter that he gave the Hospitallers control some of these castra since “our people is inexperienced in such matters.” The above data and Béla IV’s special “devotion” toward the island support the interpretation that it was the Hospital which indeed controlled that castle for a while. The Hospitallers might have been more experienced in this respect than the majority of the Hungarians, but there are no palpable signs of their castle-building activity in Hungary. There was no radical change in the Angevin period either. Although there was a “new” castle of the Priory in Béla from 1303 and the Hospital took over the former Templar headquarters in Vrana, which no doubt was a huge and splendid fortification, these still do not indicate fundamental change in the basic activity of the Order. Several secular lords had more castles even after the consolidation of

519 Margaret’s island, in the Middle Ages: Insula Leporum (island of the rabbits) (today Budapest).


the Angevin rulership and the recovery of the royal domain. Changes took place from around the end of the period under query. These were partly in connection with the changes in the leadership of the Priory, but, first of all, they reflected the menace of the coming Turks. The striking increase in the number of castra from the second third of the fifteenth century directly reflects on the reactions to the growth of Ottoman power in the Balkans.

The order of presenting the preceptories here is different from that of Ede Reiszig and Lelja Dobronić, who followed an alphabetical order. The preceptories are listed in the order of their first appearance/mention in the sources. This method may be somewhat hazardous, but still provides a more lively description of the development of the network of the preceptories. Preferring this order, one of the most annoying phenomena is that if the Székesfehérvár preceptory is first, the rest of the presentation will look ill-proportioned as there are many more sources for this preceptory than any other unit of the Priory. As mentioned earlier, Székesfehérvár was not only the very first but the most substantial preceptory of the Priory for a long time. In addition, it was the only administrative unit whose archive is extant. Accordingly, to start with this particular preceptory is felicitous in a way that most potential questions can be raised, unlike many other units for which there are only one or two pieces of evidence that show, for instance, their mere existence.

Another characteristic feature which should be clarified in the preamble concerns the principles of the presentation. A list of subjects is presented above which chiefly determines the framework of this survey. However, the organization and management of estates of the preceptories will not be reconstructed in their entirety. Especially since my research shows that as far the landed properties are concerned it is ill-advised to terminate the investigation since there are several units which were included in the gift of 1193 and reappeared only in the late Middle Ages. This also concerns the domus to a certain extent. I have criticized the work of Ede Reiszig several times so far, first of all because of the Stephanite confusion and its consequences. Concerning the database he published in the second volume of his

monograph one should advance a much more cautious criticism. Not only is it a very detailed and painstaking “history” of the Priory, but also, if all the “houses”/dependencies which belonged to orders other than the Hospital are omitted, what remains is still valuable for the history of the Order. From a different angle, the same can be said concerning the work of Lelja Dobronić. Even if she identifies more dependencies as houses than there were in reality, the record of existence of these units is very important for either a critical survey or for further research, not to mention the fact that there are not remarkably more primary sources at our disposal than were used by Reiszig and Dobronić. Nonetheless, in some cases I utilized -- mostly unpublished -- charters which have hitherto been overlooked by scholars. Still, I maintain that there is a definite need for new research focusing on the estates of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory. This belief is also based on the fact that several databases have recently been digitized and grand new digital databases and repertories have been produced which provide a unique opportunity: to reach a level of complexity and entirety of medieval and early modern sources. Undoubtedly, these tools make our knowledge more accurate and help rectify unfounded theories prevailing for eight decades.

Accordingly, as mentioned above, the aim here is a somewhat irregular summary of the institutional history of the preceptories of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory, mainly from the angle of their personnel. Besides recording the most important characteristics some primary sources which were unused so far can help amend the results of former research. In many cases these data make it possible to modify/correct, for instance, the duration of existence of the dependencies.

---

523 The first volume of the monograph, however, is much more misleading since several conclusions of the author were based on primary sources pertaining to religious orders other than the Hospital.

524 Dobronić, Posjedi i Sjedišta Templara, Ivanovaca i Sepulkralaca u Horvatskoj, 17-95.


### 6.2. Catalogue

**Székesfehérvár**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Székesfehérvár</td>
<td>Fejér</td>
<td>St. Stephen</td>
<td>c.1150/1192</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>Queen Euphrosyne, Archbishop Martyrius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>former Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>Hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Personnel: |
|------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| year/interval | Preceptor | Custos | Prior | Lector | Other |
| 1226       | John           |                |                |        |       |
| 1243       | Lucas          | Julian         |                |        |       |
| 1256       | Bernard        | John           |                |        |       |
| 1259       | Pontius        | Tesselin       |                |        |       |
| 1264       | Ruscan         |                | Rodoan vicepreceptor |        |
| 1265-67    | Benedict       |                |                |        |       |
| 1269-70    | Tesselin       |                |                |        |       |
| 1274       | Argellin       |                |                |        |       |
| 1275       | (H)ugo de Monte Claro |        | Guillerm     |        |       |
| 1277       | Robert         |                |                |        |       |
| 1279-88    | Benedict       |                |                |        |       |
| 1290-92    | Michael        |                |                |        |       |
| 1303       | Ulric          |                |                |        |       |
| 1315       | Johannes Gallicus |            |                |        |       |
| 1323       |                | Michael crucifer |                |        |       |
| 1325       | Corrad         |                |                |        |       |
| 1327       | Benedict       |                |                |        |       |
| 1328       | Marc           | Philip          |                |        |       |
| 1329       | Pietro de Gragnana |            |                |        |       |
| 1332-1343  | Donat²³⁰      |                | Stephen clericus chori |        |
| 1344       |                | Peter presbyter chori |        |       |
| 1346       |                | Simon clericus chori, Dominic | |       |

---


²²⁸ May be identical with the preceptor of Sopron in 1278. As for horizontal mobility, see also Baudoin, preceptor in 1375-1376, who became the preceptor of Fadd and Varasd.

²²⁹ He also acted as the preceptor of Gyánt, Varasd, and Győr.

³³⁰ In 1335 he was also preceptor of Esztergom. He might be identical with the preceptor of Našice in 1329: Donat of Lucca. Johannes custos, Andrew lector appear in a forgery in 1341.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Interval</th>
<th>Preceptor</th>
<th>Custos</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>Lector</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Herric of Samburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John, clericus chori, officialis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blasius crucifer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John, clericus chori, officialis</td>
<td>Urban clericus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blasius crucifer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356</td>
<td></td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ladiislas clericus chori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360</td>
<td></td>
<td>Francis (sub)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dominic crucifer,</td>
<td>John, clericus chori, capellanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew clericus chori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baudoin crucifer,</td>
<td>John, clericus chori, capellanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew crucifer,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hermann</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ladiislas crucifer,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew crucifer,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Baudoin</td>
<td>Donat</td>
<td>Emeric sacerdos,</td>
<td>Donat viceprior, Zudar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>capellanus, Ladiislas crucifer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375</td>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John, clericus chori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376</td>
<td>Baudoin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John, clericus chori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>John Sas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emeric capellanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382</td>
<td>Emeric Bwbe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George clericus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Baudoin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael clericus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ladislas</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>John, clericus chori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386</td>
<td>Benedict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

531 From 1349, he also acted as the lieutenant prior of Hungary and the preceptor of Gyánt.

532 The charter in which he appeared is dated to between 1351 and 1357.

533 He also acted as the lieutenant prior of Hungary in this period.

534 He is identical with the preceptor! "... frater Albertinus prior preceptor domus hospitalis sancti regis Stephani de Alba," Dl.6235.

535 Dl.106170.

536 From 1377 he acted as the preceptor of Fadd and Varasd.

537 He also acted as the lieutenant prior of Hungary in 1379.

538 He later became Prior of Vrana.
The “core” of the Székesfehérvár preceptory, the monasterium was founded around 1150: its walls were already being built when Archbishop Martirius of Esztergom died in 1157. The charter of 1272 reports that the house was erected outside the wall (extra muros) of Székesfehérvár. The importance of this location was emphasized by Erik Fügedi who pointed out that “the Island gathered and sorted the ways towards the West,” that is, the house was established in a central geographical position (medium regni). The political and sacral significance of the settlement indicates that its foundation was a conscious, non-arbitrary one. The presence of the pilgrims visiting the grave of St. Stephen provided a certain need for the settling down of an Order performing such activity.

Unlike the Priory, the late twelfth-century history of the preceptory cannot be reconstructed. More is known about the twelfth-century layout of the building. An excavation begun in 1978 but due to the high-level ground water it was interrupted in 1984. Three different ground levels have been identified, including a twelfth-century one. Although the archeologists failed to identify unequivocally the different elements of the building complex, they ascertained that besides the monastery, it included a church dedicated to St. Stephen of Hungary, a great hall (chapter hall? -- ZsH), and the ruins of two towers.

---

539 For the Székesfehérvár preceptory as the very first entity of the Order and as an important place of authentication of the realm, see Chapter III and VIII.

540 Fejér CD 2: 184. The intitulationes of late medieval charters issued by the Székesfehérvár preceptory as a place of authentication contains the expression insula which clearly refers to the fact Hospital building complex was surrounded by a marshy area. It is still visible on an early seventeenth-century wood-cut.


543 See Appendix D.

544 Gyula Siklósi, Adattár Székesfehérvár középkori és törökki építészeti könyv [Repertory on the Architecture of Székesfehérvár in the Middle Ages and during the Turkish Occupation] (Székesfehérvár: Megyei Művelődési Központ, 1990), 79-86.

and a stair-tower. On the basis of a charter of 1252 it can be inferred that the preceptory also functioned as a hospitium. The brethren applied for exemption from the observance of silentium during the meals “because of the multitude of guests.” The convent de facto acted as a place of authentication (locus credibilis) from 1243 at the latest, but it is conceivable that one copy of the Golden Bull of 1222 which had been committed to the Hospital (penes hospitale) was deposited in the “registrum” of the Székesfehérvár preceptory. Its role in pragmatic literacy is of primary importance because with the charters they issued as a place of authentication shed light on the house itself, particularly on its personnel.

The first official of Székesfehérvár, a certain John, prior of the house, is known from 1226, when he attended the negotiations between the Benedictine abbey of Pannonhalma and the preceptory over the tithe levied in Somogy County. He also attached his seal to the charter containing the agreement. Unfortunately, on the basis of his name we cannot conclude either his origin or social status. Not much is known about the preceptor and the keeper (custos) in 1243 except that some of the brethren followed the king to the Dalmatian coast in his escape from the Mongols.

Some conclusions, however, can be drawn from the list of the names of the brethren. First, it is striking that the officials of the preceptory were of foreign origin for a long period of time: Pontius, Ruscan, Tesselin, Rodoan, Argellin, Hugo de Monte Claro, Guillerm. On the other hand, the alternation was relatively high, at least in the period between 1243 and 1277: for a bit more than two decades at least five preceptors and eight custodes served in the

---


547 Fejér CD 4/2: 126-127; Theiner 1: 212; Cartulaire no. 2589.

548 This question is discussed separately in Chapter VIII.

549 PRT 1: 672-673; MonWesp 1: 70; MES 1: 260, 278; ÁUO 1: 222-223.

550 ÁUO 7: 144-145.
preceptory. Notwithstanding, for some years no data is available.\textsuperscript{551} Third, we can also conclude as to the importance of the office of the custos played in the literacy. His name was never omitted from the series dignitatum of the charters issued by the preceptory as happened with those of the preceptors or the priors in the period from 1265 to 1295. It is a hypothetical idea that in the second half of the thirteenth century, the preceptors were milites while the custodes-priores might have been priest-brothers. An earlier phase of research explored whether the preceptories of this region were regarded by the preceptors as a sort of springboard towards the Latin East in their careers and it was the priest-brothers who represented more permanence in the preceptory. The sources, however, do not seem to confirm this supposition. Unfortunately, in this period (up to 1343) no conventual commissioners (testimonia) were named in the charters; thus it is hopeless to establish anything concerning the brethren of lower rank (e.g., clerici chori).

On the basis of the currently available sources it is difficult to estimate the gravity of the changes which might have taken place after the fall of the Holy Land or the beginning of the Angevin rulership. By surveying and grouping the names recorded in the charters, two “lines” can be observed and neither of them implies local origin of the officials of the preceptory. One of them can be regarded as a “German line” between 1303 and 1368, represented by Ulric, Conrad, Donat, Herric of Samburg, another Donat, and a certain Hermann. The other line can be called, for the moment, the “Latin line” where perhaps, similar to the seat of the Priory, the Provençal-Italian rivalry can be detected between 1315 and 1376: Johannes Gallicus, Marc (of Bologna?), Pietro de Gragnana, Raymond, Baudoin (of Lucca?). Irrespective of the “lines,” a manifest stability can be observed at the Székesfehérvár preceptory during the priorship of the Cornutis: the average time for offices held reached twelve years. In addition, during the office of Baudoin Cornuti (1348-1374), the lieutenant of the prior was appointed from Székesfehérvár in the person of Donat and Albert. Their career as Hospitallers is “depicted” in the table below.

\textsuperscript{551}Two “longer” offices can be observed: preceptor Hugo de Monte Claro (1274-1277) and the custos-prior Tesselin (1259-1264, 1269-1270). Cf. Henry J. Sire, The Knights of Malta (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), 104-105.
As is clear from the table, the “peak” of Donat’s power was between 1356 and 1361 but the reasons behind it and its objectives are not visible. It could have been a deliberate concentration of power in connection with his office as viceprior, but may also have been a case of necessity, an overall phenomenon in the Order, a way of cutting the personnel down to a minimum. Even more striking is completing the picture with Gwylerm de Alcaniz, who also acted as preceptor of several preceptories in the same period. From that table it is clear that in 1361 three Hospitaller brothers administered eleven preceptories, half of the units of the Priory! Moreover, the lieutenant prior was also among them.

552 See the extended table in APPENDIX D.
Donat, similar to the majority of the personnel came out of the blue, but Albert’s career is quite interesting. As is also shown above, he started his “visible” career as the preceptor of Gora and Sopron in 1358. With the knowledge of the later history of Sopron and the huge geographical distance between these places, he conceivably administered the latter from the first, namely from Gora. This interpretation can be confirmed by the later activity of Albert. In 1360, he became the preceptor of Dubica and the castellan of Moštanica, that is, he was given all the Hospitaller dependencies south of the Sava River. This might have been in connection with his origin, as he is supposed to have come from the neighborhood of Dubica, perhaps from Kusuc(i)a.\(^{553}\) Albert appeared before the provost of the Buda collegiate chapter with his son, Iwko of Kusychya in 1374.\(^{554}\) At first sight it may be awkward that a professed brother had a son, but it may be explained by early widowerhood.\(^{555}\) It is, however, more eye-catching that Albert’s son originated from the same place as the former preceptor of Dubica: Elias, son of Odolen of Kusuc(i)a, from the immediate neighborhood of Dubica. It may provide an explanation why Albert started his career in this southern region, and that after his preceptor office in Székesfehérvár\(^{556}\) and his lieutenant priorship why he returned to Dubica in 1375. The change might have been in connection with the succession in the prioral seat\(^{557}\) that meant the coming of the Beaumonts into office, which also took place in this period.

After this period, the fluctuation accelerated again in Székesfehérvár: eight preceptors succeeded each other during the last twelve years of the period under query. The reasons for this phenomenon are not clear. Lucas, preceptor of 1380, is perhaps identical with the lieutenant of prior John of Palisna between 1379 and 1385. The eminence of Székesfehérvár is mirrored in the appointment of lieutenant priors from this preceptory for a long time. It was

---

\(^{553}\) Presumably identical with present-day Košutara (Croatia).

\(^{554}\) DL.106171, Fejér CD 9/4: 611-613. According to the calendar of the MOL: Kusythia.

\(^{555}\) Although Albert had already served the Order for twenty-six years it cannot be ruled out that he became a widower relatively early. His death some years later (before 1383) may indicate that he was elderly at that time.

\(^{556}\) Interestingly, he still acted as prior of the convent of Székesfehérvár for a while. DL.6235.

\(^{557}\) See in Chapter V.
actually the first Hospitaller preceptory which acknowledged Palisna as prior of Hungary.\textsuperscript{558} There is no indication, however, that Palisna had anything to do with Székesfehérvár at all.\textsuperscript{559} Emeric Bwbek, the successor of Lucas as preceptor, was appointed as prior of Hungary by King Sigismund and acted between 1392 and 1403, but he finally ended up as ingloriously as Palisna.

Different conclusions can be drawn by surveying the circle of “other” brothers who appeared in the sources from 1343. There is little doubt about the local origin of the priest-brothers. It is denoted not only by their names (Stephen, Peter, Simon, Dominic, John, Blasius, etc.) but also by their tasks in the activity of a place of authentication. Often called testimonium, they were sent to the site of an inquiry to be carried out; for the successful conduct of this task, knowledge of Hungarian and customary law were required. In theory, it cannot be ruled out that the testimonia took interpreters with them. In practice, however, it is unlikely that the parties involved in the affair would cover the extra expenses.\textsuperscript{560}

The proportion of “Hungarian” names in the higher offices also increased from the mid-fourteenth century. Moreover, a new trend can be observed from the 1370s: professed brothers of high social standing appeared in the Székesfehérvár preceptory. Although Alexander -- a canon of the cathedral chapter of Eger which he left for Székesfehérvár -- was omitted from the “official” genealogy, he surely belonged the well-known Zudar kindred.\textsuperscript{561} Emeric Bwbek, preceptor in 1382, also arrived from the aristocracy: his father was the palatine of the kingdom, his uncle was the voivode of Transylvania; the Archbishop of Kalocsa, Count of the Szeklers, and the magister tawarnicorum of the queen were also among his brothers.\textsuperscript{562} If, by any chance, the entrance fee was in practice in the Hungarian-

\textsuperscript{558}DI.7550.

\textsuperscript{559}A certain John crucifer appeared in 1369 (Imre Nagy, et al., ed., Zala vármegye története. Oklevéltár, 1024-1490 [A history of Zala County. Charters] 2 vols. (Budapest, 1886-1890), 2: 70-93), but he can be identified rather with the one who appeared as priest-brother in 1375 (Df.201013).

\textsuperscript{560}Cf. Zsolt Hunyadi, “The Locus Credibilis in Hungarian Hospitaller Commanderies,” in La Commanderie, 292-293.

\textsuperscript{561}See Chapter IV.

Slavonian Priory, then the Székesfehérvár preceptory profited remarkably out of the appearance of such local recruits.

In connection with the personnel of the preceptory two additional and somewhat interrelated phenomena should be taken into account. First, the question of offices and functions in the preceptory in the course of the fourteenth century are noteworthy. As can be seen in the table above, relatively fewer custodes are known from the Angevin period and only three priors of the convent are known for almost nine decades. It certainly might have been related to the shift of balance between the offices, but one should not forget about the conditions created by the nature/proportion of sources at our disposal. The names listed above have been reconstructed from the charters issued by the convent as a place of authentication and from documents produced by other scriptoria in connection with the estates of the preceptory. This fact draws the scholar’s attention at least to two aspects. First, the absolute number and the proportion of the privileges decreased and in consequence the percentage of the series dignitatum dwindled radically. On the other hand, it became more frequent that secular officials and litterati represented the preceptors and custodes, thus the names of the conventual dignitaries have not been recorded. Therefore, only cautious conclusions may be drawn. The second element of the question is the relation of the above functions. Having surveyed the Arpadian period, it became apparent that the functions of the custos and prior were often linked, but this did not occur after 1292. If the office of the custos was merged with any other it was that of the preceptor, who was ultimately in charge of the most profitable administration. Certainly, from time to time the duty of the preceptor was that of the receiver of the incomes/revenues to transfer them to the prior or directly to the treasury of the Order. Accordingly, the administration of the membra was handed over to other brothers, who sometimes lived on the dependencies of the preceptory where they oversaw the estate management. This could be problematic in case of the Székesfehérvár preceptory as its membra were scattered over a huge area well after the detachment and striking out of certain estates. It can be exemplified by the results of a survey conducted some years ago. This showed that the activity of the Székesfehérvár preceptory as a place of authentication was extended to ten counties of the kingdom. The reason for this great extension can be explained
by the striking fact that the majority of the parties who turned to the convent for charters were abutters or owners of adjacent lands in the vicinity of the estates of the preceptory (Somogy, Tolna, Zala counties), notwithstanding their distance from Székesfehérvár itself. The locals turned to the Hospitaller scriptorium even if there were a place of authentication nearby.\footnote{Zsolt Hunyadi, The central convent of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem in Hungary as a place of authentication up to the middle of the fourteenth century, M.A. thesis (Budapest: Central European University, 1996), 56.}

Perhaps the activity as a place of authentication accelerated the establishment of a new function: that of the lector. The first -- indirect -- data derives from 1365, when a certain Francis sublector acted as the testimonium of the convent in a private legal affair.\footnote{“... hominem nostrum silicet Franciscum clericum nostrum sublectorem...” Df.200973.} This clearly shows the existence of the office of the lector at that time. However, as mentioned above, in case of the Székesfehérvár preceptory the custos was in charge of theprocuration of charters issued as a place of authentication as opposed to the chapter houses, where it was usually the lector. The close relation of the office of the custos with that of the preceptor implies its importance. Thus the appearance of the lector’s office might have been in connection with the establishment of a conventual school under his direction. If it were indeed linked to such an office then placing the lector’s name into the series dignitatum must have been permanent. This permanency, however, can be observed only from the last decades of the fourteenth century.\footnote{27 April 1368 (Dl.100421, Dl.10348), 29 March 1373 (Dl.71232), 27 May 1385 (Dl.45459), 3 June 1389 (Dl.30646), 27 May 1390 (Dl.90933, Dl.86989, Dl.88128), etc.} Zoltán Miklósy linked the occurrence of the lector in the charters with the fact that the septem artes liberales were taught in conventual school.\footnote{Zoltán Miklósy, “Hiteles hely és iskola a középkorban,” [Place of Authentication and School in the Middle Ages] Levéltári Közlemények 18-19 (1940-1941): 178.} This deduction goes much too far, but the existence of the school is conceivable; but if so then its ante quem can be put well before 1390.\footnote{Zsolt Hunyadi, “... et iugiter famulantibus regi sempiterno... Megjegyzések a fehérvári johannita konvent egy hamis okleveléhez,” [Remarks on a forgery attributed to the Székesfehérvár Hospitaller commandery] Acta Historica Universitatis Szegediensis 109 (1999): 43.}

Another important issue is the reorganization of the preceptories, at times which can be
chiefly reconstructed from the titles of the preceptors. It seems that the takeover of the Templar possessions caused manifest changes in the structure of the preceptory from 1329 onwards. Accordingly, besides Székesfehérvár, Pietro de Gragnana acted jointly as the preceptor of the hitherto separate units of Gyán, V arasd, and Györ.\footnote{Df.257974, Df.258481.} To administer the first three looks feasible, but it is not clear why not the preceptor of Sopron was in charge of the adjacent Györ. A few years later, in 1335,\footnote{Fejér CD 8/4: 129-130.} Donat preceptor managed the goods belonging to the Esztergom preceptory, which had perhaps lost their earning power. In addition, in this particular charter Donat rented out the estates of the Hospital at Dada, which implies that the preceptory of Dada had also ceased to be a separate unit by this time. Between 1348 and 1361\footnote{Fejér CD 8/2: 588, 9/3: 123-125; 9/7: 151-157; A Okl 8: 231-232; László Fenyvesi, Tolna megye középkori történetéhez kapcsolódó oklevelek regesztái [Charter-calendars concerning the medieval history of Tolna County] (Szekszárd: Tolna M egyei Önkormányzat Levéltára, 2000), 79; Géza Érszegi, “Fejér megyére vonatkozó oklevéleknél a székesfehérvári keresztes konvent magán levéltáránban, 1193-1542,” [Charters with reference to Fejér County from the private archive of the Székesfehérvár Hospitaller convent] Fejér megyei Történeti Évkönyv 5 (1971): 188; Lajos Thallóczy, and Sándor Horváth, ed., Alsó-Szlavóniai okmánytár (Dubica, Orbász és Szana vármegyék). Codex diplomaticus partium regno Hungariae adnexarum (Comitatuum Dublicza, Orbász et Szana) 1244-1718 (Budapest; 1912), 66; Smičiklas 13: 153.} another Donat preceptor (1348-1371) managed the goods of Gyánt, which finally were attached to the estates of Székesfehérvár. For a while (from 1356 to 1361), Karaševo was also “added” to the title of Donat, but this might have been rather nominal leadership since the preceptory was very far from both Székesfehérvár and Gyánt.

As stated in the introduction of this chapter, estates of the preceptory will not be surveyed, instead the reader may consult the databases mentioned above\footnote{Reiszig 2: 101-138; Engel, Magyarország a középkor végén, passim.} as well as the work of Géza Érszegi.\footnote{Érszegi, “Fejér megyére vonatkozó oklevéleknél,” 177-264.}

***

Szentpéter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T o p o n y m</th>
<th>C o u n t y</th>
<th>P a t r o c i n i u m</th>
<th>F i r s t</th>
<th>L a s t</th>
<th>F o u n d e r / “A f f i l i a t i o n”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

568 Df.257974, Df.258481.

569 Fejér CD 8/4: 129-130.

Personnel: unknown

In 1166, a church in Zala County, dedicated to St. Peter, was given to the Hospital:574
fratribus iherosolomitanis pro remedio anime mee ... supradicti fratres et sancti pauperes hospitalis domus.575 Since no preceptory dedicated to St. Peter is known from later sources its accurate localization is hopeless. As the parish church of any of the known preceptories it might have existed for a long time.

Kesztelc

Personnel: unknown

Kesztelc was a short-lived preceptory in Tolna County where no domus is known to exist. In 1215 Pope Innocent IV confirmed the St. George church of the Hospital including their chapels and all other belongings which the brethren iuste et pacifice possessed.577 Ede Reiszeg supposes that the church was founded by the Sebestyén kindred, but I found no direct evidence confirming this idea.578 The representatives of the preceptory attended the negotiations between the Pannonhalma Benedictine abbey and the Priory over the tithe levied

---


574The private grant consisted of three predial lands and a church. Reiszeg supposes that the house had been destroyed during the Mongol invasion but -- as a matter of fact -- there was no domus mentioned at all. Reiszeg 2: 101.

575Fejér CD 2: 174-175; Cartulaire no. 368; HO 7: 1-2.

576Reiszeg 2: 77-78.

577Fejér CD 3/1: 179-180; Cartulaire no. 1463.

The first information about the preceptory of Szirák comes from 1219, when its procurator accused the castrenses and castle-warriors (iobagiones castri) of Zemplén of destroying the estates of the Order in Zemplén County. To trace what happened, comes Gyula of Keve sent the suspects for an ordeal (ad candentis ferri) to be held before the cathedral chapter of Várad. The next data is taken from a charter which reports that the common preceptor of Szirák, Szomolya, and Tolmács rented an estate (Berény, Nógrád County) from the custos of the cathedral chapter of Esztergom until 1274. It is hard to figure out whether these units -- most likely including a domus as well -- were joined earlier or it only was the case in 1274.

---

579... de consensu magistri sui et fratrum suorum commorantium ... et Keztelch. PRT 1: 672-673; MonWesp 1: 70; MES 1: 260, 278., ÁUO 1: 222-223.

580 Reiszig 2: 78.

581 Reiszig 2: 139-141; Csánki 1: 108, 113; ÁM F 4: 300; Kozák, “Constructions,” 119-120.

582 1274: Szomolya et Tolmács.


584 ÁUO 9: 92; MES 2: 45.
For Esztergom it is clear, but concerning Szirák, the only data from 1219 is not enough for a solid argument. One can only be confident in the fact that Peter Imbert was listed exclusively as preceptor of Szirák while attending the provincial chapter at Csurgó in 1275.\textsuperscript{585} It was the last time when the preceptory occurred in charters.

***

Csurgó

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Csurgó\textsuperscript{586}</td>
<td>Somogy</td>
<td>St. Margaret</td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>Princess Margaret?, sister of King Béla III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly</td>
<td>Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1261</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Simon\textsuperscript{588}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266</td>
<td>Guylerm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benedict\textsuperscript{589}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275</td>
<td>(H)Ugo Boraldy\textsuperscript{590}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329</td>
<td>Marchuzio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1336</td>
<td>Treullus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1339-42</td>
<td>Nicholas\textsuperscript{591}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355-63</td>
<td>Gywylerm de Alcaniz\textsuperscript{592}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366</td>
<td>Raymond de Beaumont\textsuperscript{593}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{585} ÁUO 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Smičiklas 6: 137-138. It is conceivable although unproved that it was the same Peter who appeared in 1274.

\textsuperscript{586} Reiszig 2: 32-38; Csák 2: 572, 577; Kozák, “Constructions,” 86-88.

\textsuperscript{587} There was a castrum of the Hospital at Csurgó by 1437. Pál Engel, “The Estates of the Hospitallers in Hungary at the end of the Middle Ages,” in Expanding the Frontiers, 296.

\textsuperscript{588} Also acted as preceptor of Újudvar.

\textsuperscript{589} Also acted as vicepreceptor.

\textsuperscript{590} He was also the preceptor of Udvarhely, and acted as the lieutenant prior of Hungary.

\textsuperscript{591} He was styled in the charter as “magnificum virum magistrum Nicolaum Zaladiensem comitem verum esse amatorem et tutorem matris sancte ecclesie et defensorem nostre religionis ... tutorem defensorem gubernatorem et protectorem preceptoris domus nostre de Chergo.”

\textsuperscript{592} He also acted as the castellan of Béla (1350-1376), the preceptor of Zelinaszentmárton (1361-1376), and that of Glogovnica (1361).

\textsuperscript{593} He was also preceptor of Újudvar.
There are very few sources at our disposal concerning the early history of the preceptory. The estate which became the nucleus of the later preceptory was on the “list” of possessions granted to the Hospital by Queen Euphrosyne in the second half of the twelfth century. According to a charter of 1215/1216 a church was established at Csurgó, but it still was regarded as a dependency of Székesfehérvár. The first data proving its separate status was the agreement in 1226 with the Benedictines mentioned above. Ede Reiszig and others submit that the church of the preceptory was dedicated to St. Margaret of Antioch, although no contemporary direct evidence for this has been found to date. The mere fact that Margaret, King Béla III’s sister, bequeathed her dowry to the Hospitallers is not enough to prove such a church dedication. The connection would have been established through her husband, Count Andrew of Somogy, and that was the reason for the Order to choose this female saint as their patron. The problem is that according to the sources the Order did not receive the dowry because it was retained by Andrew’s son, Andronic. The brethren turned to the Curia expressing their complaint.

The next information concerns the debate with the Benedictines of Pannonhalma over the tithe levied in Somogy County. It cannot be ruled out that Csurgó simply “inherited” public domain.

---

594 He also acted as the preceptor of Újudvar and as the lieutenant prior of Hungary.
595 He also acted as the preceptor of Dubica and Újudvar.
596 Fejér CD 2: 288; Cartulaire no. 936; MES 1: 142-147.
598 PRT 1: 672-673; MonWesp 1: 70; MES 1: 260, 278, ÁUO 1: 222-223.
600 Fejér CD 3/1: 56-57; MonWesp 1: 17; Cartulaire no. 1302; See also CHAPTER III.
601 PRT 2: 93, 313; MonWesp 1: 140; ÁUO 3: 7.
the problem from Székesfehérvár. They followed the example of the once “mother” preceptory in several respects, such as acting as a place of authentication, at any rate from 1264 onwards. The map of the preceptories and their major dependencies shows a particular situation. There were at least three houses (domus) close to each other: Csurgó, Szenta, and Udvarhely. Most of the adjacent estates could have been administered from any of these neighboring houses as these were closer than many lands of the Székesfehérvár preceptory. Still, Csurgó was usually managed jointly with Újudvar, which was a bit towards the north, while occasionally was managed together with Udvarhely, Bela, and Dubica. Besides its advantageous geographical situation, the importance of the preceptory is implied by the fact that the first known provincial chapter was held here in 1275. (H)ugo Boraldy, the preceptor of Csurgó in that year, also acted as the lieutenant prior of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory.

Half a century of silence in the sources leaves the impression that the significance of Csurgó somewhat decreased. This is partly implied by the fact that no charter is known from the Angevin period issued by the convent as a place of authentication. In addition, the prior assigned a secular gubernator to the preceptory for three years in 1339. Although not unknown in the overall practice of the Hospital, this was the first occurrence of such solution in Hungary. From 1355 a professed brother was the head of the preceptory: Gwylerm de Alcaniz, who was simultaneously the castellan of Bela. From this time onwards preceptors of foreign origin administered the dependencies of the preceptory. Their significance is worth

---

602 See in Chapter VIII.

603 See Chapter III and IV.

604 ÁUO 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Smičiklas 6: 137-138.


mentioning; they were none other than the Beaumonts. Between 1366 and 1375 Raymond de Beaumont headed the preceptory jointly with Újudvar. Raymond, by the harsh intervention of King Louis I, became the prior of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory in the summer of 1374. The Provençal brother regarded Csurgó as his residence as far as he convoked his first (and -- in the period under query -- the last) provincial chapter at Csurgó in September 1374. In 1375, Raymond passed the preceptorship to his lieutenant, Arnold de Beaumont when he left Hungary for a longer period of time. Arnold is known to have been resident (or at least a recurrent visitor) in Csurgó since he regularly received the payment of rents of the Priory instead of the prior or the provincial chapters. Arnold was reinstalled by Riccardo Caracciolo in May 1384 for ten years to Dubica and Udvarhely jointly. It is likely that he managed to obtain the responsiones as he arrived in Hungary in November 1384 in the company of Raymond de Beaumont. How long this situation lasted is not known, but Csurgó had lost its status as preceptory by the beginning of the fifteenth century.

As is manifest from the above table, besides the preceptors (of foreign origin), only one official of the preceptory is known from the sources: a certain Benedict prior, who also acted as vicepreceptor in 1269. It is likely that the latter title was ad hoc in nature, applied in the absence of the preceptor. The absence of the custodes from the written sources is striking,

---

607 See Chapter V.
608 The last such meeting was held at Csurgó in 1339. Solymosi, A földeúri járadékok, 258-259; A Okl 23: 336-337.
609 Fejér CD 9/4: 613-616; Smičiklas 15: 59.
611 E.g., Dl.6459, cf. Chapter VII.
612 AOM 281, fol. 37v. See Appendix B no. 69.
613 Fejér CD 10/2: 179.
614 “Nos frater Benedictus prior et vicepreceptor domus hospitalis de Churgo notum facimus quibus expedit...” Df.269944.
especially as in the case of Székesfehérvár the keeper played an important role in the activity of the convent as a place of authentication. Thus there are no data about the merging of the offices in Csurgó.

***

Aracsa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aracsa</td>
<td>Tolna</td>
<td></td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospital</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel: unknown

The core of the future preceptory was the estate which was granted by Queen Euphrosyne and confirmed by King Béla III in 1193. The ante quem of the establishment of the community is 1226 since the representative of the brothers staying at Aracsa also appeared on the occasion of the agreement that brought about the tithe due to the Order in Somogy County and challenged by the Benedictines of Pannonhalma. Afterwards, Aracsa only occurred as an estate of the Hospital until the late Middle Ages.

***

Esztergom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esztergom</td>
<td>Esztergom</td>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>1335/1401</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospital</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>+ + (balneum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adrian hospitalarius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

613 Reiszig 2: 8-11.

614 “... de consensu magistri sui et fratrum suorum commorantium ... et in Oracha.” PRT 1: 672-673; MonW esp 1: 70; MES 1: 260, 278; A U O 1: 222-223.


618 He also acted as the preceptor of Sziráék, Szomolya, and Tolmács.
One of the most problematic units of the Priory was the preceptory of Esztergom. The Stephanite problem\textsuperscript{622} mentioned above has misdirected surveys on the topic several times: the starting point of which was the false identification and the evaluation of its role. Similar to Aracsa, the first reliable data derives from the agreement of 1226, where the Esztergom convent was also represented.\textsuperscript{623} It was, however, not the one with the dedication to St. Stephen, since that belonged to the canons regular of St. Stephen it was dedicated to the Holy Cross. Reiszig’s explanation on this issue is hazy in many respects. On the basis of the excavations of István Horváth it can be stated that the Hospitaller building complex, including a hospital, was established in the “royal town.”\textsuperscript{624} According to Horváth, the Hospitaller church was mentioned as parish church several times between 1230 and 1534. The existence of the hospital as part of the preceptory is deduced from the office of a certain Adrian (hospitalarius), who acted as a witness in a case between the Benedictine abbot of Pannonhalma and his people that was conducted in the Hospitaller house in 1233.\textsuperscript{625} Five

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
year/ interval & preceptor & custos & prior & lector & other \\
\hline
1294 & & & & Wytko\textsuperscript{619} & \\
1297 & & Lawrence & & & \\
c.1300 & John (magister) & Durand & & & \\
1313-16 & Herric (magister) & & & & \\
1329 & Orbizano of Lucca\textsuperscript{646} & & & & \\
1335 & Donat\textsuperscript{621} & & & & \\
1401 & Francis & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{619}He might have been a Stephanite brother.

\textsuperscript{620}He also acted as the lieutenant prior of Hungary.

\textsuperscript{621}And joint preceptor of Székesfehérvár.


\textsuperscript{623}“... de consenso magistri sui et fratrum suorum commorantium ... et Strigonii” PRT 1: 672-673; MonWesp 1: 70; MES 1: 260, 278; ÁUO 1: 222-223.


\textsuperscript{625}MES 1: 291; PRT 1: 716; ÁUO 6: 533-538; AMF 2: 250.
years later, King Béla IV gave a public bath (balneum commune)\textsuperscript{626} called Tapolca (Toplica) to the Hospital which had originally been founded by Anne of Antioch, his grandmother, in the district of Esztergom in the late twelfth century.\textsuperscript{627}

After the above data, there is no information about the Esztergom preceptory for a long time. It might have been in connection with the damages caused by the Mongols, who almost completely destroyed Esztergom. The first data from the second half of the thirteenth century report the cancellation of the rent of the possession of Matthew, canon of the Esztergom cathedral chapter. Since the Order did not pay the rent in time, the chapter annulled the contract.\textsuperscript{628} It also turns out from the charter that Peter, preceptor, jointly administered Esztergom, Szirák, Szomolya, and Tolmács. Szirák and Esztergom were founded relatively early, but the privilege of 1193 mentioned estates in the proximity of the latter.\textsuperscript{629} Thus it is not clear which estates were managed from these “northern” houses. By arguing for Esztergom, its significance as political and sacral center should be highlighted, as it was the seat of the Primate of Hungary. It was a town, perhaps similar to Székesfehérvár, where the Hospital had to be present. It can perhaps be confirmed by the fact that the Templars settled down around 1216 although they had no economic interest in the neighborhood.\textsuperscript{630}

On the basis of the location (the royal town) of the preceptory it was presumably a royal foundation. Its founder was either Béla III or Andrew II. The location of the preceptory is interesting since the widespread duality of urban-rural preceptories in Western Europe is not found in the Hungarian Priory. The reason is probably delayed urban development. This situation reveals the core of the problem: one must differentiate between town and town as well as between town and urban-like settlements. Obviously, even though the center of a

\textsuperscript{626}Fejér CD 4/1: 104-111; 9/5: 153; Smičiklas 4: 48-50; MES 1: 326; RA no. 637.

\textsuperscript{627}István Horváth, “Esztergom,” in KMTL, 201.

\textsuperscript{628}ÁUO 9: 92; MES 2: 45.

\textsuperscript{629}Ebszöny. See in Chapter III and Di. 27. Győrrffy ÁkO 93-96; Fejér CD 2: 283-290; MES 1: 142-147; RA no. 155; Cartulaire no. 936.

\textsuperscript{630}Balázs Stossek, “Maisons et Possessions des Templiers en Hongrie,” in Expanding the Frontiers, 245-249.
preceptory was located in a town it does not necessarily imply that it raised all its income in
town, especially if it was a market town (oppidum) where the Order exercised its
overlordship. The district of Esztergom was, however, a royal town where no estates of the
Hospital were to be found (not even later). The overall objective of the foundation may be
sought in the function of the hospital as Esztergom was/could be an important station on the
inland pilgrim route to the Holy Land. The importance of Hospitaller activity was perhaps
mirrored in the phenomenon that, except for the above-mentioned Peter, one can find
hospitallers and masters (magister)\(^{631}\) and not preceptors of this unit up to 1329.\(^ {632}\) The next
period indicates not the change in the basic function of the preceptory but the loss of its
former autonomous status. No other preceptory was associated with the name of Orbizano of
Lucca, but he also acted as the lieutenant prior in 1329.\(^ {633}\) From the first third of the
thirteenth century it seems that the assignment of the viceprior to any preceptory functioned
as an indicator implying the decline of profit-raising activity and the beginning of the loss of
“independence” (Sopron, Gyánt, etc.). The “decline” in Esztergom proved to be relatively
short, since no source has been found concerning the activity of the Esztergom preceptory
after 1335. Supposedly, albeit not proved, a certain Francis, preceptor, who appeared in the
sources in 1401, headed this establishment.\(^ {634}\)

***

Újudvar

\(^{631}\)Whose title was typical in hospitals. Cf. Zoltán Somogyi, A középkori Magyarország szegényügye

\(^{632}\)The status of Wytko, who appeared in 1294, is somewhat uncertain even though his Hospitaller being
is ascertained by the wording of the source: “... coram religiosis viris Wytkone fratre domus hospitalis: fratre
Nycolao magistro cruciferorum sancti regis Stephani de Strigonio et Bankone fratre eiusdem in capella sancti
Blasii in curia hospitalis apud Strigonium existente ... Item in contracta ecclesie Sancte Crucis” Fejér CD 6/1:
306-317; RA no. 3986; AUO 9: 137; MES 2: 198; 2: 354-360; A M F 2: 253, 279. If he were a Stephanite brother
then the order of enumeration was different and the ‘fratre eiusdem’ expression referred only to Banko. In
addition, Wytko is styled as belonging to the Hospital while Nicholas was magister cruciferorum.

\(^{633}\)Df.257974, Df.258481. The situation is quite complex since it is not known what happened to the
Esztergom house of the Templars. If it was taken over and maintained by the Hospital then it cannot be ruled out
that Orbizano and Donat administered it and not the preceptory with the dedication of Holy Cross. Fejér CD 8/4:
129-130.

\(^{634}\)ZsO 2: no. 1051.
The history of the Újúdvar preceptory was very similar to that of Csurgó although it was organized as an autonomous administrative unit somewhat later. Újúdvar was listed among the estates donated by Queen Euphrosyne and the debate over tithing in 1215/1216 also

---

635Csányi 3: 120; Reisz 2: 143-147; K ozák, “Constructions,” 121-122; Dobronić, Posjedi i Sjedišta Templara, Ivanovaca i Sepulkralaca, 24-26, 147; István Antics, A Johannita-rend története és az újudvari konvent [A History of the Hospital and the Újudvar Convent] (Szeged: JATE, 1992, manuscript), 53-64.

636Also acted as the preceptor of Csurgó.

637From 1329 he also acted as the preceptor of Béla.

638Between 1344 and 1346 he also acted as the preceptor of Sopron and lieutenant prior of Hungary.

639Also acted as the preceptor of Székesfehérvár and Karaševé while being lieutenant prior of Hungary.

640And preceptor of Csurgó.

641Joint with Csurgó.

642He also acted as the preceptor of Csurgó and lieutenant prior of Hungary.

643Fejér CD 2: 288; Cartulaire no. 936; MES 1: 142-147.
reported a church of the Hospital here. Similar to Csurgó it might have been a parish church belonging the Székesfehérvár preceptory. Since no one represented Újudvar on the occasion of the accord between the Benedictines of Pannonhalma and the Order in 1226, it may be inferred that there was no domus and community yet in existence. This theory, like that formulated in the literature, is confirmed by a charter of 1236 which mentions the possession of the Order at Újudvar: ... et terram ville Noue Curie cruciferorum domus hospitalis iacentem. According to Hospitaller terminology, the domus hospitalis expression refers the Order as a whole and not to a singular house in such a context. This means that there was no independent preceptory of the Priory at Újudvar, since if there had been the above estate would have belonged it. The next data, from 1259, however, report a full-fledged establishment since the convent acted as a place of authentication. Accordingly, the development into a preceptory took place between 1236 and 1259, presumably closer to the first date. It is a time-consuming process to get from the placement of the foundation stone of a monastery until it is fully functional. The next information about the role played by the community in pragmatic literacy derives from 1262, but the first in extenso charter is known from 1264. Then a certain Simon headed the preceptory jointly with Csurgó, but this was not regularized for a further quarter of a century. Preceptors were quite often absent which probably led to the occurrence of the title of vicepreceptor in 1266. The sequence of data from the Arpadian period ceased with a certain Guylerm, who acted as preceptor of Újudvar in 1273. His origin is unknown, thus it is obscure whether he was identical with he

---


645 Reisz 2: 143; Rászlai, “Johanniták a középkori Somogy megyében,” 81. József Török indirectly implies that the first reference which concerned not only a mere possession occurred in 1259. Török-Legeza, Máltaiak, 23.

646 ÁUO 7: 24.

647 ÁUO 7: 518-519.

648 ÁUO 8: 41-42.

649 ÁUO 8: 91-92; 8: 117-119; RA nos. 1412-1413.

650 Undated charter, DI.36646. Archivists have dated the document to between 1270 and 1280, although on the photocopy of the charter someone has indicated: ‘c. 1273,’ which is conceivable. See also, ÁUO 9: 42-43.
who acted as preceptor in Csurgó in 1266 or with Guylerm de Sancto Paulo,\textsuperscript{651} preceptor of Čiče who attended the provincial chapter held in Csurgó in 1275.

Much more is known about the Angevin period, chiefly owing to the fact that unlike Csurgó, Újudvar continued its activity as a place of authentication until the decree of King Louis I of 1351.\textsuperscript{652} In addition, the leaders of the preceptory, with some exceptions, are known by their full names, providing a better chance to identify their origins. The orientation towards the Priory of Venice during the priorship of the Gragnanas was already mentioned in \textit{Chapter V}, including the role potentially played by John of Pula as preceptor.\textsuperscript{653} After his activity, the Italian presence became even stronger. In 1329, Raynerio of Lucca was the preceptor of Újudvar, while between 1336 and 1346 Giovanni Latini de Perugia whose local (Hungarian-Slavonian) career most likely started here. By 1344 he was also administering the Sopron preceptory and he became in effect the lieutenant of the prior until 1346. From the mid-fourteenth century, however, Újudvar was managed separately only once, in 1371.\textsuperscript{654} The preceptory was jointly administered with Sopron (1344),\textsuperscript{655} with Székesfehérvár and Karaševo (1357),\textsuperscript{656} and with Csurgó, led by the Beaumonts, from 1366. It seems from the extant charters that the residence of the common preceptor was Csurgó. Perhaps it accelerated the slow decay of Újudvar since the estates of the preceptory were pledged by the prior, John of Palisna, to the Kanizsas in 1382.\textsuperscript{657} The pledge set such a high amount of money (4,000 golden florins) that there was no effort to redeem them any longer. Therefore the possibility must be raised that it was a feigned \textit{inpinignoratio} and in reality the estates of the Order had

\textsuperscript{651}Fejér CD 4/3: 322-330; 9/7: 680-682; RA nos. 1502-1503.

\textsuperscript{652}See in \textit{Chapter VIII}. The last charter which was issued by Újudvar as a place of authentication was procured in 1352. Nagy, Zala vármegye története, 1: 514-515. See also, Antics, A Johannita-rend története és az újudvari konvent, passim.

\textsuperscript{653}Dl.106115, Df.258480, AOkl 10: 111-112.

\textsuperscript{654}``...frater Baldonus crucifer, preceptor de Wyoduar...,'' Smičklas 14: 362-363.

\textsuperscript{655}``...fratris Johanni Latini viceprioris nostri necnon preceptoris domorum nostrarum de Sopron et Novacuria,'' Dl.100023

\textsuperscript{656}Dl.41319.

\textsuperscript{657}Fejér CD 9/7: 467-469; 10/1: 52.
been sold.

***

Győr

| Toonym                    | County          | Patrocinium | First mention | Last mention | Founder / "Affiliation"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Győr</td>
<td>Győr</td>
<td>John the Baptist</td>
<td>1238/1271</td>
<td>1550/1554</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitalis</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+ (balneum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1329</td>
<td>Pietro de Gragnana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the dating and the localization of the preceptory are problematic. As mentioned in Chapter III, the scholarly literature has identified a certain Pethe, who appeared in 1216, as the preceptor of Győr. Not repeating the argument, it remains dubious. Thus the first real data concerning Győr comes from 1238, when, similar to Esztergom, King Béla IV gave the Order a public bath there. As a matter of fact, it still does not fully prove that there also was a house (domus) and/or a community of the Hospitallers whether the bath functioned as a dependency and a source of income. Still it required the presence of a brother. This sort of questioning also concerns the estates. Ede Reiszig and others have identified the villa cruciferorum between Győr and Baráti as belonging to the Hospital in 1261, although it cannot be ruled out that it was the property of the Templars. Nonetheless, King Stephen V, by the token of the royal planning of Győr, made the Hospitallers and their people move to the castle by providing all the settlers the exemptions of the hospites. Unfortunately, it is not clear from the charter who exactly moved (and from where) to the territory of the castle of

---

658 Csáinki 3: 541; Reiszig 2: 69-74; ÁMF 2: 591-592; 596-598;

659 He also acted as the preceptor of Székesfehérvár, V arasd, and Gyánt.

660 “... hoc autem factum est in presentia ... et Pethe magistri hospitalis Domus...” ÁUO 1: 139-140.

661 Fejér CD 4/1: 104-111; 9/5: 153; Smičiklas 4: 48-50; MES 1: 326; RA no. 637.

662 HOkl 40; Fejér CD 2: 328-329, 382; ÁMF 2: 605; Fejér CD 7/5: 328-329 (wrongly dated).
Györ.\textsuperscript{663} The next and at the same time the last data comes from 1329, when Pietro de Gragnana administered the dependencies belonging to Györ, Székesfehérvár, Varasd, and Gyánt.\textsuperscript{664} Tracing relationships on a map, it seems that this particular constellation of preceptories was not due to any economic rationality. Most likely the nephew of the prior was assigned to all the preceptories which were vacant at that time. A St. Catherine hospital is known to have existed in Györ from the 1420s, but there is no evidence that it was built by the Order in the period under query.

***

Sopron

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toonym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sopron\textsuperscript{665}</td>
<td>Sopron</td>
<td>John the Baptist</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

formally Templar: domus castrum hospitale locus credibilis

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/ interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>Rudewan\textsuperscript{666}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1276</td>
<td>Theoderic</td>
<td>Dytric crucifer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1278</td>
<td>Rodian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1289</td>
<td>Detric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297-1300</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302-1307</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1308-1321</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325-1336</td>
<td>Lorenzo of Perugia\textsuperscript{667}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{663} ... ita ut de ipsorum medio malignorum cavillatio amputetur, quosdam populos castri jauriensis ... populos et cruciferorum domus hospitalis s. Joannis ... iisdem hospitibus nostris coniunximus,” Fejér CD 5/1: 146-149; A M F 2: 592.

\textsuperscript{664} Df.257974, Df.258481.


\textsuperscript{666} Styled as commendator in the charter.

\textsuperscript{667} In 1329 he also acted as the preceptor of Egyházasfalva and Bő.
Even Sopron, one of the best studied preceptories of the Priory, has raised several questions awaiting satisfactory answers concerning the presence of the Hospitallers. The first time that the Order was linked with the County of Sopron was in 1217. King Andrew II, upon his stay in the Holy Land, gave the gate-toll of Babót to the Hospital. I am also of the opinion maintained by some scholars that this act indirectly proves that there was no house of the Order in Sopron, because if so this would have been given the grant. The Sopron preceptory could have guaranteed the responsiones to be sent to the Convent. I refuse to accept the idea of most scholars that a charter of 1225 proves the existence of a preceptory in Sopron. It seems more likely that the Hospitallers settled in the town sometime between 1247 and 1250. This is already implied by the contract mentioned in Chapter III reporting that the Hospital had assumed the responsibility to station fifty knights in Pozsony, Moson, Sopron, Vasvár, and Újvár or other places against Christian invaders. The brethren did not start building a castle but they -- settled in a dwelling-tower and two houses and -- made an agreement with the locals to guard one of the towers of the town. Negotiations, however, soon fell into disaccord. The king entrusted the count of Sopron to heal the breach between

---

668 He also acted as the lieutenant prior of Hungary. Perhaps Sopron was, for a while, administered as camera (vice)prioralis.

669 He also acted as the lieutenant prior of Hungary and the preceptor of Újudvar from 1336. From 1346 he became the protector of Sopron.

670 Between 1360 and 1368 he also acted as the preceptor of Dubica, Gora, and, in 1360-1361, the castellan of Mőstanica.

671 Fejér CD 3/1: 239-243; Cartulaire no. 1590; Theiner 1: 16; RA no. 328; Fenyvesi, Tolna megye középkori történetéhez kapcsolódó oklevelek, 19; Burgenlandes 1: 72, 182.

672 Reiszig 2: 84; Belitzky, Sopron vármegye története, 494.


the parties. Nonetheless, the house itself, the hospital and a chapel dedicated to St. John the Baptist (built shortly after 1250) were situated outside the walls of the castle of Sopron along the road towards Vienna. Its topographical location clearly mirrors the original objectives of the Order, thus it cannot be ruled out that the community was founded earlier than concluded above, partly because at the foundation of a hospital defensive considerations were not of primary importance. On the other hand, the mid-thirteenth century was by far not the period when the Order preferred the foundation of hospitals in European priories. Western provinces were over the peak of the establishment of institutions of such hospitaller function and the Order endeavored to transfer these hospitals into secular management. It is an important parallel since virtually nothing is known about the activity of the Sopron hospital. The brethren ran the hospital but this activity came to an end in 1346 when the Priory handed over its management to the town. In order to provide the financial basis for the institution, the lieutenant prior ordered half of the revenues from the tolls to be applied to the maintenance of the hospital. The rest had to be reserved for the Hospitaller house and the chapel. It undoubtedly betokened a crisis and can be reinforced by the fact that the convent ceased to act as a place of authentication in 1349, before the ban introduced by King Louis I in 1351.

More interesting than the above overview is the list of preceptors of the administrative unit of Sopron. There is no need to argue for the non-local origin of the preceptors in the...

---


Arpadian period although it is striking that these are patently not Latin-like names. This phenomenon certainly raises the possibility that local German townsmen\(^\text{681}\) acted as the preceptors of Sopron, which was also partly mirrored in the terminology since they used the commendator expression from time to time. This idea is also confirmed by the fact that, on the basis of their names, any of the preceptors might have been of local origin for more than two decades from 1279. Nevertheless, there is only a certain Peter preceptor (1308-1321) of Sopron whose local origin (from the urbanized noble Dági/Agendorfer family) can be proved.\(^\text{682}\) It is conceivable that the leadership of the Order (the prior) was dissatisfied with the activity of the “locals” since a new era began from 1325. This period had two basic characteristics. First, from this time onwards preceptors of foreign origin administered the belongings of the preceptories or at least enjoyed its incomes. Second, the reorganization of the administrative units following the takeover of the Templar properties remarkably concerned the Sopron preceptory since two of the former Templar dependencies were located in the vicinity of Sopron: Bő and Christiana. By 1325-1326 Lorenzo of Perugia administered all three of these domus\(^\text{683}\) and by this token he opened a Perugian period for more than twenty-five years, which only was interrupted for a short while by the Provençal Fulco Rocafo lii in 1340.\(^\text{684}\) At the same time, the decay of the preceptory started and the indirect implication of this was the fact that the unit was assigned to the lieutenant prior. I believe that the lieutenant prior acted at times as a sort of superintendent and those preceptories which fell under his command can be regarded as camera viceprioralis. The decline of the Sopron preceptory was only completed during the preceptorship of Giovanni Latini of Perugia (1344-1349), which became manifest in the conveyance of the hospital into the hands of the municipal governors. In addition, the penultimate name on the list, a certain Paul, occurred in

---

\(^\text{681}\) The possibility that Detryc crucifer (1276) is identical with the preceptor in 1298 perhaps indicates the mobility within the preceptory. Házi, Sopron szabad királyi város története, 1/1: 5-6; HO 3: 24-25.


\(^\text{684}\) Smičiklas 10: 555-557; A Okl 24: 163.
connection with forging charters, which implies a laxity of discipline in the convent before 1350, although was not forged in the preceptory. The “end game” -- strictly speaking about the period under query -- took place in the course of the preceptorship of Albert (1358-1361), who simultaneously administered units geographically distant from each other. Sopron, Dubica, Gora et castellan of Moštanica. Since Sopron was the only preceptory situated north of the Drava River, it is highly unlikely that Albert was resident in northwestern Hungary. Moreover, although Albert headed Dubica and Gora up to 1368, there is no further information about the Sopron preceptory.

***

Gyánt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gyánt788</td>
<td>Tolna</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1260-1280</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/ interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
<td>Mauricius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329</td>
<td>Pietro de Gragnana789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348-1361</td>
<td>Donat790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gyánt was listed among the gifts of Queen Euphrosyne confirmed in 1193, but the next information about it is relatively late, in the second half of the thirteenth century. The first data is an undated charter issued by the preceptor of Gyánt as a place of authentication, which

---

785 “Paulus tunc ... crucifer ... quem in ipsa domo hospitali reperissent,” Nagy, Sopron vármegye története, 214-220.


787 Thallóczy-Horváth, Alsó-Szlavóniai okmánytár, 224-225.

788 Reiszig 2: 67-69.

789 Also acted as the preceptor of Székesfehérvár, Varasd, and Győr.

790 Also acted as the preceptor of Székesfehérvár and from 1349 as lieutenant prior of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory.
might have been enacted ad hoc.\textsuperscript{691} Gusztáv Wenzel, the editor of the document, dated it to 1286 while the archivists of the National Archives of Hungary determined its post and ante quem as 1260 and 1280.\textsuperscript{692} Unfortunately, no explanation was provided for any of these suggestions. What is certain is that the preceptory was located in Tolna County and that its first known preceptor was a certain Mauricius, of unknown origin. Little can be learned about the activity of the preceptory in the Arpadian and Angevin periods. In 1329, as mentioned above, Pietro de Gragnana administered the preceptory jointly with Székesfehérvár, Varasd, and Győr.\textsuperscript{693} From 1348 the preceptor of Székesfehérvár also headed Gyánt until 1361\textsuperscript{694} and, as in the example of Sopron, this preceptory fell under the command of the lieutenant prior, which could have been the first step towards losing autonomy. This was the case with Gyánt; thereafter it became the dependency of Székesfehérvár and occurs in the sources as an estate.\textsuperscript{695}

***

Dopsin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dopsin\textsuperscript{696}</td>
<td>Valkó</td>
<td></td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1356/1384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel: unknown

Dopsin was one of the little-known preceptories situated in the southern region. Practically, we have two pieces of information which indicate the existence of a preceptory at Dopsin in

\textsuperscript{691}See Chapter VIII.

\textsuperscript{692}Df.25765; ÁUO 12: 450.

\textsuperscript{693}Df.257974, Df.258481. The Italian notary recorded the toponym as Gionto.

\textsuperscript{694}Dl.106127, Dl.106134; Fejér CD 8/2: 588; A O K l 8: 231-232; Fenyvesi, Tolna megye középkori történetéhez kapcsolódó oklevelek, 79; Thallóczy-Horváth, Alsó-Szlavóniai okmánytár, 66. Smičiklas 13: 153.

\textsuperscript{695}Reiszig 2: 70-71.

\textsuperscript{696}Reiszig 2: 39; Lelja Dobronić, Viteški redovi, 157-158; Dobronić, Posjedi i Sjedišta Templara, Ivanovaca i Sepulkralaca, 65, 124-125, 148.
Valkó County: from 1263 and 1300. There is also a presumption concerning Dopsin. A certain Adam, preceptor of the “houses in Syrmium,” perhaps also administered Dopsin in 1315. The last two data, recorded in 1356 and 1384, report only an estate of the Order at Dopsin. The latter two certainly do not rule out that Dopsin still functioned as a preceptory, but, unfortunately, do not prove it either. What is more, by the charter of 1384 Riccardo Caracciolo assigned Baudoin de Monte Iustino to the preceptories of Našice, Karaševo, and Szentlörinc and gave him licentiam recuperandi possessionem Dobze sitam in prioratu nostra. If there were a separate administrative unit at Dopsin that had been entitled to recover its possessions.

***

Pakrac

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakrac</td>
<td>Požega/K riž</td>
<td></td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>1367/1522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>- 704</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1278/1279</td>
<td>Hugo 705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

697 “… cum cruciferis de Dubza et per eundem fluvium Wlkou… “ Fejér CD 4/3: 138-142; Smičiklas 5: 264-266.


699 A O 1: 376, 389-390; A O k1 4: 11-12, 85.

700 Fejér CD 9/2: 520.

701 À O M 281, fol. 37°. See in Appendix B no. 69.


703 Received as an estate from King Andrew II.

704 Cf. Szentiván (Trnava).
Pakrac was one of the most important preceptories of the Priory over the Drava River. The reason lies in the fact that the nucleus estate had been received by the Order even before the first turn towards Slavonia in 1238.\textsuperscript{707} It cannot be reconstructed when exactly this became a separate unit. However, it cannot be ruled out that the preceptor of Pakrac was mentioned in the course of the inspection of the boundaries of an estate in Požega County (to which Pakrac belonged at that time) in 1250.\textsuperscript{708} It is palpable that the convent of the preceptory also acted as a place of authentication from (or before) 1266\textsuperscript{709} even though it was not regular and it came to an end by 1278. 1293 was the last moment of the Arpadian period when we are informed about the preceptory.\textsuperscript{710} In fact, if Lucchetus was not the preceptor of the Lombard Yporregia then it is likely that he headed Pakrac in 1294.\textsuperscript{711} The table above may give the impression that the preceptory had perished by the end of the Arpadian period. The point is that it was not possible to reconstruct the personnel of the preceptory, nonetheless, the Priory had its important unit and residence at Pakrac for much longer. Between 1326 and 1340 at least four provincial chapters were held at Pakrac. Ede Reisz\includegraphics[width=10cm]{image1.png} ig ascertains a castle at Pakrac from 1357, however, the idea in this form is not supported by sources.\textsuperscript{712} The first reference can be found in 1326 when a charter mentions the castellanus castri s. Joannis de Pucherts.\textsuperscript{713} We believe, unlike popular apprehensions,\textsuperscript{714} that the St. John castle was in the

\textsuperscript{705} Also acted as the lieutenant of the prior of Hungary.

\textsuperscript{706} Receptor Yporregia. Several spellings of Pakrác are known from the sources: Pukruch, Pocrica, Pocrizze; Cf. also “...In prioratu Lombardie: fratrem Georgium de Yporregia preceptorem...” (1365) AOM 319, fol. 324v. “...“Anthonius de Sancto Paulo preceptor Yporegie...” (1393), A OM 326, fol. 125v-126v.

\textsuperscript{707} Fejér CD 4/1: 104-111; 9/5: 153; Smi\includegraphics[width=10cm]{image2.png} klas 4: 48-50; MES 1: 326; RA no. 637.


\textsuperscript{709} Smi\includegraphics[width=10cm]{image4.png} klas 5: 411-413; HO 6: 138-142.

\textsuperscript{710} HO 7: 228-230; Smi\includegraphics[width=10cm]{image5.png} klas 7: 133-135;

\textsuperscript{711} Smi\includegraphics[width=10cm]{image6.png} klas 7: 171-172.

\textsuperscript{712} Reisz\includegraphics[width=10cm]{image7.png} g 2: 81.

\textsuperscript{713} Fejér CD 8/3: 147-149; A O kl 10: 146-147.
vicinity of Pakrac and was dependent upon Pakrac until 1326. However, the Order made an exchange of estates with King Charles I in 1328 and by its token possession of Trnava, situated closer to the castle than Pakrac, was taken by the Hospital; thus the castle was separated from the Pakrac preceptory. The domus of Pakrac appeared last in the period under query in 1367, but it only vanished from the sources in 1401 as it was still used by the Hospital, admittedly with decreasing importance during the last two decades of the Angevin period.

***

Čiće

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toonym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First Mentention</th>
<th>Last Mentention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Čican – Ćiće 116</td>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Interval</th>
<th>Preceptor</th>
<th>Custos</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>Lector</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Guylerm de Sancto Paulo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293</td>
<td>Oris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first information about a preceptory in the vicinity of the castle of Selyn in Zagreb County, or, better to say, about its preceptor, goes back to 1270. Conceivably, the nucleus

---


716 Fejér CD 9/2: 624; Smičiklas 12: 414. Fejér wrongly dated it to 1357 and Smičiklas took it for granted. Thus it is also wrong in Dobronić’s work. Cf. Dobronić, Posjedi i Sjedišta Templara, Ivanovaca i Sepulkralaca, 60.

717 Mályusz, Zsigmondkori oklevél tár, 2: no. 1051.


of the future preceptory was received by the Hospital in the first third of the thirteenth century. There are indications in a charter of 1293 in which the lieutenant prior confirmed the exemptions of the hospites of the village situated in the neighborhood of the castle of Selyn.  

Although the Order settled down in this region relatively early, the management of its estates was not successful with the settlers. An important issue of the provincial chapter of 1275 was the renting out the estates (terrae vacuae et quasi desertae) belonging to Čice. It did not permanently resolve the problem, but deferred it for a good while. The Priory made another attempt in the summer of 1327 and farmed out the adjacent lands, but most likely in the meantime the prior had initiated negotiations with King Charles I concerning an exchange of estates. Charters issued in February and March 1328 already reported an accord accomplished with the Hungarian ruler. Moreover, it turns out from these documents that the introduction of the king into the newly acquired estates failed. The exchange does not necessarily imply the immediate closing-down of the preceptory, but there is no further information about this administrative unit.

***

Tolmács

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tonym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tolmács</td>
<td>Nógrád</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>Palatine Denis, son of Denis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>Peter²⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²²² HO 7: 228-230; Smičiklas 7: 133-135.

²⁷¹ Á U O 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Smičiklas 6: 137-138.


²²³ Smičiklas 9: 378-381, 383-385; A O kl 12: 43, 55, 82.

²²⁴ Reisz 2: 142; Á MF 4: 308.

²²⁵ He also acted as the preceptor of Szirák and Szomolya.
The basis for Tolmács -- a preceptory in close relations with Szirá, Esztergom and Szomolya -- was an estate given by Palatine Dionysius. He donated a piece of land at the restoration of the castle-goods in 1239, which was said to be situated within the confines of Jenő. Accordingly, Tolmács began to grow into a separate preceptory as one of the very rare private donations. The next, and unfortunately the last piece of information is the withdrawal of the above-mentioned rent in 1274, when Tolmács was administered jointly with Esztergom, Szirá, and Szomolya.\textsuperscript{726}

***

Szomolya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / &quot;Affiliation&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Szomolya\textsuperscript{727} – Borsosberény</td>
<td>Nógrád</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>Esztergom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/ interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>Peter\textsuperscript{728}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was managed together with the preceptories of Esztergom, Szirá, and Tolmács in 1274.\textsuperscript{729} The ruins of the former Hospitaller building (-complex?) can be seen at the boundaries of present-day Borsosberény.\textsuperscript{730}

***

Torda

---

\textsuperscript{726}Á U O 9: 92; M E S 2: 45. See also Géza Kovács, Adatok Tolmács község történetéhez [Data concerning the history of Tolmács village] (Tolmács: Kovács Géza, 1993), 9. Kovács mentions, without clear reference, that the Tolmács domus burnt down and was rebuilt in 1321.

\textsuperscript{727}Csánski 1: 89, 108; Reiszig 2: 141; Á M F 4: 300.

\textsuperscript{728}He also acted as the preceptor of Szirá and Tolmács.

\textsuperscript{729}Kovács, Adatok Tolmács község történetéhez, 110.

\textsuperscript{730}Á U O 9: 92; M E S 2: 45.
Torda, located far from the “core” of the Priory, is the only preceptory of the Hospital east of the Danube River whose existence can be proven. Nothing is known about its foundation. The first data which can be linked to the community at Torda is the witness of a certain Detric crucifer made while recording a last will in Radna in 1268.\(^{733}\) Nevertheless, it is only logistics that makes us to think that if Detric had anything in common with the Hospital then it must have been the preceptory of Torda as it was by far the closest administrative unit. The next piece of information also concerns a last will: in 1274 a certain Frustan, crucifer of Torda, appear, as a testimonium in Miriszló (Mereslou), some twenty kilometers from Torda.\(^{734}\) Part of the activity as a place of authentication is also apparent in the issuance of charters by around 1288; a charter, issued by the convent, was mentioned during an investigation held in the village of the Order (Villa Cruciferorum) close to Torda. The often-mentioned charter of 1276, attributed to the convent, is a nineteenth-century forgery.\(^{735}\) The short, known history of the preceptory ended at the end of the Arpadian period: Myle preceptor issued two charters as a place of authentication in 1295 and 1296.\(^{736}\) Although the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Torda(^{731})</th>
<th>Torda Holy Cross</th>
<th>mention</th>
<th>mention</th>
<th>“Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1268)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Detric crucifer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frustan crucifer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1276)</td>
<td>James of Wechelyn(^{732})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1295-96</td>
<td>Myle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{731}\)Reiszig 2: 142-143; Kozák, “Constructions,” 119-121.

\(^{732}\)He appears in a forgery.


\(^{734}\)Fejér CD 5/2: 223-224; 5/2: 604-606; Zimmermann-Werner, Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen, 1: 124-125; Jakó, Codex diplomaticus Transsylvaniae, 234.

\(^{735}\)Fejér CD 7/4: 166-167; Jerney, “A magyarországi káptalanok és konventek,” 120-121; Reiszig 2: 143; Jakó, Codex diplomaticus Transsylvaniae, 239.

\(^{736}\)Fejér CD 6/1: 366-368; 7/4: 236; Jakó, Codex diplomaticus Transsylvaniae, 304-305, 307-309. The charter of 1297 which mentions the village of the Hospitallers is a forgery. Jakó, Codex diplomaticus
village of the Order at Torda was mentioned even later, the preceptory does not occur again in the sources. A long prevailing idea emerged concerning the existence of the preceptory well up to 1360. Dezső Csánki and Ede Reiszig mention a charter -- which although its archival signature was reported lost by Reiszig -- referring to the preceptor of Torda. The chronology of the document has been restored by Zsigmond Jakó and it is clear that it was issued in 1296 but it only survived as a mid-fourteenth-century copy. Still, it is doubtful that the preceptory could vanish “overnight” at the turn of the thirteenth century. This skepticism is partly reinforced by indirect data from 1315, when the prior set the conditions of a lease. Accordingly, if the prior (here Rolando de Gragnana) happened to travel to Transylvania, then the leaseholders (nobles of Karul) were supposed to provide two-days’ food and fodder (descensus) on the way and on the return journey. It cannot be ruled out that one of the sites to be visited might have been Torda; nonetheless, it is also likely that the place of destination was in Szatmár County, where the Hospital also possessed lands in the neighborhood of the nobles of Károly (Karul). For a prior of Italian origin it was a remissible sin to confuse north Transylvania with Szatmár County. The Hungarian Hospitaller Master Ferrustan sold certain estates of the Order at Adony (Bereg County) and at Vezend (Szatmár County) in 1262, but in the course of a debate over landed properties in 1327 it turned out that the Hospital still had lands in the vicinity of Károly in Szatmár County. It cannot be ruled out that these estates were administered from Torda.

---

737 E.g., DI.28574, AO kl 2: 38-39; Zimmermann-Werner, Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen, 1: 216; DI.30376.

738 Csánki 5: 683; Reiszig 2: 143; Jakó, Codex diplomaticus Transsylvaniae, 310-311.

739 AO 1: 389-390; AO kl 4: 85.

740 Present-day Nagykároly.


Although Ede Reiszig constantly insists that the Hospital had a convent in Dada in 1244, in the charter quoted by him it is not stated expressis verbis. A certain terra cruciferorum is mentioned, which no doubt could have been the nucleus of a later separate administrative unit. There is grounds for speaking about a preceptory from 1275. In 1279, King Ladislas IV, at the confirmation of the Dominican nuns of Margitsziget, relied upon the inspection of the boundaries delineated in 1275 which mentioned Dada. It is difficult to figure out the absolute chronology from the document, but it seems that the preceptory still existed in 1279. Reiszig seems to identify it from the charter as Belynd (sic!) but from the wording it not unequivocal: ... nobiles Belyud, videlicet Seruus Dei, et Preceptor de Dada contradictores extiterunt. Thereafter Dada ceased to exist as a separate unit. Since there were estates belonging to the Székesfehérvár preceptory, most likely these were united in terms of administration. This theory is reinforced by the fact that in 1335 the preceptor of Székesfehérvár rented out the estates which had formerly belonged to Dada.

---

744Dl.12171.
745"... preceptor de Dada ... metae terrae Egidii predicti et cruciferorum de Dada ... populis cruciferorum hospitalariorum de Dada... “ Fejér CD 7/5: 404-418.
746Fejér CD 5/2: 528-543; ÁUO 9: 227-238.
747ÁUO 9: 159-162.
748Fejér CD 8/4: 129-130.
The preceptory is known for more than a century, still, virtually nothing is known about its activity. The reason for such a lapse can be explained partly by the fact that owing to proximity, its dependencies were often administered together with those of Csurgó. On the other hand, it seems that at times Udvarhely was confused with Újudvar, as happened, for instance, at the provincial chapter held in Csurgó in 1275. Hugo Boraldy, besides being the preceptor of Csurgó and the lieutenant prior, administered the membra of Udvarhely. The preceptory functioned separately in 1329, although it is unknown for how long since the hitherto separate unit appeared in the sources “only” as possessio in 1353 and 1380. However, Udvarhely again appeared as a preceptory, admittedly not alone, in 1384: ...

***

749 He also acted as the preceptor of Csurgó and the lieutenant prior of Hungary.

750 Cf. 1336 Johannes Molaraxon in Chapter IV.

751 He also acted as the preceptor of Dubica and Csurgó.


753 Dl. 106125, Dl. 98631.

754 AOM 281, fol. 37v. Although the huge distance makes it uncertain that these units were indeed administered together.
Bela

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bela ~ Belavar</td>
<td>Varasd ~ Varaždin</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>1440/41</td>
<td>Csurgo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus castrum hospitale</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Margarita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293</td>
<td>Gwyllerm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322</td>
<td>Girardo de Gragnana</td>
<td>castellan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329</td>
<td>John of Pula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1340</td>
<td>Dionysius castellan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1376</td>
<td>Gwyllerm de Alcaniz</td>
<td>castellan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reiszeg introduced the history of Bela as being taken from the Templars, but it is apparent that this unit is not identical with the one also called Bela, which still has not been properly localized. The nucleus of the future preceptory was an (originally castle-) estate which the Order received in 1238.\(^{761}\) It is unknown when the core of the preceptory, the castle, was erected. The preceptor of Bela, a certain Margarita, attended to the provincial chapter in 1275, but not as castellan.\(^{762}\) Nor is information available about either the castle or its

---


\(^{756}\)He also acted as the lieutenant of the prior of Hungary.

\(^{757}\)He also acted as the lieutenant of the prior of Hungary.

\(^{758}\)He also acted as the preceptor of Újudvar in 1326.

\(^{759}\)He also acted as the preceptor of Zelinaszentmártón and Glogovnica.

\(^{760}\)He also acted as the preceptor of Glogovnica in 1361 and that of Zelinaszentmártón (Božjakovina) in 1376.

\(^{761}\)Fejér CD 4/1: 104-111; 9/5: 153; Smičiklas 4: 48-50; MES 1: 326; RA no. 637.

\(^{762}\)ÁUO 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Smičiklas 6: 137-138.
castellan until the beginning of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{763} Obviously, since a castellan appeared in 1306, this clearly refers to the existence of a castle.\textsuperscript{764} The history of the castle, however, was quite adventuresome. The sons of Warden Henry, local oligarchs and thus the enemies of Charles I, occupied the castle 1315 and it was only regained by Nicholas, son of Peter of Ludbreg, in the course of the next year.\textsuperscript{765} Most likely it happened after Rolando de Gragnana left Hungary and there was no head of the Priory for a long while. The new prior, Filippo de Gragnana, was appointed in 1317 but arrived at his priory as late as 1320. Upon his arrival he immediately rewarded Nicholas for his fidelity and help.\textsuperscript{766} The importance of the castle was perhaps mirrored in the fact that in his absence Filippo had committed the fortification to his lieutenant, Girardo de Gragnana.\textsuperscript{767} In 1329 the preceptor was the same John of Pula\textsuperscript{768} who had administered the preceptory of Újudvar in 1326,\textsuperscript{769} and irrespective of the direction of horizontal mobility he stayed close to his patria proper.

There is a hiatus in the “news” of the castle during the vacancy of the Priory (1330-1335), nonetheless, the newly appointed prior, Pierre Cornuti, issued his first charter here (in castro nostro Bella) in 1336.\textsuperscript{770} However, neither the preceptor nor the castellan is known from this year. Some years later, a certain Dionysius acted as castellan of Bela, simultaneously heading the preceptories of Zelinaszentmárton and Glogovnica.\textsuperscript{771} The geographical proximity implies that it was feasible to administer these units jointly, but this also can indicate that after a long peace following the consolidation of Charles I the castle

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{763} Df.257974, Df.258481.
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\bibitem{765} Df.257974, Df.258481.
\bibitem{766} Dl.106115, Df.258480, AOkl 10: 111-112.
\bibitem{767} Ók 2: 55-56; Smičiklas 9: 97-98; AOkl 6: 316-317.
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\bibitem{770} AOkl 1: 273.
\bibitem{761} Df.257974, Df.258481.
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\bibitem{768} Smičiklas 8: 114-115; Cartulaire no. 4711; AOkl 2: 12-13.
\bibitem{769} Smičiklas 8: 114-115; Cartulaire no. 4711; AOkl 2: 12-13.
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\bibitem{771} Smičiklas 8: 114-115; Cartulaire no. 4711; AOkl 2: 12-13.
was losing from its significance. On the other hand, from 1350 an influential Hospitaller, Gwylerm de Alcaniz, acted as the castellan of Béla for more than a quarter of a century. He is known for accumulating titles or for concentrating power. Besides his status as castellan, he also headed the preceptory of Csurgó (1355-1363), Glogovnica in 1361, and Zelina-szentmárton between 1361 and 1376. The stability of his position is indicated by the fact that he outlived the otherwise long priorship of Baudoin Cornuti. No other castellans are known until the end of the period under query, but the castle and/or the preceptory did not vanish, since John of Palisna, jr., the nephew of the rebellious prior, “retired” here in 1389 and stayed until at least 1396.\footnote{\textsuperscript{772}}

***

Margitsziget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margitsziget ~ Insula Leporum\footnote{\textsuperscript{773}}</td>
<td>Pilis</td>
<td></td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel: unknown

This was a relatively short-lived unit of the Hospital. Some of scholars have attributed the building of the castle to the new defensive policy of King Béla IV; it has been linked especially with his letter sent to Pope Innocent IV around 1247. The Hungarian ruler informed the pope that “the other part [of the Hospitallers] has been placed for the defence of those castles we had erected alongside the River Danube since our people are untrained.”\footnote{\textsuperscript{774}}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{772}}Di.92043; Di.104707, Mányusz, Zsigmondkori oklevéltár, 1: no. 4455; Di.33058.


\footnote{\textsuperscript{774}}Fejér CD 4/2: 218-224; Theiner 1: 230-232; Senga, “IV. Béla külpolitikája,” 590-605; K atona, A tatárijárás emlékezete, 341-344. The letter was dated by Toru Senga to 1247 but this does not rule out 1248. Tamás K atona dated the letter to 1250, while György Győrffy first put it in 1253 (György Győrffy, Pest-Buda kialakulása. Budapest története a honfoglalástól az Árpád-kor végi székvárossá alakulásig [The development of Pest-Buda. A history of Budapest from the conquest until the tranformation into a capital city at the end of the Arpadian period] (Budapest: A kadémiai Kiadó, 1997), 178) and somewhat later to around 1250 (ÁMF 4: 652); Horler, “A johanniták és a korai magyar vártípus,” 138.
cannot be ruled out that the Hospital seized the square-shaped, four-corner-tower castle\textsuperscript{775} in the southern part of Margitsziget, which, according to the wording of the source was built by the king and not by the brethren. Nonetheless, the presence of the Order can only be proved during the reign of King Ladislas IV.\textsuperscript{776} In addition, besides the mere possession, nothing is known about the activity of the Hospitallers on the “island of rabbits.” It is conceivable that the brethren abandoned the castle after the Mongols ceased to be a menace and the death of Béla IV.

\[\text{***}\]

Ljuba

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Toponym & County & Patrocinium & First mention & Last mention & Founder / “Affiliation” \\
\hline
Ljuba – Ljubac\textsuperscript{777} & Croatia & & 1303 & 1350 & Warden Paul \\
formerly Templar & domus & castrum & hospitale & locus credibilis & other (church, chapel, etc.) \\
- & + & - & +? & - & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Personnel:

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
year/interval & preceptor & custos & prior & lector & other \\
\hline
1303 & N. & & & & \\
1350 & James of Redeoterio & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

A misleading picture has been drawn of the preceptory in the scholarly literature so far. Lelja Dobronić counted on the Hospitaller presence in Ljuba from the very beginning of the thirteenth century (1205),\textsuperscript{778} but those data most likely referred to a public/municipal hospital dedicated to St. John and only partly to Templar dependencies.\textsuperscript{779} Nonetheless, the “history” of the Hospitaller preceptory began around the end of the Arpadian period. The Master of the

\textsuperscript{775}Györffy, Pest-Buda kialakulása, 178; Irás-M elis, “Die Margaretsinsel und ihre Klöster im Mittelalter,” 412.


\textsuperscript{777}Dobronić, Vitezki redovi, 154; Dobronić, Posjedi i Sjedišta Templara, Ivanovaca i Sepulkralaca, 89-91, 148-149.

\textsuperscript{778}Smičiklas 3: 50-52; Fejér 7/5: 166-170.

\textsuperscript{779}Smičiklas 4: 162-163, 202-203; Fejér CD 7/4: 91; Á U O 2: 143-144, 146-147.
Hospital, Guillaume de Villaret himself, mentioned in a letter of 1303 that the Priory received Ljuba together with an island from Paulus banus.\textsuperscript{780} It is conceivable that it may have been Paul Subić, warden of the Littoral (1278 to 1309), thus the gift can be dated between 1278 and 1303. The later activity of the preceptory is unknown. In 1350 it appeared as a separate unit under the command of a Provençal brother,\textsuperscript{781} but whether this entity was identical with the one recorded in 1303 or it was the former Templar property then headed by the fellow countrymen of Baudoin Cornuti cannot be proved.

***

Dubica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dubica</td>
<td>Dubica</td>
<td></td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitals</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/ interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1314</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347-58</td>
<td>Elias, son of Odozen of Kosucha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 1352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emeric, son of George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360-1368</td>
<td>Albert\textsuperscript{783}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13717)-1374</td>
<td>Arnold de Beaumont\textsuperscript{784}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375-76 (-83)</td>
<td>Albert\textsuperscript{784}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383-</td>
<td>Jacopo de Leone\textsuperscript{785}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384-</td>
<td>Arnold de Beaumont\textsuperscript{786}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385</td>
<td>Lucas\textsuperscript{787}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{780} Smičiklas 8: 59-60; A Okl 1: 250.

\textsuperscript{781} Smičiklas 11: 566-567.

\textsuperscript{782} Relszig 2: 39-42; Dobronić, Viteški redovi, 184-185; Dobronić, Posjedi i sjedišta Templara, Ivanovaca i Sepulkralaca, 68-70.

\textsuperscript{783} He also acted as the preceptor of Sopron, Gora, and castellan of Moštanica.

\textsuperscript{784} He formerly acted as the preceptor of Székesfehérvár.

\textsuperscript{785} He died before 1386.

\textsuperscript{786} He also acted as the preceptor of Újúdvar and Csurgó.

\textsuperscript{787} He also acted as the lieutenant prior of Hungary.
Dubica was founded by the Templars on the right bank of the Una River. It was among the first properties taken over since it was possessed by the Hospital in March 1314, and from 1329 at the latest the title of the Count of Dubica was usually borne by the preceptors of Dubica.\textsuperscript{789} Hereafter we have no news about the preceptory for a long time. The next and important moment was 1347. The preceptory was headed by a noble of local origin: Elias, son of Odolen of Kosuc(i)a.\textsuperscript{790} Although there are no genealogical surveys available, I have managed to figure out that Odolen was a local nobleman (died before 1354) and he had four sons, among them Elias.\textsuperscript{791} Another novelty was that during his preceptorship Dubica began to take part in pragmatic literacy as a place of authentication. This activity was confined to Dubica County, thus it might have been in connection with the lordship which the Hospital “inherited” from the Templars. It was perhaps also related to the fact that the members of the family of Elias were not only local landowners but played an active role in the county; for instance, Nicholas as comes terrestris. The preceptory partly began to follow this new path when a certain Albert was assigned to it in 1360.\textsuperscript{792} He was an ambitious local nobleman who had a remarkable career during his quarter of a century activity as a Hospitaller,\textsuperscript{793} nonetheless, he finally returned to Dubica. The exact moment of the succession is not known since Elias appears in a charter issued in August 1360 in which he was styled as Hospitaller,\textsuperscript{794} but as quondam preceptor. Albert, however, only acted as preceptor from

\textsuperscript{788}He also acted as the preceptor of Gora.

\textsuperscript{789}See in Chapter IV.

\textsuperscript{790}Thallóczy-Barabás, A Blagay-család oklevéltára, 123-124.


\textsuperscript{792}Fejér CD 9/3: 195.

\textsuperscript{793}See above.

\textsuperscript{794}"... frater Elias domus hospitalis ordinis sancti Iohannis Jerosolimitani condam preceptor de Dubycha et Stephanus eiusdem filii videlicet Odoloni nobilis de districtu Dubichensi ab una parte... " Thallóczy-Barabás, A Blagay-család oklevéltára, 145; Smičiklas 13: 49.
December of the same year.\textsuperscript{795}

Albert administered this unit until 1368\textsuperscript{796} while he also acted as the preceptor of Székesfehérvár and as lieutenant prior of Hungary by 1371 at the latest.\textsuperscript{797} I am of the opinion that the local career of Arnold of Beaumont began in Dubica in the absence of Albert, but it is hard to date it exactly. Only the end of the story is known, when, after his succession to the office of the prior, Albert returned to Dubica (winter 1374/75),\textsuperscript{798} while Arnold was assigned to the preceptories of Csurgó and Dubica. How long Albert headed the preceptory is not known; the only information is that due to his death Juan Fernandez Heredia assigned Jacopo de Leone, the Hospitaller captain at Smyrna, for ten years to Dubica in March 1383.\textsuperscript{799} Jacopo could not have served the full term of his office, partly because in July 1386 he had already been reported dead,\textsuperscript{800} but also because in May 1384 Riccardo Caracciolo appointed Arnold de Beaumont as the preceptor of Dubica.\textsuperscript{801} Perhaps as a means of compensation, Heredia assigned Jacopo to a vacant preceptorium in the Priory of Venice a couple of months later.\textsuperscript{802} No later than April 1385, however, a certain Lucas\textsuperscript{803} governed the preceptory, who, being an adherent of John of Palisna, may have been appointed by Heredia. The later career of Lucas is unknown, but in July 1386 Gérard Cornuti was appointed as the preceptor of Dubica for ten years by Raymond de Beaumont again. That is to say, there were four

\textsuperscript{795}Fejér CD 9/3: 195.

\textsuperscript{796}Thallóczy-Horváth, Alsó-Szlavóniai okmánytár, 224-225.

\textsuperscript{797}Cf. 5 September 1371, Dl.106160, Dl.106161. Admittedly, he did not bear the title of the prior but represented the Priory as a whole. It might have been thus due to the death of Donat, whom he succeeded in the office of the preceptor as well by 13 September. The death of Donat was reported \textit{expressis verbis} on 13 October. Dl.106162.

\textsuperscript{798}Dl.33758. It seems, however, that he retained his prioral status in Székesfehérvár. See above. In addition, he also acted for a while as the preceptor of K arašev; Dl.33758.

\textsuperscript{799}AOM 322, fol. 253'. Dobronić, Viteški redovi, 170-171 (with misreadings). See in \textsc{Appendix B} no. 67.

\textsuperscript{800}AOM 323, fol. 192'.

\textsuperscript{801}AOM 281, fol. 37'. Riccardo Caracciolo assigned Baudoin de Monte Iustino to the preceptories of Našice, K arašev and Szentlőrinc for ten years in May 1384. Baudoin appeared in Zara in November together with another Hospitaller, Petrus de Villa Musi, whose affiliation is unknown. Dl.7111, Fejér CD 10/2: 179.

\textsuperscript{802}AOM 322, fol. 222'.

\textsuperscript{803}Thallóczy-Horváth, Alsó-Szlavónia, 109, 111; Dl.35274.
appointed preceptors of Dubica within three years, assigned by the counter-parties alternately.

***

Gora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toonym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gora</td>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/ interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1314</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1322</td>
<td>Jacopo of Siena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340</td>
<td>Filippo of Perugia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358-1368</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386</td>
<td>Gerard Cornuti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The former Templar property was also taken over relatively early since it was administered by the Hospital as early as 1314. In this year a certain John headed the preceptory, whose task might have been the reorganization of the preceptory. Thereafter, the dependencies of the preceptory were governed by preceptors of foreign origin; in the first half of the 1320s Jacopo of Siena was preceptor, although it is unknown whether he was still in office when the prior convoked the provincial chapter in Gora in 1327. In 1340 Filippo de Perugia managed the goods of the preceptory, but his activity is obscure. The administrators of the unit are not known for the next two decades; all that is known is that the high officers of the

---


805He also acted as the preceptor of Sopron, Dubica, and castellan of Moštanica.

806According to Reiszig the Hospital possessed an estate here by 1284, but there is no such reference in the charter he quotes. Cf. Reiszig 2: 68; A UO 9: 411.

807Thallóczy-Barabáš, A Blagay-család oklevéltára, 74-75; Smičiklas 8: 353-354; A O kI 3: 316.


809Thallóczy-Barabáš, A Blagay-család oklevéltára, 99-100; Smičiklas 9: 341-342; A O kI 11: 126.
Priory gathered together here in 1353. This might have been a special meeting since the provincial chapter had been held a month earlier in Dubica.\textsuperscript{810} The reason for this reunion was that some of the leaseholders did not attend the first occasion in April, therefore they had been deprived of their rents.

The unknown preceptor was succeeded by Albert in 1358, who took over the administration of the preceptories south of the Sava River for a decade. After his death the preceptory occurred in the sources only once in 1384, when Riccardo Caracciolo assigned a Provençal Hospitaller, Gerard Cornuti, to Gora.\textsuperscript{811}

***

**Hresztva**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toonym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hresztva − Hresnó</td>
<td>Croatia?</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td></td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Personnel:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/ interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1314</td>
<td>Guellerim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 1314 this unit had also been taken over by the Hospital from the dissolved Templars but its location is still obscure.\textsuperscript{812} The above data is not only the first but also the last about this preceptory. Conceivably, it lost its status in the very beginning of the rearrangement of the administrative units after the takeover and it reappeared in the fifteenth century as an estate of the Priory.\textsuperscript{813}

***

**Našice**

\textsuperscript{810}Smičiklas 12: 165-167.

\textsuperscript{811}A OM 281, fol. 92v. See in APPENDIX B no. 73.

\textsuperscript{812}Thallóczy-Barabás, A Blagay-család oklevéltára, 74-75; Smičiklas 8: 353-354; Ao kl 3: 316.

\textsuperscript{813}Reiszig 2: 154.
The original Templar preceptory was taken over by the Hospital by 1315. Then it was administered by a Hospitaller preceptor, although it is not known whether he was identical with the one who appeared at Újudvar in 1307 or with another heading the preceptory at Gora in 1314. The figures of the Hospitaller brothers, Myrch and Andrew, reveal something interesting which may shed some light on this transition period. The prior rented out a piece of land which belonged to the preceptory (in territorio de Nekche) -- which was said to have usually been held by Myrch -- along with all its belongings exceptis curiis quas tenet Andrew presbiter. It seems from the wording of the charter as if the brothers held these dependencies like prebends. On the other hand, it is not clear how to understand the consueverat tenere expression. How is it possible to speak about usage after one or two years. Or can it be assumed that they were originally Templar brothers? Unfortunately, there is not enough source material to reconstruct the situation.

The next data are from 1323, when the prior rented out another landed property of the

---


815 He also acted as the preceptor of Karaševo.

816 He also acted as the preceptor of Karaševo and Szentörinc.

817 AO 1: 376; AOkl 4: 11-12.

818 Furthermore, in the meantime Charles I granted away the some of the possessions belonging to Našice. See in CHAPTER IV.
preceptory to a tenant (iobagio) of Našice. Unfortunately, the name of the preceptor was not recorded. Some years later, Donat of Lucca represented Našice at the provincial chapter of 1329. In addition, he also administered the adjacent preceptory of Karaševo. It cannot be ruled out that the above Donat is identical with the one who headed the Székesfehérvár preceptory between 1332 and 1343. Hereafter, the available sources are very scattered. Still, it can be ascertained that the preceptory functioned until the end of the period under query.

Riccardo Caracciolo assigned Baudoin de Monte Iustino to Našice jointly with two other units. He perhaps enjoyed its revenues and did not in fact govern, although he had a chance as having arrived in Hungary in November 1384.

***

Csáktornya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Csáktornya ~ Caklovac</td>
<td>Körös</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1387/1495</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel: unknown

According to a prevailing theory, the castle might have been built by a certain Csák who was a powerful local lord in this region at the turn of the thirteenth century. It is likely that the castle had been confiscated by Charles I during the process of the consolidation of his power and was transferred to the Hospital around 1317. The fortification was held by the Order until 1387, when King Sigismund took it forcibly, probably from John of Palisna.
Zelinaszentmárton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toonym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Szentmárton ~ Zelinaszentmárton, Božjakovina 826</td>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>St. Martin</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar domus castrum hospitale locus credibilis other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/ interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1324</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1340</td>
<td>Dionisius 827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361-1376</td>
<td>Gwyllerm 828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380-1381</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken from the Templars with a church dedication to a warrior-saint, the domus and perhaps the church or chapel of the preceptory was located at Zelina Creek. The identification of the preceptory or the preceptor is difficult when they were referred in the charters barely as de sancto martino and there are no other helpful markers. 829 The identification of the first occurrence in 1324 is easy since the scribe notified it in the charter. 830 This agreement concerned a debate with the chapter house of Zagreb about the tithe levied on the cells of the Order in the diocese of Zagreb. It was agreed that the tithe should be paid by the preceptor of Zelinaszentmárton (Božjakovina). One can also conclude from the situation that the Hospital happened to neglect the payment of the tithe on former Templar goods. Did they try to abuse


827 He also acted as the castellan of Bela, preceptor Zelinaszentmárton (Božjakovina), and Glogovnica (Ivanec).

828 He also acted as the castellan of Bela, preceptor of Zelinaszentmárton (Božjakovina) and Glogovnica (Ivanec).

829 Perhaps this was the basis for Reiszig to “create” another preceptory in the Muraköz, which I also took for granted for a while. With the help of detailed surveys, however, it can be deduced that the Hospital indeed had estates in this region but there is no sign of the existence of a preceptory or even a domus. Cf. Reiszig 2: 99-110. See, for instance, Ivan Tkalić, ed., Monumenta Historica liberae regiae civitatis Zaborabiae, metropolis regni Dalmatiae, Croatiae et Slavoniae. Povjestni spomenici slob. kralj. grada Zabreba, 14 vols. (Zagreb, 1889-1932), 1: 82-83; Smičiklas 11: 352-353.

830 Fejér CD 8/7: 170-172; Smičiklas 9: 195-196; A Okl 8: 149.
the situation or just could not handle it appropriately?

The reorganization of the preceptories also concerned this preceptory, as is shown by the fact that this unit was administered jointly with Bela and Glogovnica (Ivanec) by Dionysius around 1340.\textsuperscript{831} Thereafter there are no data about the preceptory for two decades. All that is known, for the subsequent period (1360-1376), is that Gwylerm de Alcaniz governed the same three units as his predecessor,\textsuperscript{832} that is, his governorship proved to be successful. The most interesting story was recorded in 1381. Michael, preceptor of Szentmárton, was sent to Italy in November 1380 as the envoy of John of Palisna, the Hungarian prior. During his absence his private house, also in Szentmárton (domum domini fratri Michaelis cruciferi preceptoris de Zenthmarthon in eadem Zenthmarthon habit), was attacked and ransacked in daylight.\textsuperscript{833} It is unknown how far it was common in the Priory that the preceptor had a separate house in the same settlement. Nonetheless, in the European practice of the Hospital it was not infrequent for even a fully professed brother to live separately from his community in the last quarter of the fourteenth century. Actually, one of the major criticisms expressed by the general papal investigation in 1373 was the laxity of discipline.

***

Trnava

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Szentiván ~ Trnava, Tornova\textsuperscript{834}</td>
<td>Požega/Križ</td>
<td>John the Baptist?</td>
<td>1321/1326</td>
<td>1403/1404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

\textsuperscript{831}Smičíklas 10: 555-557.

\textsuperscript{832}Thallóczy-Horváth, Alsó-Szlavóniai okmánytár, A Alsó-Szlavónia 66; Smičíklas 13: 153; Df.230580.

\textsuperscript{833}Fejér CD 9/7: 438-440. See also in \textbf{Chapter VII}.

Somewhat opposing the prevailing theory concerning Szentiván (Trnava), I believe that the existence of the St. John castle can be deduced earlier than the first mention of the Trnava possession. It is known that the Order obtained Trnava through an exchange with King Charles I in 1328. I infer, however, that it only concerned the estate and not the castle, which also formed a part of the preceptory. Nor can it be proved, although presumed, that the castle already stood around 1250 and was most likely administered jointly with Pakrac. This presumption is based, besides its geographical proximity, on the fact that Filippo de Gragnana issued a charter here in 1321 with the date: Datum in Possegaria in domo nostra de veteri castellaria. Since Bela is the only castle which could have been taken into account in Varasd County, I identify this castle with the one in Požega County. For the present this is only a supposition. As mentioned above in connection with Pakrac, Pietro de Gragnana acted as the castellan of a certain castrum s. Joannis de Pucherts in 1326. Accordingly, the castle still belonged to Pakrac and it was the exchange in 1328 which modified the constellation of the dependencies and finally Trnava became the center of the preceptory. It also formed a part of the overall rearrangement of the preceptories in the first third of the fourteenth century. Thereafter, however, there is no information about the preceptory until 1361, when a certain Peter was the castellan and also acted as the preceptor of Rasošja. It remained in the possession of the Order until the end of the period under query when it was confiscated by

He also acted as the count of Dubica.

He also acted as the preceptor de Rasošja.


See above, at Čiće.


Fejér CD 8/3: 147-149; A Okl 10: 146-147.

Smičiklas 9: 380-381; A Okl 12: 55.

King Sigismund from the rebellious Emeric Bwbek in 1403-1404.\textsuperscript{843}

***

Szenta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Szenta</td>
<td>Somogy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus credibilis</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/ interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bartholomeo of Bologna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Szenta was a short-lived preceptory of the Priory. Originally it was an estate belonging to Csurgó and it achieved a separate status, most likely during the rearrangement of the preceptories in the beginning of the fourteenth century. It is also conceivable that the number of Italian brothers who arrived at the Hungarian Priory increased remarkably in the beginning of the 1320s and there were many who wanted offices and incomes attached to those units. One of the brothers, Bartholomeo of Bologna, appeared as the conventualis of Szenta (Zanta) when the Order made an attempt to manage the financial crisis by appointing estates for alienation in 1326.\textsuperscript{845} The importance of the house can be perceived from the fact that the Priory held its provincial chapter in Szenta in 1345: de consilio, assensu et consensu tocius capituli nostri nuper in domo nostra de Zanta solemniter celebrari....\textsuperscript{846} Thereafter, the unit ceased to function separately and the possessions attached to it were rented out from 1360.\textsuperscript{847}

***

Szentlőrinc

\textsuperscript{843} Engel, “The Estates of the Hospitallers in Hungary,” 294.

\textsuperscript{844} Reiszig 2: 157. He regards this unit as an estate, only from 1360.

\textsuperscript{845} DI.106115, A Okl 10: 109-110.

\textsuperscript{846} DI.100023.

\textsuperscript{847} Fejér CD 9/3: 198-199 (188-189). For details, see Chapter VII.
The Szentlőrinc preceptory was originally taken over from the Templars. Conceivably, this unit soon lost its autonomy, since during the reorganization of the preceptories in 1326 the provincial chapter licensed Csurgó and Újúdvar to rent out Szentlőrinc together with its dependencies. How long the lease lasted is unknown; it was originally set for ten years, but the regular payment of the rent automatically extended the period of contract. Perhaps the long rent is the reason for having no information about Szentlőrinc; not even the acquittances are extant. One can find Szentlőrinc as a separate administrative unit of the Priory as late as 1373-1374, headed by a certain John. The active role played by John may indicate his local origin as opposed to the preceptor, Baudoin de Monte Iustino, who was appointed by Riccardo Caracciolo jointly to Našice and Karaševo a decade later.

***

Vrana

---

848 Reiszig 2: 80-81; it seems that Reiszig did not notice that it originally was held by the Templars. ÁMF 1: 389-390; Engel, “The Estates of the Hospitaliers in Hungary,” 296-297.

849 He also acted as the preceptor of Našice and Karaševo.

850 Dl.106115, Df.258480, AOkl 10: 111-112.

851 Dl.106326; Dl.106168; Dl.106171, Fejér CD 9/4: 611-613.

852 AOM 281, fol. 37v. See Appendix B no. 73. See also Chapter V.

Situated in the Dalmatian coastal area, Vrana was the headquarters of the Hungarian province of the Templars until their dissolution. The date of the takeover and its very procedure is unknown, but it must have happened before 1328 since in that year Vrana was besieged by the Croats (crohati). The attackers caused serious losses to the Hospitaller defenders who were backed by seculars; the defense was finally successful.\textsuperscript{855} Unlike expectations of a “headquarters,” hereafter relatively little news was recorded about Vrana. The reluctant behavior of Giovanni de Camporiano in 1337\textsuperscript{856} was noted as well as two provincial chapters held in 1340\textsuperscript{857} and 1350.\textsuperscript{858} However, the latter occasion was attended only by the castellan of Bela and brothers who lived in the immediate neighborhood of Vrana. From the above table it is clear that the personnel arrived from Italy, which was self-evident during the period of the Gragnanas but less obvious under the Cornutis. There is no need to seek sophisticated arguments since the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory belonged to the Langue of Italy. Looking at the maps, it is striking that for the majority of the Italian brethren it took less effort to travel to Vrana from Italy than, for instance, for a brother of local origin who had a stagia at Székesfehérvár. Only two occasions are known when the prior stayed at Vrana\textsuperscript{859} and two

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
formerly Templar & domus & castrum & hospitale & locus & other (church, chapel, etc.) \\
\hline
+ & + & + & - & - & + \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Personnel:
\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
year/interval & preceptor & custos & prior & lector & other \\
\hline
1328 & Nicolò de Camporiano & & & & Girardo de Gragnana, Francesco de Gragnana, Bonacurso de Fulingo, Girardo de Massadeloren, Marc of Bologna \\
1337 & & & & & Giovanni de Camporiano \\
1350 & Marçolino de Ancona & & Pietro de Gaudiosa & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{854}He also acted as the lieutenant prior of Hungary.

\textsuperscript{855}Fejér CD 8/3: 341-343; A O kl 12: 146.


\textsuperscript{857}Smičiklas 10: 555-557; A O kl 24: 163.

\textsuperscript{858}Smičiklas 11: 566-567.
charters are known to have been issued by the convent of the Vrana preceptory in the second half of the fourteenth century, in 1361\textsuperscript{860} and in 1374.\textsuperscript{861}

The above brief survey makes the evaluation of the role of Vrana in the Hospitaller Priory somewhat ambiguous. There is hardly any clear reference to the central role Vrana played in the life of the Priory. Presumably, the relevant literature deduced the “headquarters status” from the former function of Vrana during the Templar possession. This view was certainly reinforced when the name of Vrana was added to the title of the prior and that the Priory from the 1340s. It was first used by the Venetians in 1345: domino Priori Vngarie et Laurane (recte: Aurane).\textsuperscript{862} In addition, from the second half of the fourteenth century several units which had lost their separate statuses as preceptories appeared as dependencies of this Priory. Scholars automatically identified it with the increasing power of (sc. the preceptory) Vrana. It is necessary, however, to reappraise the role of Vrana with regard to its position in the Priory as a whole. It is obvious from the titles (intitulationes and inscriptiones) found in charters that the prioratus Aurane expression stood for the synonym of the prioratus Hungarie et Sclavonie.\textsuperscript{863} It is acceptable to think that the brethren staying at Vrana were influential enough to attempt to transfer its leading role as the former center of the Templars, but they basically failed. Nonetheless, the addition of the name of Vrana became a sort of tradition which was used in written materials. It is likely that Vrana was the largest preceptory of the Priory as far as its fortification is concerned, but it was not enough to play a determinant role in the Priory. Partly, as mentioned in \textsc{Chapter IV}, it was not typical in the case of the Hospitallers to “mark out” preceptories as headquarters although some

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{859}One of them is an undated letter sent by Baudoin Cornuti to his lieutenant, Donat, between 1350 and 1371. The archivists of the MOL wrongly dated it to 1380-1382, Dl.106196. The other mentions the prior staying at Vrana (in castro Aurana) in connection with a rent in 1371. Dl.5976, Dl.6319, Dl.25836, Df.258485, Fejér CD 9/4: 263, 371-372.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{860}Dl.87423.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{861}Dl.6237, Dl.6238.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{863}For several examples, see \textsc{Appendix B}. No effort was made to alter, for instance, the inscription of the seal of the Priory. Cf. \textsc{Chapter VIII}.
\end{flushleft}
administrative units had major impacts on others, for instance Székesfehérvár in Hungary. But exactly this sort of influence cannot be found in connection with Vrana. Its advantageous location was much more important for the Templars, whose dependencies were situated in its neighborhood at the time of their settling down in the region. On the contrary, most of the Hospital’s interests lay far from Vrana towards the north, even though the “median line” of the Priory was shifted by the takeover of the Templar properties: Vrana still remained much too far away.

The other side of the problem is interrelated with this view. If the Hospitallers had made huge efforts to find the most profitable way of administering their units, they were least likely to have chosen the remote Vrana. They did not do so, I believe; it is rather a long prevailing misinterpretation of scholars who managed, sometimes involuntarily, to root this idea deep in Hungarian scholarship. The phenomenon that a given estate no longer belonged to a preceptory but to the Priory of Vrana does not mean that the preceptory of Vrana had any relations with it in fact. In reality, it meant that such an estate was administered by the prior himself as a camera prioralis, in this way having access to its incomes. This was an increasing practice in the second half of the fourteenth century, but it seems to have accelerated beyond measure during the priorship of John of Palisna. Behind the scenes, his efforts manifestly aimed at increasing the incomes at his disposal. The process gained such an ascendancy in the fifteenth century that some preceptories applied for royal intervention, for instance, in 1466, \(^{864}\) to defend their dependencies against the prior.

***

**Bonyhádvarasd**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varasd ~ Bonyhádvarasd(^{865})</td>
<td>Tolna</td>
<td></td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus</td>
<td>credibilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^{865}\)Reiszig 2: 147.
The nucleus estate of the future Varasd preceptory was on the list of the gift of Queen Euphrosyne and its confirmation by King Béla III in 1193, but it did not have separate status for long. Presumably, the reorganization of the preceptories at the takeover of the Templar properties put Varasd into a new position. In addition, although it still did not achieve full autonomy, it was administered by a kinsman of the prior, Pietro de Gragnana, in 1329. Thereafter, Varasd disappears from the sources for decades. At the time of its next occurrence in 1377, Varasd was administered jointly with the adjacent Fadd by Baudoin of Lucca, who might have been preceptor for a short while. There is no later information about Varasd as a preceptory.

---

### Karaševo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toonym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krassó ~ Karaševo&lt;sup&gt;872&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Baranya</td>
<td>St. Nicholas</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>1395 (1454)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar domus castrum hospitale locus credibilis other (church, chapel, etc.)&lt;sup&gt;873&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>866</sup> He also acted as the preceptor of Székesfehérvár, Gyánt, and Győr.

<sup>867</sup> Jointly with Fadd.

<sup>868</sup> Fejér CD 2: 288; Cartulaire no. 936; MES 1: 142-147.

<sup>869</sup> Of.257974, Df.258481.

<sup>870</sup> Fejér CD 9/5: 149-152; DI.106182; Érszegi, “Fejér megyére vonatkozó oklevelek,” 198; Fenyvesi, Tolna megye középkori történetéhez kapcsolódó oklevelek, 125.

<sup>871</sup> For a quarter of a century Baudoin was the fourth brother in the Priory from Lucca.


<sup>873</sup> Castle from 1437.
Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1329</td>
<td>Donat of Lucca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356-61</td>
<td>Donat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384</td>
<td>Baudoin de Monte Iustino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1395</td>
<td>Bartolomeo de Porta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Karaševo was known as an estate from the thirteenth century it is not known whether it belonged to the Temple or the Hospital. This uncertainty is also indicated by the examples above since the fact that it appeared first in 1329 as a separate unit may refer to its Templar origin, but it may also mean that the originally Hospitaller estate was given autonomy after the reorganization of the preceptories. It was administered jointly with Našice in 1329, which may imply that it originally belonged to the Temple or perhaps simply the geographical proximity suggested that the Order administered it this way. After a twenty-five year hiatus, Karaševo was administered by the lieutenant prior -- together with Székesfehérvár and Gyánt -- and the huge distance between the units indicates that Karaševo had begun to lose its importance. The same concerns the period when the above-mentioned Albert -- the former lieutenant prior and preceptor of Székesfehérvár -- returned to Dubica and was also assigned to Karaševo for a short period. Presumably, Albert did not become resident in Karaševo, as Baudoin de Monte Iustino did not a decade later nor Bartholomeo de Porta two decades later.

***

Egyházasfalva

---

874 Jointly with Našice.
875 He also acted as the preceptor of Székesfehérvár and Gyánt.
876 Jointly with Dubica.
877 He also acted as preceptor of Našice and Szentlőrinc.
878 According to Győrffy, it belonged to the Hospital, but Engel correctly points out that on the basis of the sources at our disposal this cannot be determined unequivocally. ÁMF 1: 333; Engel, “The Estates of the Hospitallers in Hungary,” 297.
879 Dl.33758.
880 AOM 281, fol. 37°. See Appendix B no. 69.
The Egyházasfalu preceptory was taken over from the dissolved Templars and, being situated in the vicinity of Sopron, it was administered by the preceptor of Sopron. The reorganization proved to be unsuccessful since there is no more data about the unit as having separate status. It appeared as an estate when the prior rented it out to the warden of Dalmatia and Slavonia in 1384.

***

Bő

At first sight, the circumstances of Bő are very similar to the adjacent Egyházasfalu but the former had somewhat greater importance. Bő was also taken over from the Templars by the

---

881 He also acted as the preceptor of Sopron and Bő.

882 Df.257974, Df.258481.

883 Fejér CD 10/2: 179.

884 Jerney, “A magyarországi káptalanok és konventek,” 90-91; Reischig 2: 16-17; Belitzky, Sopron vármegye története, 956.

885 He also acted as the preceptor of Sopron and Egyházasfalu.
Hospitaller Priory before 1329,\textsuperscript{886} and it might have acted as a place of authentication while being a Templar preceptory. Nonetheless, two charters are indirectly known which were issued by the convent of Bő in the fourteenth century (1330, 1351),\textsuperscript{887} although it only implies an ad hoc activity as a place of authentication. Like Egyházasfalalu, Bő was rented out as an estate from 1384.\textsuperscript{888}

***

Glogovnica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glogovnica – Ivanec Vojakovski\textsuperscript{889}</td>
<td>Križ</td>
<td>St. George?</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly Templar</td>
<td>domus</td>
<td>castrum</td>
<td>hospitale</td>
<td>locus</td>
<td>credibilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/ interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1340</td>
<td>Dionisius\textsuperscript{890}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361</td>
<td>Gwylerm de Alcaniz\textsuperscript{891}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glogovnica, neighboring on the house of the canons regular of the Holy Sepulchre, was another preceptory which originally belonged to the Temple.\textsuperscript{892} Virtually nothing is known about its short history. It was headed by Gwylerm de Alcaniz between c. 1340 and 1361. It is remarkable, however, that the preceptory was administered jointly with two adjacent units: the castle of Bela and the preceptory of Zelinaszentmárton (Božjakovina).

\textsuperscript{886} He also acted as the preceptor of Sopron and Christiana.

\textsuperscript{887} Reisz\textsuperscript{2}: 17; Nagy, Sopron vármegeye története, 1: 215.

\textsuperscript{888} AOM 281, fol. 37°. See Appendix B no. 69.

\textsuperscript{889} Reisz\textsuperscript{2}: 64-65. Georg Heller, Comitat\textsuperscript{us} Crisi\textsuperscript{ensis}. Veröffentlichungen des Finnisch-Ugrischen Seminars an der Universität München, Ser. A. Die historischen Ortsnamen von Ungarn (München: Universität München, 1978), 71-72, 101; Dobronić, Viteški redovi, 185; Dobronić, Posjedi i sjedišta Templara, Ivanovaca i Sepulkralaca, 36-38, 132-138; Engel, “The Estates of the Hospitallers in Hungary,” 295.

\textsuperscript{890} He also acted as the castellan of Bela and the preceptor of Zelinaszentmárton (Božjakovina).

\textsuperscript{891} He also acted as the castellan of Bela and the preceptor of Zelinaszentmárton (Božjakovina).

\textsuperscript{892} Reisz\textsuperscript{2} completely confused the two dissimilar houses. Cf. ÁUO 7: 152-157.
### Rasošja

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toonym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rasošja</td>
<td>Požega/Križ</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>former Templar</td>
<td>domus castrum hospitale</td>
<td>locus creditiis</td>
<td>other (church, chapel, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year/ interval</th>
<th>preceptor</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>prior</th>
<th>lector</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1344</td>
<td>Orbizanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is an unverified presumption that Rasošja was taken over from the Templars. Even so, it appeared in the sources relatively late, in 1344, when it was administered by a certain Orbizanus.\(^{896}\) The list of the brethren attending the provincial chapter in 1344 implies that he might have been of Italian origin, although the prior was a Provençaux. The next, and last, data report in 1361 that Rasošja was administered jointly with the adjacent Ivanec under the command of a certain Peter.\(^{897}\) During the fifteenth century it only appears as an estate belonging to the Priory.\(^{898}\)

### Lešnik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toonym</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Patrocinium</th>
<th>First mention</th>
<th>Last mention</th>
<th>Founder / “Affiliation”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lešnik</td>
<td>Požega</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{894}\)Perhaps identical with Orbizano de Lucca, preceptor of Esztergom in 1329. See above.

\(^{895}\)He also acted as the castellan Szentiván (Trnava).

\(^{896}\)Dl.100023.

\(^{897}\)Smičiklas 13: 153; Thallóczy-Horváth, Alsó-Szlavóniai okmánytár, 66.

\(^{898}\)Reiszig 2: 156.

\(^{899}\)Reiszig 2: 155; Dobronić, Posjedi i Sjedišta Templara, Ivanovaca i Sepulkralaca, 45, 70, 78; Engel, “The Estates of the Hospitallers in Hungary,” 294.
The original Templar property of Lešnik appears in the sources as a Hospitaller dependency in 1343 (et cadit in Lesnykpotoka ad metas cruciferorum et ibi terminatur). Unlike the opinion of Reiszlig and Engel, I have ascertained that Lešnik achieved a separate status and included a functioning house for a while. This was already perhaps the case by 1343, since in the next year the preceptory was administered alone: fratris Johanni Contarensis preceptoris domus nostre de Lesniça. Hereafter, the unit appears only as an estate.

***

Moštanica

Although Ede Reiszlig listed Moštanica among the dependencies, according to the principles of the present survey all entities are listed which were more than mere estates of the Priory. Thus the castle of Moštanica should be regarded as having had separate status at least for a short while. It is an interesting question, even though it cannot be answered satisfactorily at the moment, why did the castellan appear in the sources exactly when he did? Why not before or not later? It cannot be ruled out that it was in connection with the activity of Albert or it might have originally been the property of his family which was taken over by the

---

901 DI.100023.
902 Reiszlig 2: 42. Dobronić, Posjedi i Sjedišta Templara, Ivanovaca i Sepulkralaca, 70-72, 108.
903 He also acted as the preceptor of Sopron, Dubica, and Gora.
Similar to Varasd and other units, Fadd was part of the twelfth-century donation and its confirmation and was administered as an estate by the preceptors of Székesfehérvár for a long time. For unknown reasons, it was separated from Székesfehérvár and appeared as a separate unit jointly with Varasd in 1377. Its autonomy, however, proved to be ephemeral since afterwards Fadd again appeared as a simple estate of the Hospital.

6.3. BROTHERS AND THEIR STATUS

Finally, the brethren and their status can be surveyed as much as extant sources allow. The different forms of membership were briefly presented in Chapter II. Unfortunately, the lack of sources imposes serious restraint on raising such questions. As presented above -- as well as it will be in Chapter VIII concerning the participation of the preceptories in pragmatic literacy -- the officials of the individual houses were named in the charters in many cases. Sometimes the origin of a particular brother can be figured out, however, it is very rare that the status of the brother is indicated in the documents. Luckily, there are a few charters which

---

904 Jointly with Varasd; he formerly acted as the preceptor of Székesfehérvár.

905 Fenyvesi, T. Tolna megye középkori történetéhez kapcsolódó oklevelek, 81-82; Bernát L. Kumorovitz, Veszprémi regeszták (1301-1387) [Charter-calendars from Veszprém] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1953), no. 216; Fejér CD 9/7: 245-248.

906 DI.106182, Fenyvesi, Tolna megye középkori történetéhez kapcsolódó oklevelek, 82; Érszegi, “Fejér megyére vonatkozó oklevelek,” 198.
make it possible to investigate the “standings” in the Order. Here the discussion is limited to the brethren who cannot be grouped in any other category, otherwise it would not be an unequivocal classification since there are separate chapters dedicated to the personnel of the preceptories and to the priors and lieutenant priors.

The first data are taken from a charter of 1315 which lists Adam, Emeric and Nicholas. Nicholas was the chaplain (capellanus) of Prior Rolando de Gragnana. Adam is described as the preceptor of unidentified houses in Syrmium; his origin is completely obscure; Emeric’s Hungarian origin is inferred, but still to be proven. The background of Nicholas is the most questionable since there are arguments pro and contra concerning either his foreign or local origin. One can argue for his foreign origin by emphasizing that he belonged to the entourage of the prior and thus accompanied him on his journeys. At the same time, later examples suggest that the chaplains of Hungarian-Slavonian priors were most likely recruited from local brethren. This would support the theory of his Hungarian origin, especially since the primary function of the chaplains was to render service in the communication and/or representation of the prior during his stay (absence) in the Hungarian kingdom.

The inference about Nicholas is reinforced by the fact that a certain George, chaplain of Pietro de Gragnana, appeared in an affair with local landowners while his superior was absent in 1325. Besides informing the reader about his status (presbyter) in the Order, the functions he performed in the Hospital are also revealed: capellanus, scriptor. The origin and status of a certain Oddo, who turns up in the sources in 1326, cannot be identified. For a decade-long period, however, there are no data about brothers with unknown affiliation, local or foreign.

The situation became more transparent during the office of the Provençal Pierre Cornuti, but it seems -- unlike general expectations -- that the majority of the brethren was not of Provençal origin. Until the mid-fourteenth century, except for some unidentified and

---

907 AO 1: 376, 389-390; A Okl 4: 11-12, 85.
908 Dl.2337, A Okl 9: 322-323.
909 Dl.106115, Df.258480, A Okl 10: 111-112.
Dalmatian brothers, the majority of Hospitallers came from Italy, not only from the Priory of Venice. This phenomenon could have been significant due to the former leadership of the Gragnanas. This constellation can be explained by the fact that Pierre Cornuti did not cut out the deadwood from the personnel. All he did in regard to his “entourage” was to appoint his compatriot, Fulco Rocafolii, as his lieutenant prior for a while, and supposedly, his chaplain also came from the same region of Provence as his superior. Owing to the long lasting Provençal leadership, the situation somewhat changed in the second half of the fourteenth century. One can find relatively few Hospitallers with unknown affiliation during the priorship of Baudoin Cornuti. At the beginning of his tenure, two brothers were recorded whose affiliation and status in the Order is rather obscure even though their origin is quite clear: Michael of Zara and Dominic of Genoa, preceptor of Pristeč. There is information about a certain John who was a sacerdos ordinis in 1358, but it is not clear from the document in which preceptory he had his stagia. Since this charter was issued in connection with a debate between the Székesfehérvár preceptory and the chapter house of Győr and John appeared in person of Donat, preceptor of Székesfehérvár, it is likely that he is identical with the keeper (custos) of the Székesfehérvár preceptory and thus he was a priest brother.

Setting aside the chronological order for a short while, it is worth raising the question how the “ordinary” entrance to the Order functioned. This returns to the methodological

9101336 Johannes Molaraxon; 1336-1340 Thadeus de Assissio/A tisio; 1340 Angelus de Senis (Siena); 1340 Albertus de Parma; 1340 Marinus de Jadria; 1340 Petrus de Sap; 1340 Bernardus de Orgol; 1344 Ugneti de Focalucgrio.


912OI.100023. Provided that this James is identical with James de Redeoterio, preceptor of Luba in 1350, who also came from the region of Lardiers, Provence. Cf. Beaucage, Visites générales, 382. A certain Alexander, notary and official of Pierre Cornuti in 1348, most likely was not a member of the Order. He might have been a paid employee. Smičiklas 11: 438-441. Cf. Jonathan Riley-Smith, The Knights of St. John in Jerusalem and Cyprus c.1050-1310 (London: Macmillan, 1967), 240.

913Smičiklas 11: 566-567.

914Fejér CD 9/7: 175-176.

915AO 3: 596, 6: 585-586.
problems raised in the introduction of the chapter: there was no need to produce written records if all were in accordance with the customs/practice of the Order. Thus it is difficult to decide how far the case of Alexander Zudar was typical in the fourteenth century. Through the intervention of Pope Gregory XI, Zudar, the former canon of the Eger cathedral chapter, was taken by the Székesfehérvár Hospitaller preceptory as professus in 1374.\footnote{MonWesp 2: 238-239.} Since no Alexander has been found in the genealogical tables of the Zudar kindred,\footnote{Pál Engel, Középkori magyar genealógia, nos. 215-216. See also Ágnes Kurcz, Lovagi kultúra Magyarországon a 13-14. században [Knightly culture in Hungary in the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988), 133. Kurcz notifies that already Mór Wertner omitted Alexander from the genealogy of the Zudars. According to Kurcz, Alexander must have been either the brother or cousin of Peter Zudar, Warden of Slavonia.} it is still doubtful whether it was the same family which made an (advantageous) exchange of their landed properties with the Order a year before, in 1373.\footnote{Dl.6151.} The bond between the member and his Order was expressed in different ways, at times indirectly and unexpectedly. The Provençal lieutenant prior, Arnold de Beaumont (1374-1378, 1384), who was at the same time the preceptor of Újudvar, wanted to settle a long debated case concerning a piece of land. During the inspection of the boundaries (reambulatio) of the estate concerned, the Hospitaller brother swore in his habit at the last boundary-mark by suum statum regularem et ad suam conscientiam Deo debitam while the laics present took their vow secundum consuetudinem regni: by standing barefoot, loosening their belts, raising their hands above their heads.\footnote{Iván Borsa, “A somogyi konvent oklevelei, 36-37.}

Chronologically, the next piece of information of interest comes from the chartularies of the central administration of the Order in Rhodes. In 1358, Master Roger de Pins admitted Lőkös Tót of Raholca (Leokus Tot de Roholtz) into the confratres of the Order under the condition that \textit{qui anno quolibet in festo nativitatis Sancti Johannis baptiste nostre domui libras duas cere dare ubicumque fueritis zelo devotionis induc tus}.\footnote{AOM 319, fol. 235\textsuperscript{v}; Dobronić, Viteški redovi, 122, 169; Engel, “14. századi magyar vonatkozású iratok,” 116-117; Neven Budak, “John of Palisna, the Hospitaller Prior of Vrana,” in Expanding the Frontiers, 283; See APPENDIX B no. 44. See also Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller, 85.} Lőkös Tót (1340-1359)
belonged to the Raholca branch of the Újlaki kindred, one of the most powerful kindred of the aristocracy in his age. He acted as magister dapiferorum regalium (1351-1359), magister pincernarum regalium (1352-1359), also as comes Siculorum (1352-1356), and as comes of Brassó (Brasov) (1353-1355). His cousin, Nicholas Konth, was the palatine at this time (1356-1367). From this point of view, his annual gift does not seem too generous. Another piece of data can be found in the Libri bullarum, recording the licence of Master Raymond Bérénger for the admission of John of Zagreb into the servientes of the Order in 1366. According to Neven Budak, John may be identical with John of Palisna, although Budak notes that there is no proof for it. I do not consider it possible at all. Pál Engel does not mention that the document recorded the admission of a serviens and not ex utroque parente nobili fuerit legitime procreatus et cum erit equis et armis munitus suficientibus. If it were Palisna he would have been taken as miles of the Order since he was a noble, although it was possible to knight members after their entrance into the Order, as happened in March 1383. The general assembly, held in Valence-sur-Rhône, licensed the Hungarian prior to accolade Petrus de Cassa who ipso non decorato militia decoret cingulo militiae ut in forma. Albeit names are not known, it is conceivable that the knighting of Peter was owing to the permission which John of Palisna was given in the previous year, in July 1382. Accordingly, Juan Fernandez d’Heredia permitted the Hungarian prior -- despite the restraint (in force for a

921Engel, Középkori magyar genealógia, no. 747.

922Pál Engel, ed. Magyarország világi archontológiája, 43, 46, 122, 192; Kurcz, Lovagi kultúra Magyarországon, 292.

923Engel, Magyarország világi archontológiája, 3-4.

924AOM 319, fol. 235v. Dobroni, Viteški redovi, 169; Engel “14. századi magyar vonatkozású iratok,” 116-117. By the same token, a Benedictine monk of -- supposedly -- German origin, was also taken into the confraternity of the Priory: “Eodem die nobilis et religiosus vir frater Ulricus de Stamlung ordinis Sancti Benedicti fuit receptus in confraternitatem in forma prescripta.” AOM 316, fol. 258v.


926See, for instance, AOM 317, fol. f. 203v.


928For the question of knighting Hungarians, see Kurcz, Lovagi kultúra Magyarországon, 135-136.
long time) concerning the admission of new members -- to admit five recruits into the milites
and servientes of the Order respectively. 929

---

By this point in the thesis a solid picture of the Hospitaller Hungarian-Slavonian Priory has been presented. The fundamentals of the history of the Order have been surveyed on the basis of the extant source materials in the period under query: the settling and development of the Order, its high officials, and the microhistory of the preceptories including the reconstruction of their personnel. It may appear with some exaggeration, that in this way the history of the Order has been more or less reconstructed. By this token, further research may deepen our knowledge on minor problems by sharpening the contours of the "picture" leading us towards the veritas famed by historians. However, it is worth emphasizing what Michael Gervers noted concerning the basic function of the Hospitaller preceptories by stating that all the preceptories were first of all economic units and "the Hospitaller preceptory would have served for more as a centre for the collection of rents and fees and the management of produce rendered in kind." 

Previous chapters drew attention to the fact that similarly to other European priories, the Hospital settled in this part of the Latin Christendom in order to establish the financial basis for the fight against the infidel. In accordance with this purpose, the rural preceptories were in a majority in comparison to those established for the needs of pilgrims and the poor. The overall goal of these houses was to find and/or create the most profitable methods of estate management in the local physical and social environments. The brethren were not to "eat up" the incomes of a single preceptory, therefore the Order strictly limited the number of recruits entering the European preceptories through time, especially

---


after the fall of the Holy Land. A survey of the potential sources of revenues of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory is presented here from this particular point of view. Similar to the previous chapters, a certain knowledge of Hungarian society is required in order to interpret several of phenomena encountered while analyzing extant written sources.

7.1. REVENUES

The limited and scattered nature of the sources at our disposal, as mentioned above many times, causes various problems as far as it determines the confines of reconstruction. Yet, many gaps can be bridged with the help of analogies to relevant scholarly literature. Accordingly, partly with reference to the previous chapters, the following types of revenues will be investigated from the point of view of the Order:

- grant of estates (royal and private)
- grant of money (royal and private)
- privileges, immunities, exemptions (ecclesiastical and secular taxes) (7.1.1.)
- seigneurial revenues (7.1.2)
- rents and leases (7.1.3)
- other revenues (7.1.4.)

The first two items were covered in Chapter III and IV and will not be dealt with here because landed properties provided income through their exploitation rather than serving as immediate sources of income. As for the second item, it does not require sophisticated imagination to estimate how the Hospitallers utilized grants given in cash.\footnote{See Chapter III. 1193: Fejér CD 2, 288; Cartulaire no. 936; MES 1: 142-147; 1208: Fejér CD 3/1, 56-57; MonWesp 1: 17; Cartulaire no. 1302; 1218: Fejér CD 3/1: 250-254; Augustinus Theiner, ed. Vetera Monumenta Historica Hungariae Sacram Illustrantia, 1216-1352, 2 vols. (Romae, 1859-1860), 1: 20-21; RA no. 355.}

\footnote{For the general situation, see Chapter II.}

Much more attention should be paid to the third item: the ecclesiastical and secular privileges, immunities and exemptions.\footnote{Much more attention should be paid to the third item: the ecclesiastical and secular privileges, immunities and exemptions.\footnote{For the general situation, see Chapter II.}}
7.1.1. PRIVILEGES, IMMUNITIES, EXEMPTIONS

From the point of view of the Order, the exemptions proved to be milestones, but this is not unequivocal as far as the entirety of the Church was concerned. As noted in Chapter III, in the decades following the settlement of the Hospital in Hungary -- like in case of other European priories -- there were reports of struggles in the process of the acknowledgement of the Order's rights. Although most of the papal bulls became known to the Hungarian clergy,934 the exemptions included in these documents often swept away the "neighbor's love" of fellow Christians. In this respect, it is significant that Archbishop Martirius of Esztergom, head of the Hungarian Church, played an important role in the settling of the Hospital. Approaching this issue with an unhistorical exclamation as "had he but known..." that the Church would face so many debates on revenues (tithes, burial rights, etc.) he would have entrusted another institution with carrying the virtue of caritas. Soon after their initial settlement, from the beginning of the thirteenth century, the Hospital had serious conflicts with the local clergy. Lacking the full documentation for these disagreements and in the absence of relevant scholarly literature for the region it is quite difficult to figure out the core of these debates without a profound knowledge of canon law.

Surveying the extant documents in chronological order can help reconstruct the nature of the debates over tithing. The first extant charter was issued by Pope Innocent III in which - - upon complaints of the Hospitallers -- he admonished the bishop of Győr in March 1208 when he tried to levy a tithe on the Order in his bishopric.935 Perhaps influenced by the unceasing series of complaints, two weeks later the pope sent a general letter to the Hungarian clergy explaining the exemption of the Hospitallers.936 This charter was regarded as a corner-stone of the exemptions of the local brethren,937 but the papal aim was different. The pope made it clear that the exemption only concerned the labores, that is, the tithe to be

---

934 Cartulaire no. 657; Fejér CD 3/1: 44-45, 84-86; Dl.106103.
935 Fejér CD 3/1: 84; MonWesp 1: 18; Cartulaire no. 1294. It is clear from the charter that the exemption from tithing meant the novalia and labores.
936 Fejér CD 3/1: 84-86.
937 Reiszig 1: 31.
paid after production by the brethren themselves, and the novalia, that is, the tithe collected from formerly uncultivated lands.\footnote{This idea is confirmed by two other facts. First, the debates over tithing did not cease after having received this particular bull. Second, several years later the same pope admonished the Hospitallers -- and the Cistercians -- since they were said not to pay the tithes on their vineyards in the bishopric of Pécs.\footnote{Supposedly these lands were cultivated as extraneus vineyards, although it is not clear from the charter, but implied that neither labores or novalia applied. The debates started to escalate just before the Fourth Lateran Council. Around this time the Székesfehérvár preceptory disputed with the bishop of Veszprém over the tithe of the rustici of the Hospitallers in that bishopric.\footnote{The papal auditor acted diligently and put together the arguments of the debating parties. Pope Innocent III sized up the facts in 1215/6 and explained to the Hospitallers of Hungary -- in a meticulously elaborated way -- that the grant of Queen Euphrosyne and its confirmation by her son did not automatically include the tithes of the donated lands since tithes could not be granted by secular persons. Thus, the basis for praescriptio had lapsed, although it was debated by the bishop of Veszprém who emphasized that the Hospitallers could prove thirty years of peaceful tenure but in reality they lacked the forty years of taciturnitas. The final decision, however, favored the Hospital on the basis of the confirmation of the exemption of the preceptory (decimas et ecclesias\footnote{The charter of Queen Euphrosyne has not come down to us nor did the Order ever refer to it. Perhaps the concept of posterior derogat priori functioned here. It is more problematic that according to Pope Innocent III, it was Pope Celestine (or Clement) who confirmed the original privilege that the} intra parochiam S. Stephani} by Popes Celestine and Lucius. The chronology suggested by the document is somewhat problematic. The papal bull clearly refers to more than one exhibited document: inclyte recordationis B\[ele\] regis et E\[uhprosine\] matris ipsius, regine Hungarie privilegia exhibuit. The charter of Queen Euphrosyne has not come down to us nor did the Order ever refer to it. Perhaps the concept of posterior derogat priori functioned here. It is more problematic that according to Pope Innocent III, it was Pope Celestine (or Clement) who confirmed the original privilege that the}{Cf. Giles Constable, Monastic tithes from their origins to the twelfth century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 280; Louis J. Lékai, The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality (Kent: The Kent University Press, 1989), 65-67.}
Hospitallers even exhibited and it authenticum apparet. So far it would be fine, but the brethren claimed that the privilege was subsequently also confirmed by Pope Lucius. Ex silentio it turns out that they did not show it during the inquest.

It appears that it must have been Pope Celestine III (1191-1198) who confirmed the privilege, insofar as he confirmed the 1193 grant of the Hungarian ruler. This idea is supported by the fact that the Székesfehérvár preceptory was introduced into the Liber Censuum in 1192 during his pontificate. The story ended at the point when Pope Lucius’ name appeared; since it was either Pope Celestine or Pope Clement III (1187-1191) who first confirmed the grant it must have happened after the pontificate of Lucius (1181-1185). If, however, it was the papal auditor who turned the chronology upside down, than the missing thirty years of peaceful tenure -- which the Hospitallers referred to -- would be found. Thus there might have been another, earlier, charter of Béla III which was nullified by the 1193 one. A third possible way of reconstruction would be if the privilege of Euphrosyne, if it ever existed, was confirmed by Lucius III, and Celestine finally confirmed both of them.

As a sort of reaction, from 1216 onwards, at least in the case of the membra of Székesfehérvár, the Hospitallers referred to praescriptio, namely, to permanent peaceful tenure. This solution, however, did not exonerate them from fighting the bishops and abbots concerned one by one. They disputed tithes with the Benedictine convent of Szekszárd in 1222 and with the bishop of Győr in 1225.

In the following year a decade-long debate was settled when the Hospitallers entered a concord with the Benedictine abbot of

---

942 In the edition by Delaville Le Roux it reads as Clement and lists Celestine among the text variants in the notes. Presumably it was abbreviated as C in the original text. Cartulaire no. 1438.
944 If there was such a document it must have been issued before 1186. See CHAPTER III.
947 Theiner 1: 61-62; MonWesp 1: 66; MES 1: 254; ÁUO 1: 211-212.
Pannonhalma about the tithes levied in Somogy County. The parties appointed judges and stated that they would be subject to the verdict whatsoever it was. By this token they accepted that the party breaking the agreement would be fined 125 marks, therefore each party pledged a village. The importance of the contract was mirrored by the fact that besides the prior of the Székesfehérvár preceptory, Johannes, the Hungarian prior who was named in the charter as magnus magister, was also present. The conclusion of the affair is not known, but it is certain that the Benedictine abbot achieved some success, because he promptly boasted to his fellow monks as well as Pope Gregory IX in 1226 and 1227 respectively. For a long time the agreement, whatever it was, functioned, but in 1261 the Hospitallers of Csurgó again came into conflict with the Benedictines of Pannonhalma about tithes levied in Somogy County.

It is unlikely, however, that this disagreement was caused by the particular situation which arose after the decretal of Gregory IX in 1234. Accordingly, in contrast to the majority of Latin Christendom, in Hungary tithes were only levied on crops and livestock, but not on incomes raised, for instance, from tolls. Nonetheless, the Hospitallers, like members of other military-religious orders, were supposed to pay the extraordinary tithes levied by the papacy. They were allowed to retain certain tithes as is manifest from their practice -- to be discussed below -- when they farmed out the estates of the Order, that is, they usually made a disposal about the tithes concerned: (1) the lessee paid the decima either to the Order or to the bishop; (2) the lessee commuted a part of the tithe; or, (3) the tithe was included in the rent.

---

948 Fejér CD 3/1: 228-230; PRT 1: 164, 638-639; ÁUO 6: 377-379; M onWesp 1: 36-37; Cartulaire no. 1472; MES 1: 210;
949 Df.206887, Df.206888; PRT 1: 680-682.
950 Df.208291; ÁUO 1: 247-248. PRT 1: no. 98.
951 PRT 2: 93, 313; ÁUO 3: 7; M onWesp 1: 140.
953 For instance in 1278, imposed by Pope Nicholas III. Fejér CD 5/2: 461-462; Theiner 1: 327; Cartulaire no. 3668.
954 Probably it was the most frequent case thus they indicated the alterations only. Cf. D1.106167.
Another affair full of hidden references is not directly linked to the question of tithing, but still may shed some light on this issue. At the beginning of 1358 Baudoin Cornuti, the Hungarian-Slavonian prior, exchanged one estate (Zdelja) of the Order for another one (Kápolna) possessed by Stephen, son of Warden Mikcs. The transaction was recorded by two royal charters (20 January and 30 April 1358). The latter is the transcription of the first, but by close reading of the documents it is clear that there are minor but quite informative differences. In the second charter, which was procured for the petition of Stephen, the Order of the appearance of the parties is different from the first document. What is interesting is that the first charter ordered that Stephen and his successors pay annually, on the feast of St. John the Baptist, one mark to the Hospitaller prior for the tithes produced from Zdelja. In the transcribed version the only disposition is that the tithes were due not to the prior but the king. In the frame-charter of the insertion, however, the king corrected it and stated that it was the right of the bishop of Zagreb.

Nonetheless, the above case can be regarded as minor discord in the light of the recrudescent debates over tithing in the Angevin period, even if these debates cannot be compared to those in the Arpadian age discussed above. The nature of these new debates differed from the earlier period as far the Hospitallers were concerned. According to the sources, it was not a legal problem, but the Priory simply neglected to pay the tithes according to the agreed-upon conditions. One of these cases came to light in 1324. The Priory had made an agreement with the cathedral chapter of Zagreb concerning the tithes to be paid on the houses and cellars of the Order in the bishopric of Zagreb. The brethren had

955 24 April 1320, Smičiklas 8: 556-559; AOkl 5: 294-295.

956 27 March 1314, Lajos Thallóczy, and Samu Barabás, eds., A Blagay-család oklevéltára. Codex diplomaticus comitum de Blagay (Budapest, 1897), 74-75; Smičiklas 8: 353-354; AOkl 3: 316; 6 May 1353, Lajos Thallóczy, and Sándor Horváth eds., Alsó-Szlavóniai okmánytár (Dubica, Orbáš és Szana vármegyék). Codex diplomaticus partium regno Hungariae adnexarum (Comitatum Dubica, Orbász et Szana) 1244-1718 (Budapest, 1912), 43-45; Smičiklas 12: 159-161.

957 AO 7: 12-13; HO 1: 219; Smičiklas 12: 448.

958 It cannot be proved, however, it is likely that the disaccord was rooted in the fact that the estate had been taken over from the Templars and being so the Hospitallers pretended as if it enjoyed the status of novalia.

959 29 May 1324, Fejér CD 8/7: 169-172; Smičiklas 9: 195-196; AOkl 8: 149-150.
neglected the payment for six years, that is, roughly since the accession of the new Prior to his office. Filippo de Gragnana acknowledged the complaint of the chapter house as he figured out that his preceptors were reluctant to pay the tithe in his absence.\textsuperscript{960} The prior applied to the chapter for an extension of the deadline and promised to settle the contention.\textsuperscript{961} The canons were ready to accept the proposal of the prior but, according to later sources, the debate went on until as late as 1358.\textsuperscript{962} Moreover, in 1347 another debate was channeled to the law against the bishop of Pécs.\textsuperscript{963} On the basis of the extant charters it is not unequivocal, yet it is likely that the fourteenth-century disputes over tithes concerned the former Templar estates. Admittedly, the last debate mentioned also concerned the territory of the Pakrac preceptory, which had been a Hospitaller demesne for a long time.

The aim here is certainly to avoid representing the Hospitallers as a wrangling, trespassing religious order. From the sources it is evident that from the turn of the thirteenth century the entirety of the Church was concerned in disputes over tithing and at certain points these lasted until the end of the fourteenth century. Surviving charters report that not only the “new” orders, but apparently all ecclesiastical institutions, took part in the “contest” either as a plaintiff or as a defendant. Moreover, although it still has not been satisfactorily clarified, the Hungarian clergy seems to have been somewhat selective in the acceptance of general theories of contemporary canon law or these tenets were amalgamated with the consuetudo terre. Nor is there reliable information on other typically debated ecclesiastical revenues raised, for instance, from burial rights\textsuperscript{964} or from service done during interdicts.

Less debate was caused by the secular privileges the Hospital obtained in Hungary. A s

\textsuperscript{960}Fejér CD 8/7: 169-172; Smičiklas 9: 195-196; A Okl 8: 150.

\textsuperscript{961}20 January 1328, Smičiklas 9: 377. It seems that for the period, the refusal of the payment of tithe was “general” in Slavonia. Cf. Ivan Tkalić, “Odpor i buna radi desetine u biskupiji zagrebačkoj u. XIV. viku,” [Rebellion and refusal the payment of the tithe in the diocese of Zagreb in the fourteenth century] Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti 49 (1879): 165-230.


\textsuperscript{963}Fejér CD 9/1: 515-518.

\textsuperscript{964}For instance, Cartulaire no. 657; MES 1: 378; Fejér CD 4/2: 125.
touched upon in Chapter III, here is just a reminder from an angle different from those above. The first secular circle of exemptions, granted by King Andrew II, is known from the confirmation of Pope Honorius III in 1218. It was in practice the grant of immunity which stated that only judges delegated by the king had jurisdiction over the people of the Hospital and they were exempt from providing feed and fodder (descensus), as well as from the payment of royal taxes (liberi denarii, pondera, other collecta). The Hospital were also permitted to sell salt within the borders of the kingdom up to the River Drava. Through the Concord of Bereg of 1233 the Hospital received further privileges from the king concerning the sale of salt. These steps manifestly imply that, like in case of other Hungarian ecclesiastical institutions, the sale of salt was an important source of income. The next and last substantial achievement in the sequence of exemptions was the grant of King Béla IV, which exempted the men of the Order from the payment of the tithe on pigs (decima porcorum) and a couple of months later, from the chybriones. Royal favour apparently came to an end with a minor exception given by King Stephen V (1270-1272) when he exempted the people of the Székesfehérvár preceptory from the imposition of the ispán (comes). During the Angevin period, the circle of privileges was not extended; only the jurisdictional privileges of the Order were confirmed by King Louis.

---

965 E.g. in 1331: Magister Jacobus, comes capelle domini regis et iudex populorum cruciferorum per Hungariam. Fejér CD 8/7: 233-234.
966 DRMH ser. 1, 1: 139-148; Theiner 1: 16-17; Cartulaire no. 1615; AUO 1: 158.
968 Smičiklas 4: 48-50; Fejér CD 4/1: 104-111; 9/5: 153; MES 1: 326; RA no. 637.
969 According to L. Solymosi it was not royal tax. Accordingly the king levied it as the lord of the royal demesne. László Solymosi, A földesúri járadékok új rendszere a 13. századi Magyarországon [The new system of seigneurial rights in thirteenth-century Hungary] (Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó, 1998), 153.
971 Fejér CD 9/2: 369; MES 4: 135, 163-164; Smičiklas 12: 310.
7.1.2. Seigneurial Revenues

At this point it is appropriate to turn to the revenues from seigneurial rights, term leases, and rents, anticipating that some of these observations will be of a general nature. It would exceed the framework of the present dissertation to present all the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century changes which characterized Hungarian society, even though it would lead us to a more profound understanding of Hospitaller estate management. It creates a difficult situation that most of the landed properties were acquired before 1301, except for the Templar possessions, but the majority of the extant sources were issued in the fourteenth century. Thus in this reconstruction we are limited mainly to the Angevin period.

The manorial system of the kingdom took solid shape during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It consisted of three major seigneurial systems: the royal, the ecclesiastical, and private lordships including the folk who were regarded as proprii of their lords. Profound social changes started in the first third of the thirteenth century and were accelerated by the aftermath of the Mongol devastation. These changes directly affected the conditions of the subjugated populations as well as the structure and composition of the ownership of the landed properties of the realm.972 The pinnacle of this process was the appearance of provincial oligarchs (petty kings).973 Their rule and the governmental system of the Arpadian period was replaced by the one introduced by Charles Robert; known as the honor-system, and it lasted as long as the first third of the fifteenth century.974 Two figures may shed some light on the proportion in the ownership of land: (1) at the end of the reign of King Louis I, in 1382, 150 castles out of the 300 of the realm were held by the king,975 (2) in the same period,

---


975 By the end of the reign of King Sigismund (1387-1437) it lowered to appr. 20%. See Pál Engel, “A magyarországi birtokszerkezet átalakulása a Zsigmond-korban (Öt északkeleti megye példája.),” [Changes of land ownership structure in the Sigismund period. (The example of five north-eastern counties)] in László
one eighth of the estates in the kingdom were possessed by the Church.\textsuperscript{976}

The Church exploited its estates by the bondsmen/women who were regarded as the belongings (proprii) of the given land from the eleventh and twelfth centuries. They can be sorted according to the service they rendered to the particular ecclesiastical institution:\textsuperscript{977} those involved in husbandry (aratores, vinitores), craftsmen and warriors ‘jobbágyok’ (iocabiones exercitantes seu bellatores). It is worth emphasizing that the above functions were not professions but only referred to the service the populi was supposed to provide towards, in our case, the Hospitallers. The Church did not hold slaves (veri servi) ab ovo, but in other respects its manorial system proved to be rather conservative through time. The social changes mentioned above elevated the (noble) iocabiones of the Church no higher than the dependent freemen who were obligated to military service to be rendered to the particular ecclesiastical institution. This development came to an end in the fourteenth century and resulted in a legally integrated social layer of tenant peasants (iocabiones) who reached the status of free men. Their status was common in respect to (1) the seigneurial impositions they were burdened with, (2) a similar property status, and (3) the right of free movement. The former social layer called iocabiones of the Church were raised to so-called nobles praediales. They belonged to the group of particular or conditional nobles\textsuperscript{978} which was a lower status compared to the veri nobiles regni whose holdings of allodial lands did not impose any service. The predial nobles were supposed to render military service to the Church. The nobles of the Church had their own autonomy, which they managed to preserve as late as the nineteenth century, although they appeared in fourteenth-century congregationes generales as their “unconditional” fellow nobles of the realm.\textsuperscript{979} During the

\textsuperscript{976}Mályusz, Egyházi társadalom, 18.

\textsuperscript{977}Although extant sources usually do not distinguish, they barely speak about populi or rustici.


\textsuperscript{979}Bónis, Hűbériség és rendiség, 157.
thirteenth-century unification and afterwards the tenant peasants owed to their lords the following taxes and services: rent (census), feed and fodder (descensus), gifts (munera), statute-labor, occasional taxes, a moving fee (terragium), death-duty (mortuarium), and payment on vineyards (chybriones, ius montanum, tributum montis, nona). The rent was paid in cash and the amount depended on the size of the arable lands: 0.1-0.2 pondus per acre, that is, 12-24 pondera per aratrum, which was equal to 1-2 fertones. The exact amount, however, was subject to negotiation in each case. In the Arpadian period it was paid once a year while in the fourteenth century it was more often paid twice. It provided the peasant with a basis for a quasi-hereditary rent on his plots (terra sua). Accordingly, as long as he paid the rent (census) regularly and fulfilled the other duties he and his heirs were not to be removed from his land. At the moment of the succession, however, the lord of the deceased tenant had the right to seize some parts of the peasant’s immobilia as his death-duty. The different holiday gifts to be given on the occasion of important church feasts were more substantial. The circle of feasts varied by institution (Easter, Christmas, Pentecost, or the feast of the patron saint of the church), the amount was usually fixed in advance. The ferial gifts consisted of three general naturalia: poultry, beverages, and bread. Statute-labor was confined by the fourteenth century in most manorial systems and was transformed into a fee paid in kind, that is, it was redeemable.

Occasional taxes were also levied in cash, but these concerned chiefly those who lived

---

980 Naturally, tenants were imposed by other dues: royal, palatine and banal taxes which may be transferred by the immunity to their lords. Thus, for instance the tenant peasants of the Order in Slavonia paid half of the marten-fur tax (marturina) and that of decima porcorum to the preceptor. Smičiklas 8: 556-559.

981 It is not to be confused with ecclesiastical mortuarium.

982 See APPENDIX D.

983 But not by all means. The tenants of the Csurgó preceptory paid the rent once a year at Easter.

984 Three times in 1321 but exact term-days are not recorded; Smičiklas 9: 10-11; A Okl 6: 39. Twice a year in 1339, at Christmas and Easter; Solymosi, A földesúri járadékok, 258-59; A Okl 23: 336-337.

985 In 1339: 1 bread and capons from each tenant.

986 In 1321 the leaser of the estate of the Order was demanded to provide “two days work of the peasants per aratrum;” while in 1353 the leaser had to render service with horse: cum uno equo servire teneantur et sint obligati. Smičiklas 9: 10-11; 12: 159-161; A Okl 6: 39; Thallóczy-Horváth, Alsó-Szlavónia, 43-47.
on royal demesnes. These were infrequent burdens on ecclesiastical or private lands. On the contrary, the moving fee (terragium) was, by the end of the fourteenth century, the most universal tax to be paid by tenant peasants. Between 1246 and 1369 it was fixed at 12 denarius. From the turn of the thirteenth century the first to obtain the right of free movement were those who lived on private lands. By the end of the fourteenth century all former proprii had been granted the liberty of free movement, a right which had once formed a part of the hospes-liberty. Having paid the moving fee and obtained permission (licentia) from his lord the peasant had the right to leave his land provided that it was not the period of intensive agricultural activity (April to September). The payments for vineyards were more substantial. Wine-growing was separated from the predial (manorial) system as early as the second half of the twelfth century, thus by the thirteenth century the vinitores of the Church had become vinidatores. In the beginning, the wine-grower (or tenant) owed chybriones to the owner, which was calculated on the basis of the size of the vineyard. By the beginning of the fourteenth century this taxation had gone through both formal and substantive changes. Accordingly, the ius montanum, tributum montis appeared as the tenth part of the wine produced, which was called universally ninth (nona) from 1351 onwards. The designation is somewhat misleading as it was not a 1/9 part of the whole but the ninth 1/10 part, distinguishing it from the ecclesiastical tithe (decima), which was the tenth 1/10. Although the Hospitallers obtained vineyards from the end of the twelfth century onwards, in most cases all we know about them is their mere existence.

While surveying the above, it is striking that observations had to be based on a relatively small amount of source material. The Hospitallers are not extraordinary in this respect among the religious orders settled in Hungary. Sources concerning the relationship

---

987 Solymosi, A földesúri járadékok, 106.
988 DRMH ser. 1, 1: 74; ser. 1, 2: 37, 50.
989 For the hospes-liberties see HO 7: 228-230; Smičiklas 7: 133-135. This privilege of 1293 prohibited the preceptor of Čičan to make an attempt for acquiring the fortune of those settlers who died without heirs.
990 Solymosi, A földesúri járadékok, 137.
991 In 1193, 1213, 1323, 1329, and 1359. See respective charters in APPENDIX A.
between the lord and his tenants are very rare. Peasants rarely required written evidence concerning their affairs, for instance, about the payment of their duties. Moreover, they seldom had immediate contact with their lord. The revenues were administered either by the official of the lord, or, in the Hospitallers’ case the proctor of the preceptory or the headman/reeve (villicus) of the village. Even if there was a written note (litterae, notitia, scriptum, instrumentum) about the given act there was no reason to keep it for decades since it did not have legal force or a claim for doing/having anything in the long run. Probably it was the seigneurial jurisdiction\(^992\) when the tenant met his lord since he (at least the major landowners) provided the court of first instance for those who lived on his lands more ioiobagionum. It is not clear in the case of the Hospitallers whether it was properly exercised by the prior or the preceptor concerned in any affair. Most likely it was an important issue in 1329, when the prior deprived one of the lessees of the Order from his piece of land because he had conspired against the Hospital by involving the tenants of the Priory and recognizing an illegal preceptor\(^993\).

The exact relation between the Order and the designer of the conspiracy is not clear from the source, but most probably he was not a predial noble of the Priory. Had it been so he would not only have been deprived of his lease, but the Hospitaller prior would have exercised his jurisdiction over him. Occasionally, scattered materials refer to the predial nobles of the Order\(^994\) although their specific activities are not mentioned nor is their exact status discernible. One can often find, however, others who were burdened with duties (fidelitas) more aliorum fidelium predialium nostrorum. The particular wording implies that although the Hospital had its own predial nobles, this group of people did not belong to them. In order to identify their status it is necessary to investigate the sources concerning the term leases of the Order.

\(^992\) DRMH ser. 1, 2: 12. See also Kamill Szoika, A földesúri bíráskodás az árpádki Magyarországon [Seigneurial jurisdiction in Hungary in the Arpadian period] (Budapest: K. M. Egyetemi Nyomda, 1944).

\(^993\) Df.257974, Df.258481.

\(^994\) Fejér CD 8/2: 619, 8/4: 129-130; Smielkias 9: 254; A Okl 9: 165.
7.1.3. RENTS AND LEASES

Being an ecclesiastical institution, there was no “ordinary” way of permanent alienation of their landed properties. Charters seldom report sales and exchanges of properties.\textsuperscript{995} In the case of the latter, the estate was conveyed either to the king\textsuperscript{996} or the transaction was accomplished with his approval\textsuperscript{997} (once with that of the queen).\textsuperscript{998} As far the Hospitallers are concerned, it is relatively easy to reconstruct the conditions of their leases. As emphasized above, the overall goal of the brethren was to achieve the most profitable estate management. Having such purposes, they either cultivated their own lands in certain parts of Europe or rented them out to laity.\textsuperscript{999} There is virtually no information about leases in the Arpadian period, which either means that they preferred their own management in the early period or the evidence has disappeared due to the heavy losses of source materials up to the end of the thirteenth century. This idea is confirmed by the fact that Peter, preceptor of Szomolya, Sziráki and Tolmács, appeared as the lessor of a piece of land before 1274. It turned out, however, that he neglected the payment of the rent for a long time; therefore, the chapter of Esztergom revoked the land. Moreover, the first known lease of the estates of the Priory concerned empty and deserted lands (\textit{terras domus nostre vacuas et quasi desertas}), expecting a better exploitation from the new lessee.\textsuperscript{1000} Since this document, or rather the


\textsuperscript{996}Fejér CD 4/2: 224; A ÖKl 11: 395; Cartulaire no. 2694; RA no. 1016; Tkalčić, Monumenta Historica Episcopatus Zagriadiensis, 1: 101; A ÖKl 7: 12-13; HO 1: 219; Smičiklas 4: 570-571, 12: 448; DI.6151.

\textsuperscript{997}Df.200871, Bernát L. Kumorovitz, Veszprémi regeszták (1301-1387) [Charter-calendars from Veszprém] (Budapest: A kadémiai Kiadó, 1953), no. 133; A Ökl 24: 231.


\textsuperscript{1000}A ÖKl 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Smičiklas 6: 137-138.
transaction, is quite informative it is worth dwelling on this point for a while.

The first important information to be noted is that leases were mostly written during the provincial chapter of the Priory. According to the customs of the Hospital, the presence of at least four brothers (preceptors) was required to form a quorum for decisions on the affairs of the Order, especially in case of the landed properties. In the Priory of England, for instance, even if the prior happened to issue charters concerning leases under his own seal, the document was supposed to be confirmed by the common seal of the Priory at the next provincial chapter. The Hungarian-Slavonian Priory followed a similar process as far as it is possible to reconstruct the dates of the provincial chapters on the basis of the charters issued for term leases. Some exceptions can be found in the case of the Székesfehérvár preceptory, which rented out its estates without the consent of the provincial chapter. Most likely there were always enough resident brothers besides the preceptor to hold a vote. Karl Borchardt observed in the province of Alamania that if the rent did not exceed a certain amount of money the preceptor was authorized to farm out landed properties without the consent of the brethren.

Unlike many Western priories, the local Hospitallers did not appoint rent collectors but they fixed term-days, roughly the same for all the lessees. They were to appear at the provincial chapters where both the prior or the lieutenant prior along with the brethren were also present. Occasionally one term-day was fixed, but generally they fixed two term-

---


1002 Gervers, Prima camera, lxxii.

1003 See Chapter IV.


1006 In 1353 Baudoin Cornuti deprived the lessees of their estates those did not come to the provincial chapter for the payment of the rent. The prior called the absent lesseis rebelles, infideles and contumaces for not attending the assembly. Smičiklas 12: 165-167. See also the convocation on 8 September 1374. Fejér CD 9/4: 614-616.
days: the feasts or of St. George and St. Michael or their octaval feast. At times they fixed other term-days: All Saints', St. Martin’s, Holy Trinity, Palm Sunday, Easter, Pentecost, or Christmas. The Hospitallers did not align themselves with the feast of St. John the Baptist as in many other priories but attributed more importance to the beginning and end of the annual intensive agricultural activity. Certainly, there is nothing surprising in this method of management as these rules and “frameworks” were dictated by common sense rationality. They rented their lands out for fixed or unfixed period of time. As for the first, the only condition for the continuation of the lease was the regular payment of the rent (census). However, the contracts produced by the Order had at least two characteristic features. First, in the case of the majority of leases the Order farmed out its lands to those who had already proved their adherence to the Hospital. Moreover, the author (actor) sometimes mentions the deeds or merits of the would-be lessee in the narration part of the charter. Accordingly, the fidelity expressed towards to the Order was added to the prerequisites for the continuation of the lease. It occurred at times that much importance was

---

1007 A U O 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Smiciklas 6: 137-38; Fejér CD 8/3: 147-149; A Okl 10: 146-147.

1008 Fejér CD 8/3: 147-149; A Okl 10: 146-147.

1009 Fejér CD 8/1: 202; Smiciklas 8: 114-115, 9: 341-342; Cartulaire no. 4711; A Okl 2: 12-13, 11: 126; Df.257974, Df.258481; Barabás, A Blagay-család oklevél, 99-100.

1010 A O 1: 376, A Okl 4: 11-12.

1011 Fejér CD 9/2: 254-255.

1012 Solymosi, A földeúri járadékok, 258-259; A Okl 23: 336-337.

1013 Barabás, A Blagay-család oklevél, 74-75; Smiciklas 8: 353-354; A Okl 3: 316.

1014 Fejér CD 8/3: 341-343; A Okl 12: 146.

1015 Although it also occurred: Dl.100023.

1016 For certain years or for lifetime.

1017 For instance, permanently: 26 May 1328. Fejér CD 8/3: 341-343; A Okl 12: 146-147.

1018 Cf. A O 1: 376; A Okl 4: 11-12.

1019 From a charter of 1329 it turns out that Domenico Ragazzino served the Order both “ultra et citra mare.” Df.257974, Df.258481.
attributed to it, as happened in the course of the very first case. Here the prior emphasized in
the agreement (pacta) that the only situation that would cause the Order to initiate
cancellation of the lease was in manifesta infidelitate contra domum nostram.\textsuperscript{1020} Nonetheless, from the complaint of Baudoin Cornuti in 1359 it is apparent that the Order was
unable to recover formerly leased estates of the Priory from those who ceased to be adherent
to the Order. This was the reason for the application to the king, who eventually gave his
consent, for the extension of the 32-year period of praescriptio.\textsuperscript{1021} As for fidelity or the
particular relationship between the Order and its lessee was concerned, two interesting cases
can be mentioned. As a means of redemption, in 1374 Albert, preceptor of Székesfehérvár
and John, preceptor of Szentlőrinc, leased a piece of landed property to a certain John and
Elisabeth, son and daughter of Paul of Tarcha. According to the charter, the Hospitallers
committed violent trespass in the course of which they killed a brother of the lessees, broke
the leg of another, beat Elisabeth herself and captured nine of their peasants. On the basis of
the judgment by probi viri, the Order offered a contract for annual rent, although it is not
known how far it was advantageous to the injured.\textsuperscript{1022} Two years later, in 1376, another
peculiar case was recorded by Gwylermus de Alcaniz, preceptor of Božjakovina.\textsuperscript{1023}
Nicholas, son of Arland, was formerly a lessee of the Hospital, but he had been deprived of
his rent for unknown reasons. He did not acquiesce to the decision of the Order and he sued
the Hospitallers. Finally, he managed to be returned to his former status under renewed
conditions.

\textsuperscript{1020}ÁUO 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Smičiklas 6: 137-138. It is to be noted, however, that those
who proved to be “faithful” leaseholders could apply for more lands for renting. It was the case with Thomas
Black (dictus Niger), who first rented an estate of the Priory from 1304 and another from 1321. Smičiklas 8: 74;

\textsuperscript{1021}Fejér CD 9/2: 373 9/3: 42-43, 9/7: 94-95. It is, however, somewhat problematic that customary law
demanded 40 years of praescriptio against ecclesiastical estates and 32 against noble properties. György Bónis,
Középkori jogunk elemei. (Római jog, kánonjog, szokásjog) [Elements of medieval Hungarian law (Roman law,
canon law, customary law)] (Budapest: K özgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, 1972), 90-91.

\textsuperscript{1022}It turns out from the charter that Albert’s son (filius suus), a certain Iwko de Kusychya was also
involved in the case. However, it is not clear from the wording of the document whether the named Hospitallers
committed these serious sins or they “only” were in charge of it.

\textsuperscript{1023}Df.230580. HAZU D-VI-25. ... et quod semper ipsum magistrum Nicolaum filium Arlandi nobis et
nostre ecclesie ac conventui fore iustum et fidelem reperimus et invenimus omnino et totaliter dedimus
restituimus et assignamus prelibato magistro Nicolao et per eum suis heredibus ac posteris...
Another characteristic feature, closely dependent on the above, was -- as noted by György Bónis half a century ago -- that leases implemented by military-religious orders were quite particular in Slavonia. Independent from the social status of the lessees, they assumed the same burdens as the predial nobles of the Order. This was probably the reason for emphasizing the importance of fidelitas, which was a substantial element of the praedialis relationship. The elements of the contracts bear further examination. In addition to the rent, the prior occasionally reserved the jurisdiction in case of the three or four most serious crimes for himself or for the preceptor of a given territory (districtus). It also occurred that he conceded it to the lessee. However, he generally owed the preceptor or prior two-thirds of all fines he imposed on the folks of the estate while he could retain one-third of the amount. Moreover, similar to the tenant peasants and predial nobles, the prior expected feed and fodder (descensus) from the lessees either in fact or in a commuted form (in cash or in kind). Lessees were also expected to give holiday gifts (munera), but sometimes were released from this burden. Several dispositions about taxes are extant which possibly related to the immunity won by the Order: the tithe on pigs (decima porcorum), the marten-fur tax (marturina), other tributa, collecta et exactiones, and occasionally the tithe as well. It is to be noted that the Hospitaller prior, being the count of Dubica, had jurisdiction over the conditional nobles of the county and thus had some revenues from them.


1025 E.g., ÁUO 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Smićiklas 6: 137-138.

1026 E.g., Df.257974, Df.258481.

1027 Fejér CD 8/4: 129-130.

1028 Solymosi, A földesúri járadékok, 258-259; A O kl 23: 336-337.


1030 Smićiklas 8: 556-559; A O kl 5: 294-595.


1032 Barabás, A Blagay-család oklevéltára, 74-75; Smićiklas 8: 353-354; A O kl 3: 316.
ex officio. 1033

Last but not least insight can be gained into the operation of the leasing system. On the basis of nine charters 1034 -- out of some fifty documents which concern term leases -- the renting out one of the estates of the Priory can be reconstructed almost for two decades. The first known event is the act in 1360, when Prior Baudoin Cornuti leased the possession of the Order in Szenta -- which belonged to the preceptory of Csurgó -- to the sons (Stephen, John, Nicholas, and Ladislas) of the late Nicholas of Lendva. The lease was given for their lifetime with a rent of five marks to be paid annually on the feast of St. Michael. Baudoin reserved his jurisdiction in case of major crimes (bloodshed, incendiary, and theft). The prior demanded the tithe from their produce and “similarly to the praediales of the Order,” once a year the lessees were supposed to provide feed and fodder (descensus) to the prior or the preceptor of Csurgó. 1035 These conditions were to be valid as long as the lessees remained faithful to the Hospital. The lessees regularly met the payment at least up to 1368. In 1371 the prior modified the contract by conceding the jurisdiction in the case of major crimes, moreover, the lessees were allowed to keep the fine they acquired from such activities. Three new elements were added to the contract. First, in 1371, only two sons of the four, Stephen and John, were listed as lessees. Second, the rent was raised from five to fourteen marks although there is no sign of the extension of the estate or inclusion of additional landed properties. Third, probably in respect of the raising of the rent, the prior demanded that the rent be divided into two parts, to be paid at the feasts of St. George and St. Michael. That is, he replaced the former single term-day with two days. Records reveal the fulfillment of the contract up to 1377 and it seems that the rent was paid twice a year. Thereafter, however, they got a receipt not from the prior but from the preceptor of Csurgó, who was in charge of the territory. The reason for this is to be sought in the succession of the priors. Raymond de Beaumont, the new prior, convoked all the prediales and leaseholders of the Priory at the first provincial chapter

1033 Thallóczy-Horváth, Alsó-Szlavónia, 59; Fejér CD 9/7: 178-179; Smičiklas 12: 651.
1034 Between 12 September 1360 and 29 September 1377.
1035 They paid 80 deniers in 1363 (Fejér CD 2: 168) while 50 deniers in 1366 (DI.5498) and 1368 (DI.5704) as descensus.
headed by him in 1374. Thus the prior renewed the contracts with the lessees of the Order including the Lendvais, whom, by this token, he exempted from the descensus. Afterwards, however, he left the country and entrusted some of his duties to his lieutenant, Arnold de Beaumont, who was by chance the preceptor of Csurgó.

7.1.4. Other Revenues

From the same period other some potential sources of income are noted: tolls, market-right, mills, and fishponds. Unfortunately, these data are very scattered and they were recorded for purposes other than leases and estate management, thus the revenues or profit made from them cannot be estimated. This is similar to the incomes raised from the activity of several preceptories as places of authentication (loca credibilia). Acknowledging the lack of satisfactory numbers of source materials, fortunately the frameworks of estate management of the Hospital in Hungary can still be outlined. Nonetheless, even on the basis of the documentation at our disposal the amount of revenues of the Priory could not be estimated. No account books have survived, not even the results of the Europe-wide papal inquest executed in 1373. Although in that case the pope

1036 Dl.6319.

1037 Barabás, A Blagay-család oklevéltára, 76-79; Smičiklas 8: 359-361; A Okl 3: 332-334; Dl.6541.


1039 Bernát L. Kumorovitz, Veszprémi regesták (1301-1387) [Charter-calendars from Veszprém] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1953), no. 786; Fejér CD 5/2: 528-543, 8/2: 495-496; A UO 9: 227-238; A Okl 7: 285; Dl.106165, Érszegi, “Fejér megyére vonatkozó oklevelek,” 196; Smičiklas 16: 211.

1040 Fejér CD 9/4: 258-260, 9/7: 301; Érszegi, “Fejér megyére vonatkozó oklevelek,” 194, 199; Fenyvesi, Tolna megye, 141; Dl.106153, Dl.106154, Dl.106202. The increase in the number of fishponds in the possession of the Priory shows the turn of the Hospitallers towards more profitable activities.

1041 To be discussed in Chapter VIII.

reprimanded the brethren for neglecting to rent out their lands, it is not certain that it was the case with the local Hospitallers. Under limited circumstances, the direction of approach must be changed to a survey of the taxes and dues paid by the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory to the central treasury of the Order.

7.2. Taxes and Dues

Those Hungarian sources that survived either in their original form or as transcripts are completely silent in respect to the imposed and paid taxes of the Priory. This is true for both their amounts and the mere fact of the payment. Research conducted in the Central Archives of the Order shows that it is not only due to the loss of sources, which was higher than the Western European average, but also due to the fact that making notes about payments were largely accidental in general practice of the Other. Even if such documents were made they only had temporal validity in the given financial year,\(^{1043}\) thus long-run keeping them was not necessary. Before the analysis and/or evaluation of the payments it is worth surveying the different taxes the preceptories were supposed to pay to the Hospitaller Convent.

From the early history of the Hospital, the financial basis of the Order was provided, to a great extent, by payments from European priories. This was the case insofar as the basic function of the single preceptories was to cover the expenses of the central government of the Order, that is, the Convent seated first in the Holy Land (Jerusalem and Acre), and later in Cyprus and Rhodes. The preceptors surrendered -- through the provincial master or prior -- a

---

\(^{1043}\) The central administration at Rhodes started the year, that is, the new copy books on 25 March. Many European priories, however, regarded “New Year’s Eve” the feast of St. John the Baptist. Nonetheless, the chapters general, often convoked to autumn dates, could fix term-days other than the above.
part of the incomes of the administrative units under their commands, raised from different sources and paid under various titles: responsiones, arreragia or debita, tallia or taxa, mortuaria, vacantia, spolia, iocalia, passagia, elemosina, and pitantia.\footnote{Except the so called camera prioralis which was a benefit of the prior and thus not to be paid to the Treasury. It was usually the Master and the chapter general to assign the camerae of a given priory. See “The old and new statutes of the order of St. John of Jerusalem,” translated from the edition of Borgoforte, A. D. MDCLXXVI. in Mons. L’abbé de Vertot, The History of the Knights of Malta (London, 1728), 66; Winter, Sources concerning the Hospitallers, 18.} The most substantial tax, perhaps, was that paid as responsio.\footnote{Cf. Anthony Luttrell, “The Hospitallers’ Western Accounts, 1373/4 and 1374/5,” Camden Miscellany 30 (1990): 1-21; Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller, 78.} Although there were attempts to fix the proportion of the responsio,\footnote{1262, § 23. See Edwin J. King, The Rule, Statutes and Customs of the Hospitallers, 1099-1310 (London: Methuen, 1934; reprint: New York: AMS Press, 1980), 59; Anthony Luttrell, “The Hospitallers’ historical activities: 1291-1400,” in Anthony Luttrell, The Hospitallers in Cyprus, Rhodes, Greece and the West, 1291-1440 (London: Variorum Reprints, 1978), XVII 7.} in the very beginning all surplus that was not regarded as of prime necessity had to be sent to the Convent. According to the statutes of the Order this often led to abuses as the preceptors interpreted the notion of “prime necessity” very differently. Therefore it was made a statute at the chapter general of 1262, and reaffirmed several times, that priors should keep an account book\footnote{1262, § 20; King, The Rule, Statutes and Customs, 58.} and that they had to pay a certain proportion of their incomes.\footnote{James E. Nisbet. “Treasury Records of the Knights of St. John in Rhodes,” Melita Historica 2 (1957): 96.} This was supposed to be one third of the revenues of the given preceptory, but the chapter general could vary from it and fix an “agreed” amount that the Priory was supposed to send.\footnote{James E. Nisbet. “Treasury Records of the Knights of St. John in Rhodes,” Melita Historica 2 (1957): 96.} The responsio was paid by the prior or the preceptors present at the chapter general to the treasury of the Order (thesaurus communis or aerarium commune) through a conventual official (receptor generalis). His primary function was the gathering of the taxes of the Order or sometimes arrangement for collection with the help of collectors. The leader of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory was not the only one who was regularly absent from the supreme assemblies of the Order. It was not infrequent that the priories sent their responsiones through the receptores of other priors, such as the English sent their taxes via the Priory of Toulouse. It also occurred, however, that taxes were...
collected by seculars, for instance, by Venetian and Genoese merchants or at times by bankers of Florence. Alberti Antichi, for instance, transported money by the commission of the Hospital.\textsuperscript{1049}

In the fourteenth century the responsio could be sent during or after the termination of the financial year to Rhodes or Avignon. According to the statutes of the chapter general of 1344 the priories of the Italian langue (lingua) sent their payments to Avignon, except those of Hungary and Messina, whose brethren were expected to send it to Naples by the middle of August.\textsuperscript{1050} A unique situation was created by the Great Schism of 1378. During the schism only nine of the 21 European priories regularly sent their responsiones to the Convent. There were some who paid virtually nothing for a decade.\textsuperscript{1051} It is more or less possible to figure out which pope the given priory adhered to, but one can be easily mislead one. As already discussed in Chapter V, it seems that the Hungarian Priory became divided. Raymond de Beaumont became an adherent of Urban VI,\textsuperscript{1052} but John of Palisna ingratiated himself with Juan Fernandez Heredia and through him was an adherent of Clement VII. From the beginning of the 1380s Heredia\textsuperscript{1053} and the anti-master, Riccardo Caracciolo, alternately assigned preceptors to Hungarian preceptories, although there is no sign of responsiones or other dues paid to any of the parties.\textsuperscript{1054}

\textsuperscript{1049}AOM 320, fol. 50r-51r. See Appendix B no. 54.

\textsuperscript{1050}AOM 280, fol. 48v. See Appendix B, no. 28. The priories usually gathered together the responsio of their preceptories but five Southern Italian preceptories paid their own dues directly to the Treasury. Cf. Luttrell “The Hospitallers’ Western Accounts,” 5.


\textsuperscript{1053}AOM 322, fol. 253r; Lelja Dobronić, Viteški redovi. Templari i Ivanovci u Hrvatskoj, [Knightly Orders. Templars and Hospitallers in Croatia] (Zagreb: Kršćanska Sadašnjost, 1984), 170-171.

According to the sources the responsio of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory amounted to 300 to 400 florins annually, which was augmented with other extraordinary taxes during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{1055} One always should bear in mind that the information is about the tax imposed and not the tax paid.\textsuperscript{1056}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1317-1327</th>
<th>1330-1340</th>
<th>1373/1374</th>
<th>1374/75</th>
<th>1382-1392</th>
<th>1418-1419\textsuperscript{1057}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsio</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150 (passagia)</td>
<td>1000 (tallia)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{TABLE 3. Taxes levied/paid on/by the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory (florins)}

The first sum of responsio is known from 1317, when Pope John XXII appointed Filippo de Gragnana as the prior of Rome and Hungary by levying an 8,000 florin tax to be paid.\textsuperscript{1058} Chiefly based on the amount of later taxes, it seems likely that this sum concerned the ten-year period of joint payment with the Priory of Rome, thus it is likely that the annual responsio was 400 florins for each priory. The second known responsio was imposed at the chapter general held at Montpellier in 1330. From the enactments of the assembly it turns out that for a ten-year period taxes of 83,400 florins, 60,000 bezants, and 100 silver marks were imposed on the priories of the Order under the title of responiones. Since it was that chapter general where the Master retained the Priory of Hungary\textsuperscript{1059} it is difficult to appraise how far it influenced the determination of the actual sum of the tax. Therefore, any estimate should be


\textsuperscript{1057}On 12 February 1418 the Master fixed the responsio of the Priory at 400 florins. AOM 340, fol. 167v. According to a charter of 21 December 1419 the Priory paid the 400 florins responsio in Constance for the year of 1419. AOM 340, fol. 170v.


made with caution, although I agree with Pál Engel in respect of the strikingly low taxes paid by the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory in comparison with other priories of the Order. However, it should be emphasized that there was no direct correlation between the incomes or profitability of the priories and the dues they paid to the Convent. The most tangible example was Cyprus, where extraordinary profit was realized for a long time, but there was a relatively small brethren to sustain. As for the Hungarian Priory, one can count comparatively few of the private grants and donations which were the main source of income in other regions of Europe. Yet these considerations do not provide a solid basis, for instance, as to conclude the importance or influence of a particular priory. Many other factors should be taken into account to label any of the administrative units as having peripheral importance in general or in particular, for instance, in the leadership of the Order as a whole.

This idea may be confirmed by the brief survey of the 10,000 florin tax imposed in September 1374, to which the Hungarian Priory, similar to the other priories of the Langue of Italy, had to contribute with 150 florins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priories and preceptories</th>
<th>Summa</th>
<th>Sum per priory (or preceptory)</th>
<th>Sum per langue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Francie</td>
<td>mille</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Campanie</td>
<td>ii·c·</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Aquitanie</td>
<td>iii·c·</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Tholose</td>
<td>vii·c</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Sancti Egidii</td>
<td>M cc</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Alvernie</td>
<td>vii·c</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Castellane</td>
<td>vi·c</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast. Emposte</td>
<td>ii·c</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Navarre</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Portugalie</td>
<td>iii·c</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Ispanie</td>
<td>iii·c</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Anglie, Scotie, Yrlandie</td>
<td>M ii·c·</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Alamanie</td>
<td>C·c·</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1061 In 1328 the sugar “industry” yielded 20,000 florins in Cyprus which amounted 1/9 part of the total taxes of the Hospitaller priories; in 1365 the responsio of Cyprus was fixed at 12,000 florins which was the highest among the priories. See Anthony Luttrell, “Sugar and Schism: The Hospitallers in Cyprus from 1378 to 1386,” in Hospitalier State, IV 158.

1062 AOM 320, fol. 41r. Note, however, that by summing the items, the total is only 9,100 instead of 10,000.
TABLE 4. Tax imposed on the priories and preceptories of the Hospital in 1374

Seemingly the sum imposed was determined not by any means on the basis of the “solvency” of the priory but on that of the Langue. In this respect the Langue of Italy (1,800 fl) was second after Provence (1,900 fl) and the reason for the relatively small sum to be paid by the priories was that there were many of them. Certainly, there were huge differences in the solvency of the priories in many cases (Auvergne versus Naples, etc.); the point is the possibility of other factors in levying any financial burden.

In surveying the various taxes one should consider other dues which were of lower rate but not to be neglected. The central treasury demanded arreragia, which meant the arrears of the responsiones, which became relatively high in several priories during the Great Schism. The appointment of priors or preceptors, who were responsible for collecting debts, could play a decisive role in priory finances. Besides the exaction of arrears, the Convent imposed emergency taxes (tallia) on its priories in a “trendy” way in the fourteenth century. Coping with financial crises, the Order often had recourse to assessing new burdens; thus these were less and less regarded “extraordinary.” For the financial years of 1373/74 and 1374/75 the tallia was fixed at 1/3 of the responsiones, but, according to the accounts of the Treasury, the Hungarian priory did not pay any tallia for these years and its responsio was paid only for the second financial year. The reason for the non-payment -- besides the general negligence

---

of the Priory -- may be explained by the troublesome succession of the prior in 1374.\textsuperscript{1064} Two years later, the general assembly of the divided Order, convoked/headed by Juan Fernandez Heredia in Valence-sur-Rhône, imposed 8,400 florins tallia on the Langue of Italy. The Hungarian Priory was supposed to contribute 1,000 florins out of the 8,400.\textsuperscript{1065} It is doubtful, however, that John of Palisna ever paid this sum, which otherwise amounted to more than the double of the regular responsio, to the Avignon Treasury. It is still to be discovered whether the divided Hungarian Priory sent any tax to Riccardo Caracciolo, the anti-master, who resided in Naples.

The fourteenth and fifteenth copy books (cartularia) of the central administration of the Order registered the dues paid as mortuaria and vacantia in separate folios. The mortuaria were revenues to be paid to the central treasury that were gathered after the death of the preceptor until 1 May of the next year;\textsuperscript{1066} vacantia meant all the revenues as long as the seat of the preceptor remained vacant. Obviously, the masters often abused the vacancy of the preceptories as long they could obtain revenues from them. It was not infrequent, either, from the fourteenth century onwards that preceptors governed the administrative units under their command while being absent. Thus they began to regard their duty as a prebend, that is, a source of income at a remote point in Europe and not as a scene of religious life that they were in charge of. From this time onwards many preceptors held more than one preceptory, even if this was against the original ideas of the Hospital. These new trends concerned the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory to a great extent.\textsuperscript{1067} This long-existent custom was approved by Pope Gregory XI in 1371 by permitting the preceptors the administer two or three preceptories provided that they were located in the same priory and their incomes altogether did not exceed 200 florins.\textsuperscript{1068}

\textsuperscript{1064}See Chapter V.

\textsuperscript{1065}A.O.M 322, fol. 292\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{1066}Cf. 1262, §47, King, The Rule, Statutes and Customs, 65.

\textsuperscript{1067}See Chapter VI.

\textsuperscript{1068}See Nicholson, The Knights Hospitaller, 51.
A part of the mobilia of the deceased brother had to be submitted to the central treasury as well. Although as early as the twelfth century the Rule fixed that those entering the Order should abandon their mundane goods, the late medieval decline in the discipline of religious orders fundamentally affected this principle. The statutes of the Order made it possible for a brother to dispose of about 1/5 part of his chattels with the consent of the Master. The rest, however, was to be submitted to the Treasury as spolia and iocalia. There is no sign that Hungarian Hospitallers ever paid such taxes to the Convent, but it is certain that the priors and preceptors had private properties and also that the Convent demanded the tax to be paid. Two examples may elucidate it. In 1374, in the course of the struggle for the prioral seat of Hungary, a papal reprimand included that the prior appointed by the Hungarian king usurped not only the goods of the Priory but also the private properties of the late Baudoin Cornuti. The basis for the complaint was the usurpation of the rights of the treasury. As for the private property of the preceptors, a charter of 1381 sheds some light on what brethren owned privately. The document reveals that while Michael, preceptor of Szentmárton, was sent to Italy in November 1380 as the envoy of the Hungarian prior, John of Palisna, his private house, also in Szentmárton, was attacked and ransacked in broad daylight (clara die venientes et ad eiusdem curiam hostiliter intrantes). He told the whole story in front of the cathedral chapter of Pécs, with the details of the damage caused by the robbers (tenant peasants of Nicholas of Szécs): two horses, cows and cash from his chest box as well as some other things. Although this incident does not provide enough basis for extrapolation to the entirety of the Priory, it clearly implies that the preceptor had his own private property.


1071 Fejér CD 9/7: 438-440.
Last but not least, there are three other kinds of taxes the Hospitallers had to pay to their headquarters: passagia, elemosina and pitantia. The first one originally meant the sums for the coverage of travels from the European provinces to the East. Practically, up to the end of the thirteenth century, it functioned as a sort of “entrance fee” inasmuch as it provided for the financial needs of the transfer to the Holy Land. From the fourteenth century, however, it was demanded by the Master to finance his travels (passagia) to the Convent. In many priories it continued as late as the seventeenth century with a function close to the original: as a sort of entrance fee -- depending on its amount -- it correlated with the office of the recruit after having taken the habit of the Hospital. 1072

More or less the same function can be observed in the case of elemosina in the priories of Alamania. 1073 The pitantia, on the other hand, covered the expenses of the brethren of the priories delegated to the Convent and/or to that of the hospices (hospitia) maintained for their service at Rhodes. 1074 There is no extant source proving that the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory contributed to such expenses, but it must have done so as the prior had a hospice on the island by the mid-fourteenth century the latest. 1075

The above survey does not refute the general observation that the financial contribution of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory to the coverage of the expenses of the Order was rather irregular and sometimes symbolic. This opinion is not only based on the imposed taxes or the missing accounts, but also on the 1363 reprimand of Pope Urban V, who whipped the local Hospitallers for their negligence in the payment of taxes. 1076 Here an attempt has been to estimate the overall incomes of the Priory on the basis of a survey of the taxes paid to the

---

1072 Nisbet, “Treasury Records of the Knights of St. John, 97.


1075 AOM 318, fol. 229v.

1076 Theiner 2: 57-58.
central Treasury of the Order. The attempt was unsuccessful because it became clear that there was no direct correlation between the revenues of any given priory and the extent of the burden imposed by the Convent. Nonetheless, this observation leads to the recognition that this discrepancy has far reaching implications for the Order as a whole. It certainly requires further investigation but, on the other hand, its meaning can be elucidated by briefly referring to two facts. First, from the second half of the fourteenth century certain Langues constantly complained about French dominance in the leadership of the Order (at Rhodes) which was no longer mirrored in the payments. Examination of the list of the Masters of the period under query shows that the actual financial contribution of the Langues was not always proportionate to the influence or power associated with it.

The determination of the solvency of the Hungarian Priory still awaits reconsideration, especially for the fifteenth century when there are numerous relevant sources. This would enable finding the answer to why the Hospitallers in Hungary were reluctant to pay the 400 florins responsio even if they had substantial incomes. For instance, Prior Raymond de Beaumont leased some possessions of the Order -- inherited from the Templars -- for 100 florins annual payment,1077 that alone amounted to a quarter of the annual responsio of the Priory. That is, one should go deeper than mere facts and figures. Looking at the later period when secular governors (gubernatores) collected the revenues of the Priory for their own benefit or for that of the royal chamber, it is not surprising that the Convent was often dissatisfied with the management by the officials of the Hospital in this part of Europe. However, they might not have seen the substance of the situation: the different social background or environment and the regional political situation, which negatively influenced the “profitability” of the brethren.

---

1077Fejér CD 10/2: 179.
CHAPTER VIII

HOSPITALLERS IN HUNGARY AND PRAGMATIC LITERACY

Similar to many Hungarian ecclesiastical establishments in the Middle Ages, the Hospitallers and the Templars settled in the kingdom played a significant role in one of the most important institutional systems of pragmatic literacy by acting as places of authentication (loca credibilia). As this system differs from the Western models in many respects, it is worth outlining its major characteristic features in order to facilitate the understanding of the Hospitallers' activity.

8.1. ADMINISTERING LAW IN HUNGARY (LOCA CREDIBILIA)

“The notary’s function was essentially that of witness: he had been present, and had written down what happened; or he had seen a document and drawn up a copy of it” - so wrote Robert Swanson on the role of England’s public notaries in the thirteenth century.\(^{1078}\) He could have written almost the same in respect to the uniquely Hungarian institution of the loca credibilia: an institution in Hungary which co-existed for several centuries with that of the public notary.\(^{1079}\) The loca credibilia were, however, more than scriptoria, or institutions of witness. Besides their role in recording and verifying transactions and in drawing up deeds, the loca credibilia performed a vital function in discharging the tasks of royal government and in undertaking judicial and administrative duties on behalf of the ruler and his principal agents. This fact paved the way for the first public notaries to appear in Hungary at the turn

---


of the thirteenth century. In contrast to places of authentication, public notaries had a much reduced role compared to Western Europe and their competence was largely confined to the field of canon law.\textsuperscript{1080}

The principal characteristics of this particular vehicle of “private” legal literacy and the participation of Hospitaller preceptories in the institution of loca credibilia will be outlined here. The loca credibilia were institutions that served the function of witnesses to legal transactions. They performed this function by issuing charters under their own authentic seals.\textsuperscript{1081} The background to this activity is most immediately linked to a decree of Pope Alexander III in 1166, which laid down that, after the death of the witnesses, only those documents might be considered valid which had been drawn up by public notaries (manu publica) or carried an authentic seal.\textsuperscript{1082}

As loca credibilia stemmed partly from pragmatic/legal literacy, its “beginnings” can be briefly noted. The origins of Hungarian legal literacy can be traced back to the beginning of the eleventh century. Although most charters attributed to St. Stephen are of dubious provenance,\textsuperscript{1083} it is widely accepted that the royal court attracted learned and erudite men from Bavaria. The number of charters issued annually by the royal court scarcely rose over the course of the eleventh century. Nevertheless, a respect for the written record is evident


\textsuperscript{1082}Cf. Bernát L. Kumorovitz, A magyar pecséthasználat története a középkorban [The history of the use of seals in the Middle Ages in Hungary] (Budapest: M agyar Nemzeti M űzeum, 1993; reprint), 14; Scripta vero authentica, si testes inscripti decesserint, nisi forte per manum publicam facta fuerint, ita quod apparent publica, aut authenticum sigillum habuerint, per quod possint probari, non videntur nobis alicuius firmitatis robur habere: Wilhelm Ewald, Siegelkunde (M unich-Wien: R. Oldenbourg, 1972), 42.

\textsuperscript{1083}Six of the ten charters analyzed proved to be forgeries while the rest have been interpolated or reformulated in the course of time.
during the reign of King Ladislas I (1077-1095). Evidence of legal literacy is suggested by surviving or reconstructed charters (although at this time they were issued without seals). The canons of the Council of Esztergom, published around 1100, provide further evidence of a wider reception of literacy.

The next step in legal literacy was the appearance of sealed private charters at the turn of the twelfth century, which partly originated from the statutes of Ladislas I and of Coloman (1095-1116). Although only one (reconstructed) cartula sigillata is known, it has been shown that such documents were used in commercial transactions between Jews and Christians as proof of a purchase or a loan. During the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, the majority of sealed charters were issued at the request of the beneficiaries involved. Doubtless they felt it important to have their rights and obligations recorded in writing. In this respect, Hungarian usage conformed to wider European norms. The other significant category of official documentation consisted of charters issued by the royal chancellery. A characteristic feature of documents of this type was that their authenticity was based on the attached royal seal, symbolizing the king himself.

The final impulse which brought the places of authentication into existence was the reform of the royal chancellery introduced by King Béla III (1173-1196). During Béla's

---


1085 Arts. 20, 21, 34. DRMH ser. 1, 1: 27, 29.


1090 For the twelth-century reform, see András Kubinyi, “Királyi kancellária és az udvari kápolna a XII. század közepén,” [Royal chancery and aulic chapel in the middle of the twelfth century] Levéltári Közlemények 46 (1975): 61-120.
reign, beneficiaries ceased to be responsible for drawing up charters recording transactions, and this task was instead apportioned to the clerks of the royal chancellery. According to a widely held opinion, Béla III was probably influenced by Western European models, partly French and, to a certain extent, English, but there is no agreement on this point. László Mezey, for instance, has pointed out that French private legal literacy flourished only after 1220-1230 and, thus could not have influenced Béla III’s reforms. Instead, Mezey and others trace the origin of Béla’s reforms to the Byzantine court. It may well be that the “pragmatic literacy” introduced by Béla’s uncle, Manuel I, served as an inspiration, especially in respect of the formal establishment in Byzantium of defined vehicles and instruments of authenticity (demosiosis) at this time.

Another group of scholars -- including Ferenc Eckhart, Imre Szentpétery, L. Bernát Kumorovitz, and György Bónis -- have argued that the places of authentication evolved as autochthonous institutions and that they originated out of the office of pristaldus (usually translated as bailiff) and out of the role played in the eleventh and twelfth centuries by the major chapter-houses in administering ordeals. The importance of the pristaldi in acting as a living record of transactions was reduced by the aforementioned decree of Pope Alexander III which emphasized that after the death of the witnesses, all other instruments except for documents with seals lost their validity. Moreover, these bailiffs were regularly

---


1092 For instance, Géza Érszegi and Árpád Varga.


1094 Cf. DRM H, ser. 1, 1: 141; DRM H, ser. 1, 2: 249.

1095 Cf. DRM H, ser. 1, 1: 148. The expression derives from the Slavonic “pristav” ~ “to be present”.

bribed (or at least said to be) by the parties involved. The renewal of the Golden Bull of 1222 in 1231 regulated and restricted the role of the pristaldi. Article 21 decreed that “because many people suffer harm from false bailiffs, their summons or testimony shall not be valid without the witness of the diocesan bishop or the chapter.”

In short, the origin of the places of authentication may be attributed to (1) the activity of the royal chancellery, which served as a model; (2) the development of customary practices, most notably in respect of the ordeal; and later (3) the use of the authentic seal. Documents sealed with an authentic seal (sigillum authenticum) had complete authenticity (fides plenaria): that is, they were to be given full credit by all parties concerned. It is in this respect that Hungarian practice diverged from West European norms: in Hungary, no one’s seal was considered authentic in respect of his own affairs and a third “official” party, for instance, locus credibilis, had to be involved. Places of authentication turned to each other to record their own legal transactions. In the process of acquiring this legal role, the conventions governing Hungarian practice confirmed and reinforced the authority and weight given to the seals of the principal religious houses.

The earliest places of authentication were the major chapter houses: Veszprém in 1181, Székesfehérvár in 1184, Buda in 1211, and Arad in 1221; and, from the mid-thirteenth century, the Benedictine abbey of Pannonhalma, the Premonstratensian priory of Jászó, the Stephanite preceptory of Esztergom, and the Hospitaller preceptory of Székesfehérvár. These constituted -- along with the other religious houses belonging to these orders -- an embryonic institutional structure.

According to recent studies, there were almost seventy places of authentication in the medieval kingdom of Hungary. By the beginning of the fourteenth century and by virtue of their locations they were able to provide loca credibilis services to the entire realm. Besides

---

1096 DRMH, ser. 1, 1: 38.

the cathedral and collegiate chapters, one may also find among the loca credibilia convents of the Benedictines, the Premonstratensians, the Hospitalers, and the Canons Regular of St. Stephen. There is, however, no sign of similar activity among either the Cistercians or the mendicant orders. Some scholars have pointed out that the lack of a conventual seal hindered such activities. It is known, however, that in Poland the Cistercians played an important role in charter production.

As a result of the development and consolidation of the institution of loca credibilia, the “written record” had superseded “memory” by no later than the last third of the thirteenth century. In regard to church affairs, however, ecclesiastical courts did not accord full recognition to charters issued by loca credibilia.

8.2. Hospitaller Preceptories as Places of Authentication

During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, nine preceptories of the Hospital (from eight counties) were involved in the loca credibilia activity either occasionally or regularly. These preceptories were: Székesfehérvár, Újvidék, Sopron, Csurgó, Dubica, Torda, Bő, Pakrac, and Gyánt. It should be noted that none of the public archives (conservatorium publicum) of these

---


1100 Six convents: ibid.


1103 Anna Adamska, “From Memory to Written Record in the Periphery of Medieval Latinitas: the Case of Poland in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries,” in Karl Heidecker, ed., Charters and the Use of the Written Word (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 91.

preceptories has survived, thus only small fractions of the original stocks are extant -- those documents which have been collected from different extant archives of other places of authentication or from private archives. Moreover, the activity of two houses (Bő and Pakrac) cannot be studied adequately as there are no extant charters issued by their scriptoria. The only known fact is that the preceptory of Pakrac acted as a place of authentication between c.1266 and 1278, while the convent at Bő, formerly a Templar house, operated as a locus credibilis between c.1330 and 1351. The activity of these preceptories has been deduced through charters issued by other institutions. Similarly, little is known about the activity of the Gyánt preceptory, since there is only one extant charter issued by its preceptor around 1286.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preceptory</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Charters (#)</th>
<th>Period of activity</th>
<th>Arpadian Age (up to 1301)</th>
<th>Angevin Period (1301-1387)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Székesfehérvár</td>
<td>Fejér</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1243-1387</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujúdvar</td>
<td>Zala</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>before 1259-1352</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csurgó</td>
<td>Somogy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1264-1299</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakrac</td>
<td>Kőrös</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>before 1266-1278</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sopron</td>
<td>Sopron</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1276-1349</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyánt</td>
<td>Tolna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torda</td>
<td>Torda</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>before 1288-1296</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bő</td>
<td>Sopron</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>before 1330</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubica</td>
<td>Dubica</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1347-1385</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5. Charters issued by Hospitaller preceptories as places of authentication, 1243 to 1387**

Nevertheless, some 300 charters are known to have been issued by the other six Hospitaller preceptories up to the last quarter of the fourteenth century. Original charters comprise 57% of the corpus, 14% are authenticated, and 6% are simple copies; 18% are only

---


1107 ÁUO 12: 450.

1110 The convent issued charters as a place of authentication until c.1543. Nevertheless, the present study only concerned charters issued before the end of the Angevin rulership in Hungary (1387).

1110 Although the last extant charter of the Sopron preceptory was issued in November 1349, the brethren was accused of making forgeries in 1350 but finally they cleared themselves. Nagy, Sopron vármegye története, 1: 214-220.

1110 For the respective charters see APPENDIX A.
mentioned in other documents and the proportion of deperdita is 4%. What is more significant is the distribution of the charters according to the issuer preceptories. On the basis of the total number of documents and the time-span of the activity -- including the above three preceptories of ephemeral activity -- one can draw two major conclusions. It is striking that two thirds of the documents were issued by the Székesfehérvár preceptory, the earliest and the most important Hospitaller place of authentication in the kingdom.\textsuperscript{1111} And, -- with the exception of Székesfehérvár and Dubica -- all the preceptories ceased to issue charters by 1353. Presumably, the decree of King Louis I (1342-1382) in 1351 and the revision of the seals used by the places of authentication in 1353 caused a fundamental change in the activity of these places.\textsuperscript{1112} Since the influence of the advowees of proprietary churches and monasteries seemed to present a real danger of intervention, Louis I ordered the authentic seals of the smaller convents (conventus minuti) to be withdrawn and broken. As a consequence, from the mid-fourteenth century, several ecclesiastical establishments terminated their activity as locus credibilis. Some chapter houses and convents, however, such as the chapters of Székesfehérvár and Buda, the Bosnian chapter, and the Székesfehérvár Hospitaller preceptory were given country-wide authority to issue charters as locus credibilis -- as recorded in the beginning of the sixteenth century by István Werböczy.\textsuperscript{1113}

\textbf{M A P 6.} Hospitaller preceptories as places of authentication, 1243–1387


\textsuperscript{1112}Art. 3, (11 December) 1351. DRMH ser. 1, 2: 10.

\textsuperscript{1113}Sándor Kolosvári, Kelemen Óvári, and Dezső Márkus ed., Werböczy István Hármaskönyve. Tripartitum opus iuris consuetudinarii inclyti regni Hungariae, Corpus Iuris Hungarici, 1000-1895, (Budapest: Franklin Társulat, 1897; reprint: Budapest, Téka, 1990), 282.
However, it should be noted that those documents which recorded term leases (census)\textsuperscript{1114} do not belong to the above group of charters claiming fides plenaria. In such cases the conveyance of property right was not ensued, thus Hungarian customary law, which prohibited the charter issue in someone’s own affairs, did not require a document issued by a place of authentication.\textsuperscript{1115} For this reason, as with other individuals or institutions, the officials of the Hungarian-Slavonian priory and the preceptors of the preceptories issued charters under their own seal concerning, for instance, their tenants.\textsuperscript{1116}

Other characteristics of the charters published by the loca credibilia include the use of either parchment or paper, handwriting, graphic symbols and ornamentation, the seal itself and whether the deed was recorded in the manner of a chirograph. The scribes (notarii), headed by the lector of the chapter, and the custodes (or the priors)\textsuperscript{1117} of the religious houses

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1114}See Chapter VII.
\item \textsuperscript{1115}Kumorovitz, “Az authentikus pecsét,” 16.
\item \textsuperscript{1116}E.g., 1275 (A\textsuperscript{U}O 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Smičiklas 6: 137-138; 1304 (Smičiklas 8: 74; 1329 (Df.257974, Df.258481).
\item \textsuperscript{1117}Miklósy, “Hiteles hely és iskola,” 171.
\end{itemize}
ensured that on each occasion the type of charter issued befitted its content. Their work was aided by the use of model charters and, later, formularies which contained set patterns for many types of deeds.

As with other Hungarian places of authentication, the activities of the Hospitaller preceptories can be categorized as either “internal” or “external.” Internal activities included (1) the issue of litterae fassionales recording private legal transactions; (2) the publication of litterae relationales, reports sent to the curia concerning the administration of out-of-court procedures; and (3) the transcription of letters of record (litterae transcriptionales), usually for the purpose of their safe-keeping. As to their formal characteristics, three types of charters can be distinguished: litterae privilegiales, patentes, and clausae. According to the type (or content) of the given document, different set phrases -- in fixed order -- can be found.\textsuperscript{1118}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Protocollum</th>
<th>Litterae Privilegiales</th>
<th>Litterae Patentes</th>
<th>Litterae Clausae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intitulatio</td>
<td>Intitulatio</td>
<td>Intitulatio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscriptio</td>
<td>Relatio -- address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salutatio</td>
<td>Relatio -- salutatio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Contextus</th>
<th>Arenga</th>
<th>Promulgatio</th>
<th>Promulgatio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narratio</td>
<td>(Narratio)</td>
<td>(Narratio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositio</td>
<td>Dispositio</td>
<td>Dispositio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clausulae</td>
<td>Clausulae</td>
<td>Clausulae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctio</td>
<td>Sanctio</td>
<td>Sanctio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corroboratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Eschatocollum</th>
<th>Datatio (Datum or Actum)</th>
<th>Datatio (Datum or Actum)</th>
<th>Datatio (Datum or Actum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Series dignitatum or testes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Formulaic sets of the charters issued by the Hospitallers places of authentication

The majority of the charters issued by Hospitaller preceptories reported declarations of the parties appearing before the place of authentication. The registered affairs incorporated almost all areas of private legal actions. For instance, there are agreements (compositio); divisions of estates among the male relatives of the paternal line (divisio); conveyances of property right, such as grants; vendition and/or emption of landed properties; pledges (inpignoratio); exchanges of immovable goods (concambium), or payment of filial quarter (quarta puellaris or filialis).

\textsuperscript{1118}Cf. Hunyadi, “Regularities and irregularities,” 139-143.
The “external” activity of the preceptories as places of authentication included (1) the perambulation of boundaries (reambulatio); (2) the institution of new owners to their estates (statutio, introductio); (3) the recording of last wills in homes; and (4) the performance of inquests (either the inquisitio simplex or the inquisitio communis). The procedure followed in “out-of-court” business could start either in the immediate vicinity of the place of authentication or in the presence of one or more of its members and was performed orally in most cases. In the case of mandates -- from the mid-thirteenth century -- the competent official of the house opened the letter of mandate and read it aloud in front of the brethren. Afterwards, in most cases, a brother of minor rank was sent to the very spot to accomplish the task (often together with the royal bailiff [homo regius]). Having completed the task, the brother(s) returned to the preceptory and made an oral report. It was, subsequently, included in the letters of relation which were sent back to the mandator as an answer from the place of authentication. Sometimes, by request, the places of authentication also issued a copy to the parties concerned. Depending on the report and/or the result of the work done by the appointed institution, the mandator made the final decision or sent a new request to clarify certain details.

In the fourteenth century, charters -- following general Hungarian practice -- named the officials, indicated their rank and the individuals appointed for detached services. Therefore we can state that the staff appointed for external surveys (e.g. witnesses) usually consisted of brothers of minor rank, that is, the choir priests (clerici chori). From the names occurring in the charters, it can be inferred that these brothers were of Hungarian origin. We can safely assume that some members of the Hospitaller places of authentication -- as that of all others -- must have spoken the vernacular as well as have studied customary law. Those brothers on detached service were supposedly familiar with the local (consuetudo terrae) or general customs of the realm (consuetudo regni).

It is worth noting that the practice of Hungarian Hospitaller preceptories basically followed the norms in vogue at the time even though a reasonable part of the brethren were of

1119Michael, Johannes, Stephanus, Simon, etc.
Both the Hospitaller scriptores and the scribes employed by the Hospitallers consistently applied the formulaic structures that were widely used in Hungary. Nevertheless, a closer analysis reveals minor differences in the usages in Hospitaller scriptoria. For instance, the documents issued by places of authentication were promulgated under the name of the ecclesiastical institution, that is, under the name of a body (e.g. Nos conventus; Conventus cruciferorum or Fratres domus hospitalis) which was the “source” of authority and trustworthiness in contrast with the norm of issuing documents in the name of a natural person. In the intitulation of the charters, the Székesfehérvár preceptory indicated only the convent; others, like Sopron and Újvidék also added the name of the preceptor or the vice-preceptor to the protocol of the documents. Moreover, in some cases Hospitaller preceptors transgressed local customs when they issued charters under their own name, omitting the convent of the brothers as happened from time to time in Csurgó, Torda, Gyánt, and Dubica. The preceptories of Sopron, Torda and Dubica represent another peculiar situation since these houses often fulfilled their obligations as places of authentication together with other ecclesiastical or secular officials.


1122 E.g., c.1264 (ÂUO 8: 91-92; 117-119); 1266 (Smilčiklas 5: 369-370; ÂUO 8: 160; Imre Nagy, et al., ed., Zala vármegye története. Oklevéltár, 1024-1490 [History of Zala County, Diplomatarium], 2 vols. (Budapest, 1886-1890), 1: 50-51); 1276 (Jenö Házi, ed., Sopron szabad királyi város története. Öklevélek, [A history of the royal exempt town of Sopron. Diplomatarium] 2 ser, (Sopron: Székely, Szabó és Társa, 1921-1943), 1/1: 5-6; HO 3, 24-25); 1289 (Házi, Sopron szabad királyi város, 1/1: 12-13; Nagy, Sopron vármegye története, 1: 52-53); 1300 (HO 8, 404-405; Fejér CD 7/3: 119-120; 7/5: 563-564).

1123 E.g., 1276 (Házi, Sopron szabad királyi város, 1/1: 5-6; HO 3: 24-25); 1296 (Jakó, Codex diplomaticus Transsilvaniae, 307-309); 1300 (HO 8: 404-405; Fejér CD 7/3: 119-120; 7/5: 563-564); 1347 (Thallóczy-Barabás, A Blagay-család oklevéltára, 123-124); 1351 (Thallóczy-Barabás, A Blagay-család oklevéltára, 125-126; Smilčiklas 12: 39-40).
There are minor differences from the general practice in the manner of dating or using corroborant tools: seals, chirographs, witness-lists (testes), dignitary-lists (series dignitatum) applied by the Hospitaller loca credibilia. Nevertheless, no procedures or formulae are used which would have been unknown in the practice of other Hungarian places of authentication. On the other hand, these establishments were similar to each other with regard to the revenue they obtained (especially fees received after charter issuance and inquests). It is difficult to estimate accurately the overall income of these houses, for there is no reliable information available on the number of transactions by any single locus credibilis. Fortunately, several decrees were enacted during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries which fixed the fees for procuring charters and for performing other services. Although many of these decrees refer to the fees which were due to the royal chancellery, they provide indirect evidence as to the fees charged by loca credibilia. It is apparent, for instance, that ornate or painted initials increased the price of a privilege. Even on relatively simple charters a gap (sigla) can sometimes be found which was left for the (missing) initials. This suggests that the writing and the decoration of the charters represented different phases in their production. In respect of the Székesfehérvár Hospitaller preceptory, for instance, all evidence of spectacular ornamentation disappears after 1280. Presumably this was due either to the relative poverty of the parties requesting authentication services, or to the increased number of charters issued by its scriptorium. From the middle of the fourteenth century decorative initials reappeared, but never reached the previous level of ornamentation. Another factor was the appearance in the first half of the fourteenth century of paper replacing parchment, at least in the case of letters close and patent. The adoption of paper certainly lowered the cost of charters.


It is difficult to calculate the exact proportion of income generated by the business of authentication. It is unlikely that the analogy of chapter houses can be applied to monastic sites, since the leaders of the chapter’s chancellery, the lector and his deputy, the sublector, and the choir priests, received the fees as part of their prebends. In respect of the monastic orders it seems that the custodes and/or priors did not derive any separate revenue from this activity, even though they had a clearly defined role in the authentication.\(^{1128}\)

It should be noted that the only Hospitaller preceptories that profited from loca credibilia activity were those which acted regularly, such as Sopron, Újúdvar, and Székesfehérvár. From this point of view, the situation of Székesfehérvár was quite significant, since it was one of the two Hospitaller places of authentication allowed to continue its activity after the reform of Louis I in 1351/1353. This establishment was, however, one of the four most important places of authentication in the kingdom and it continued its activity up to the mid-sixteenth century, that is, until the Turkish occupation of the Hungarian kingdom. As the authority of the Hospitaller preceptory of Székesfehérvár was expanded to the entire kingdom, the number of parties and charters issued, and the income from this activity increased exponentially from the late fourteenth century onwards. In fact, since the Hospitallers lacked both royal and private grants they became progressively more dependent on loca credibilia activities for revenues. Besides the tithe gathered by the Hospitallers, the Order’s main revenues came from rents of land leased at term. However, as a consequence of persistent alienation of the goods of the Order this source of income decreased and therefore the income of its legal activity became extremely important.

8.3. The use of Seals

One of the most significant tools of pragmatic literacy is the seal attached to charters. Since the use of seals reveals many points far beyond the activity of places of authentication it is worth surveying in a separate subchapter. There are general matters concerning the details of the use of seals and their importance which in a way belong to the topics discussed in

\(^{1128}\)Mezey, “A pécsi egyetemalapítás,” 77.
previous chapters. In order to create a transparent picture of this topic as a whole, an attempt has been made to gather all the relevant pieces of information here. In the course of the following survey, the focus will be on the functional, sigillographical, and representative characteristics in the use of seals.

Although there is a manifest effort in sigillography to create a uniform typology, it is almost hopeless to establish the net of all possible considerations which would fit all scholarly expectations. It is crucial, however, because it points out the framework of the typology which will serve as a basis for the determination of the categories and for grouping the specimens of seals into classes. Partially following the way paved by the historiography of the Hospital makes the task easier, yet a slightly different grouping is used from that of E. J. King, the well-known monographer of the Order.\textsuperscript{1129} From a functional point of view, four classes were created: 1) seals of the priory; 2) seals of the officials of the priory; 3) common seals of the preceptories; and 4) seals of the officials of the preceptories. Somewhat different parameters are followed here from the principles of King’s basic work in regard to the seals taken into account. The following survey concerns not only the extant seals\textsuperscript{1130} but also all indirect pieces of information about corroborant tools ever used. These may be the sealing clauses of the corroborant formula of the charters or the ruins of once attached seals which help in reconstructing the use of Hospitaller seals.

Perhaps the first -- even though not the earliest -- seal was the one of the priory (sigillum prioratus). It was used in affairs which concerned the priory as a whole, particularly in case of the leasing of the possession of the priory; thus it can be regarded as a seal ad causas.\textsuperscript{1131} It cannot be ruled out that the priory established its seal at the very moment of the establishment of the Hungarian(-Slavonian) priory, but on the basis of its function it is more likely that its engraving took place as late as the beginning of the fourteenth century. Besides

\textsuperscript{1129}Edwin J. King, The Seals of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem (London: Methuen, 1932), 95.

\textsuperscript{1130}Primarily we utilized the seals to be found in the Collectio Antemohacisiana of the National Archives of Hungary; the so-called Kumorovitz-collection, kept in the Medieval Department of the Budapest Historical Museum; and the seal-copy collection of the Art History Research Group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

\textsuperscript{1131}Cf. Imre Takács, A magyarországi káptalanok és konventek középkori pecsétjei [The medieval seals of the Hungarian chapters and convents] (Budapest: MTA Művészettörténeti Kutató Intézet, 1992), 29.
the extant specimens, there is another fact which supports this hypothesis: the documents issued upon the sole leasing known from the Arpadian period (1275) was sealed by the seal of the prior.\textsuperscript{1132} Moreover, the confirmation of the privileges of the hospites at Čiče was authenticated with the seal of the lieutenant prior.\textsuperscript{1133} The leasing of the landed properties of the priory started at the beginning of the Angevin period, but the personal seals of the priors were used for such affairs during the first two decades of the period.\textsuperscript{1134} The existence of the seal of the priory may be assumed in 1320 and thus it can be linked to the activity of Prior Filippo de Gragnana.\textsuperscript{1135} The seal(s?) of the document have not survived, but the cuts for the former leather thong of the seals are visible on the 3-cm-wide plica of the parchment. The corroboration of the charter informs the reader that it had been sealed by the “seals of the priory,” although it is not clear what the plural form referred to. Since it was issued at the provincial chapter held at Gyánt, most likely the preceptors present also attached their own seals to the document. A year later, however, the sealing clause of a charter reported that it had been sealed with the seal of the priory (sigillum prioratus) at the provincial chapter. Unfortunately, the former seal is now detached and the blue-yellow twisted silk only attests the existence of the corroborant tool.\textsuperscript{1136} Thereafter, Filippo de Gragnana regularly used the seal of the priory but he certainly did not carry about it since it was also used in his absence by his lieutenant, Girardo de Gragnana, who sealed a document in connection with an affair in 1326.\textsuperscript{1137} Certainly, he held himself to the customs of the Order, as the seal of the priory was supposed to be kept in the archive (conservatorium) of the Order. Abuses can be observed from time to time. In part, this led Master Helion de Villeneuve to decree in 1337 that the seal of the priory had to be kept under the seal of the prior and that of four

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1132}ÁUO 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Smičiklas 6: 137-138.
\item \textsuperscript{1133}HO 7: 228-230; Smičiklas 7: 133-135.
\item \textsuperscript{1134}Smičiklas 8: 86-87, 353-354; A Okl 1: 311, 3: 109-110, 316; A O 1: 247-248; Thallóczy-Barabás, A Blagay-család oklevéltára, 74-75.
\item \textsuperscript{1135}24 April 1320. Smičiklas 8: 556-559; A Okl 5: 294-295.
\item \textsuperscript{1136}9 April 1321. Smičiklas 9: 10-11; A Okl 6: 39.
\item \textsuperscript{1137}24 April 1326. Dl.106115, Df.258480, A Okl 10: 111-112.
\end{itemize}
prud’hommes and used on the advice of these persons. Although the Master referred to abuses and losses which affected the Order, on the basis of the Hungarian practice it seems that he wanted the more rigorous observation of an already existing custom and not to introduce something ex novo. It must have been so even if there were misuses of the seals. In November 1329, nine seals were suspended on a document issued at the provincial chapter. It is not surprising but the corroboration reveals a somewhat unusual situation: has privilegiales litteras fieri fecimus et novi sigilli prioratus nostri Hungarie et Scavonie et sigilli nostri secreti et sigillorum fratrum suprascriptorum apensione muniri et roborari. Accordingly, the priory had a new seal engraved which may have been in connection with the conjuration mentioned in the narration part of the charter. From the above it is clear that Filippo de Gragnana attached his personal seal to the document, perhaps as its counter-seal.

Thereafter the priory was vacant for five years, so it is small wonder that we do not hear about the seal of the priory. The new prior, however, used the seal of the priory on his first appearance in Hungary in 1336. Conceivably, he used the same seal as his predecessor although he did not make any reference to this either in this charter or later. Nor it is known which seal was used on the next extant document three years later, in 1339, since only the silhouette of the former seal can be seen on the reverse of the parchment. In 1340, however, Pierre Cornuti used his personal seal and not that of the priory. The reason for this was functional since it was not used in relation to the landed properties of the priory:

\[1138\] King, The Seals of the Order, 130-131.
\[1140\] See Chapter VII. There is another, undated charter which reports the fact of the replacement of the seal of the priory. On the basis of the inserted charter, the editor of the Charters of the Angevin period (AO kl) included it among the charters issued in 1323. On the basis of the introduction of the new seal of the priory it is likely, however, that the document was issued between May 1328 and November 1329. Most probably it took place at the provincial chapter held in November 1329. Dl.106114, Fejér CD 8/2: 495-496, AO kl 7: 285.
he appointed his lieutenant. Several years later, a document related to a leasing was authenticated both by the seal of the priory and by the personal seals of the preceptors present at the provincial chapter held in Szenta in 1345. In the eighteenth century György Pray seems to have reprinted the seal-figure (fleur-de-lis) and the inscription (+S[IGILLUM] PRIORATUS HOSPITALIS S[ANCTI] I[H]OA[N]IS HUNG[ARIAE] ET SCLA[ON]IAE) of the seal of the priory, but his identification cannot be confirmed since the seal is lost. On the basis of extant sources it can be asserted that this seal was not in use for a long time. In 1350, Prior Baudoin Cornuti attached this seal to a document issued at the provincial chapter held in Vrana, but in February 1353 he asked King Louis I to annul the seal of the priory. It turned out that Frà Moriále had removed the seal (together with important charters of the priory) and alienated many goods of the priory through its use. The new seal was ready soon, as it was used at the provincial chapter held in May and it luckily survived, although badly damaged, on one of the charters issued on this occasion. It is a round-shaped seal, and its figure depicts a fleur-de-lis with ornamental foliage. Due to its present-day poor state of preservation and to poor publication its exact dimensions and inscription cannot be determined. Nonetheless, with regard to the major characteristics this seal seems to be

---

1143 31 May 1340. Smičiklas 10: 555-557; A Okl 24: 163. The edition reads the place of issuance of the charter as ‘Turana’ and identified it with Turin (Italy). It would explain why the prior had no access to the seal of the priory. However, we figured out that it is a misreading and the toponym in the text correctly is ‘Aurana’ that is Vrana. Here, Pierre Cornuti easily could have had access to the seal.

1144 24 April 1345. Dl.100023.

1145 Scholarly literature on sigillography sometimes does not make accurate notional distinction between the seal as an object (as a whole) and the figure represented on its forefront or sometimes on its reverse. To avoid misunderstandings here we refer to the latter as “seal-figure.”

1146 Dissertatio historico-critica de Prioratu Auranae in qua origo, progressus, et interitus, ex monumentis nondum editis, compendio a P. Georgio Pray e S. J. explicantur (Viennae: Josephus Kurzböck, 1773), 104.

1147 16 January 1350. Smičiklas 11: 566-567. According to the corroboration of the charter the seal of the preceptory of Vrana was also attached: in ciuis ... litteras duplices unius et eiusdem tenoris sigillis sancti gregorii baiulie Aurane et prioratus nostri Ungarie et Sclavonie pendentibus fecimus.

1148 14 February 1353. Dl.31, Dl.106124, Dl.106664, Fejér CD 9/2: 228-229.

1149 6 May 1353. Alsó-Szlavónia 43-45; Smičiklas 12: 159-161.

1150 Lejla Dobronić, Viteški redovi. Templari i Ivanovci u Hrvatskoj [Knightly Orders. Templars and Hospitallers in Croatia] (Zagreb: Kršcanska Sadašnjost, 1984), 162; eadem, Templari i Ivanovci u Hrvatskoj
identical with the one used in 1345 thus it is likely that only minor “safety elements” were modified on the new authenticating tool. Baudoin regularly used the seal of the priory so that there is no evidence for the use of his personal seal in Hungary. His successor, Raymond de Beaumont, used the same seal. Interestingly, none of the charters issued at the first provincial chapter he celebrated in September 1374 has sealing a clause although they were sealed with suspended seals and one of them has been preserved in fairly good state. Following the assembly, Raymond left the priory and there is no sign that his lieutenant ever used the seal of the priory. A dmittedly, no further provincial chapters were convoked until the end of the period under query, which was also due to the situation caused by the Great Schism in 1378. It is worth noting however, that Raymond, who was in office until 1381, returned for a short period in November 1384. At that time he leased out a good part of the possessions of the priory to Tamás of Szentgyörgy, Warden of Dalmatia and Slavonia for a substantial sum of money. More important is the fact, emphasized by the prior, that besides his personal seal he also attached the seal of the priory to the charter. In this way he wanted to emphasize his being the legitimate prior of Hungary and Slavonia. In his absence, supposedly, it was his lieutenant, Arnold de Beaumont who kept the seal in the preceptory of Csurgó. It is improbable that he or his fellow brothers handed it over to John of Palisna.

Manifestly less, but still valuable, information is at scholars’ disposal about the personal seals of the priory’s officials: seals of the priors and their lieutenants. According to

[Templars and Hospitallers in Croatia] Bibliotheka Povjesnica (Zagreb: Dom i Svijet, 2002), 163. Its diameter is around 40 mm.


1152About the troublesome succession of the prioral seat, see CHAPTER V.

1153Dl.6319. Fejér CD 9/4: 614-616. See in APPENDIX C no. 16.


1155See in CHAPTER IV.

1156Dl.7111, Fejér CD 10/2: 179.
the situation described above, the seals of the priors were used in the affairs of the priory before the establishment of the sigillum prioratus as well as in their “own” official affairs. The first reference to a personal seal dates back to 1189, when the first prior, Martin, placed his seal on a charter in Bohemia as preceptor hospitalis, although it is not known whether the seal was attached to his office or not. Much more is known about the seal of Prior Johannes who suspended his seal on a document about the agreement with the Benedictines of Pannonhalma concerning the debate over tithes. It is a round-shaped seal with a conventional fleur-de-lis; its inscription reads: (S)IGILLUM PRIORIS VNGARIE HOSPITALIS.

As far as its seal-figure is concerned, it may have been the archetype of the seal of the priory that appeared later. The lily might have symbolized the French origin of the majority of the brethren at the time of its engraving. It is also to be noted that the inscription referred to the development of the priory as well since it does not include Sclavonia. We also have to reckon with a methodological problem concerning to the identification of the priors’ seals. With the exception of the above-mentioned Martin and Filippo de Gragnana, the sealing clauses of the charters do not clearly reveal whose seal was attached to the document. The connection between the intitulation and the corroboration formulas of the charter is usually crucial: e.g. Nos frater XY ... sigilli nostri .... If the expression sigillum nostrum is preceded by (Nos) Conventus in the intitulation then it clearly referred to the common seal of the given preceptory. Therefore, the corroboration formulas used in the Arpadian period do not help in the accurate identification of the seals and this chiefly remains the case in the Angevin era as well. There are only two (or perhaps three) exceptions. The first is the case of Rolando de

---

1157 Ego Martinus, quondam prepositus et nunc preceptor hospitalis, sigillum meum appono. Antonius Boczek, et al., ed., Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae, 15 vols. (Olomucii-Brunae, 1836-1903), 1: 328; Cartulaire no. 865. It was an inscription-seal: +MARTINUS PREPOSITUS. See Libor Jan, “Pečeti rytířských duchovních řádů v Čechách a na Moravě 1189-1310 (s přihlédnutím k dalšímu vývoji),” [The seals of the military-religious orders in Bohemia and Moravia 1189-1310 (with special regard to their wider context)] Zprávy Krajského vlastivědného muzea v Olomouci 246 (1987): 2, 21, Fig. 1.

1158 See CHAPTER VII.

1159 PRT 1: 672-673; MonWesp 1: 70; 310; MES 1: 260, 278; ĀUΟ 1: 222-223.

1160 See APPENDIX C no. 15.

1161 See CHAPTER III.
Gragnana. The pieces of the former seal are still visible on a charter he issued in 1315\textsuperscript{1162} and it is evident that it was a vesica-shaped seal. Since the sealing clause of the document referred to the seal as being authentic, it cannot be identified as a memorial seal (sigillum memoriale). Conceivably, in this particular case Rolando used his personal seal as the prioral one, since it is assumed that the seal attached to the office of the prior was still round-shaped in the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{1163} Admittedly, these are assumptions, compared to the situation of Filippo de Gragnana, who expressis verbis noted that he placed his personal seal on the charter issued at the provincial chapter held in 1329: sigilli nostri secreti.\textsuperscript{1164}

Naturally, much more standardization can be observed in regard to the common seal of single preceptories. It was of fundamental importance for the activity of Hospitaller preceptories as places of authentication, as outlined above, since one of the most essential tools of such an establishment was its institutional seal. It is important to emphasize, however, that the activity of a preceptory as a place of authentication could have played a significant role in the emergence of a common seal, but was not the only initiative factor.\textsuperscript{1165} This is particularly evident in the case of the chapter houses. Their participation in the administration of ordeals, as noted above, required the existence of such an authenticating tool. The seal could also symbolize the autonomy of the college of the canons against episcopal power. This not only inspired the establishment of the common (corporate) seal but to a certain extent influenced the seal of the church (sigillum ecclesiae) by including the expression sigillum capituli in its inscription.\textsuperscript{1166} The activity as a place of authentication can

\textsuperscript{1162}Dl. 1857; AO 1: 376; AOkl 4: 11-12.

\textsuperscript{1163}The silhouette of a round-shape seal is visible on the reverse of the charter of Francesco de Gragnana issued in 1319. It is also plausible that it was the vice-prioral seal. Dl. 1960.


\textsuperscript{1166}Cf. Takács, A magyarországi káptalanok és konventek, 17-18.
still be regarded as a mediator, especially for the Hospitallers. The inscription of the earliest known common seal, that of the Székesfehérvár preceptory, reads: +SIGILLUM CAPITULI DO[MUS] HOSPITALIS IH[ERO][SO]LIMITANI DE ALBA, which is somewhat misleading with regard to the Order.\textsuperscript{1167} The Hospitallers tried to follow local customs even though occasionally the brethren separated itself from the preceptor, especially if he was a secular person.\textsuperscript{1168}

The corroboration formula of the first extant charter of the Székesfehérvár preceptory was already mentioned in connection with the Mongol invasion in the early 1240s. It contains relevant information for the present problem: quia proprium sigillum nostrum erat in maritima propter metum tartarorum ... litteras ... concessimus ... fratris Juliani custodis, fratris Luce preceptoris domus nostre et predicti magistri Ambrosii sigillis communitas.\textsuperscript{1169} Accordingly, in the absence of the common seal the officials placed their own tools of authentication on the charter. To increase the authenticity of the document, the name of Ambrosius, the general proctor of the preceptory and the lieutenant master of the priory, appeared in the intitulation as well. Undoubtedly the ante quem of this conventual seal is 1243. Although Kornél Szovák noted that the preceptory had introduced its common seal by royal mandate around the mid-thirteenth century, this hypothesis is not satisfactorily demonstrated.\textsuperscript{1170}

\footnote{1167}{It also appears in the intitulation of two early extant charters of the Székesfehérvár preceptory issued as a place of authentication. 1256 (Dl.83128); HO 6: 100-101; Kóta, Középkori oklevelek Vas megyei levéltárakban, 16-17. See \textsc{Appendix C}, no. 1.}

\footnote{1168}{Cf. 9 December 1339. Solymosi, A földesúri járadékok, 258-259; AOkl 23: 336-337.}

\footnote{1169}{ÁUO 7: 144-145.}

\footnote{1170}{Kornél Szovák, “Bencés hiteleshelyek a középkori Magyarországon,” [Benedictine monasteries as places of authentication in medieval Hungary] in Imre Takács, ed., Paradisum plantavit. Bencés monostorok a középkori Magyarországon (Pannonhalmi Bencés Főapátság, 2001), 83. In this respect, he seems to refer to the work of L. Solymosi but providing no page numbers. László Solymosi, “A székesfehérvári káptalan hiteleshelyi működésének főbb sajátosságai az Árpád-korban,” [M ajor characteristics of the activity of the Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter as a place of authentication] in Gábor Farkas, ed., A székesfehérvári Boldogasszony bazilika történeti jelentősége (Székesfehérvár: Székesfehérvár Város Levéltára, 1996), 180-201. We could not find anything which would confirm this hypothesis.}
Unfortunately there is not enough evidence to identify the seals used between 1243 and 1265. The original charter of 1256 was transferred abroad and the seal cannot be seen in the photograph. The first known seal’s inscription is that from 1259, but the seal itself is unknown. The earliest reliable data can be discovered on a charter which was issued in 1265; both the inscription and the seal-figure are recognizable. The photocopies shown in Appendix C illustrate that the same seal, that is to say, the same typarium was in use until the end of the Middle Ages. This major seal (sigillum maius) is round-shaped (Ø 55 mm) with an inscription framed by dotted circles. A standing Hospitaller brother can be seen on the seal, wearing the habit of the Order and holding a book in his left hand. The figure has not thus far been identified with either St. John the Baptist or St. Stephen. The figure of St. John the Baptist is quite frequent on the seals of European Hospitallers, but he chiefly appears with his attributes, namely, with the Easter lamb and a palm branch. Formerly I tended to identify the seal-figure with John the Baptist since there are some very similar samples in European usage. Imre Takács’s work, however, drew my attention to the common seal of the Stephanite convent of regular canons of Budafelhévíz (Holy Spirit), which is very close to that from Székesfehérvár from an iconographical point of view. Thus it seems wise to refrain from identifying the depicted figure with either of the patrons of the Order and the

1171 1243 (Dl.99844), 1256 (Dl.83128), 1259 (Df.262482), 1265 (Dl.582).
1172 See the charters of 1265 (Dl.582), 1500 (Dl.33501), 1524 (Dl.34291).
1173 According to Hungarian practice, the seal-figure should be the patron saint either of the house or the order itself. See Takács, A magyarországi káptalanok és konventek, Fig. 42/1. Takács, however, gives the inscription incorrectly! Sándor Domanovszky, ed., Magyar művelődéstörténet. Ösműveltség és középkori kultúra [Hungarian cultural history: Ancient and medieval culture], (Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, n. d.) 1: 365; János Jerney, “A magyarországi káptalanok és konventek,” [The chapters and convents in Hungary], Magyar Történelmi Tár 2 (1855), Fig. 72. See Appendix C, nos. 1-4.

1176 Takács, A magyarországi káptalanok és konventek, 50; Fig. 8; See in Appendix C, nos. 5-6.
The conventual church, although most Hungarian ecclesiastical institutions followed this path. The connecting link between the two convents may be the hospitaler nature of the activity processed by both orders and houses respectively. Another common characteristic feature which they shared was the activity as locus credibilis and perhaps it was indicated by the book held by the Hospitaler figure on the seal even though they were not (known as) men of letter.

The smaller seal (sigillum minus or memoriale) of the Székesfehérvár preceptory was attached by a leather thong in 1276, as opposed to the normal use when the seal closed the charters or was impressed on the back side of the parchment. The memorial seal is vesica-shaped and measures c. 44×27 mm. Unfortunately, all the seal-figures of the specimens found in the Kumorovitz-collection and in the National Archives of Hungary are badly damaged, so identifying them is almost hopeless. Yet similarities may be observed in comparison with the memorial seal of the Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter. The inscription around a standing figure can be reconstructed as: +S[IGILLUM] M E M [ORIALE] D O[M U S H] O S P I T A L [I S] D E A L B A. Imre Takács has determined 1325 as the ante quem of this copied seal. Nonetheless, investigating the extant letters close and letters patent issued by the preceptory, a very similar vesica-shaped contour can be observed measuring c.45×27 mm. In addition, the figures and the inscription of the charter of 1325 and that of the 1276 are identical. Consequently, on the basis of the seal-figure, the memorial seal should be re-dated to 1276, and what is more, according to the dimensions of the contours, the ante quem of its use could

---

1177 Takács, A magyarországi káptalanok és konventek, 45-101. There are also exceptions: cathedral chapter of Esztergom (pp. 57-58); Benedictine convent of Garamszentbenedek (pp. 61-62); collegiate chapter of Hájszentlőrinc (p. 65), etc.

1178 1276 (Dl.49224).

1179 See APPENDIX C, no. 7.

1180 Takács, A magyarországi káptalanok, 83.

1181 Dl.25035 (1268/9), Dl.49224 (1277), Dl.25766 (c.1280), Dl.104898 (1299).

1182 The dimensions of the seal on the charter of 1325: 46×27 mm.

1183 Dl.2304.

1184 Dl.49224.
even be 1268 or 1269. Similar to the practice of other places of authentication, the indication of the seal’s authenticity in the corroborations was quite inconsistent in the course of the second half of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{1185} The expression was stabilized in the Székesfehérvár preceptory by the first third of the fourteenth century: sigilli nostri authentici munimine roboratas\textsuperscript{1186} or sigillo nostro authentico fecimus consignari.\textsuperscript{1187}

It is not known how far the use of seal in Székesfehérvár influenced similar activity by other Hospitaller preceptories. What is sure is that one can determine the ante quem of the use of seal on the basis of the beginning of the activity as a place of authentication. Practically no seals of preceptories are known other than the ones used by the Hospitaller loca credibilia.\textsuperscript{1188} The reconstruction is more perplexing as there were Hospitaller scriptoria which indicated the preceptor or other officials of the given administrative unit in the intitulation of the charters. It is more than likely that these documents were sealed with the personal seals of the officials involved and not with the common one. It is conceivable that the choice of this solution was determined by the lack of a common seal of the brethren since some of them had no such corroborating tool in the second half of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{1189} For instance, Gerard, the viceprior of Újudvar in 1266,\textsuperscript{1190} or the preceptors of the Sopron preceptory attached or suspended their personal (official) seals to/on the charters which they issued as places of authentication.\textsuperscript{1191} Nor should it be ruled out that those preceptories


\textsuperscript{1186}See the charters of 1298 (Dl.1499), 1333 (HO 3: 100), 1334 (Dl.2854), 1343 (Df.229977), 1347 (Dl.30646).

\textsuperscript{1187}1353 (Dl.3261).

\textsuperscript{1188}Except the one of Vrana (1350); Smičiklas 11: 566-567.


\textsuperscript{1190}Smičiklas 5: 369-370; ÁU O 8: 160; Nagy, Zala vármegye története, 1: 50-51.

\textsuperscript{1191}c.1275-1277 Theodoric: Df.264832; Házi, Sopron szabad királyi város, 1/1: 5-6; HO 3: 24-25; Rhodianus in 1278: Fejér CD 7/4: 179-180; Detric in 1289: Házi, Sopron szabad királyi város, 1/1: 12-13; Nagy, Sopron vármegye története, 1: 52-53. There is a vesica-shaped silhouette visible on the reverse of the latter which might have been the personal seal of Detric or that of the memorial seal of the preceptory.
In all likelihood -- as far the Arpadian period is concerned -- a common seal was used in Csurgó from 1278, in Torda from 1295, in Újudvar from 1298 and in Sopron from 1307 the latest. In Újudvar and Sopron, the early charters issued by the locus credibilis were authenticated by the seal of the preceptor, but the increasing number of affairs demanded the introduction of the common seal. “Similar” to the Székesfehérvár preceptory, the figure of the common seal of Újudvar does not depict the patron saint either of the conventual church or of the Order, which coincided in this case. The seal is 40 mm in diameter and it depicts a simple isosceles cross with shanks that are broadened towards their ends. Thus it is reminiscent of the eight-pointed cross of the Hospital and can be regarded as a self-representation of the Order, similarly to the common seal of the Székesfehérvár preceptory. In the upper part of the Újudvar seal, a conventional (pointed) star (or sun) can be seen on the sinister, while a crescent is depicted on the dexter. The inscription on the seal (+S. CONVENTUS CRUCIFERORUM DE NOVA CURIA) raises an earlier question. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, as well as in connection with the formulaic sets of the charters, the members of the Order were often called cruciferi in this part of Latin Christendom. Moreover, the brethren also used such expressions as intitulatio, that is, self-denomination. The appearance of such an expression in the inscription of the seal and its characteristic features ascertain its engraving around the mid-thirteenth century. As if the already

---

1192 Df.286407.

1193 On the basis of the amount of the extant charters, Újudvar was second while Sopron the third in rank after Székesfehérvár. However, the abolishment of the seals of minor places of authentication terminated the authenticating activity at Újudvar and other Hospitaller preceptories.

1194 For its Central European counterpart, see the common seal of the preceptory of Prague: Jan, “Pečeti rytířských duchovních řádu v Čechách a na Moravě,” 6, 21-22, Fig. 4-5; and the common seal of Český Dub (Svetíč). I owe thanks to dr. Libor Jan who rendered a photo-copy of the unpublished seal at my disposal.

1195 The seal (BTM Kumorovitz-collection, 64.139) of the charter of 1298 (Dl.1503) is badly damaged, there is an almost unharmed specimen on a charter of 1307. (Di.1716, 64.175) See in APPENDIX C, no. 9.

1196 Such intitulations can be observed in the practice of the Székesfehérvár preceptory from the 1260s. (Di.582, Di.962, Di.619, Df.230000). On the basis of palaeographical features, Imre Takács dated the engraving of the seal to the mid-thirteenth century. Takács, A magyarországi káptalanok és konventek, 93; See also Jerney, “A magyarországi káptalanok és konventek,” Fig. 96.
existing practice were continued by the Sopron preceptory, it did not depict its patron, John the Baptist, on its common seal but chose the depiction of the Lamb of God (Agnus Dei). However, since the Easter lamb can be found among the attributes of John the Baptist it might be an indirect reference to the Order’s patron saint. Especially as the depiction of Agnus Dei was quite frequent in the use of the priory as well as the Order in general.\textsuperscript{1197} The inscription on the 30-mm diameter round-shaped seal reads $+S[\text{GIL\textsc{UM}}]\ D\text{OM[US]}\ C\text{R\textsc{C\textsc{C}IF\textsc{F}ER\textsc{R}OR\textsc{UM}}\ I\text{N}\ S\text{V\textsc{P\textsc{R\textsc{O\textsc{N}}}}}$.\textsuperscript{1198} The ante quem of the use of the seal is 1310 as it was attached to the reverse of a charter issued by Peter preceptor.\textsuperscript{1199} Before the creation of the common seal of the preceptory, the preceptor’s personal seal was attached to the charters between 1302 and 1307.\textsuperscript{1200} The next series of specimens are extant from the period of preceptors Lorenzo of Perugia (1325-1336) and that of Giovanni Latini of Perugia (1344-1349). These seals also display Agnus Dei but besides the manifest iconographical differences it is striking -- although it has not been noticed so far -- that the lamb is depicted as standing in the opposite direction in comparison with the ones used formerly. It is likely that at the succession of the former preceptor, around 1325, the brethren engraved a new common seal retaining its seal-figure but, by the same token, they introduced “safety elements” as well.\textsuperscript{1201} On the basis of this situation, the use/existence of a memorial seal cannot be proved in the practice of the Sopron preceptory. Nonetheless, the activity of the preceptory came to an end in the mid-fourteenth century, but -- as noted in Chapter VI -- this was not only a direct consequence of the abolition of the seals of the conventus minuti ordered by King Louis I in 1351.

\textsuperscript{1197} Jan, “Pěstířských duchovních řádů v Čechách a na Moravě,” 2, 21, Fig. 3; and the common seal of Český Dub (Světlá). I owe thanks to dr. Libor Jan who rendered a photo-copy of the unpublished seal at my disposal.

\textsuperscript{1198} Ø c.20 mm. Df.201669, Df.201718, Df.201769. See in \textsc{A}pp\textsc{p}endix \textsc{C} no. 14. It occurred that the preceptor used the common seal in his own affair! Df.201701. For the Sopron seals, see also Károly Mollay, “A Szélmalom utcai vám, 1217-1564,” [Toll of the Szélmalom street, 1217-1564] Soproni Szemle 45 (1991): 104-105.

\textsuperscript{1199} Ø c.30 mm. See Appendix C, no. 11. GY M S M L Sopron v. lt. Dl. 47.

\textsuperscript{1200} Ø c.30 mm. See Appendix C, no. 13. GY M S M L Sopron v. lt. Dl. 35, 38.

\textsuperscript{1201} Ø c.30 mm. See Appendix C, no. 12. GY M S M L Sopron v. lt. Dl. 82, 84, 85, 115, 136.
Last but not least let us turn to the personal seals used by officials of the preceptories. As far as the Arpadian period is concerned, all the extant documents were mentioned above. The first known functional seal was that of the prior of the Székesfehérvár preceptory who, supposedly, placed his seal on the above-mentioned charter of 1226. Unfortunately, this seal, unlike the master’s, has not survived. The seals of the preceptors and that of the keeper (custos) of 1243 are not extant, either, since the charter is known only from its transcription of 1248. The seals of the preceptors on charters, those issued by the minor Hospitaller loca credibila, were also mentioned in the Arpadian period but this phenomenon ceased by the fourteenth century. The Angevin period saw the occasional use of the functional seal of the preceptors and the seals of those preceptors present at the provincial chapter can also be taken into account since they usually placed their corroborant tool on the documents issued at such assemblies. From the period under query, only three extant seals were found in the collections of Hungarian archives and collections. From a chronological point of view, the first was the afore-mentioned seal of the Gérard, vice-preceptor of Újudvar who attached his seal -- depicting agnus dei -- to a charter in 1266. Although the inscription of the seal is badly damaged, its first letters are still legible: +S.FRA[... ] which may refer to its being personal seal. The second extant specimen was also mentioned above: the seal of John, commendator of Sopron used between 1302-1307. The Hospitaller cross can be seen on the seal, which clearly have a reference to John’s status but there is no indication of his office in the inscription (+S.FRATER IOHANNIS). Accordingly this seal also can be regarded as self-representation since it is not the family coat-of-arms depicted. As opposed to the last

---


1203 E.g., 24 April 1345. Cf. Chapter VII.

example, the seal of Giovanni Latini of Perugia. a c. 20-mm-diameter conventional shield with four pales can be seen with the inscription: S. FRATER? IOHANNIS.

The particular status of Dubica county created a special situation not only in the activity of the place of authentication but also in the use of seal. It can be exemplified by three cases. A certain Baudoin, Count of Dubica, who was at the same time the castellan of the Hospitaller fortification at Szentiván (Tornava) issued a charter jointly with the comes terrestris, but the document was sealed neither with his the seal of the Order nor with the castellan’s personal one but with the seal of Dubica county. The two other documents were issued in 1353 by Elias, preceptor of Dubica, also acting together with the comes terrestris. In contrast to his charters between 1347 and 1351, these documents were also sealed with the county seal. Conceivably, the reason for the use of the county seal -- in a county which fell under the jurisdiction of the Order -- is to be sought not in the lack of the functional or personal seal. For a more thorough understanding of the situation one should turn to comparative investigations with particular emphasis on the role played by municipal authorities in pragmatic literacy.

Admittedly, the above survey of the seals may be considered scanty, but on the basis of the scattered source materials it would be irresponsible to make further extrapolations, but at least an outline of the use of seals is now discernible. It certain cases (e.g. the seal of the priory) the future emergence of even a few seals from the archives would increase our knowledge enormously concerning this topic. Nonetheless, at the known level of the loss of medieval written sources only extended archival and sigillographical research will yield hitherto unknown relevant information.

1205 1346, Df.201769 (G Y M S M L Dl.135).

1206 Smičiklas 11: 551.

1207 Thallóczy-Barabás, A Blagay-család oklevéltára, 132-134; Smičiklas 12: 152-153. It is also plausible that there was a common seal which was annulled by King Louis I and it was the reason for the substitution after 1351.

IX. Conclusions

Here I briefly (1) survey the major statements of the dissertation, (2) highlight the theses of the research work, and (3) draw further conclusions. The dissertation is a modern elaboration of the history of the Hospitallers in the medieval Kingdom of Hungary. The work is built on the most comprehensive source base ever compiled concerning the Hungarian-Slavonian Hospitaller Priory. I augmented the database complied by Ede Reiszig by utilizing hitherto unknown primary sources from both foreign and local archives. This process, however, also meant the discarding source materials from the corpus which pertain to orders other than the Hospital, for instance, to the canons regular of St. Stephen. Accordingly, I assert that those units can be identified unequivocally on the basis of my sources, which are listed in the catalogue. The most significant units of the Priory are known and also the important common features of the others. However, due to the great loss of sources it cannot be fully ruled out that documents referring to the Hospital might be held in either the National Archives of Hungary or in foreign collections. For instance, several preceptories (Szenta, Udvarhely, Lešnik) in my catalogue were either overlooked by former scholars or not recognized as having preceptory status. Since the proofs of evidence are based on two or three primary sources in some cases, it is conceivable that the emergence of a few new documents could extend the list of the administrative units. Moreover, various segments of the topic remained obscure in the course of the survey (e.g., the liturgy, or caring for the poor), primarily due to the lack of relevant sources. The appearance of one or two charters would radically “upgrade” our knowledge.

I have adopted a policy remarkably different from the former scholarly literature, first of all, from the work of Ede Reiszig, the monographer of the Order in Hungary. Based on a much broader horizon of sources and applying different methodological procedures, I have reconstructed a rather different picture of the role the Hospitallers played in medieval Hungary. One of the most important reasons for the discrepancy springs from the discovery of
the canons regular of St. Stephen of Hungary, which fundamentally altered the main lines of the history of the Hospital. Thus, the leading role of Székesfehérvár (as opposed to hitherto-famed Esztergom) became more transparent and the disproportion in the distribution of the Hospitaller preceptories in the different areas of the realm became more striking. An additional alteration is methodological in nature; that is, unlike Reiszig and others, I conducted my research according to the administrative units, the preceptories, not the houses (domus) of the Order. As is clear from the map of preceptories, except the Transylvanian Torda and the preceptories northeast of Esztergom in the thirteenth century, the Order was present in the Trans-Danubian region, in Slavonia and -- after the dissolution of the Templars -- in the Dalmatian coastal areas. The explanation for this phenomenon is manifold. The donation of land grants to the Order is an important contributing factor. The grant of Queen Euphrosyne and its confirmation in 1193 can be regarded as a starting point; after a short examination of the map, the reason for the actual density of the preceptories and other estates does not require further argument. The next substantial royal gift of landed properties was given in 1238 and the Slavonian properties proved to be significant through time, although many of the rest were localized in different parts of the kingdom. Objective causes can also be listed while elucidating the situation. First of all, the ever-greater development of western Hungary should be mentioned, but the higher density of population and the earlier prevalence of money economy must also be taken into account as parameters for the choice of the location of the first gifts. Nonetheless, these factors do not provide a satisfactory explanation why this situation remained unchanged for so long.

The explication, I believe, can be deduced from the aims and endeavors of the Hospitallers as well as from the overall and regional characteristics of Hungarian society. In the dissertation, I worked from the principle that the overall purpose of the preceptories of the European priories was to provide the necessary supplies (recruiting, fundraising, etc.) for the defense of the Holy Land and later for fighting the infidel. In this respect, the Order had to organize the most profitable way of administering its landed properties and dependencies. In Hungary the Hospital faced the problem -- like most of the landowners in the kingdom -- of the difficulty of administering widely scattered estates. The huge distances between the
separate dependencies required highly skilled administration and clearly reduced the quantity of goods that could be sent out by the brethren. This consequently decreased the surplus available to be furnished to the center of the Order. Moreover, since the preceptories were established for the administration of the goods of the priory it is conceivable that if there were a large number of landed properties in other parts of the kingdom, they arranged additional administrative units. Tracing the changes on the maps, however, it is striking that the two substantial royal grants determined the framework of the future presence of the Hospital in twelfth--fourteenth-century Hungary. In the background of this phenomenon one can find not only considerable royal support -- characteristic in Hungary and elsewhere in East Central Europe -- but also the lack of private donations, which resulted partly from the different system of inheritance. In respect of private gifts, it also should be noted that it was very difficult to “manipulate” or direct them, unlike royal grants where the beneficiary often “suggested” to the king where he should donate a piece of land. Private donors were restricted to those areas where they had something to give even though it was not a perfect place for the Hospital from the point of view of logistics. In addition, in the case of private gifts the donors had to obtain the consent of all members of their kindred, which made the implementation of the procedure much more complicated.

The determinant role of royal gifts and the lack of private benevolence raise another circle of questions since there might have been other factors concerning the support of the Hospitallers (as in case of other religious orders). One such factor could be the different forms benevolence took: a mere gift, a donation for salvation, or a gift given upon the entrance to a religious order either ad hoc or on a regular basis, as in the case of the Hospitallers (elemosina). The results of my survey, however, show that the leaders of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory were -- with a few exceptions -- of foreign origin up to the beginning of the 1380s. A similar situation was reconstructed in the case of the personnel of the preceptories, although there the number of locally recruited brethren had begun to increase somewhat earlier, in the middle of the fourteenth century. Relatively little is known about the preceptories’ personnel of lower rank, partly because they appear in the sources quite late, in the 1340s. The fact that they are almost exclusively indicated by their first names makes the
identification of their origin and social status virtually hopeless. Thus, one has to conclude that the integration of the Order and its personnel in Hungary advanced remarkably slowly and the majority of the brethren of the Priory was of foreign origin, which partly justified the low level of benevolence of the locals. It should be emphasized, however, that this is a somewhat special approach since the Templars, having similar status, had more substantial private grants in Hungary although their integration virtually failed. By the time the Hospitallers' integration into society and church organization began to accelerate, the prestige of the military-religious orders had dwindled radically, which also decreased the number of potential donors and the amount of gifts received.

Surveying the integration of the Hospitallers into Hungarian society, one faces not only a mere linear “maturation” as far as the appearance of locals in the personnel of the preceptories is concerned; the development of knightly culture in fourteenth-century Hungary should also be taken into account. The appearance of high-standing local Hospitallers or patrons of the Order (e.g., Lőkös Tót of Roholcz, Alexander Zudar, Emeric Bwbek) in the Priory from the mid-fourteenth century shows that by that time it was prestigious to become a member of a military/knightly order. It is, however, again only one side of the coin, since, simultaneously, the leadership of the Hospital imposed very strict limitations concerning the entrance to an “overpopulated” order, which would have depleted the surplus produced in its preceptories. Accordingly, telling prerequisites (e.g., high social standing, a substantial entrance fee) were required to obtain the habit of the Order. Especially because the prestige of the Order or at least that of its general staff gradually increased and the Prior of Vrana (sc. of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory) was regarded as one of the prelates of the kingdom. It is difficult to conclude accurately how the priors of foreign origin perceived their status in Hungary (Baudoin Cornuti appeared in the entourage of King Louis I), but doubtless the ambitious John of Palisna seized the importance of this office.

My research shows that the brethren did not unequivocally excel in activities traditionally attributed to the Order, which is another reason for emphasizing that the increase of prestige of the Hospitallers was connected with the conveyance of knightly culture. Although the Hospital was established with the intention of caring for the poor and needy,
very few hospitals of the Order in Europe provided professional curing or healing. Thus, it is not surprising that this research could only prove the existence of two hospitals (Székesfehérvár and Sopron) and two baths (Esztergom and Győr) which were run by the Priory, although the latter were originally not Hospitaller foundations. Inferring from the location of the hospitals it seems that they primarily served the need of pilgrims. In addition, similar to many other European hospitals of the Order, the Sopron hospital of the Priory was taken over by the town around the mid-fourteenth century. Since the presence of hospitals in towns can function (like the presence of the mendicant orders) as an indicator of the development of a particular settlement, the outcome of my research can broaden the horizon of such interpretations.

Neither can military activity, the other important undertaking of the Order, be regarded as a characteristic feature of the Hospitallers settled in the Hungarian kingdom. If not as early as the period of the settling down (around 1150), doubtless later Hungarian rulers reckoned upon the military power of the Hospitallers from time to time. Despite this general observation, King Andrew II entrusted the Teutonic Order with the defense of the eastern frontiers of the realm (1211-1225) against the pagan Cumans. What sort of role the Hospital played during the Mongol invasion (1241-1242) is also puzzling. Only the presence of the Templars can be proved at the fateful Battle of Muhi, even though a group of Hospitallers probably accompanied King Béla IV on his escape towards the Dalmatian coast. After the Mongol devastation the king wanted the Order to play a significant role in his new defensive policy, but these ideas had vanished by 1250. On the basis of my survey, one can also raise doubts concerning the involvement of the Hospitallers in large-scale castle-building activity after the mid-twelfth century. It also remains an unverified supposition that the cruciferi who backed Charles Robert in the Battle of Rozgony (1312) were Hospitallers. After the dissolution of the Templars, the Priory gained a foothold in areas of strategic importance (in Vrana, for instance, although its role as the exclusive headquarters of the Priory could not be proved) and this may well have led to involvement in the Dalmatian politics of King Louis I. The period under query saw only the indirect participation of the “resources” of the Priory in the fight against the infidel; although admittedly, this might have been the consequence of the
anti-Turkish policy of the Hungarian ruler. The most palpable military activity can be seen in
the self-defense of the Order. In the course of the period of the oligarchs at the turn of the
thirteenth century and later, during the war(s) with Venice the Priory suffered serious losses
and was on the defensive. The evaluation of the end of the period under query (and the
following years) is problematic, since the ambitious (and by then rebellious) John of Palisna
(and later Emeric Bwbek) turned against the royal power and the military force of the
Hospital appeared as a “private army” of a prior who revolted against the crowned ruler. The
unique situation created by the Great Schism (from 1378) can be seen behind these
extraordinary events. The schism caused fractures not only in the overall structure of the
Hospital but also (similar to the Bohemian situation) within the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory.

On the basis of the above, a question is automatically raised: How did the Hospitallers
deserve the support and benevolence of the Hungarian rulers? What sort of activity justified
their presence in the Hungarian kingdom and how did it facilitate their integration into the
society? As far the first question is concerned, we lack palpable pieces of information. First of
all, the diplomatic service of the Hospitallers can be mentioned from the reign of King
Andrew II (e.g., the activity of Raimbaud of Voczon) up to the rule of King Louis I (e.g., the
Treaty of Zadar in 1358). Beyond direct, factual proofs, the international network of the Order
as a supranational body can be taken into account in this respect. Most of the leaders of the
Hungarian-Slavonian Priory traveled constantly, they regularly visited the Priory and
administered the goods of their “province” through their lieutenants. Accordingly, they could
easily keep personal contact with either the leadership of the Order or between the papal curia
and Hungary. On the other hand, albeit indirectly, the Hungarian rulers supported the
Christian efforts in the Holy Land in the broader sense by the donations to the Hospital in
Hungary (and outside). The preceptories which emerged on the basis of the substantial royal
gifts raised money and sent it to the center of the Order (wherever it was located) and
eventually these resources were utilized for the defense of Latin Christendom. At times the
contribution of the Hungarian Hospitallers to the overall expenses of the Order seems rather
symbolic, but its significance may be understood from a later period. From the reign of King
Sigismund onwards it occurred more and more often that the priory remained vacant and the
ruler appointed secular governors to collect the surplus from the goods of the Priory. The unfa
terling countenance of the Master of the Hospital, Philibert de Naillac -- besides the protestation against the intervention -- showed that every florin counted in the fight against the infidel.

This problem leads to another set of questions, that is, how far the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory can be regarded as marginal and/or peripheral in the overall hierarchy of the Hospital. Obviously, an adequate answer could be given if priories in similar situation (e.g., Polish or Scandinavian areas) had been thoroughly surveyed and analyzed through the lens of fixed parameters. Lacking the abundance of such information, instead of detailed comparison we are limited to speculation on this issue. As touched upon in this dissertation, the payments made by the priories did not correlate by any means with the significance or influence of a particular priory; it rather related -- at least in theory -- to the profitability of the given province. In this respect the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory was not under favorable conditions. These circumstances, however, were not manifest at the time of their settlement and later it was clearly not in the interests of the Hospitallers to alter them. Nonetheless, two characteristic phenomena should be mentioned. The langues (linguae) of Provence and Italy steadily rivaled for the Hungarian Priory and finally they elaborated a rotational system of the office of the prior. Moreover, from the first third of the fifteenth century Alamania also joined this “competition.” It is important to emphasize -- against long-standing misinterpretations -- that the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory did not belong to the Province of Alamania. Lacking relevant primary sources, it is hard to judge whether it was a consequence of the changes in dynastic relations of the Hungarian rulers or more developed prestige (or both). This situation can also be linked to the tense period of the early 1370s when a rivalry developed over the office of the Hungarian-Slavonian prior. Besides the Master of the Hospital, both the pope and the Hungarian king had their own appointees for the post. The actual political relations and influence are mirrored in the fact that finally Louis I’s will predominated over the others in the appointment of the Provençal Raymond de Beaumont.

The question concerning how the Hospitallers were integrated into the Hungarian society, however, is still pending. The survey conducted here suggests that there are at least
two manners of approach. The first is a somewhat obvious but less informative way. The preceptories of the Priory, similar to other ecclesiastical lordships in Hungary, administered the production of their own lands in an “ordinary” manner: they cultivated the estates either through their tenant peasants (rustici, iobagiones) or they rented out (census) many pieces of land to predial nobles. The slight difference was that, compared to other priories of the Order, it was not the preceptors who collected the surplus or revenues. It was rather the prior who assembled the predials of the priory (who were said to live more fidelium predialium nostrorum) at the provincial chapters convoked annually or triennially. As testified by the sources, the Hospitallers in Hungary followed local customs in the course of this activity, even though they seemed to attribute more importance to fidelity expressed towards the Order in their choice of leaseholders than was expected by other religious orders.

Another approach to the question is through the integration of the Hospitaller preceptories into the Hungarian institutional system of the places of authentication (loca credibilia). Nine preceptories of the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory were involved in the administration of private legal affairs for shorter and longer periods and the intensity of the activity of the Székesfehérvár preceptory was remarkable country-wide. Several conclusions can be drawn from this phenomenon. First, the trust of the members of a society was mirrored in the choice of a particular place of authentication that they turned to with their affairs, for instance, for procuring a charter. Especially this was the case if the chosen place was not the nearest settlement. I hold a similar opinion concerning the king or the highest officials of the realm. Beyond the sphere of operation (which was gradually extended) of a particular institution, trust played a decisive role when they commissioned a place of authentication to launch inquests (inquisitio) into certain cases. Among the aspects of selection, trustworthiness met with special attention after 1351. Due to the general loss of credence private parties paid to the places of authentication, which were often said to be corrupt (especially in the case of proprietary churches by their patrons), King Louis I deprived the minor religious houses of the authentic seal and thus from the right to issue authentic documents. From this time onwards only the preceptories of Székesfehérvár and Dubica performed such a role, although the latter was in a particular situation as it acted on behalf of the County of Dubica.
Besides the elusive “trust(worthiness)” attributed to these establishments, at least three further points should be taken into account. First, those members of a convent who played an active role in this activity were supposed to speak Hungarian. In theory it cannot be ruled out that they employed interpreters, but this is rather unlikely since it would have burdened the “account” of the parties involved, who usually formed a cost-sensitive circle. Second, a knowledge of Hungarian customary law, which differed from Roman law at several points, was also a prerequisite. Last but not least, it is worth highlighting that the scriptoria of the preceptories followed the path laid down by the Hungarian places of authentication and there are no tangible signs that they applied the erudition they potentially brought from abroad. The Hospitallers in the European priories did not acquire particular fame in legal literacy; while visiting the Hungarian-Slavonian Priory the priors brought with them notaries public who were rarely fully professed brothers. Summing up, on the basis of the role played by the Hospital in the authentication activity one can conclude the following: (1) there might have been members of local origin in the Order well before the appearance of direct pieces of evidence; (2) the activity performed in relation to legal literacy might have played a mediating role towards either the town (Sopron) or the county (Dubica).

Despite all the effort behind my survey, there are still numerous “blank spots” on the map of the history of the Hospital in medieval Hungary. Most of all, the enormous loss of records makes the whole picture fragmentary, since the insufficient extant source material hinders the modern scholar from completing the reconstruction. The feeling of completeness is also reduced by the fact that I failed to disprove all the former unfounded theses point by point and this basically springs from two reasons. Partly I found it not fully reconcilable with the genre of a doctoral dissertation to submit the whole structure to polemics; partly the original objective -- aiming at a thorough revision of the work of Ede Reiszig -- got to the point that it proved easier to start the investigation and analysis from the very beginning. Moreover, with regard to the potential readership of the dissertation there would have been numerous elements to be incorporated in order to facilitate the mere understanding of the controversy, but they did not have scholarly relevance and would have expanded the work redundantly.
Besides the immediate results of the present dissertation, I am convinced that the outcome of this survey can be fully exploited by putting it into a wider context of comparative investigations. First of all, a similar analysis of the Templars in medieval Hungary would provide a solid basis for comparative research. A research project was recently launched aiming at such objectives, but unfortunately it remained unfinished. As soon as it is completed there will be grounds for comparing the conclusions drawn from the analysis of the Hospitaller sources with special regard to the similarities or dissimilarities of the strategy of the orders or the effect they had during their presence in the kingdom of Hungary. Additionally, the comparison of the local characteristics of the neighboring regions (Bohemia, Austria, Poland) would also yield important results and provide an opportunity for broadening the horizon of interpretation. Finally, the new picture drawn of the military-religious orders should be compared with those of other religious orders settled in medieval Hungary. These future steps would complete a contribution to the recovery of medieval church history in Hungary, which was driven into the background for many decades.
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<td>Df.285379?, Reg. orig. an IX., ep. 186.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theiner 1: 133; Boltízsár 214; Cartulaire no. 2119.</td>
<td>Gregory IX, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236.01.16.a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theiner 1: 142-143; A U O 2: 37-39; Boltízsár 214;</td>
<td>Gregory IX, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236.01.16.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theiner 1: 143; Cartulaire no. 2136.</td>
<td>Gregory IX, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1237.05.20.a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theiner 1: 154; M onW esp 1: 106; A U O 2: 59; Boltízsár 214.</td>
<td>Gregory IX, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1237.05.20.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A U O 2: 60; Theiner 1: 154; M onW esp 1: 110;</td>
<td>Gregory IX, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1237.08.28.</td>
<td>Reg. orig. A n. XI; ep. 213;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/1: 92; Theiner 1: 158; M onW esp 1: 108; Boltízsár 214;</td>
<td>Gregory IX, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238.01.29.</td>
<td>Dl.106180</td>
<td>A1377</td>
<td>Smičiklas 4: 48-50; Fejér CD 4/1: 104-111; 9/5: 153; Boltízsár 215-216;</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238.04.28</td>
<td>Di.106117</td>
<td>A1338</td>
<td>Kukuljević Reg. nr. 354; MES 1: 326; RA no. 637; Fejér CD 4/1: 135-136; Fejér CD 7/1: 260-261; Boltízsár 216; RA no. 639; Gregory IX, pope</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238.99.99</td>
<td>Coll. Dipl Wagnerio, Jankovich tom. VII. no. 95.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/1: 145; Gregory IX, pope</td>
<td>Gregory IX, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239.99.99</td>
<td>in Df.280246</td>
<td>A1284/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Denis, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240.10.99</td>
<td>Di.1222</td>
<td>A1356</td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/1: 177-178; MonWesp 1: 114; Boltízsár 294; Gregory IX, pope</td>
<td>Gregory IX, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240.99.99</td>
<td>Di.33913, A H, NRA fasc. 1531; nr. 3. Litt. reg. 2090, Di.33914</td>
<td>A1242</td>
<td>Theiner 1: 177-178; MonWesp 1: 114; Boltízsár 294; Gregory IX, pope</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241.02.07</td>
<td>Reg. orig. A n. XIV. ep. 221.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/1: 299-301; Theiner 1: 187-188; Boltízsár 294; Gregory IX, pope</td>
<td>Gregory IX, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242.08.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRH 2: 588; Rogerius cap. 40; Boltízsár 294; Rogerius, canon of Váradi</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242.10.13 ante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smičiški 4: 162-163; Fejér CD 7/4: 91; A UO 2: 143-144. Kukuljević Reg. no. 418.</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242.07.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/1: 123-124; Fejér CD 4/1: 145; Gregory IX, pope</td>
<td>Innocent IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243.07.21</td>
<td>A1272/1309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243.10.13 ante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smičiški 4: 202-203</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243.11.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smičiški 4: 205-206; Lucic M em. di Trau 47</td>
<td>Domadus comes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243.99.99.a</td>
<td>Di.99844</td>
<td>A1248</td>
<td>Boltízsár 294; Gregory IX, pope</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1244.05.02 forgery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smičiški 4: 122</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1244.99.99.b</td>
<td>Di.12171</td>
<td>T1421</td>
<td>Veszprém cathedral chapter</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245.99.99</td>
<td>Di.237642?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>MES 1: 360-361; A UO 7: 203; Fejér CD 4/1: 357</td>
<td>Esztergomi Stephanus convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247.06.02</td>
<td>RegVat, vol. 22, fol. 75r-76v</td>
<td>A1250</td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/1: 313-315; A UO 2: 152-153; Boltízsár 294-295; RA no. 764</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247.08.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A UO 7: 234;</td>
<td>Innocent IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247.11.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/2: 218-224; Theiner 1: 230-232; Boltízsár 297; K atárirás, 341-344;</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248.03.28</td>
<td>Di.99844</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A UO 7, 261-262; RA no. 876;</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248.06.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul 1: nr. 46; Fejér CD 4/1: 465-467; Theiner 1: 206-207; A UO 2: 205-206; Boltízsár 295; Cartulaire no. 2477;</td>
<td>Innocent IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248.07.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cartulaire no. 2481. (+vol. 4: 350.)</td>
<td>Féraud de Barras, prior of St. Gilles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248.10.02</td>
<td>Di.39391</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Innocent IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248.10.03</td>
<td>Di.39392</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>MES 1: 378; Fejér CD 4/2: 125; Boltízsár 295;</td>
<td>Innocent IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248.99.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dubsky, Fundata Species Facti 3</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249.99.99.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/2: 49-52;</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249.99.99.c</td>
<td>Di.106317, Di.23113</td>
<td>T1426, M 1742</td>
<td>Erszei 185, Csánki 3: 308.</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250.05.03.</td>
<td>Archives de l’Orient Latin, Paris, 2b (1884): 222-224.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250.07.05.</td>
<td>RA no. 927.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250.07.19.</td>
<td>RegVat, vol. 22, fol. 75r-76v.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/2: 75-76; Theiner 1: 208-211; Potthast 14016; Boltizsár 296; Jakó, Erdély, 195.</td>
<td>Innocent IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250.07.22.</td>
<td>Dl.342, Dl.2274</td>
<td>E, A1325</td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/2: 62-64; Boltizsár 296; Cartulaire no. 2526; RA no. 929;</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252.02.03.</td>
<td>Reg. orig An. IX; ep. 361.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theiner 1: 212-213; MonWesp 1: 129; Fejér CD 4/2: 123-124; Boltizsár 296.</td>
<td>Innocent IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252.02.13.</td>
<td>Dl.28; Dl.106106, Dl.106181</td>
<td>E, E, T1377</td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/2: 125; 4/2: 174-176; MonWesp 1: 130; Boltizsár 296; Pray 116-120; Cartulaire no. 2588.</td>
<td>Innocent IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252.02.25.</td>
<td>Dl.106180</td>
<td>A1377</td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/2: 126-127; Theiner 1: 212; Boltizsár 296; Cartulaire no. 2589;</td>
<td>Innocent IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252.08.99.</td>
<td>Palermo, Reg. II. delle Praelazie, f. 419</td>
<td>M1510</td>
<td>Cartulaire no. 2615;</td>
<td>Conrad IV, king of the Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252.12.09.</td>
<td>Dl.39393</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boltizsár 296;</td>
<td>Innocent IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253.05.08.</td>
<td>Reg. orig. A n. X., ep. 679.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theiner 1: 219-220;</td>
<td>Innocent IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253.07.17.</td>
<td>Dl.38472</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Smičiklas 4: 535-536;</td>
<td>Non cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1254.01.99.</td>
<td>Marselle, Arch. des. B.-du-Rh. ordre de M alte, H, Syrie, no. 287.</td>
<td>M1700-1800</td>
<td>Cartulaire no. 2663; Borhcardt, Empire 206;</td>
<td>Conrad IV, king of Jerusalem and Sicily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1254.10.02.</td>
<td>Dl.258474, Viena, Arch. imp. roy. ms. 100.</td>
<td>M1701-1800</td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/2: 224; A UO 11: 395; Boltizsár 296-297; Cartulaire no. 2694; RA no. 1016; Tkalcči E. 101; Smičiklas 4: 570-571.</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1255.03.17.a</td>
<td>Dl.34002</td>
<td>A1275 (A1615)</td>
<td>AH, NRA no. fasc. 1531; nr. 13. Litt. reg. 2092;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1255.03.17.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smičiklas 4: 593; A UO 11: 411-412.</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1255.08.01.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/2: 327-328; Boltizsár 297;</td>
<td>Alexander IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1256.04.13.</td>
<td>Dl.39394</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Smičiklas Suppl. 1: 208.</td>
<td>Alexander IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1256.06.13.</td>
<td>Dl.83128</td>
<td>E, T1277</td>
<td>Cf. Fejér CD 7/2: 54-57.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1256.10.30.</td>
<td>Dl.411, Dl.442</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/2: 377; Boltizsár 298;</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1258.04.05.</td>
<td>Dl.106107</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Boltizsár 298;</td>
<td>Alexander IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1258.06.10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/2: 466-469; A UO 2: 301-303; Theiner 1: 236; Boltizsár 298; Cartulaire no. 2896;</td>
<td>Alexander IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259.05.26.</td>
<td>Dl.258476?</td>
<td>M1701-1800</td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/2: 504-506; Theiner 1: 237-238; Boltizsár 373; MES 1: 454; Cartulaire no. 2920;</td>
<td>Alexander IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259.10.02.</td>
<td>Dl.34002</td>
<td>A1275</td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/2: 492-495; A UO 11: 456-457; Smičiklas 5: 135-136; Cartulaire no. 2932; Boltizsár 373; Tkalcči M on Zagr 1: 122; K ukuljevič Reg. nr. 775; RA no. 1221;</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259.99.99.</td>
<td>in Dl.5163</td>
<td>T1259 (A1364)</td>
<td>Ujudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261.04.18.</td>
<td>Dl.515, Df.283246</td>
<td>M, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261.10.05.</td>
<td>Df.207065, Df.208315</td>
<td>E, T1400-1401</td>
<td>PRT 2: 93, 313, A U O 3: 7; MonWesp 1: 140; A U O 3: 7;</td>
<td>Urban IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261.10.13. ante</td>
<td>Df.287881</td>
<td>A1265</td>
<td>Smičiklas 5: 197-198; K ukuljevič Reg. nr. 818.</td>
<td>Bélá IV, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261.99.99.</td>
<td>Dl.1877</td>
<td>A1411</td>
<td>HOOk 40; Fejér CD 2: 329-329, 382; Fejér CD 7/5: 328-329. (1260!)</td>
<td>Henry, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262.05.23.</td>
<td>Dl.37359</td>
<td>A1263</td>
<td>A U O 8: 41-42.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262.06.04.</td>
<td>Dl.98502, Dl.98510, Dl.98648</td>
<td>A1302, A1383</td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/3: 98-99; 6/2: 110; K árolyi cs. 1: 2-3, 1: 34; Boltzásr 374; Cartulaire no. 3030; A O kl 1: 126;</td>
<td>Várads cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262.05.18.a</td>
<td>Df.106108</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Boltzásr 374.</td>
<td>Esztergom cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263.05.18.b</td>
<td>Df.106109</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263.10.01.</td>
<td>Df.33715</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/3: 138-142; Smičiklas 5: 264-266.</td>
<td>Bélá IV, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264.01.02.</td>
<td>Dl.104885</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A U O 8: 119.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264.03.25.</td>
<td>Dl.106420</td>
<td>A1435</td>
<td>Fejér CD 7/5: 342-343; CD 4/3: 246-248; Boltzásr 374-375; Cartulaire no. 3088; K oszta, Hermann E. 175; Fenyves 28.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265.03.07.</td>
<td>Df.107879</td>
<td>A1455</td>
<td>Fejér CD 7/1: 325-328; Cartulaire no. 3119;</td>
<td>Clement IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265.05.27.</td>
<td>Dl.1876</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clement IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266.03.14.</td>
<td>Dl.1876</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Smičiklas 5: 369-370; A U O 8: 160;</td>
<td>Gerard, vicepreceptor of Újudvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266.03.29.</td>
<td>Dl.1876</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerard, vicepreceptor of Újudvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266.10.27.</td>
<td>AOM 46, nr. 1; Dl.38113</td>
<td>E, M</td>
<td>Pauli 1: 110.</td>
<td>Aiottus Uguccio, notary public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266.11.23.</td>
<td>Df.200021</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/7: 680; RA no. 1503.</td>
<td>Bélá IV, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1267.06.18</td>
<td>Dl.619</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HOki 49-50.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1267.06.30</td>
<td>Lucques, Bibl. pub. ms. 988, f. 366b.</td>
<td>M 1701-1800</td>
<td>Cartulaire no. 3265.</td>
<td>Clement IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1267.08.28</td>
<td>Df.230000</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1268.07.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/3: 471-472; Boltzsár 375;</td>
<td>Clement IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1268.08.20</td>
<td>Dl.25035</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>BuDÓkl 1: 101-102;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269.01.21</td>
<td>Dl.106111; Df.208409</td>
<td>E, M 1719</td>
<td>PRT 10: 531; Boltzsár 375;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269.01.21</td>
<td>A 1397</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/3: 539-540; 6/2: 110-112; PRT 10: 530-531;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269.03.05</td>
<td>Df.269944</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Csurgó Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269.04.09</td>
<td>Dl.671</td>
<td>A 1275</td>
<td></td>
<td>Béla IV, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269.04.19</td>
<td>AOM 7. nr. 16 (ii). - desideratur</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Pauli, 1: 265; Cartulaire no. 3334;</td>
<td>Hugues de Hadestel, viscount of Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269.11.99</td>
<td>AOM 7. nr. 18. - desideratur</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Pauli, 1: 188; Cartulaire no. 3371;</td>
<td>Hugh III, king of Jerusalem and Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269.99.99.a</td>
<td>in Dl.99875</td>
<td>T 1292</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269.99.99.b</td>
<td>in Dl.99875</td>
<td>T 1292</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270.05.03</td>
<td>ante</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smičklas 5: 538-540.</td>
<td>Béla IV, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270.05.24</td>
<td>Dl.56728</td>
<td>A 1282</td>
<td>Fejér CD 5/1: 23; RA no. 1922.</td>
<td>Stephen V, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270.09.01</td>
<td>Df.283555</td>
<td>A 1270</td>
<td>AUO 12: 36-38; Tkalći Mon. Episc. Zagr. 1: 154; Smičklas 5: 556-558;</td>
<td>Hodus, count of Zagreb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270.99.99.a</td>
<td>Dl.749</td>
<td>M 1301-1400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Judvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270.99.99.b</td>
<td>in Dl.749</td>
<td>T 1270 (T1389)</td>
<td>RA no. 2051/71, AUO 3: 237-8; AUO 5: 176-177;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270.1290. 07.04.</td>
<td>Df.282790</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AUO 12: 490.</td>
<td>M. palátine, count of Sopron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270-1300</td>
<td>Dl.86972</td>
<td>T 1325</td>
<td>AO kl 9: 120.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270-1325. 05.01.</td>
<td>Dl.2298</td>
<td>T 1325</td>
<td>A O 2: 193; AO kl 9: 103.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271.03.30.</td>
<td>Dl.753, Dl.154; Dl.2870; Dl.10745; Df.258544</td>
<td>E, A 1416, A 1429, A 1419, T 1429</td>
<td>BuDÓkl 1: 121-122; AUO 8: 371-372; Fejér CD 5/1: 173-175; Boltzsár 376;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271.99.99.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 5/1: 146-149; Boltzsár 375-376;</td>
<td>Stephen V, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272.04.06.</td>
<td>Dl.800, Dl.106669-73, Dl.106317, Dl.106673</td>
<td>A 1438, A 1492, T 1426, A 1534, A 1529, A 1492, A 1529</td>
<td>Fejér CD 2: 184; 5/1: 211-214; 11/1: 67-69; Boltzsár 376; RA no. 2182; Érszegi 185;</td>
<td>Stephen V, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272.11.06.</td>
<td>Dl.106181</td>
<td>T 1377</td>
<td>Ladislas IV, king of Hungary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272.11.12.</td>
<td>Dl.106112, Ker. lev. C. 1. F. 4; 37.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 5/1: 270-275; Boltiszár 373;</td>
<td>Gregory X, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272.1280. 07.06.</td>
<td>Dl.889</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ÁUO 9: 112; RA no. 2575;</td>
<td>Csurgó Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1273.08.25. circa</td>
<td>Dl.36646</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ÁUO 9: 42-43;</td>
<td>Ududvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274.06.11.</td>
<td>Dl.857</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ÁUO 12: 128-129; Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274.06.25.</td>
<td>Df.277180</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ÁUO 12: 164-165; Fejér CD 5/2: 270-275; Boltiszár 373; Máté, voivode of Transylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274.09.18.</td>
<td>T 1274</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ÁUO 9: 92; AES 2: 45; Péter, preceptor of Szomolya, Szirá and Talmács</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274.10.06. ante</td>
<td>Df.237961</td>
<td>T 1274</td>
<td>ÁUO 9: 92; AES 2: 45; Esztergom cath. chap., G. provost of E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274.99.99.a</td>
<td>Dl.924</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ÁUO 9: 128-130; Cartulaire no. 3572; Pontius de Fayn, prior of H-SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274.99.99.b</td>
<td>Dl.927, Dl.928, Dl.9102</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 7/5: 404-418; (A 1376 alapján); Buda collegiate chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275.1290</td>
<td>Dl.264832</td>
<td>M 1806</td>
<td>Damas pro memoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1276.04.15.</td>
<td>Dl.199224</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ÁUO 9: 159-162; Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1276.07.28. forgery</td>
<td>Df.201647</td>
<td>A 1277</td>
<td>Hází, Sopron 1/1: 5-6; HO 3: 24-25; Theoderic, Hosp. of Sopron, Stephen judge of Sopron, Town of Sopron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1276.10.20.</td>
<td>Dl.940</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ÁUO 9: 265-268; RA no. 2684;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1277.05.24.</td>
<td>Dl.968</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ÁUO 9: 192; Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1277.06.27.</td>
<td>Dl.262635</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ÁUO 9: 192; Ladislas IV, king of Hungary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1277.11.06.</td>
<td>Dl.977</td>
<td>A 1328</td>
<td>ÁUO 9: 188; Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1277.99.99.a</td>
<td>Dl.991</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A U O 9: 189-190; RA no. 2836.</td>
<td>Ujudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1278.01.13</td>
<td>Df.286407</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Csurgo Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1278.01-08.99</td>
<td>Dl.1009</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>MES 2: 85; Fejér CD 5/2: 436-438; A U O 9: 206-207; BudOkl 1: 173-174; Boltizsár 453; RA no. 2862</td>
<td>Ladislas IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1278.06.15</td>
<td>Df.264832</td>
<td>M1701-1800</td>
<td>Fejér CD 7/4: 179-180; Boltizsár 453;</td>
<td>Rhodian, preceptor of Sopron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1278.07.30</td>
<td>Re. orig. A n. l. ep. 128.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 5/2: 461-462; Theiner 1: 327; Boltizsár 453; Cartulaire no. 3668;</td>
<td>Nicholas III, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1278.09.22.a</td>
<td>Theiner 1: 333; Boltizsár 453;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas III, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1278.09.22.b</td>
<td>Theiner 1: 335.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas III, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1278.09.22.c</td>
<td>Theiner 1: 336-337; A U O 4: 159; Boltizsár, 453;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas III, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1278.11.06</td>
<td>(E) Blagay cs. 29-35; Smičiklas 6: 261;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timothy, bishop of Zagreb and his fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279.03.22</td>
<td>Cartulaire no. 3692;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin de Presovice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279.07.01</td>
<td>Dl.38478</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Blagay cs. 36-38;</td>
<td>Ladomer, bishop of Várad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279.07.04</td>
<td>Smičiklas 6: 304-306.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zagreb cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279.07.15</td>
<td>Dl.40199</td>
<td>A1291</td>
<td>RA no. 2998.</td>
<td>Ladislas IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279.07.16</td>
<td>Dl.229988</td>
<td>A1402</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279.08.22</td>
<td>Dl.40147</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A U O 4: 210;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279.12.09</td>
<td>Theiner 1: 344.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas III, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279.99.99.a</td>
<td>T1416/1 436</td>
<td>T1279</td>
<td>Borsa TSM (1987): 26; RA no. 2756;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279.99.99.b</td>
<td>T1729</td>
<td>RA no. 3015;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279.99.99.c</td>
<td>T1729</td>
<td>T1729</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ladislas IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279.99.99.d</td>
<td>T1729</td>
<td>T1729</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ladislas IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279.99.99.e</td>
<td>T1729</td>
<td>T1729</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ladislas IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279.99.99.f</td>
<td>T1729</td>
<td>T1729</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ladislas IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280.06.29. circa</td>
<td>deperdita</td>
<td>A U O 10: 444;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280.07.14. circa</td>
<td>Dl.25766</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A U O 10: 444.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280.08.15</td>
<td>Cartulaire no. 3729.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hermannus de Brunshorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280.08.16</td>
<td>Coll. Dipl. Wagner-Jankovich Tom. D. nr. 136.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas III, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280.08.17</td>
<td>Dl.106664</td>
<td>A1486</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ladislas IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1281.06.15</td>
<td>Dl.1128</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>John, palatine, count of Sopron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1282.09.03 ante</td>
<td>Dl.1128</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>BudOkl 1: 203-204; A U O 9: 332-333; MES 2: 157; RA no. 3164.</td>
<td>Ladislas IV, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1283.99.99.</td>
<td>Dipl. variorum Jankovich Tom. 1. p. 79;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1285.03.07</td>
<td>Dl.320375</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1285.09.25</td>
<td>Df.200035</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286.04.18.</td>
<td>DL.25765</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A U O 12: 450.</td>
<td>Mauricius, preceptor of Gyánt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286.11.03.</td>
<td>Ker. lev. C. 1. F. 2: 15;</td>
<td>Boltiszár 455; Cartulaire no. 3947;</td>
<td>Honorius IV, pope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286.99.99.</td>
<td>DF.282166</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Zala vm 1: 96;</td>
<td>Csurgó Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1287.03.12.</td>
<td>Reg. orig. An. II. ep. 264.</td>
<td>Theiner 1: 355; Boltiszár 455; Cartulaire no. 3955;</td>
<td>Honorius IV, pope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1288.03.17.</td>
<td>DF.200037</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1288.06.08.</td>
<td>DF.277193</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 5/3: 434-436; ZW 1: 158; Jakó, Erdély 273-274.</td>
<td>Ladislas, voivode of Transylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1289.01.10.</td>
<td>DF.201665</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Házi, Sopron 1/I: 12-13; Sopron vm. 1: 52-53;</td>
<td>Detric, commendator of Sopron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1289.99.99.</td>
<td>in DT.266353</td>
<td>T 1289</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or ante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1289.99.99.</td>
<td>DF.266353</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290.01.22.</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TT (1888): 592.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290.06.22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290.08.01.</td>
<td>Cartulaire no. 4105.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290.09.01.</td>
<td>DL.1289</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M on W esp 2: 13; BudOkl 1: 259;</td>
<td>Nicholas IV, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290.11.25.-</td>
<td>DT.229876</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Zala vm 1: 119.</td>
<td>Lawrence, castellan of K aniszsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310.11.25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291.08.17.</td>
<td>DL.12035</td>
<td>A 1327</td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew III, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291.99.99.a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291.99.99.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292.01.25.</td>
<td>DL.1341</td>
<td>A 1292</td>
<td>Zala vm 1: 105-107;</td>
<td>Ujudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292.09.28.</td>
<td>DL.99875</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A U O 12: 537-540;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293.03.23.</td>
<td>A 1544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1294.03.07.</td>
<td>Zadar, Sv. K rsevana, caps. IX. m. X. no. 125.</td>
<td>Smičiklas 7: 133-135;</td>
<td>Wycliffe, preceptor of Bela, vices gerens magistri per H et Sl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1294.07.29.</td>
<td>DT.236350, DT.236353</td>
<td>E, A 1320</td>
<td>Fejér CD 6/1: 306-317; RA no. 3986; AU O 9: 137, MES 2: 198; 2: 354-360;</td>
<td>Andrew III, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1294-1310.</td>
<td>DT.230084</td>
<td>T1415</td>
<td></td>
<td>Csurgó Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1295.03.24.</td>
<td>DL.31060</td>
<td>A 1392</td>
<td>Jakó, Erdély 304; HO 8: 349-350; ZsO 1: nr. 2414.</td>
<td>Peter, bishop of Transylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1295.07.25.</td>
<td>DF.277209</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 6/1: 366-368; 7/4: 236; Jakó, Erdély 304-305; Boltiszár 456;</td>
<td>Myle, preceptor of Torda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1295.08.23.</td>
<td>DL.7679</td>
<td>A 1345</td>
<td>HO 8: 352-353;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1295.99.99.</td>
<td>DF.247951</td>
<td>A 1295</td>
<td></td>
<td>Csurgó Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1295.99.99.</td>
<td>in DL.7679</td>
<td>T1345</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or ante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296.04.03.</td>
<td>in DT.277222</td>
<td>T 1296</td>
<td>Jakó, Erdély 307.</td>
<td>Andrew III, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296.04.03.</td>
<td>DT.277222</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Jakó, Erdély 307-309;</td>
<td>Myle, preceptor of Torda and John, provost of Szében</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296.04.17.</td>
<td>DL.31128</td>
<td>M 1350</td>
<td>Jakó, Erdély 310-311.</td>
<td>Várad cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(circa)</td>
<td>Boltizsár 456.</td>
<td>Boniface VIII, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297.09.26.</td>
<td>in DL.61160</td>
<td>T 1297</td>
<td>HO 1: 91-92; RA no. 4131;</td>
<td>Csurgo Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297.10.31.</td>
<td>in DL.1476</td>
<td>T 1297</td>
<td>A UO 10: 250-251; RA no. 4138-39;</td>
<td>Andrew III, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297.04.20.</td>
<td>DL.1499</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HOKL 163-164;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297.09.26.</td>
<td>in DL.1499</td>
<td>T 1298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298.05.12.</td>
<td>DL.40245</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SMIK 7: 341-342.</td>
<td>Guilelm, notary, parish priest of Zadar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298.06.08.</td>
<td>DL.1503</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A UO 10: 326-327.</td>
<td>Ujúdvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1299.09.99.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300.02.02.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300.05.12.</td>
<td>DL.68193</td>
<td>M 1701-1800</td>
<td>HO 8: 404-405; Fejér CD 7/5: 563-564; Boltizsár 456-457; Fejér CD 7/3: 119-120.</td>
<td>Peter preceptor of Sopron and Gregory parish priest of Sopron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300.11.06.</td>
<td>DL.47821</td>
<td>A 1300</td>
<td>MES 1: 272; A UO 6: 484; 490.</td>
<td>Andrew III, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300.11.12.</td>
<td>DL.47821</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A UO 6: 490.</td>
<td>Esztergom cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300.01.31.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300.11.29.</td>
<td>DL.1625 (NRA 1534)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A O 1: 19; Burgenlandes 3: 7; A O Kl 1: 94.</td>
<td>Ujúdvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303.06.11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303.09.25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303.09.25</td>
<td>T1303</td>
<td>W 11;</td>
<td>Burgenlandes 3: 15; A OKl 1: 238; John, preceptor of Sopron, Wolfcerus judge and burghers of Sopron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303.11.12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Smičiklas 8: 59-60; A OKl 1: 250. Guillem Vilaret, Hosp. master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304.01.13</td>
<td>D1.33656</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Smičiklas 8: 74; A OKl 1: 273. Constance, Hosp. master of H-Sl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304.06.22</td>
<td>D1.107879</td>
<td>A 1455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304.07.19</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Smičiklas 8: 86-87; A OKl 1: 311. Loquetus Busque, Hosp. brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306.02.02</td>
<td>Df.255655, Df.255667</td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/1: 202; Smičiklas 8: 114-115; Cartulaire no. 4711; Engel, A rch. 1: 276; A OKl 2: 12-13. Oliver, prior of H-Sl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306.06.23</td>
<td>T1306</td>
<td>Zichy 1: 112-113; A OKl 2: 28; Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306.09.16</td>
<td>D1.28574</td>
<td>T1306</td>
<td>Pataki, A njou 16-17; A OKl 2: 38-39; Ladislas, voivode of Transylvania and count of Szolnok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307.01.25</td>
<td>Df.201672, GY M SM L. Sopron v. lt. Dl.38</td>
<td>E Hází, Sopron 1/1: 19; Sopron vm. 1: 66; Burgenlandes 3: 29; A OKl 2: 57. John, preceptor of Sopron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307.12.21</td>
<td>A SV: Reg. Clem. V.</td>
<td>Theiner 1: 422; MES 2: 580; A OKl 2: 122; Clement V, pope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307.99.99</td>
<td>Dl.1718</td>
<td>E, A 1358</td>
<td>AO 1: 139-140; Smičiklas 8: 147-148; A OKl 2: 130-131; Ujjudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1308.04.23</td>
<td>D1.1718</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AO 1: 145-146; A OKl 2: 155. Ujjudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1308.05.01</td>
<td>Df.201673, GY M SM L. Sopron v. lt. Dl.39.</td>
<td>E Hází, Sopron 1/1: 19-20; Burgenlandes 3, 33; A OKl 2: 158. Peter, preceptor of Sopron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1308.99.99</td>
<td>Df.233155, Df.286775</td>
<td>E, T1314, M 1784</td>
<td>AO 1: 164-165; A OKl 2: 233; Ujjudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1309.02.08</td>
<td>Df.201674, GY M SM L. Sopron v. lt. Dl.40.</td>
<td>E Hází, Sopron 1/1: 20; Burgenlandes 3, 38; A OKl 2: 250. Peter, preceptor of Sopron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1309.05.04</td>
<td>Df.201678, GY M SM L. Sopron v. lt. Dl.44.</td>
<td>E, A 1367</td>
<td>Hází, Sopron 1/1: 21-22; Burgenlandes 3, 39-40, A OKl 2: 276. Peter, preceptor of Sopron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310.02.09</td>
<td>D1.94059</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A OKl 2: 366; Ujjudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310.03.29</td>
<td>Df.201680, GY M SM L. Sopron v. lt. Dl.46.</td>
<td>E Hází, Sopron 1/1: 23; Burgenlandes 3: 44; A OKl 2: 374. Peter, preceptor of Sopron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310.11.13</td>
<td>Df.201681, GY M SM L. Sopron v. lt. Dl.47.</td>
<td>E Hází 1/1: 23; Burgenlandes 3: 45; A OKl 2: 422; Peter, preceptor of Sopron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311.01.13.a</td>
<td>Df.230400, Df.230406</td>
<td>T1346, T1346</td>
<td>Tkalčić, M on. civ. Zagr. 1: 450-451; Smičiklas 9, 294; A OKl 3: 9-10; Zagreb cathedral chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311.01.13.b</td>
<td>Df.230204</td>
<td>E, A 1317, A 1317, M 1800-1900</td>
<td>Tkalčić, M on. civ. Zagr. 1: 82-83; Smičiklas 8: 271-273; A OKl 3, 10; Stephen, warden of Slavonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312.01.13</td>
<td>Dl.70396</td>
<td>A 1393</td>
<td>ZsO 1: 329; A OKl 3: 103; Ujjudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312.02.11</td>
<td>D1.2874</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AO 1: 247-248; A OKl 3: 109-110; Loquetus, prior of H-Sl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312.05.16.a</td>
<td>AOM Arch. 10 nr. 70.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AOM Arch. 10 nr. 71.</td>
<td>Pauli 2: 30 (nr. 24), R Clem V, 7952; Clement V, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312.05.16.</td>
<td>AOM Arch. 10 nr. 71.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AOM Arch. 10 nr. 71.</td>
<td>Pauli 2: 30 (nr. 24), R Clem V, 7952; Clement V, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312.05.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DT 36</td>
<td>Thuróczi Chron. Hung. 2: 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312.06.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DT 36</td>
<td>Sopron Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314.03.13</td>
<td>Dl.1841</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Sopron vm. 1: 77; Burgenlandes 3: 74; A Okl 3: 314;</td>
<td>Sopron Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314.03.27</td>
<td>Dl.66495</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Blagay cs. 74-75; Smičiklas 8: 353-354; A Okl 3: 316;</td>
<td>Loquetus, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314.05.12</td>
<td>Dl.86930</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Blagay cs. 76-79; A Okl 3: 332-334; Smičiklas 8: 359-361;</td>
<td>A Augustine, bishop of Zagreb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314.12.20</td>
<td>Dl.1851</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A O 1: 367-368; A Okl 3: 379;</td>
<td>Zalavár Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315.01.11</td>
<td>Dl.1857</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AO 1: 376; A Okl 4: 11-12.</td>
<td>Rolando de Gragnana, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315.07.08</td>
<td>Dl.86932,</td>
<td>E, T1325</td>
<td>AO 4: 51; A Okl 9: 48;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315.09.26</td>
<td>A1315</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beke A; TT. (1896): 498; Beke, K olózmönostor 18.</td>
<td>K olózmönostor, Benedectine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316.03.07</td>
<td>Dl.1863</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>MES 2: 720-721; A Okl 4: 97;</td>
<td>Thomas, archbishop of Esztergom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1318.03.10</td>
<td>A Okl 5: 33; Mollat 2: 6549.</td>
<td></td>
<td>John XXII, pope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1318.05.23</td>
<td>A Okl 5: 64; Mollat 2: 7284.</td>
<td></td>
<td>John XXII, pope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319.05.06</td>
<td>Dl.1960</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AO 1: 514-515; A Okl 5: 177;</td>
<td>Francis, general proctor of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319.05.24</td>
<td>in Dl.70396</td>
<td>T1319</td>
<td>AO Kl 5: 184-185.</td>
<td>Ujudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319.10.09</td>
<td>A SV Litt communes</td>
<td>Mollat 3: 10462, A Okl 5: 232;</td>
<td>John XXII, pope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319.10.09</td>
<td>A SV Litt communes</td>
<td>Mollat 3: 10462, A Okl 5: 232;</td>
<td>John XXII, pope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320.04.24</td>
<td>Dl.34297,</td>
<td>E, M 1773</td>
<td>Smičiklas 8: 556-559; A Okl 5: 294-295.</td>
<td>Filippo de Gragnana, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320.06.17</td>
<td>Jean XXII, Lettres communes, 11632</td>
<td></td>
<td>John XXII, pope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320.10.06</td>
<td>Df.236419</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér 8/2: 269-271; Pest m. 35; Bakács, Pest m. 124; A Okl 5: 347; MES 3: 7.</td>
<td>James, Stephanite master of Esztergom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321.08.04</td>
<td>Jean XXII, Lettres communes, 13960</td>
<td></td>
<td>John XXII, pope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321.09.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A Okl 6: 100.</td>
<td>Hosp. preceptor of Villingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322.06.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A Okl 6: 236; Reg. Habsb. 139.</td>
<td>James provost of Zagreb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322.07.26</td>
<td>Dl.262639</td>
<td>T1322</td>
<td>A Okl 6: 260; Vasvári kápt. Okl. 27.</td>
<td>James, provost of Zagreb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322.08.20</td>
<td>Dl.99580</td>
<td>A1358</td>
<td>A Okl 6: 273.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322.11.17.a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theiner 1: 485-486; Mollat 4, no. 16591; A Okl 6: 306.</td>
<td>John XXII, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322.11.17.b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mollat 4, no. 16602.</td>
<td>John XXII, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322.12.13</td>
<td>Dl.2132</td>
<td>A1369</td>
<td>A O 2: 55-56; Smičiklas 9: 97-98; A Okl 6: 316-317;</td>
<td>Charles I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322.12.18</td>
<td>Dl.2068</td>
<td>A1349</td>
<td>Burgenlandes 3: 137; Fejér CD 8/2: 362-363; 8/2: 543-545; A Okl 6: 318-319; Fenyvesi 70.</td>
<td>Charles I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323.05.03-07.20.</td>
<td>in Dl.2176</td>
<td>T1323</td>
<td>A Okl 7: 83.</td>
<td>Thomas, abbot of Tihany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323.06.04.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/5: 288-289; Zichy 1: 228-229; A Okl 7: 121;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323.06.17.</td>
<td>Dl.76313</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Zichy 1: 228-229; Fejér CD 8/5: 288-289; A Okl 7: 131;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323.07.21.</td>
<td>Dl.2176, Df.283194</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A Okl 7: 174-175.</td>
<td>Thomas, abbot of Tihany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323.11.29.</td>
<td>Dl.106114</td>
<td>A 1323</td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/2: 495-496; A Okl 7: 285.</td>
<td>Filippo de Gragnana, prior of H-Sl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324.02.21.</td>
<td>Dl.2068</td>
<td>A 1349</td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/2: 543-545; A Okl 8: 47; Burgenlandes 3: 170-171; Doc. Trans. 2: 111; Feriyesi 77.</td>
<td>Charles I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324.04.19.</td>
<td>Jean X XII, Lettres communes, 19359</td>
<td></td>
<td>John X XII, pope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324.05.28.</td>
<td>Dl.2251</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/2: 562-565; A Okl 8: 148.</td>
<td>Charles I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324.05.29.a</td>
<td>Df.283555</td>
<td>A 1324, A 1328</td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/7: 170-172; Farlati 5: 416-417; Smičiklas 9: 195-196; A Okl 8: 149;</td>
<td>Zagreb cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324.05.29.b</td>
<td>Df.283555</td>
<td>A 1328</td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/7: 169-172; Smičiklas 9: 195-196; A Okl 8: 150;</td>
<td>Filippo de Gragnana prior of H-Sl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324.12.16. ante</td>
<td>in Df.200125</td>
<td>T1324</td>
<td>Veszpr. reg. 71.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324.12.27.</td>
<td>Df.264753</td>
<td>M 1701-1800</td>
<td>A Okl 8: 285; Sumeghy 11;</td>
<td>Újudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.05.01.</td>
<td>Dl.2298</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A O 2: 193.</td>
<td>Bartholomew, prior of Budafelhévíz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.05.25.</td>
<td>Dl.86972</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A Okl 9: 124.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.06.24.</td>
<td>Dl.2304</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A O 2: 199; A Okl 9: 159; Károly, Fejér vm. 4, 209.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.07.01.a ante</td>
<td>T1325</td>
<td>Koller 2: 339; Fejér CD 8/2: 619; Smičiklas 9: 254; A Okl 9: 165.</td>
<td>Charles I, king of H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.07.01.b ante</td>
<td>T1325</td>
<td>Koller 2: 339; Fejér CD 8/2: 619; Smičiklas 9: 254; A Okl 9: 165.</td>
<td>Deputy count of County Pozsega</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.07.08.</td>
<td>Df.258479</td>
<td>A 1325, M</td>
<td>Koller 2: 338-342; Smičiklas 9: 254-255; A Okl 9: 176-177;</td>
<td>Alexander, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.09.08.</td>
<td>Df.68092</td>
<td>T1353</td>
<td>A Okl 9: 222-223;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.09.15.</td>
<td>Dl.99941</td>
<td>A 1332</td>
<td>A Okl 9: 226;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.10.30.</td>
<td>Df.201716, GY M SM L Dl.82</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HO 3, 83-84; Házi 1/1, 45; Burgenlandes 3: 206-207; A Okl 9: 270-271.</td>
<td>Andrew son of Renold, deputy count of Sopron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.11.30.</td>
<td>Dl.342, Dl.234, Dl.2274</td>
<td>E, M 1700-1800 (2)</td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/2: 613-615; A Okl 9: 290;</td>
<td>Charles I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.99.99.a ante</td>
<td>Dl.76352</td>
<td>T1325</td>
<td>A Okl 9: 311-312.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.99.99.a</td>
<td>Dl.2335 (NRA 642, 28)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A Okl 9: 321; Zala 1: 190-191;</td>
<td>Újudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325.99.99.c</td>
<td>Dl.2337</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A Okl 9: 322-323.</td>
<td>Unknown place of authentication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325-1340, sine annum</td>
<td>Dl.24895</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A Okl 10: no. 18; HO 3: 84-85; Házi,</td>
<td>Sopron Hosp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.02.02.</td>
<td>Dl.106181</td>
<td>T1376</td>
<td>A Okl 10: 58; Kőfalvi no. 88.</td>
<td>Pecsvarad Benedictine preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.04.24.a</td>
<td>in Dl.106115</td>
<td>T1326</td>
<td>A Okl 10: 109.</td>
<td>John XXII, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.04.24.b</td>
<td>in Dl.106115</td>
<td>T1326</td>
<td>A Okl 10: 109.</td>
<td>Hungarian priory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.04.24.c</td>
<td>in Dl.106115</td>
<td>T1326</td>
<td>A Okl 10: 109-110.</td>
<td>Hungarian priory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.04.24.d</td>
<td>in Dl.106115</td>
<td>T1326</td>
<td>A Okl 10: 110.</td>
<td>Ladislaus, bishop of Pécs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.04.29.</td>
<td>Df.249085</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A Okl 10: 107; Fejér CD 8/5: 288-289;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.05.01.</td>
<td>in Dl.2359</td>
<td>T1326</td>
<td>A Okl 10: 134.</td>
<td>Ujudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.05.11.</td>
<td>Dl.2359</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A Okl 10: 134.</td>
<td>Alexander, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.05.22.</td>
<td>Dl.3653</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/3: 147-149; A Okl 10: 146-147;</td>
<td>Filippo de Gragnana, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.05.24.a</td>
<td>Dl.106118, Dl.106182, Dl.106184</td>
<td>T1376, T1377, T1377</td>
<td>A Okl 10: 348-349; Érszegi 186;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.05.24.b</td>
<td>Dl.2301</td>
<td>T1334</td>
<td>A O 2: 343; A Okl 11: 57;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.05.16.</td>
<td>Dl.2411</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A Okl 11: 65;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.05.25.</td>
<td>Df.291474</td>
<td>A1390</td>
<td>Theiner 1: 514; A Okl 11: 115-116;</td>
<td>John XXII, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.06.03.</td>
<td>Dl.66504</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Blagay cs. 99-100; Smičiklas 9: 341-342; A Okl 11: 126.</td>
<td>Filippo de Gragnana, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.06.14.</td>
<td>in Dl.88128</td>
<td>T1437</td>
<td>Héderváry 1: 24-25; A Okl 11: 147;</td>
<td>Alexander, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.06.25.</td>
<td>Dl.10933, Dl.86989, Dl.88128</td>
<td>A1390, T1437</td>
<td>A Okl 11: 182; Fenyvesi 80.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326.07.01.</td>
<td>Dl.101669</td>
<td>A1340</td>
<td>A Okl 12: 10.</td>
<td>Engelhard, Cistercian abbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1328.99.99</td>
<td>Dl.91238</td>
<td>T1329</td>
<td>A Okl 12: 269.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329.07.07</td>
<td>Dl.91238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329.11.25</td>
<td>Df.257974, Df.258481</td>
<td>E, M 1701-1800</td>
<td></td>
<td>Filippo de Gragnana, prior of H-Sl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329.99.99</td>
<td>Dl.106114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Filippo de Gragnana, prior of H-Sl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330.03.22</td>
<td>in Dl.49853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zala county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330.06.11</td>
<td>Df.201312</td>
<td>A1447</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330.06.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>T1330</td>
<td></td>
<td>B6 Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330.11.02</td>
<td>AOM 280, f. 5r</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Engel 1997, 112-113; Tipton 303-3;</td>
<td>Helion de Villeneuve, Hosp. master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330.11.02</td>
<td>AOM 280, f. 7v</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Engel 1997, 113-115; Tipton 303-4</td>
<td>Helion de Villeneuve, Hosp. master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330.11.99</td>
<td>AOM 280, f. 14r</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Tipton 304.</td>
<td>Chapter general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330.11.99</td>
<td>AOM 280, f. 21r</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Tipton 308.</td>
<td>Chapter general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330.04.01</td>
<td>Df.251683</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/7: 233-234.</td>
<td>Győr cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330.06.10</td>
<td>Df.264766</td>
<td>M 1701-1800</td>
<td></td>
<td>Újudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1331.04.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1331.05.01</td>
<td>Dl.2781</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Zala vm. 1: 272-273; A Okl 17: 106-107.</td>
<td>Újudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1331.10.02</td>
<td>Dl.94067</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A Okl 17: 200.</td>
<td>Zalavár Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1331.12.23</td>
<td>Dl.3078</td>
<td>HO 3:</td>
<td>118-119; A Okl 17: 234-235.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334.03.20</td>
<td>Df.236422</td>
<td>A1334</td>
<td>MES 3: 247.</td>
<td>Esztergom Stephanite convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334.09.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>T1334,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334.09.15</td>
<td>in Dl.2847</td>
<td>T1334</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334.09.30</td>
<td>Dl.2854</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334.99.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ljubič, Listine M on Spect Hist. Merid Slav 1: 155; 169; 176; 398;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334.99.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John XXII, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334.09.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John XXII, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335.02.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár and Esztergom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335.04.30</td>
<td>Dl.40692</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335.07.20</td>
<td>Df.201832, Df.202085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sopron Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335.08.14.</td>
<td>Dl.68712</td>
<td>A1487</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335.08.16.</td>
<td>Df.230084</td>
<td>T1415</td>
<td>ZSO 5: 237.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335.10.30.</td>
<td>in Dl.2957</td>
<td>T1335</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zala county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335.11.06.</td>
<td>Dl.2957, Dl.25797</td>
<td>E, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Újjudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335.11.18.</td>
<td>Dl.2960</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Újjudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335.99.99.b</td>
<td>Df.201745, Df.202085, GYMSML D.111</td>
<td>E, A1367</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sopron Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1336.05.09.</td>
<td>DT.262642</td>
<td>A1414</td>
<td>Vásári kápt. Okl. 34-37.</td>
<td>Veszprém cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1336.12.06.</td>
<td>Df.255655, Df.255667</td>
<td>E, A1374</td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/4: 204-206; Smičiklas 10: 285-286;</td>
<td>Petrus Cornutus, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1336.12.18.</td>
<td>Dl.3973</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Újjudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1337.02.16.</td>
<td>Df.201749, GY M SL D.115</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Sopron vm. okl. 1: 139; Házi, Sopron 1/1: 70.</td>
<td>Sopron Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1337.04.05.</td>
<td>DT.291707, Reg. Vat. 124, ep. 135.; reg. A v. 51, f. 88;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Theiner 1: 613; Benoit XII, Lettres communes, 5028.</td>
<td>Benedict XII, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1337.04.11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farlati 5: 96; Benoit XII, Lettres communes, 5031.</td>
<td>Benedict XII, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1337.04.13.</td>
<td>Benoit XII, Lettres communes, 4610</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vidal 1: 436.</td>
<td>Benedict XII, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1337.10.10.</td>
<td>Dl.3093</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sopron Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1337.04.24.</td>
<td>Dl.106117</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejé CD 4/1: 141-142; Boltizsár 294.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338.05.01.</td>
<td>in Df.207158</td>
<td>T1338</td>
<td>PRT 2: 389-390.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338.07.08.</td>
<td>Dl.99970</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338.08.22.</td>
<td>Dl.3172</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338.09.02.</td>
<td>in Dl.3181</td>
<td>T1338</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1339.03.17.</td>
<td>in Dl.3217</td>
<td>T1339</td>
<td>A Okl 22: 75.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1339.03.17.</td>
<td>Dl.3217</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A Okl 22: 75.</td>
<td>Paul, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1339.07.12.- 10.06.</td>
<td>in Dl.3263</td>
<td>T1339</td>
<td>A Okl 23: 202-203.</td>
<td>Paul, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1339.10.06.</td>
<td>Dl.3261</td>
<td>A1353</td>
<td>AO 3: 596; A Okl 23: 283; Györffy, Kéleri elemek 143; Györffy Gy; KCsA, 1935-39. 411;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340.03.08.</td>
<td>Dl.51117</td>
<td>T1340</td>
<td>Kállay 1: 136; A Okl 24: 60.</td>
<td>Paul, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340.03.08.- 03.22.</td>
<td>in Dl.51117</td>
<td>T1340</td>
<td>Kállay 1: 136; A Okl 24: 60.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340.03.09.</td>
<td>Dl.51115</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Kállay 1: 136; A Okl 24: 63;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
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<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340.05.31.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smičiklas 10: 555-557; A O kl 24: 163.</td>
<td>Petrus Cornutus, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340.05.31- 1344.08.08.</td>
<td>H A Z U</td>
<td>A 1518</td>
<td>Smičiklas 10: 555-557;</td>
<td>Fulco Rocafolii, lieutenant of Petrus Cornuti in H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340.07.04.</td>
<td>in Dl.106118</td>
<td>T 1340</td>
<td>A O kl 24: 200;</td>
<td>Charles I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340.07.07.</td>
<td>Df.200870</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A Smiklas 10: 555-557;</td>
<td>Zalavár Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340.07.25.</td>
<td>Dl.106118</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Veszpr reg; Erszegi 186; Fejér CD 8/4: 464-465.</td>
<td>Veszprémcathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340.08.20.</td>
<td>Df.200871</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Vesz. reg 133; A O kl 24: 231.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340.08.99.</td>
<td>A O M 280, f.45r-46v</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Chapter General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340.09.15.</td>
<td>Dl.3384</td>
<td>T 1341</td>
<td>A O Kl 24: 249-250; A O. 4: 96-97.</td>
<td>Vilmos Drugeth, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340.10.06.</td>
<td>Df.226331</td>
<td>E, A 1718, 1718</td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/4: 465-467; A O kl 24: 265;</td>
<td>Veszprémcathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340.11.08.</td>
<td>in Dl.99989</td>
<td>T 1340</td>
<td>A O kl 24: 290.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341.03.05.</td>
<td>Dl.106120</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 187.</td>
<td>Veszprémcathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341.05.03.</td>
<td>Dl.106121</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 187; Fejér CD 8/4: 530-531;</td>
<td>Veszprémcathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341.05.08.</td>
<td>Dl.106122</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Paul, royal judge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341.05.28.</td>
<td>Df.266373, forgery</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341.05.28.</td>
<td>in Dl.266373</td>
<td>T 1341</td>
<td>A O Kl 24: 249-250; A O. 4: 96-97.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341.12.29.</td>
<td>Df.264770</td>
<td>M 1701- 1800</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ujudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342.07.24.</td>
<td>Df.264771</td>
<td>M 1701- 1800</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ujudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342.07.27.</td>
<td>in Dl.3504</td>
<td>T 1342</td>
<td>A O 4: 245-247.</td>
<td>Ujudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342.08.03.</td>
<td>Dl.3504</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Borsa SM M 28 (1997) 30/169.</td>
<td>Somogy Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1343.03.02</td>
<td>Df.229977</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1343.04.30.</td>
<td>Dl.51223</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Kállay 1: 160; Fenyvesi 92.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344.04.12.</td>
<td>Dl.3682</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sopron Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344.04.15.</td>
<td>Df.249093</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/5: 288-290;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344.05.26.</td>
<td>Df.257410</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ujudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344.08.08.</td>
<td>Dl.100023</td>
<td>A 1345</td>
<td></td>
<td>Petrus Cornutus, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344.09.12-12.12</td>
<td>AOM 280, f. 48v.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Chapter General</td>
<td>preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344.10.07</td>
<td>Di.64716</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Újudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Ujjudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345.02.02</td>
<td>Df.260575, Df.280499</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345.03.01</td>
<td>Df.286401</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345.03.12</td>
<td>Df.263645</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Somogy Benedictine convent</td>
<td>Somogy Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345.04.24</td>
<td>Di.100023</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Petrás Cornutus, prior</td>
<td>Petrás Cornutus, prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345.05.01</td>
<td>Dl.3841</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Venice, government</td>
<td>Venice, government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345.10.07</td>
<td>Df.274082</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345.12.12</td>
<td>Di.237295?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Clement VI, pope</td>
<td>Clement VI, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346.01.31.a</td>
<td>Di.51366</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346.01.31.b</td>
<td>Di.51367</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>John, viceprior H-SI, protector of Sopron and Újudvar</td>
<td>John, viceprior H-SI, protector of Sopron and Újudvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346.03.10</td>
<td>Di.201769</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Lawrence, magister tawarnicorum</td>
<td>Lawrence, magister tawarnicorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346.04.17</td>
<td>Di.107876</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Clement VI, pope</td>
<td>Clement VI, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346.05.01</td>
<td>Di.3841</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>John, comes capellae</td>
<td>John, comes capellae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346.05.09</td>
<td>Di.99417</td>
<td>M 1801-1900</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346.05.10</td>
<td>Di.41050</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Zagreb cathedral chapter</td>
<td>Zagreb cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346.05.11</td>
<td>Di.230400</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HO 4: 170-171; Házi, Sopron 1/1: 89-90.</td>
<td>Sopron Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346.06.23</td>
<td>Di.76844</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Zichy 2: 255-257;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347.08.07</td>
<td>Di.41050</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347.08.13</td>
<td>Di.66510, Di.66511</td>
<td>E, A1348</td>
<td>Blagay cs. 123-124.</td>
<td>Elias, preceptor of Dubica and Péter, comes terrestris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347.09.01</td>
<td>Di.106123</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/1: 419-422.</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/1: 419-422.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347.10.10</td>
<td>Di.30646</td>
<td>A1389</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347.9.99</td>
<td>Di.66510, Di.66511</td>
<td>E, A1348</td>
<td>Smičiklas 11: 352-353; ZA 1348</td>
<td>Smičiklas 11: 352-353; ZA 1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347.02.10</td>
<td>Di.74452</td>
<td>A1348</td>
<td>Smičiklas 11: 444-445; Televi cs. 1: 84-87.</td>
<td>Baudoin Cornutus, viceprior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348.03.24.a</td>
<td>AOM 317, 211r.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Deodatus de Gazon, Hosp. master</td>
<td>Deodatus de Gazon, Hosp. master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348.03.24.b</td>
<td>AOM 317, 211r.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Deodatus de Gazon, Hosp. master</td>
<td>Deodatus de Gazon, Hosp. master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348.03.24</td>
<td>AOM 317, f. 211r-v</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deodatus de Gozon, Hosp. master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348.06.02</td>
<td>Dl.66511</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Blagay cs. 124-125; Smičiklas 11: 462-463.</td>
<td>John deputy warden of Croatia and Nicholas son of Odolen, comes terrestris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348.10.16</td>
<td>Dl.106127, Dl.106134</td>
<td>T1356, T1358</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/7: 153.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348.10.16</td>
<td>Dl.106134</td>
<td>A1358</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis I, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348.12.10</td>
<td>Dl.402</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349.10.01</td>
<td>Df.230430</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Smičiklas 11: 551.</td>
<td>Baldonus, count of Dubica and Nicholas, comes terrestris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349.10.21</td>
<td>Dl.2068</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 8/2: 588; A O kl 8: 231-232; Fenyvesi 79;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349.11.01</td>
<td>in Dl.4161</td>
<td>T1351</td>
<td>Sopron vm. okl. 215. (214-220.)</td>
<td>Sopron Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350.01.15</td>
<td>Df.288072</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Smičiklas 11: 563-565.</td>
<td>Zagreb cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350.03.10</td>
<td>Dl.4117</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Zala vm. 1: 497-498.</td>
<td>Újudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350.03.25</td>
<td>Df.291740</td>
<td>A1350</td>
<td>Smičiklas 11: 589-591; Fejér CD 9/1: 791-793; Tkalcic, M on Zagr 2: 57-58;</td>
<td>Guido, papal legate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350.05.13</td>
<td>Df.291740</td>
<td>A1350</td>
<td>Wenzel, A cta extera, 2: 383-384.</td>
<td>Guido, papal legate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350.07.18</td>
<td>Df.291740</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Tkalcic 2: 56-58; Smičiklas 11: 610-611.</td>
<td>John, Cistercian abbot of Zagreb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1357</td>
<td>Dl.106196</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>[Baudoin Cornuti], prior of Vrana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350.03.28</td>
<td>AOM 318, f. 229v</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deodatus de Gozon, Hosp. master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350.04.13</td>
<td>Dl.4161</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Sopron vm. 1: 214-220.</td>
<td>Nicholas Gilétfi, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350.05.01</td>
<td>Df.264774</td>
<td>M1701-1800</td>
<td></td>
<td>Újudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351.03.28</td>
<td>AOM 318, f. 229v</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deodatus de Gozon, Hosp. master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351.03.28</td>
<td>AOM 318, f. 229v</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deodatus de Gozon, Hosp. master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351.09.26</td>
<td>Dl.66516</td>
<td>A1353</td>
<td>Blagay cs. 125-126; Smičiklas 12: 39-40.</td>
<td>Elias, preceptor of Dubica and Nicholas, comes terrestris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351.10.17</td>
<td>Dl.66516</td>
<td>A1353</td>
<td>Blagay cs. 126-127.</td>
<td>Elias, preceptor of Dubica and Nicholas, comes terrestris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351.1357</td>
<td>Df.200873</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Veszpz. reg. 172.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352.01.29</td>
<td>Dl.107878, Df.292621</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Theiner 1: 805; Fejér CD 9/2: 170-174; MES 4: 69-71; Smičiklas 12: 67-70.</td>
<td>Clement VI, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352.03.19</td>
<td>Dl.4263</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Zala vm. 1: 514-515.</td>
<td>Újudvar Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352.06.14</td>
<td>Dl.33597</td>
<td>A1373</td>
<td>Smičiklas 12: 97-100.</td>
<td>Zagreb cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352.07.15</td>
<td>Theiner 1: 815-816.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clement V I, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353.02.14.a</td>
<td>Dl.106124, Dl.106664,</td>
<td>E, A1486</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/2: 228-229;</td>
<td>Louis I, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353.02.14.b</td>
<td>Dl.106664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis I, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353.03.18.a</td>
<td>Dl.66516</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Blagay cs. 132.</td>
<td>Elias, preceptor of Dubica and Nicholas, comes terrestris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353.03.18.b</td>
<td>Dl.66517</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Blagay cs. 133-134; Smičiklas 12: 152-153.</td>
<td>Elias, preceptor of Dubica and Nicholas, comes terrestris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353.04.20.</td>
<td>Dl.106205</td>
<td>A1392</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/2: 254-255; Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353.04.29.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smičiklas 12: 158-159.</td>
<td>Elias, preceptor of Dubica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353.05.06.a</td>
<td>Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (Wien)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alsó-Szlavónia 43-45(-47.), Smičiklas 12: 159-161.</td>
<td>Baudoin Cornuti, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353.05.06.b</td>
<td>Dl.3261</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AO 3: 596.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353.07.03.ante</td>
<td>Df.252351, Df.239532</td>
<td>E, M 1801-1900</td>
<td>Smičiklas 12: 165-167.</td>
<td>Baudoin Cornuti, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353.07.06.ante</td>
<td>Df.106144</td>
<td>T1365</td>
<td>Erszegi 188.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353.08.07.</td>
<td>Dl.106125</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Pécs cathedral chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353.08.20.</td>
<td>Dl.68092</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Nicholas, palatine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353.10.13.ante</td>
<td>Df.226755</td>
<td>T1353</td>
<td>Mons Sacer 1: 445.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354.03.23.</td>
<td>Dl.41239</td>
<td>A1354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354.04.08.</td>
<td>Dl.41239</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355.06.11.</td>
<td>Dl.4522</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A O 6: 323; Smičiklas 12: 291-292.</td>
<td>Zagreb cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355.08.17.</td>
<td>Dl.106089</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/2: 370.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355.09.1.</td>
<td>Df.249103</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355.10.13.</td>
<td>Dl.106126</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér 9/7: 138.</td>
<td>Nicholas of Szécs, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356.01.27.</td>
<td>Dl.106127</td>
<td>A1356</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas of Szécs, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356.01.31.</td>
<td>Dl.106127</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/7: 147-150.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356.02.04.</td>
<td>Dl.106127</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 188; Fejér CD 9/7: 151-157.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356.02.07.</td>
<td>Dl.106128</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 188; Fejér CD 9/2: 526-527.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356.03.23.</td>
<td>Dl.106129</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/2: 566.</td>
<td>Nicholas of Szécs, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356.06.22.</td>
<td>Df.249105</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356.10.07.</td>
<td>Df.106130</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/2: 520.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356.11.15.</td>
<td>Df.87319</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pécs cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1357.03.05.</td>
<td>Df.4553, Df.208539, Df.264677, Df.106713, Df.25122</td>
<td>E, M 1701-1800, M 1501-1600</td>
<td>Fejér 9/2: 369-370; MES 4: 163-164;</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1357.04.06.</td>
<td>A H, NRA fasc. 458, nr. 31; Litt. reg. 638.</td>
<td>A 1364/1488/1549</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358.10.13</td>
<td>Dl.106135</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/7: 175-176.</td>
<td>Nicholas of Szécs, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358.11.01</td>
<td>Dl.99580</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358.11.12</td>
<td>Df.262588, Df.262589</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Vasvári kápt. Okl. 48; Alsó-Szlavónia 36; Fejér CD 9/2: 709; 9/7: 174; HO 1: 219.</td>
<td>Dubica county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358.99.99.a</td>
<td>Dl.5177</td>
<td>T1364</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358.99.99.b</td>
<td>Dl.5177</td>
<td>T1364</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358.99.99.c</td>
<td>Dl.5177</td>
<td>T1364</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359.02.07</td>
<td>Dl.13896, Dl.106664</td>
<td>A1446, A1486</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/2: 373; 9/3: 42-43; 9/7: 94-95.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359.04.24</td>
<td>Df.200217</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Veszp. reg. no. 510.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359.04.25</td>
<td>Df.200219</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Veszp. reg. no. 512.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359.04.30</td>
<td>Dl.106137</td>
<td>A1359</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/3: 123-125.</td>
<td>Nicholas son of Ugrin, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359.05.13.a</td>
<td>Dl.106137</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359.05.13.b</td>
<td>Dl.106138</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 189; Fejér CD 9/3: 73-74.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359.05.25</td>
<td>Dl.66425, Dl.66406</td>
<td>E, M 1701-1800</td>
<td>Fejér 9/6: 103.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359.12.18</td>
<td>Dl.106139</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Alsó-Szlavónia 59; Fejér CD 9/7: 178-179; Smičiklas 12: 651.</td>
<td>Zagreb cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359.99.99</td>
<td>Dl.106140</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 4/2: 485; Boltizsár 373.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360.01.23</td>
<td>Dl.106140</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Alsó-Szlavónia 62-63; Fejér CD 9/3: 185-186; Smičiklas 13: 4-5.</td>
<td>Pozsega, collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360.08.25</td>
<td>Dl.66525</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Blagay cs. 145; Smičiklas 13: 49;</td>
<td>Zagreb cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360.10.03</td>
<td>Dl.106141, Dl.106187</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fenyvesi 116-117.</td>
<td>Nicholas K ont. palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360.12.21</td>
<td>Dl.106142</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/3: 195.</td>
<td>Pozsega, collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361.04.13</td>
<td>Dl.41477</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361.06.24</td>
<td>Dl.61823</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Alsó-Szlavónia 66; Smičiklas 13: 153.</td>
<td>Baudoin Cornutus, prior of H-Sl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361.09.09</td>
<td>Dl.87372, Dl.106143, Dl.106422, Dl.106589, Dl.106209, Dl.106244, Dl.106337</td>
<td>A1361, A1361</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361.10.02</td>
<td>Dl.106143, Dl.87372, Dl.106589, Dl.106422, Dl.106209, Dl.106244, Dl.106209, Dl.106244, Dl.106337</td>
<td>A1361, A1361</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361.99.99</td>
<td>Dl.87423</td>
<td>T1367</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vrana, preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362.03.08</td>
<td>Df.263475</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362.03.19</td>
<td>Dl.42460, Dl.263601</td>
<td>T1390, T1390</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362.04.16</td>
<td>Dl.2832</td>
<td>T1449</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362.08.18</td>
<td>Dl.100111</td>
<td>A1366</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362.08.25.a</td>
<td>Dl.42460</td>
<td>A1366</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362.08.25.b</td>
<td>Dl.100111</td>
<td>T1390</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363.06.28</td>
<td>Df.230084</td>
<td>T1415</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363.08.27</td>
<td>Theiner 2: 57-58.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban V, pope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363.09.24</td>
<td>Dl.41532</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363.09.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 2: 168.</td>
<td>Guylermus de A Icaniz, preceptor of Csurgó and castellan of Béla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363.12.05</td>
<td>Di.106178, Di.106182, Di.106146, Di.106184</td>
<td>T1376</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364.03.04</td>
<td>Df.253839</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364.04.08</td>
<td>Urbain V, Lettres communes, 10297</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban V, pope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364.04.26</td>
<td>Di.106144</td>
<td>T1365 Erszegi 190.</td>
<td>Nicholas Kont, palatine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364.04.29</td>
<td>Di.106184</td>
<td>A1377</td>
<td>Nicholas Kont, palatine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364.07.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. Pór, Nagy Lajos 2: 385.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364.07.26</td>
<td>Di.5333</td>
<td>A1364 Fejér CD 9/3: 390.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364.08.09</td>
<td>Di.5333</td>
<td>E Fejér CD 9/3: 455-456.</td>
<td>Pécs cathedral chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364.11.13</td>
<td>Di.106146</td>
<td>A1366</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364.12.01</td>
<td>Di.106146</td>
<td>A1366</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364.12.21</td>
<td>Di.20</td>
<td>E RA no. 123; Kárácsonyi (Koszta), H H 4.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364.12.27</td>
<td>Di.4553, Df.208539, Df.264677, Di.106713</td>
<td>E, E, M1501-1600</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364.99.99</td>
<td>Df.230028</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365.02.12</td>
<td>Di.35232</td>
<td>E Alsó-Szlavónia 82-83.</td>
<td>Baudoin Cornuti, prior of H-SI and count of Dubica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365.02.27</td>
<td>Di.41613</td>
<td>E Csánki 3: 308.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365.03.19</td>
<td>in, Df.200247</td>
<td>T1365 Veszpr. reg. no. 585.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365.04.12</td>
<td>Di.106090</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365.08.17</td>
<td>Df.209251</td>
<td>A1366 (T1366)</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365.09.15</td>
<td>in Di.106144</td>
<td>T1365 Erszegi 191.</td>
<td>Nicholas Kont, palatine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365.09.18</td>
<td>Df.200250</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365.09.19</td>
<td>Di.106144, Df.281331</td>
<td>A1365 Erszegi 191; G yarmathy, Horváth család, 347-349; SzSzBML 46-48.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365.09.29</td>
<td>Df.200973</td>
<td>E Veszpr. reg. no. 589.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365.11.29</td>
<td>Di.106144, Df.281331</td>
<td>E Erszegi 191; SzSzBML 48-452</td>
<td>Nicholas Kont, palatine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365.12.21</td>
<td>Di.106145, Di.106413</td>
<td>E, A1435 Erszegi 191-192.</td>
<td>Nicholas Kont, palatine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.02.01.</td>
<td>DI.106146</td>
<td>A 1366</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.02.23.</td>
<td>DI.106146</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.03.11.</td>
<td>DI.200251</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Veszp. reg. no. 596.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.03.16.</td>
<td>DI.106147</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Szakály, Tolna 106.</td>
<td>Nicholas, deputy count of Tolna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.03.20.</td>
<td>AOM 319, f. 235v.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Engel 1997, 116-117.</td>
<td>Raymond de Bérenger, Hosp. master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.03.29.</td>
<td>DI.200252</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Veszp. reg. no. 597.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.05.04.</td>
<td>DI.106148</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 192.</td>
<td>Nicholas K ont, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.05.05.a</td>
<td>DI.106149</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 192.</td>
<td>Nicholas K ont, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.05.05.b</td>
<td>DI.99450</td>
<td>E, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.05.17.</td>
<td>DI.49286</td>
<td>T1368</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.06.07.</td>
<td>DI.106150</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/7: 245-248.</td>
<td>Nicholas K ont, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.07.25.</td>
<td>DI.106151</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pécs cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.08.05.</td>
<td>DI.200977</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Veszpr. Reg. no. 601.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.09.29.</td>
<td>DI.5498</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond, preceptor of Újvidék and Csurgó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366.10.06.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theiner 2: 83. Fejér CD 9/7: 241-243.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367.05.22.</td>
<td>DI.8617</td>
<td>A1405, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baudoin Cornuti, prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367.11.15.</td>
<td>DI.200985</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367.11.18.</td>
<td>DI.283218</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Veszp. reg. no. 616.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367.99.99.</td>
<td>HAZU I d 32 elen. f. 253-254. fasc. 22. Instr. 50;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Smičiklas 14: 106; Dobronic 1984b 30;</td>
<td>Zagreb cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368.02.14.</td>
<td>DI.201009</td>
<td>A 1374</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368.04.27.</td>
<td>DI.100421, DI.103482</td>
<td>A 1421, A 1405</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368.05.30.</td>
<td>DI.49286</td>
<td>A 1369</td>
<td>Borsa SM M 24 (1993) 9/73.</td>
<td>Ladislas of Opilia, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368.06.18.</td>
<td>DI.69697</td>
<td>T1373</td>
<td>Zala vm. 2: 70-93.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368.08.28.</td>
<td>DI.5694</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368.09.03.</td>
<td>DI.49286</td>
<td>T1369</td>
<td>Borsa SM M 24 (1993) 10/77.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368.09.06.</td>
<td>DI.49286</td>
<td>T1369</td>
<td>Borsa SM M 24 (1993) 10/78.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368.09.18.</td>
<td>DI.38489</td>
<td>A 1486</td>
<td>Alsó-Szlavónia 224-225.</td>
<td>Aibert, preceptor of Dubica and Stephen, comes terrestriś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368.09.29.</td>
<td>DI.5704</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond, preceptor of Csurgó and Újvidék</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369.01.27.</td>
<td>DI.200263</td>
<td>A 1370</td>
<td>Veszp. reg. no. 631, 632.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369.05.01.</td>
<td>in DI.69697</td>
<td>T1371/ T1373</td>
<td>Zala vm. 2: 70-93.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369.05.15.</td>
<td>Urbain V,</td>
<td>T1391</td>
<td>Vesz. reg. no. 638.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lettres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369.06.12.a</td>
<td>Df.201088</td>
<td>T1391</td>
<td>Vesz. reg. no. 641.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369.06.12.b</td>
<td>Df.201088</td>
<td>T1391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369.07.09.</td>
<td>Df.201088</td>
<td>A1391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369.08.22.</td>
<td>Dl.106152</td>
<td>A1369</td>
<td>Erszegi 192-193; Fejér 9/4: 160-161; Fenyvesi 120.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369.08.27.</td>
<td>Dl.106152</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 193; Fenyvesi 120.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370.01.02.</td>
<td>Df.201002</td>
<td>A1370</td>
<td>Vesz. reg. no. 654, 668.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370.03.18.</td>
<td>in Dl.69697</td>
<td>T1373</td>
<td>Zala vm. 70-93.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370.04.22.</td>
<td>Dl.106153</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/7: 301.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370.05.08.-05.22.</td>
<td>in Dl.106170</td>
<td>T1374</td>
<td>Erszegi 193-194.</td>
<td>Veszprém cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370.05.08.ante</td>
<td>in Dl.106170</td>
<td>T1374</td>
<td>Erszegi 193.</td>
<td>Ladislas of Opulia, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370.05.22.</td>
<td>Dl.106154</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 194; Fejér CD 9/4: 258-260.</td>
<td>Veszprém cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370.05.25.</td>
<td>Dl.106155</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 194.</td>
<td>Veszprém cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370.06.26.</td>
<td>Dl.106156</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Vesz. reg. no. 672.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370.09.02.</td>
<td>Dl.106157</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 194-195; Fenyvesi 121-122.</td>
<td>Ladislas of Opulia, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370.10.13.</td>
<td>Dl.106158</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ladislas of Opulia, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371.01.17.</td>
<td>Df.200267</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371.01.20.</td>
<td>Dl.106159</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ladislas of Opulia, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371.09.05.</td>
<td>Dl.106160, Dl.106161</td>
<td>A1371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371.09.18.</td>
<td>Dl.106160, Dl.106161</td>
<td>E, E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371.10.13.a</td>
<td>Dl.106162</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ladislas of Opulia, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371.10.13.b</td>
<td>Dl.106163</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 195; Fenyvesi 122-123.</td>
<td>Nicholas of Szécs, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372.05.16.</td>
<td>Dl.29</td>
<td>A1394</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372.06.20.</td>
<td>Dl.106164</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 195.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372.07.05.</td>
<td>Dl.106166</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 195-196; Siklósi 82.</td>
<td>Ladislas of Opulia, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372.07.07.</td>
<td>in Dl.106178</td>
<td>T1376</td>
<td>Erszegi 196.</td>
<td>Ladislas of Opulia, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372.07.11.</td>
<td>Dl.106165</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 196.</td>
<td>Ladislas of Opulia, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373.01.24.</td>
<td>Dl.106326</td>
<td>T1429</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emeric Bwbek, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373.01.25.</td>
<td>Dl.71311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373.03.29.</td>
<td>Dl.71232</td>
<td>A 1426 (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373.05.25.</td>
<td>Dl.106167</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373.10.09.</td>
<td>Dl.6204</td>
<td>T 1374</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/7: 347-356.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373.10.31.</td>
<td>Dl.6151</td>
<td>A 1373</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373.11.16.</td>
<td>Dl.6151</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eger cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373.11.22.</td>
<td>AOM 347, f. 51r-v</td>
<td>P (A 1427)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guilhemus Ferrandi, notary public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373.12.03.</td>
<td>Dl.69697</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Zala 2: 70-93, PRT 10: 565-575</td>
<td>Emeric Lackfi, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.01.13.</td>
<td>Dl.6204</td>
<td>T 1374</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/7: 347-356;</td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.01.13.</td>
<td>Dl.6204</td>
<td>T 1374</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/7: 347-356;</td>
<td>Somogy Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.01.20.</td>
<td>Dl.106168</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.04.14.</td>
<td>Dl.106169</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Veszprém cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.05.01.</td>
<td>Dl.6203</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Borsa SM M 30 (1999) 17-18.</td>
<td>Somogy Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.05.03.</td>
<td>Dl.71222, Dl.71225</td>
<td>M , A 1395/M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.05.05.a</td>
<td>Dl.98074</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.05.05.b</td>
<td>Df.249125</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.05.10.</td>
<td>Dl.106170</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 196.</td>
<td>Emeric, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.05.14.</td>
<td>Dl.41941</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.05.16.</td>
<td>Dl.6204</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/7: 347-356.</td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.05.21.</td>
<td>Dl.6221</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond de Beaumont, preceptor of Csurgó and Ujudvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.05.22.</td>
<td>Dl.106171</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/4: 611-613.</td>
<td>John, provost of Buda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.06.08.</td>
<td>Df.280087</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.09.08.a</td>
<td>Dl.6319</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/4: 614-616.</td>
<td>Raymond de Beaumont, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.09.08.b</td>
<td>Df.255666</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Kukuljević, PV 81: 60-61; Smičklas 15: 59.</td>
<td>Raymond de Beaumont, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.09.08.c</td>
<td>Df.255667</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/4: 613-614.</td>
<td>Raymond de Beaumont, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.09.11</td>
<td>Dl.33758</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>Raymond de Bellomonte, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.10.01</td>
<td>Dl.6237, Dl.6238</td>
<td>E, M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vrana, Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.10.06.a</td>
<td>Df.200271</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.10.06.b</td>
<td>AOM 320, f. 50v-51r</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Julliac, Hosp. master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.10.13</td>
<td>Dl.106172</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 197; Fejér CD 9/7: 344.</td>
<td>Emeric, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.12.31</td>
<td>Dl.100142</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374.99.99</td>
<td>Dl.98346</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>(T1718)</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.01.03</td>
<td>Df.201013</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Veszp. reg. no. 699.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.01.23</td>
<td>Dl.52233</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Kállay no. 1725; Temes vm. 1: 133.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.04.09</td>
<td>Dl.106181</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 197; Fenyvesi 123.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.05.02</td>
<td>Dl.6274</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Borsa SM M 30 (1999): 24-25.</td>
<td>Somogy Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.05.08.a</td>
<td>Dl.106173</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.05.08.b</td>
<td>Dl.106174</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 197; Fejér CD 9/7: 371-372;</td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.05.10</td>
<td>Dl.106174</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/5: 68-69.</td>
<td>Somogy Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.07.23</td>
<td>Dl.106175</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.08.08.a</td>
<td>Dl.106175</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.08.08.b</td>
<td>Dl.106176</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.08.21</td>
<td>Df.249126</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.10.27</td>
<td>A annales Ecclesiastici, vii,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory XI, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.11.01</td>
<td>Reg. Vat. 271. f. 62v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory XI, pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375.99.99</td>
<td>AOM 16, no. 52.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Luttrell, Western Accounts XI 13, 18;</td>
<td>Robert de Julliac, Hosp. master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376.01.06-01.13</td>
<td>Df.230580</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1401-1500</td>
<td>Engel, Arch. 1: 276.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376.01.18.</td>
<td>DL.6329</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Szentmárton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376.05.08.</td>
<td>DL.106177</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas of Gara, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376.05.20.</td>
<td>DL.106178</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 197.</td>
<td>Nicholas of Gara, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376.06.14.</td>
<td>DL.6363</td>
<td>A1376</td>
<td></td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376.06.15.</td>
<td>DL.6364</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Borsa SM M 30 (1999): 26.</td>
<td>Somogy Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376.06.17.</td>
<td>DL.6366</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376.09.08.</td>
<td>DL.106181</td>
<td>T1377</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pécsvárad Benedictine preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376.09.29.</td>
<td>DL.6383</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>A moldus, preceptor of Csurgó and viceprior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376.10.17.</td>
<td>DL.106181</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376.11.25.</td>
<td>DL.6391</td>
<td>A1377</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/7: 374-376, Borsa SM M 30 (1999): 29.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.01.24.a</td>
<td>DF.200274</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Veszpr. reg. no. 712.</td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.01.24.b</td>
<td>DL.106184</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 197-198.</td>
<td>Nicholas of Gara, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.02.16.</td>
<td>DL.42144</td>
<td>A1380</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.02.22.</td>
<td>DL.106179</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/5: 149-152.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.03.01.</td>
<td>DL.106180</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/5: 153-156.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.03.08.</td>
<td>DL.6409</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Borsa SM M 30 (1999): 31.</td>
<td>Somogy Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.03.15.</td>
<td>DL.6391</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Borsa SM M 30 (1999) 31-32/398.</td>
<td>Somogy Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.03.25.</td>
<td>in DL.106182</td>
<td>T1377</td>
<td>Erszegi 198; Fenyvesi 125.</td>
<td>Veszprém cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.03.25.a</td>
<td>DF.233327</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Borsa SM M 30 (1999): 36-37.</td>
<td>Somogy Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.03.25.b</td>
<td>in DL.106182</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Erszegi 198; Fenyvesi 125.</td>
<td>Nicholas of Gara, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.06.01.</td>
<td>DL.24485</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zalavár Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.06.27.</td>
<td>DF.251765</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.07.08.</td>
<td>DL.106183</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kalocsa, cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.09.25.</td>
<td>DL.200276</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.09.29.</td>
<td>DL.6459</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>A moldus, preceptor of Csurgó and viceprior of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377.11.25.</td>
<td>DL.24917</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378.01.19.</td>
<td>DF.267758</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fenyvesi 125-126.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378.03.06.</td>
<td>DL.25146</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378.03.10.</td>
<td>DL.42281</td>
<td>A1378</td>
<td>Borsa SM M 30 (1999): 39.</td>
<td>Louis I, king of H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378.03.18.</td>
<td>DL.106185</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378.05.08.</td>
<td>Dl.106186</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378.05.11.</td>
<td>Dl.6536</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arnold, preceptor of Ujúdvar and viceprior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378.05.12.</td>
<td>Dl.106424</td>
<td>A1435</td>
<td></td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378.05.16.</td>
<td>Dl.6541</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Závavár Benedictine convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378.07.15.</td>
<td>Df.201022</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378.10.13.</td>
<td>Dl.24918</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378.11.01.</td>
<td>Dl.9481</td>
<td>T1409</td>
<td>ZsO 2: 276-279; Fenyvesi 127-128.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379.05.08.</td>
<td>Dl.6616</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>James of Szepes, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379.12.07.</td>
<td>Df.200280</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380.04.17.</td>
<td>Dl.42150</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380.04.29.</td>
<td>Dl.106187</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380.05.07.</td>
<td>Dl.42154</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380.07.01.</td>
<td>Dl.44118</td>
<td>T1436</td>
<td>AOkl 23: no. 211.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380.07.18.</td>
<td>Df.249141</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380.08.27.</td>
<td>Dl.98631</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Veszprép cathedral chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380.10.11.</td>
<td>Df.201029</td>
<td>A1380</td>
<td>Veszp. reg. no. 740.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380.12.21.</td>
<td>in Dl.106188</td>
<td>T1381</td>
<td>Érszegi 198; Fenyvesi 128-129.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381.02.09.a</td>
<td>Dl.106188, Dl.106200</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fenyvesi 129-130.</td>
<td>Nicholas of Szécs, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381.02.09.b</td>
<td>Dl.106188, Dl.106200</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Érszegi 198-199; Fenyvesi 130.</td>
<td>Nicholas of Szécs, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381.05.26.</td>
<td>Df.258487</td>
<td>M 1701-1800</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/5: 496-497; Smičiškla 16: 190.</td>
<td>Zara, town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381.06.13.a</td>
<td>Dl.106189</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Érszegi 199; Fenyvesi 131.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381.06.13.b</td>
<td>Dl.42316</td>
<td>T1385</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381.08.11.</td>
<td>Dl.106190</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/7: 438-440.</td>
<td>Pécs cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381.08.21.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Smičiškla 16: 211.</td>
<td>Zagreb cathedral chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381.09.15.</td>
<td>Dl.106191</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Érszegi 199; Fenyvesi 129, 131.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381.09.20.</td>
<td>Df.200290</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Veszp. reg. no. 761.</td>
<td>Nicholas of Szécs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381.10.07</td>
<td>Dl.106192, Dl.36780, Df.258489</td>
<td>E, M 1697, M</td>
<td>Szakály, Tolna 108; Fenyvesi 131-132.</td>
<td>royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381.10.13</td>
<td>Dl.106193</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fenyvesi 133.</td>
<td>Nicholas of Gara, palatine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381.11.24</td>
<td>Dl.106194</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fenyvesi 133; Fejér CD 9/5: 499; Udvardy, Kalocsi kápt. 121.</td>
<td>Kalocsa, cathedral chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382.01.21</td>
<td>Dl.87542 E</td>
<td>A1382</td>
<td>Szécesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382.02.02</td>
<td>Dl.50166 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Szécesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382.04.01</td>
<td>Df.200345 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Szécesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382.05.12</td>
<td>Dl.106195 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas of Szécs, royal judge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382.05.17</td>
<td>Df.201033 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Veszp. reg. no. 769.</td>
<td>Szécesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382.07.15</td>
<td>AOM 322. f. 251r P</td>
<td>Dobronič 1984a, 171-172.</td>
<td>Juan Fernandez Heredia, Hosp. master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382.07.16</td>
<td>AOM 322. f. 251v. P</td>
<td>Dobronič 1984a, 172.</td>
<td>Juan Fernandez Heredia, Hosp. master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382.07.17</td>
<td>AOM 322. ff. 251v-252r. P</td>
<td>Dobronič 1984a, 172-174.</td>
<td>Juan Fernandez Heredia, Hosp. master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382.07.20</td>
<td>AOM 322. f. 252v. P</td>
<td>Dobronič 1984a 174.</td>
<td>Juan Fernandez Heredia, Hosp. master</td>
<td>Chapter general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382.09.29</td>
<td>Df.6952, Df.6951 Df.258490 E, A 1488, M 1701-1800</td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/7: 467-469; 10/1: 52; Pray 21-22.</td>
<td>Szécesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382.12.08</td>
<td>Dl.6974 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Szécesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383.03.09</td>
<td>Dl.106200 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas of Szécs, royal judge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383.03.12</td>
<td>AOM 322, f. 252v P</td>
<td>Dobronič 1984a 169-170.</td>
<td>Juan Fernandez Heredia, Hosp. master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383.03.12</td>
<td>AOM 322, f. 252v P</td>
<td>Dobronič 1984a 170.</td>
<td>Chapter General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383.03.12</td>
<td>AOM 322, f. 253r P</td>
<td>Dobronič 1984a 170-171.</td>
<td>Juan Fernandez Heredia, Hosp. master</td>
<td>Chapter General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383.03.12</td>
<td>AOM 322, f. 292r-v P</td>
<td>Dobronič 1984a</td>
<td>Juan Fernandez Heredia, Hosp. master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383.03.20-04.05. in Dl.106197</td>
<td>T1383</td>
<td>Erzségi 199; Fenyvesi 135.</td>
<td>Szécesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383.04.30.</td>
<td>Dl.106197 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fenyvesi 135.</td>
<td>Nicholas of Szécs, royal judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383.05.03.</td>
<td>Dl.42254 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Szovák, Meritorum 86-87.</td>
<td>Szécesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383.05.12</td>
<td>Dl.106198 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 10/1: 125; Fenyvesi 135-136.</td>
<td>Szécesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383.05.12</td>
<td>Dl.106199 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Szécesfehérvár</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383.10.24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paulus de Paulo, Memoriali ad an. 1383, Pray 22-23.</td>
<td>collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384.03.03.</td>
<td>D1.42281</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Riccardo Caracciolo, antimaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384.03.21.</td>
<td>D1.100195</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Riccardo Caracciolo, antimaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384.04.01.</td>
<td>Df.253848</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Riccardo Caracciolo, antimaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384.05.23.a</td>
<td>AOM 281. f. 37v</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Riccardo Caracciolo, antimaster</td>
<td>Riccardo Caracciolo, antimaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384.05.23.b</td>
<td>AOM 281. f. 37v</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Riccardo Caracciolo, antimaster</td>
<td>Riccardo Caracciolo, antimaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384.08.21.a</td>
<td>D1.2870</td>
<td>A1429</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384.08.21.b</td>
<td>Df.258544</td>
<td>Y1429</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384.09.29.</td>
<td>Df.201051</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384.11.05.</td>
<td>D1.71223</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384.11.16.</td>
<td>D1.7111</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Fejér CD 10/2: 179.</td>
<td>Raymond de Bellomonte, prior of H-SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385.02.19.</td>
<td>D1.106201, D1.106303</td>
<td>A1385, A1424</td>
<td>Mary, queen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385.03.04.</td>
<td>D1.106201, D1.106103</td>
<td>E, A1424</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385.04.17.</td>
<td>D1.35274</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Lucas, preceptor of Dubica and Nicholas son of Hector, comes terrestris</td>
<td>Mary, queen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385.05.27.</td>
<td>D1.45459</td>
<td>A1471</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385.07.18.</td>
<td>Df.253849</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Zala vm 2: 208.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385.09.09.</td>
<td>AOM 24. nr. 11.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Juan Fernandez de Heredia</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386.02.02.</td>
<td>D1.7191</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386.04.04.</td>
<td>D1.42350</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mary, queen</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386.05.23.</td>
<td>AOM 281. f. 86r-v</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Riccardo Caracciolo, antimaster</td>
<td>Riccardo Caracciolo, antimaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386.06.15.</td>
<td>AOM 281. 92v.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Riccardo Caracciolo, antimaster</td>
<td>Riccardo Caracciolo, antimaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386.06.22.</td>
<td>Df.249145</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Archive no</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Publication, calendar</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386.07.02</td>
<td>AOM 281. f. 93v.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riccardo Caracciolo, antimaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386.07.17</td>
<td>Df.249146</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386.10.07</td>
<td>Dl.100238</td>
<td>T1390</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386.10.07</td>
<td>Dl.100238</td>
<td>T1390</td>
<td></td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386.99.99</td>
<td>Circa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fejér CD 9/2: 717-723.</td>
<td>Székesfehérvár Hosp. preceptory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387.01.28</td>
<td>Df.258492</td>
<td>M 1701-1800</td>
<td>Fejér CD 10/1: 135, Sütő 2003, 2: no. 783.</td>
<td>John of Palisna, prior of Vrana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387.03.01</td>
<td>Df.230666</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Sütő 2003.</td>
<td>Ladislás of Losonc, captain of the Southern region, warden of Severin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387.07.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kukuljević 81: 71-72; Báñffy 1: 389-395.</td>
<td>Mary, queen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387.09.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smičiklas 17: 87.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387.10.12</td>
<td>Df.258494</td>
<td>M 1701-1800</td>
<td>Fejér CD 10/1: 394.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387.11.17</td>
<td>Df.258494</td>
<td>M 1701-1800</td>
<td>Fejér CD 10/1: 394.</td>
<td>Albert, prior of Vrana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIPLOMATARIUM

1.
1256. 06. 13. M OL DI.83128

Capitulum Domus Hospitalis Iherosolimitani de Alba. Omnibus cristiane fidei cultoribus quam presentibus tam futuris presentes litteras inspecturis salutem in eo qui est salus omnium. Omne quod memoriam et firmitatem appetit dignum est et rationi consentineum testimonio commendare litterarum ne terra caligine oblivionis prevalente a memoria succedentium evanescat. Quocirca universitatì vestre harum serie litterarum declaramus quod Quetscem filius Mykse de villa Inatha ex una parte, Buzma et Petrus filii Ygscem de eadem villa ex altera in nostra presentia personaliter constituti sunt, se pari consensu et communi voluntate supra possessione sua in Chouz existente talem fecisse divisionem, ut divimidis partes emptiorum molendini quod est suum in parte superiori in fundo curie. Quetscem cum dimidietate ipsi fundi, et tertia pars totius possessionis interiori dicte ville ipso contingentis terre videlicet feneti, et silve, nec non tres homines quorum nomina sunt hec Maria filia nomine Marinna, et Buhtus filius eisdem Marinne, dimisissent eisdem Quetscem. Al liis omnibus memoret possessionibus particulis et familia Buzme, et Petro remanentibus. A diacerunt etiam obligendo se in solidum ut nullus ipsorum ab ipsa divisionis compositione posset aliquid one resillire, vel eiusdem divisionis seriem perturbare. In cuius rei memoriam pleniorem ad instantiam et petitionem partium litteras presentes sigilli nostri munimine roboratas Quetscem concessimus sepedicto. Datum Anno ab incarnatione Domini M o CCo Quinquagesimo sexto primo I dus Iunii. Fratre Bernardo preceptore, fratre Iohanne ecclesie nostre custode existentibus.

2.
1276. 12. 28. M OL DI.10745

Conventus domus hospitalis Jerosolimitan de Alba. Omnibus Christi fidelibus presentes litteras inspecturis salutem in Domino sempiternam. A d universorum notitiam tenore presentium volumus pervenire, quod Chaba et Ab el filii Stephani de villa Czecze, pro se

*The overall objective of the following collection is to facilitate the use of the dissertation. Accordingly, the reader primarily can find hitherto unpublished primary sources. In addition, there are charters which have already been edited but contain serious mistakes or extensive omissions. In some cases I incorporated important texts which were edited in publications not easily accessed by the scholars of East-Central Europe, or vice versa: by Western readers. There are also a few documents to which I made many references in the text of the dissertation and found helpful to render the whole text at the reader’s disposal. Unless otherwise specified, I used the following signs:
.. omission in the original text
<--- lacuna or illegible part
[] completion
[...] omission
tamquam Theodoro et Marco fratribus suis ab una parte, Thoma filio universos de eadem villa Czecze ex altera, coram nobis constitutis proposuit extitit ab eisdem, quod iidem Chaba, A bel tamquam Theodorus et Marcus dimidietate terre sexaginta iugerum quod presens in easem villa Czecze ipsos versos, et thomam iure hereditario contigeant et eiusdem contra Chaba et fratres suos praenotatos coram Laurentio condam Palatino in Calumniatores convictis ipsi Laurentio Palatino et donatione eisdem Palatik in manus Stephani filii K ulchey fuerat devoluta, et postmodum per predictos filios Stephani ab ipso s Stephano portio comparata extiterat. prout in privilegio Capituli A Ibensis per Chabam et A bel coram nobis presentato virim contingeri. A parte ab alia medietate dicta terra metis separatam et abstinctam pro sex marci et fertone denarius ordinem a prefato sicut iidem Chaba et A bel dixerunt. ex integre receptis et maxime propter cognationis proximitatem et diliectionem eiusdem Thoma et consequenter omnibus hereditibus vendidissent perpetuo pacifice et quiete ac irreperibiliter possidendam. Nec hoc praeter mittendum quod iidem Chaba et A bel suo et predictorum fratrum ratione pro quibus comparaverunt eundem Thomam a vinculo calumnia et gravamine quod item et predictos universos. Secundum tandem privilegii eiusdem Laurentii palatini erant obligari et astricti reddiderunt absolutum et pariter expendium eo assumpso, quod si contra eundem Thomam ratione praefato calumnia litem movere attemtarent, ipsi iidem Chaba et A bel ac fratres eorum supranotati tamquam calumniatores convincantur et si ipse Thomas ratione terre contra Chabam et A bel tamquam Theodorum et Marcus causam suscitarent volens plus requirere ab eisdem, quam dimidietatem predictorum sexaginta iugerum modo premisso pretio comparatam similiter pana debita salvo vice puneuntur, sicut ad id sepedictus Thomas se ultronea obligavit voluntate. In cuius rei testimonium et memoriam pleniorem presentes concessimus litteras sigilli nostri roboratas. Datum Anno Domini 1276 quinto Calendas Januarii. Fratre Guilhelmo prior idem eodemque custode ecclesie nostra, et fratre Ugone preceptore domus nostra existentibus.

1285. 09. 25. M OL Df.200035

Conventus domus hospitalis Iherosolimitani de Alba. Omnibus Christi fidelibus presentes litteras inspecturis salutem in Domino sempiternam. A d universorum notitiam tenore presentium [volumus] pervenire, quod Matheus filius Huul de villa Fanch ab una parte, Magister Mychael serviens in Christo venerabilis patris domini *P* episcopi Wesprimiensis, Jurk et Paulus filius Petri de villa Fanch iobagiones eiusdem domini episcopi pro se pro Gyune predictis ac pro aliis sociis et colitis eorum de eadem villa ex altera coram nobis constituti: idem Matheus et predicti iobagiones domini episcopi terram episcopale in Fanch existentem, quamidem Dominus episcopus predictus magistro Michaeli mediante suis litteris contulit sub eisdem terris metis et terminis [pro] quibus sibi comes Symon de Bvuri de mandato domini episcopi a terra Matheii distingendo [pro] ut et assignavit reliquerunt pacifice possidendam et habendam cuius quidem terre metarum cursum eadem partes tale esse retulerunt, quod prime due mete sunt iuxta fluvium Sar et ab inde directe per duplices metas tendit versus occidentem et vadit usque ad magnam viam per quam de villa End[red] itur ad villam Chathar et iuxta eadem viam sunt due mete de hinc super terra campestri distinctionem nostro secrerunt eandem extitit ab eisdem nostros emisso, quod mediatatem insule ad ipsam sperantis prefatus magister M ichael et ipsi iobagiones episcopi reliquerunt M atheo prenotato a tali interposita, quod signa ipsarum partium super distinctionem terre memorate aut insule questionem suscitare voluerit aliqualem pene viginti marcarum subiaceat eo ipso adiacentem est quod Chb filius Chyboz et Gyne filius Cosme de predicta villa Fanch in nostre
presentia comparentes premisse divisioni terre consensum prebuerunt et assensum. In cuius rei testimonium et memoriam pleniorem presentes ad petitionem partium dedimus litteras nostro sigillo communitas. Anno Domini M CC octuagesimo quinto septimo K alendas octobris, fratre B endicto priore eodemque ecclesie nostro custode existente

* * *

1288. 03. 17. M OL Df.200037

Conventus domus hospitalis de A lba. Omnibus Christi fidelibus presentes litteras inspecturis salutem in domino sempiternam. Ad universorum notitiam tenore presentium volumus pervenire, quod M athyas filius M ucha de numero iobagionum ecclesie Wesprimiensis de villa L yula coram nobis personaliter constitutus, quandam vineam suam emptitiam, sicut dixit, in territorio ipsius ville L yula, in monte Chaklya vocato, super quatorv iugeribus terrarum sitam et unum iugerum terre inculte eidem vinee contigui iacentem, ab oriente vinee dicti M ucha et B lasii filii eiusdem A ndrye vinee Pauli sacerdotis de A lba, ab occidente cuidam vi->---> et vinee Endrech filii comitis E ndre, et ab aquilione vinee eiusdem Mathye commetaneam, omnibus predictis commetaneis sui in nostri presentia permittentibus et consentientibus K anizou ioculatori domini regis pro septem marcis denariorum est confessus vendidisse perpetuo possidendam et ipsas septem marcas ab eodem K anizou, ad se dixit plene recepisse, eo assumpto, quod qui cuique predictam vineam vel ipsam terram, seu aliquam particulum ex eisdem. A b ipso K anizou vel ab eiusdem heredibus aut ab eis, quibus per eundem legite donata fuerit vel legata repetere voluerit in posterum ex tunc eodem idem M athyas pariter et eiusdem successores semper et ubique modis omnibus expedire tenebuntur labore proprio et expensas. In cuius rei testimonium et memoriam pleniorem ad petitionem eiusdem M athye presentes ipsi K anizou dedimus litteras nostro sigillo communitas. Anno Domini M CC octuagesimo octavo sextodecimo K alendas A prilis, fratre B endicto prior eodemque ecclesie nostro custode existente.

* * *

1289 M OL Df.266353

[C] onventus domus hospitalis I herosolimitani de A lba. Omnibus Christi fidelibus presentes litteras inspecturis salutem in domino sempiternam. A d universorum notitiam tenore presentium volumus pervenire, quod reverendus vir magister T hedorus ecclesie A lbensis prepositus, ab una parte et Stephanus filius comitis L uce de genere I nata ex altera in nostra personaliter constituti presentia exhibuerunt nobis litteras serenissime domine E lysabeth dei gratia regine Ungaricae patentes in hec verba: <---> Unde predictus Stephanus filius comitis L uce nomine suo et fratru suorum videlicet D yonis, T homae, Petri et magistri L uce comparens, dictam decem marcas se et eodem fratres suos recepisse est confessus. Affirmans premissa omnia, videlicet vineam B okscleve et locum sessionalem ac terram decem iugurum in Endred existentia eis per dictam dominum prepositum assignata suisse plenarie modo prescripto et statuta. Hoc specialiter declarato, quod idem Stephanus suo et predictorum fratrum suorum nomine litteras et privilegium si quas vel quod super iamdictam possessione Isgren predictis domino preposito et ipsius fratribus nunc devoluta, ut promittitur et perpetuata confectas a quocumque et quios modo ante pro ipsis promisse ordinationi seu compositioni preiudiciales vel preiudiciale quaspiam ipsorum penes se maliciose reservasse testimonio presentium cassari volunt et petii revocari. Ita ut ubicumque in posterum per ipsis vel ex ipsis per aliquem, aut eorumde cognatos contra dictam dominum prepositum et
eiusdem fratres in litem proderint, cassa habeantur et irrita et totis utribus penitur vacuata. In cuius rei testimonium et perpetuam firmitatem presentes dicto domino preposito et ipsius fratribus ac per eos ipsorum successoribus dedimus litteras nostro sigillo communitas. Anno Domini et M prenotatis.

* * *

6.

1312. 05. 16. a AOM 10. nr. 70.¹

Clemens episcopus servus servorum dei dilectis filiis nobilibus viris universis ducibus, marchionibus, comitibus et baronibus per regnum Ungarie constitutis salutem et apostolican benedictionem. Nuper in generali concilio per nos Vienne auctore domino celebrato post longam deliberationem prehabitam et maturam acceptabilius fore altissimo magis honorabile fidei orthodoxe cultoribus ac subventioni Terre Sancte utilius bona quondam domus et ordinis Militie Templi ordini hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolimitani concedere quam ordini de novo creando unire aut etiam applicare consilium deliberationis nostre providit, sed quia tum aliquibus assententibus utilius fore bona ipsa ordini noviter creando conferre quam dicti hospitalis ordini applicare tunc noster affectus speratum effectum super hoc obtinere nequivit. Tandem vero sic per dei gratiam actum fore dinoscitur quod sexto nonae presentis montis Maii eodem sacro approbante concilio hospitali seu ipsius hospitalis ordini supradictis prefata bona concedenda et applicanda duximus et maturam conferendae utilius bona quondam domus et ordinis Militie Templi in Regnis et Terris carissimorum in Christo filiorum nostrorum .. Castelle .. Aragonioni .. Portugalie .. Maiorcarum .. Regum illustrium extra regnum Francie consistentibus dumtaxat exceptis que ab unione concessione et applicatione huiusmodi ex certis causis excipienda duximus et etiam excludenda ipsa dispositione nostre et sedis apostolice specialiter reservantes quoque de illis alter pro dicte terre subsidio per nostram et dicte sedis providentiam extiterit ordinatum. Quare nobilitatem vestram rogamus et hortamur attentius quatinus pro reverentia salvatoris cuius in hac parte negotium promovemus ac dicte sedis et nostra .. M agistro et fratribus seu prioribus et preceptoribus hospitalis eiusdem in terris vestris constitutis et eorum singulis seu procuratoribus eorumdem quod dicta bona in eisdem terris iuxta predicte concessionis nostre tenorem integre et pacifice valeant et habere assequi et habere vestri favoris et prout extiterit opportunum et eis cura nanciscendam, habendam et retinendam possessionem bonorum ipsorum ferventer. Sic igitur in premissis vos promptos et paratos exhibetis quod preter retributionis eternae premium quod nobis inde merebimini vobis laudis humano cumulus augentur. Noste nobilitatem vestram dignis commendare laudibus in domino valeamus; Volumus autem quod presentes litteras nobis presentatis et ostensis eisdem earum latori restituitatis omnino ut aliis de quibus expedierit valeant presentari. Datum Liberoni Valentiensis diocesis xij kalendae Junii pontificatus nostri A nno septimo

* * *

7.

1312. 05. 16. b AOM 10. nr. 71.

Clemens episcopus servus servorum dei venerabilibus fratribus universis archiepiscopis et episcopis per regnum Ungarie constitutis salutem et apostolican benedictionem. Nuper in

¹Edition: Pauli 2: 30.
generali concilio per nos Vienne disponente domino celebrato post longam deliberationem
prehabitant et maturam acceptabilium fore altissimo magis honorabile fidei orthodoxe
cultoribus ac subventioni Terre Sancte utilius bona quondam domus et ordinis Militie Templi
ordini hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolimitani concedere quam ordini de novo creando
unire aut etiam applicare consilium deliberationis nostre providit. Sed quia tunc aliquidus
asserentibus utilius fore bonis eiusdem ordinis. Nisi tunc noster affectus speratum ne
obtineat. Tandem vero sic per dei gratiam actum fore dinoicetur quod sexto nonae montis M aii eodem
sacro approbante concilio hospitali seu ipsius hospitalis ordinis supradiictis prefata bona
concedenda et aplicanda duximus ac etiam unienda bonis eiusdem ordinis Militie Templi in
Regnis et terris carissimorum in Christo filiorum nostrorum .. Castelle .. A ragonion ..
Portugalie et .. Maiorcarum Regem illustrum extra regnum Francie consistentiis dunitaxat
exceptis que ab unione concessione et applicatione huiusmodi ex certis causis eipicienda
duximus et etiam exclusidionis nostre et sedis apostolice specialiter
reservantes quosque de illis aliter pro dicto terre subsidio per nostram et dicte sedis
providentiam exterior ordinaet. Quare fraternitatem vestram rogamus et hortamur attentius
vobis per apostolica scripta districte precipendo mandantes quatinus pro
reverentia salvatoris cuius in hac parte negotium promovemus ac dicte sedis et nostra ..
Magistro et fratribus seu prioribus et preceptoribus hospitalis eiusdem et eorum singulis aut
procurator vel procuratoribus eorumdem quod predicta bona in provinciis vestris fraters
dexcerpiscipi ac in vestris et frater episcopi civitatis et diocesis consistenita iuxta
predicte concessiones nostre tenorem integre et pacifice valeat assequi et habeber vestri
favoris prestetis auxilium ac ipsis circa nanciscendam, habendam et retinendam possessionem
bonorum ipsorum ferventer assistatis cum pro parte ipsorum fueritis
requisiti. Sic igitur in premisis vobis promptos et liberales exhibere curetis quod preter
retributionis eternae premium quod nobis inde rependetur a domino. Nos fraternitatis vestrae
circumspectae prudentiam usque in domino laudamur. Sed quia presentes litteras nobis
ostendis et earum latori restituatis omnino ut aliis de quibus expedierit valeant presentari. Datum L
iberoni V alentiensis dioecesis xvij kalendae Unii pontificatus nostri Anno septimo

* * *

1322. 08. 20. M 0L Dl.99850

Nos conventus cruciferorum domus hospitalis ecclesie beati regis Stephani de A lba,
memorie commendantes significamus quibus expedit universis, quod magistro Nicolao filio
Omodei ab una parte ... et] M ark filio Petri de [Saagh in Comitatu Symigensi parte ab altera
coram nobis personaliter constituti; per prefatum magistrum virum Nicolaum filium Omodei
propositum extitit viva voce et relatum, quod licet [...] ips[e] quandam possessionem [Saagh
vocata]m in Comitatu Symigensi habitam et existentem, temporibus inparrans aliquidus
occupavisset, et occupatum usque haec temparum, iuxta liberum sue voluntans conservasset
et detinuisset ac plu[quam?] instrumenta super eandem patentem emanari fecisset. Tandem
reminissens divinam pietatem estiens ipsum possessionem Saagh predicti M ark filli
Petri et aliorum proximorum suorum habitam et sic indebire occupatam conservasse
independium salutis anime sue. Ideo ipse du<---->nitu pietatis nolens ---->ans anima sua in
occupations f pretate possessionis honorare ---->mere, ymo volens magis releniens et alienare
prefatam possessionem Saagh cum omnibus utilitatis quovis nomine votinans sub metis
suis prioribus et antiquis quibus in antea poss<----> ydem M ark filio Petri et aliis proximis
eiusdem eo jure ea plenitudine, quo progenitore eiusdem M ark eandem habuisset , et propter
bonum pacis ac concordie unionem remississet, et i<----> coram nobis litteras vero instrumenta <----> que ipse super eadem possessione emanari fecisset seu habuisset, quaram vigore eandem possedisset in presentia cujusvis judicis exhiberentur p<----> omnino reddidit manes et viribus ---->tuans; promittimus etiam quod quamprimum presentes nobis in spem reportare fuerint formam mostri privilegii redigi faciemus easdem. Datum <----> festi beati regis Stephani. Anno Domini M o CCCo vigesimo secundo.

* * *

9.

1325. 05. 25. M OL DI.86972

Conventus domus hospitalis Jerosolomitani de Alba. Omnibus Christi fidelibus presens scriptum inspecturis salutem in domino sempiternam. A d universorum notitiam tam presentium quam futurorum harum series volumus pervenire, quod Cranth et M athe filius Andrew fratres Pauli filii Chege cives castri Albensi, ad nostram personaliter accedentes presentiam exhibuerunt nobis privilegium judicis juratorum et universitatis civium civitatis Strigoniensis, superfacto ciusdum <----> pallati in medio ipsorum existentis confectum <----> Petentes a nobis cum instantia ut ipsum privilegium nostro privis legum dignaremus confirmare, cuius quidem privilegii tenor talis est <----> Unde nos justis veris et legi timis petitionibus predictorum Elye et M athe accedentes qui ipsa privilegium civitatis Strigoniensis nec abrasum, non cancellatum nec in aliqua sui parte vitiatum fore recognoscentes tenorem eiusdem privilegii rescribi de verbo ad verbum in se facientes uberiore rei ad cautelam in nostro privilegio duximus confirmandum sigilli nostri munimine roboratum. Datum in vigilia Pentecostes. Anno Domini M o CCCo vigesimo similiter quinto. Fratre Corrado preceptore eodemque custode domus nostre existente.

* * *

10.

1325. 09. 15. M OL DI.99941

Nos conventus domus hospitalis de Alba significamus tenore presentium universis, quod Nicolaus filius Salamonis de Babun de comitatu Symigiensi coram nobis constitutus totam possessionem suam ibidem Babun existentem videlicet in terris arabilibus, silvis, et aliis utilitatis omnibus ipsum Nicolaum de jure contingente et universitatis non cancellatum nec in aliqua sui parte vitiatum fore recognoscentes tenorem eiusdem privilegii rescribi de verbo ad verbum in se facientes uberiore rei ad cautelam in nostro privilegio duximus confirmandum sigilli nostri munimine roboratum. Datum in octavis Nativitatis beate Virginis. Anno Domini M o [CCCo] XXo quinto. Fratre Corrado preceptore eodemque custode domus nostre existente.

* * *

11.

1328. 07. 07. M OL DI.977
Conventus domus hospitalis Jerosolimitani de Alba. Omnibus Christi fidelibus presentem paginam inspecturis salutem in domino sempiternam. Ad universorum notitiam tenore presentium volumus pervenire, quod Johannes filius Mathei proximi qoundam Pauli clerici de inferiore villa Endred ad nostra accedens presentiam nobis humiliter supplicavit instantissimo postulaveris, ut tenorem privilegii sui casualiter amissi sicut dixit super facto cuiusdam vinee in terra ville Chegue existentis in legistro ecclesie nostre olym depositum et conservatum, requiri re inveniri et describi facere dignamem cuiusquidem privilegii per nos re inventi tenor talis est. Unde nos petitionibus predicti Johannes filii Mathey favorabili inclinati cum nos petitionem eiusdem veram et legitimam fore agnovisseremus, tenorem dicti privilegii in legistro nostro re inventi, de verbo ad verbum inseri facere dignaremus cuiusquidem privilegii per nos re inventi tenor talis est.<---> Unde nos petitionibus predicti Johannes filii Mathey favorabili inclinati cum nos petitionem eiusdem veram et legitimam fore agnovisseremus, tenorem dicti privilegii in legistro nostro re inventi, de verbo ad verbum inseri facere dignaremus cuiusquidem privilegii per nos re inventi tenor talis est. 

* * *

1330. 11. 02. A O M 280, fol. 4r-5v²

Subsequenter vero prefatus dominus magister et generale capitulum congregatum in loco predicta habita deliberatione provida et matura super exoneratione saucine debitorum dicte religionis et super subsidio prefati domini magistri in proximo faciendo gratis et unaminiter promiserunt solvere in proximo festo Sancti Johannis baptiste anno domini M CCCXXXI quantitates pecunie subdistinctas, prout in eorundem priorum litteris ipsorum bullis plenarie continetur: Nos frater Elyonus de Villanoua dei gratia sacre domus hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolimitani magister humilis et pauperum Christi custos et frater Petrus de Vngula Sancti Egidii, Guillelmus de Citriaco Francie, Oddo de M onteacuto Aluernie, Stephanus Velascii Portugallie, Leonardus de Tibertis Anglie, Artaldus de Chauanone Nauarre, Guillelmus de M aleo A quitanie, Henricus de Mesnilis Campanie, Johannes de Riparia Urbis et Pisanum, Berengarius de A uroso Baroli, Pontius de M onteacuto Capue, Napolio de Tiberis Venetiarum, Florius de A ste Lombardie, Fredericus M alespine M essane domus eiusdem priorum et alii quamplures et proceres domus eiusdem in nostro generali capitulo apud M ontempessulanum solenniter celebrato anno Domini M CCCXXX die X X I I I I Octobris presentialiter congregato considerato et presenti onera gravia debitorum et necessitatem nostri conventus Rodi, quibus nostra religio opprimitur in presenti, volentes et intendentes remedium apponere debitum in premissis, nos predictus magister et voluntate, consilio et consensu priorum et aliorum fratrum et procerum predictorum et ipsius capituli, et nos dicti priorum et procerorum et ipsum capitulo de voluntate, assensu et consensu ipsius domini magistri, et omnes simul super hiis habito colloquio et tractatu et deliberatione matura unaminiter et concorditer pro evidenti utilitate et comodo domus nostre ad cautelam nos prescripti procere volumus, ordinamus et promittimus, nos prenotati priorum presentes pro nobis, preceptoribus et prioratibus nostri, et pro aliis prioribus et preceptoribus absentibus, volente et consentiente prescripto domino magistro et capitulo, ipso domino magistro presenti et stipulandi dare et solvere in proximo festo Sancti Johannis baptiste anno M CCCXXXI pro


³Cf. A O M 326, fol. 194r'-195v'.
subsidio et responsione presentis anni in dicto festo finiti pecunie quantitates subscriptas, videlicet:

Et subscripti prioratus et preceptorie, quorum priores et preceptores sunt absentes, licet procuratores aliquorum ex ipsis assint nobiscum in dicto capitulo, nostrum et capituli nostri prescripti in hac parte ordinationem sequentes in eundem modum quantitates subscriptas, videlicet:

Item prior et preceptores prioratus Hungarie flor. auri IIII[...]

In quorum omnium fidem et testimonium presentes nostras patentes litteras faci iussimus sigillis nostri pendentibus communitas. Datum in Montepessulano, die II Novembris, anno incarnationis Domini M CCC XXX.

* * *

1330. 11. 02. AOM 280, fol. 6²-8r⁴

In eundem modum prefati priores et preceptores, per eorum patentes litteras promiserunt solvere seuentibus annis responsiones subscriptas durante dicto decennio, bullatas bullis pendentibus eorumundi in serie subsequenti:

Nos frater Elyonus de Villanoua etc. et frater Petrus de Vngula Sancti Egidii, Guillelmus de Citriaco Francie, Oddo de Montecacuto Alurernie, Stephanus Velascii Portugalie, Leonardus de Tibertis Anglie, Artaldus de Chauanono Naurerre, Guillelhumus de Malleo Aquitania, Henricus de Mesniliis Campanie, Johannis de Riparia Urbis et Pisarum, Berengarius de Aurosio Baroli, Pontius de Montecacuto Capue, Neapoli de Tibertis Venetiarum, Florius de Aste Lombardie, Fredericus Malespine Messane domus eiusdem domus eiusdem priores et alii quamplures preceptores et proceres domus eiusdem in nostro generali capitulo apud Montempessulanum solenniter celebrato anno Domini MCCCXX die X X X Octobris presentiator congregati considerantes et attendentes onera gravia debitorum et necessitatem nostri conventus Rodi, quibus nostra religio opprimitur in presenti, volentes et intendentes remedium apponere debitum in premissis, nos predictus magister et voluntate, consilio et assensu et consensu priorum et aliorum fratrum et procerum predictorum et ipsius capituli, et nos dicti priores et proceres et ipsum capitulum de voluntate, assensu et consensu ipsius domini magistri, et omnes simul super hiis habito colloquio, tractatu et deliberatione matura unaminiter et concorditer pro evidenti utilitate et commodo domus nostrae ad cautelam nos prescripti proceres volumus, ordinamus et promittimus, nos prenotati priores presentes pro nobis, preceptoribus et prioratus nostris, et pro aliiis prioribus et preceptoribus absentibus, volente et consentiente prescripto domino magistro et capitulo presenti et stipulanti dare et solvere ultra mare ipso domino magistro et conventui, vel cui ipse dominus magister preceperit, responsiones eorum taxatas anno quolibet in festo Sancte Marie de mense Augusto vel adtardius in festo Sancte Crucis de mense Septembri per decem annos incipiendo in proximo futuro festo Sancti Johannis baptiste anno domini M CCC XXI et inantea numerandos annuatim sicut predictitur quantitates subscriptas vel valorem ipsarum in auro vel argento videlicet:

[...]

---

Item prioratus Ungarie flor. IIII
c
In quorum omnium fidem et testimonium presentes nostras patentes litteras faci iussimus sigillis nostris pendentibus communitas. Datum in Montepessulano, die II Novembris, anno domini M CCC XXX°.

* * *

1330. 11. 00. AOM 280, fol. 14

[...] Prefatus dominus magister retinuit ad manum suam fratres subscriptos cum baiuliis et arnesiis suis cum consilio et auctoritate dicti capituli sui retento quod tres fratres quos voluerit possit cum eorum baiuliis et arnesiis retinere in quolibet prioratu. Videlicet: [...] [fol. 18°] In prioratu Ungarie: -

* * *

1330. 11. 00. AOM 280, fol. 21

[...] Subscriptas baiulias capituli generalis retinuit dominus magistri auctoritate dicti capituli ad manum suam ordinandas per ipsum sup. Videlicet:
Castellania Emposte
Preceptoriam Armenie
Priorem Ungarie |
Priorem Castelle | et prioratus ipsorum
Priorem Cathalonie |
Preceptoriam Neapolis
Comitatum Alifie
Ducatum Athenarum

* * *

1332. 08. 31. MOL Dl.99941

[Conventus domus hospitalis Jerosolomitan de Alba. Omnibus Christi fidelibus presentes litteras inspecturis salutem in domino sempiternam. Ad universorum notitiam tenore presentium volumus pervenire, quod Johannes et Stephanus filii Mathias de Babun ad nostram accedentes presentiam exhibuerunt nobis litteras nostras patentes petentes et supplicantes homiliter et devote ut ad ubiorem conservationis iuris evidentiam ratas habere et infirman privilegii nostri redigi faciendo nostro faceremus privileglio confirmare, quorum tenor talis est [...] Itaque nos infrascripta veritate prescriptorum litterarum nostrorum patentem petitionibus dictorum Johannis et Stephani iustis et admissione dignis favorabiliter inclinati easdem in nulla sui parte viciatas de verbo ad verbum memoratis Johanni et

6Tipton: subscriptas.
Stephano eorumque posteris ex certa scientia perpetua et irrevocabiliter dictam possessionem possiari et habere huius scripti patentis confirmamus. Datum secunda feria proxima ante quindecas festi sancti regis Stephani. A nno ab incarnatione domini M ill esimo CCCo X X X o secundo. Religioso viro et discreto fratre Donato preceptore eodemque custode ecclesie nostre existente.

* * *

1332. 10. 05. M OL Dl.91256

Nos conventus domus hospitalis de Alba, damus pro memoria, quod Martinus filius Dionisii de Wosyang coram nobis personaliter constitutus causam suam quam Johannes filius Nicolai de Thamasy de comitatu Wesprimiensi coram domino Johanne palatino et judice comanorum in octavas beati M ichaelis A rchangeli movet contra ipsum Pethe fratri Donk famulo ipsius presentium exhibitis dedit et promisit prosequandam ratum et firmum habiturus quidquid. Ideo procurator ipsius fecerit vel ordinarit in causa sua prenotata. Datum feria secunda proxima ante octavas supradictas. A nno domini M o CCCo X X X o secundo.

* * *

1334. 09. 30. M OL Dl.2854

Conventus domus hospitalis Jerosolomitani de Alba. Omnibus Christi fidelibus presentes litteras inspecturis salutem in domino sempiternam. A d universorum notitiam tenere presentium volumus pervenire, quod accedens ad nostram presentiam Ladizlaus filius quondam magistri Ugrini filii B agyun ab una parte; Item discreti viri magistri videlicet Johannes custos ecclesie Albensis et Paulus frater eiusdem canonici eiusdem ecclesie pro se ipsis et M artino fratre ipsorum ex altera coram nobis personaliter constitutis; prenominatus Ladizlaus porcionarium possessionem suam hereditarium tam in comitatu Symigiensi in Gyog habitam cum omni plenitudine sui iuris ac utilitatum integritate locis sessionibus terris cultis et incolitis silvis pratis, fenetis, vineis, servis de eadem Gyog ac universis pertinentiis ad eandem porcionarium possessionem spectantibus cum metarum ambitu et omnium proximorum vicinorum et commetaneorum suorum confessus est prenominatis magistris Johanni custodi, Paulo et Martino fratribus eiusdem ac heredibus ipsius M artini pro viginti quattuor marcs B udensis denariorum plene habitorum et receptorum ab eisdem in perpetuum vendidisse et ad manus eorumdem iure perpetuo et irrevocabiliter dedisse tradisse et asignasse ipsi et in filios filiorum ac heredum per heredes dicti M artini possidendum, tenendum pariter et habendam. Obligant se idem Ladizlaus sponte coram nobis ut si qui in processu temporum ipsos videlicet Johanne custodem, Paulum et M artinum predictos aut heredes ipsius M artini racione predicte possessionarie porcionis in toto vel in parte inpedire, molestare, agravare vel quoquimodo in causam trahere mittentur, extunc idem Ladizlaus aut ipsius heredes ubique et coramquisque iudice propriis laboribus et expensis tenentis expedire. In cuius rei memoriam plenioremque firmitatem presentes ad petitionem partium concessimus litteras privilegiales sigilli nostri autentici munimine roboratas. Data in crastino beati M ichaelis A rchangeli. A nno ab incarnatione domini M illesimo CCCmo tricesimo quarto. Religioso viro et discreto fratre Donato preceptore eodemque custode ecclesie nostre existente.

* * *

18.
In nomine domini amen. Anno incarnationis domini millesimo trecentesimo tricesimo quinto, die quindecima mensis Septembris apud Rodum incepta fuit solemnis celebratio capituli generalis baillivorum, fratrum et procerum conventus Rodi de mandato reverendissimi in Christo patris domini fratris Elyoni de Villanova divina providentia sacre domus hospitalis Sancti Johannis Hierosolymitani magistri dignissimi causa predicta in eius presentia congregatorum. Qui quidem dominus magister, fratres et proceres et ipsum generale capitulum deliberatione congrua precedentem unaminiter et concorditer fecerunt et ordinaverunt baillivos conventus subscriptos, videlicet:

Et subsequenter idem dominus magister una cum baillivis, fratribus et proceribus conventus ipsius et ipsum generale capitulum deliberato consilio fecerunt et ordinaverunt subscriptos priores infrascriptis prioratibus vaccantibus in partibus transmarinis, videlicet:

fratrem Petrum Cornuti priorem Ungarie ad annos quinque sub responsione IIII C flor. De prioratibus vero Alamanie et Bohemie vaccantibus non fuit ordinatum, sed idem dominus magister auctoritate dicti capituli retinuit sibi potestatem providendi de ipsis prioratibus supra anneam.

* * *

20.

Nouerint vniuersi et singuli presentes priuilegiales litteras inspecturi ac quoque audituri, quod accedens ad presenciam nostram fratris Petri Cornuti sancte domus hospitalis sancti Ioannis Hyerosolymitani per Hungariam et Sclauoniam humilis prioris nobilis vir comes Beda natus olim comitis Ivan, nobis humiliter postulauit, ut eidem confirmare dignaremur et suis heredibus et heredum suorum successoribus quoddam priuilegium olim concessum comiti Ivano patri suo per olim fratem Oliverum sancte domus hospitalis predicti per Hugariam et Sclauoniam magistrum vocatum de quadem possessione Tusna vocata cum omnibus suis pertinenciis, secundum quod in dicto priuilegio concesso comiti Ivano patri suo plenarie continetur. Nos considerantes grata seruicia ipsius comitis Beda exhibita ordini nostro in castro nostro de Bella et alibi ubicumque fratribus et iobbagionibus nostris, et quotidianie exhibet et exhibere intendit et in posterum exhibere promittit, et ut ad ea exhibenda forcius animetur, considerato eciam, quod propter guerram Theotonicorum, quam habent cum illis de partibus Sclauonie utilem fore ordini nostro et castro predicto et iobbagionibus nostris, et quod a multis periculis homines nostros et terram nostram euitare possit tanquam existentem(!) in medio metalem terram nostram et Theutonicos, ac eciam considerata bona fama ipsius, pro eidenti utilisate domus nostre et castri predicti de consilio et voluntate fratris Laurencii de Perusio preceptoris domus nostre de Sopronio, et fratris Ioannis Latinii de Perusio preceptoris domus nostre de Nova Curia, fratris Treulli preceptoris domus nostre de Chorgouica, fratris Ioannis Molaraxon et fratris Thadei de Atisio et aliorum fratribus et procerum nobis adsistencium in dicto castro, predictam possessionem Tusna vocatam cum

---

1335. 09. 15. AOM 280, fol. 33

1336. 12. 06. MOL Df.255655, Df.255667

omnibus suis partinenciis eidem comiti Beda et suis heredibus et heredum suorum successoribus confirmamum et de nouo concedimus perpetuo tenendam et possidendam, gaudendam et usufructuandam. Cuius priuilegii tenor talis est: [Charter of Oliver fo 1306]. In quorum omnium testimonium et certitudinem pleniorem presentes litteras fieri fecimus ac sigilli prioratus nostri Hungarie muniri et roborari. Datum in castro nostro Bela, die sexto mensis decembris, anno domini millesimo trecentesimo tricesimo sexto, indicicione quarta.

***

21.

1337. 10. 10. M OL DL.3093

Nos conventus cruciferorum in Supprunio memorie commendantes significamus tam presentibus quam futuris inspecturis quod accedens ad nostram presentiam nobilis vir comes Stephanus filius Cozma una cum filius suis Nicolao, Johanne et Michaele professi sunt coram nobis oraculo vive vocis quod ratione hereditatis sue in Bussendorf quibus honorabiliis viris atque potentibus magistro Paulo et fratru suo Laurentis comitis de maiori Martino et heredibus ipsorum iure perpetuo vendiderunt quod in eodem debito de tribus marcis latorum Wiennesium cum singulis decem pensis marcarum computando a predictis dominis, Paulo atque Laurentio sint rationabiliter expediri. In cuius memoriam presentes litteras sigillo conventus nostri donavimus roboratas. Datum Supprunii feria sexta proxima ante festum beati Cholomanni. A nno domini M illesimo T recentesimo T ricesimo Septimo.

***

22.

1338. 07. 08. M OL DL.99970

Nos conventus domus hospitalis de Alba memorie commendantes significamus universis, quod magister Deseu filius Andree de Pezye ab una parte, item Jacobi filius M athei de eadem ex altera coram nobis personaliter constituti; idem magister Deseu confessus est universas terras et possessiones predicti Jacobi videlicet terras arables iuxta aquam Chamuld nuncupatam in vicinitate terre Nicolai filii M athei de eadem a parte occidentali, a parte vero orientali circa fenetum dicti magistri Deseu adjacentes; item circa predictam aquam Chamuld dua iugera terre et fenetum in quantitate dictorum duorum iugera terre in extremitate eorumdem existens; item iuxta aquam que de predicta villa Pezye cuncurrit ab aquilione fenetum ad quatvor falcas; item villam Pezye vocatam a parte meridionali ville predicti Deseu similiter Pezye vocate existente per metas terreas elevatas; item fenetum ad unum falcas; item iuxta aquam que de predicta villa Pezye cuncurrit, a parte orientali existens predicto Jacobo filio M athei et per eum suis heredibus de sui occupatione reddiddisse et reliquisse perpetuo et irrevocabiliiter possidendas. Preterea prenominatus Jacobus M ilso? terras et possessiones Pezye vocatas a Georgio, Jaco, Nicolao, Michaele et Demetrio filiiis quondam Symonis bani aquisitas iuxta aquam que de villa Kege vadit ad aquam circa villam Pezye existentem adjacentes quae scilicet via a parte meridionali separat terram prescripti Jacobi et a parte aquiliones separat et distingit predictas terras Deseu memorati sepedicta Deseu de sua parte confessus est commississe perpetuo et irrevocabiliiter possidendas. Data quarta feria proxima ante quindenas festi Nativitatis beati Johannis baptiste. A nno Domini M o CCCo X X X o octavo.

***
23.

1338. 08. 22. M OL Dl.3172
Nos conventus cruciferorum domus hospitalis de Alba significamus universis presentium per tenorem quod magister Egidius de Bokolcha in nostri presentia personaliter constitutus privilegium honorabilis capituli ecclesie A Ibensis mediante quo Johannes filius M artini quondam civis de Kewrusheg unam vineam in territorio seu in metis possessionis Gyog existentem quondam servorum suorum et generationis sue videlicet June et Vilmus nuncupatorum a Johanne et Stephanus filiorum M ychaelis filii Petri patruelim suorum et super quadraguinta iugeribus terrarum arabilium vel paulo plus in metis eiusdem possessionis existentium emptionis titulo conparat simul cum instrumento seu privilegio conventus Tyconiensis cum quibus ipse prefata vineam cum terris arabilibus ratione patruelitatis a prefato Johanne filio M artini discretio viro magistro Johanni custodi ecclesie A Ibensis confessus est ministerio sue vive vocis dedisse et ad manus eiusdem assignasse cum eodem possessione Gyog quam eidem domino Johanni custodi cum fratribus suis in concambium aliarum possessionum Ketroncham, Dobrafolva et Brassanch nominatarum dedimus, contulimus perpetuo et irrevocabiliter possidendas, tenendas pariter et habendas. In cuius rei testimonium presentes concessimus litteras nostras patentes sigillique nostri munimine consignatas Datum tercio die festi beati regis Stephani Anno Domini M o C C C o X X X o octavo.

* * *

24.

1339. 12. 09. M OL Df.258550

* * *

25.

1340. 08. 00., AOM 280, fol. 44"-46"
[fol. 45r] Item remarde est que dou prioure de Mesine non se fait a ores aucune ordenacion ni provizon et que le maistre en pensse ordener surre annee per auctorite dou chapistre aue qui le conseill des prudeshomes segont que li sera avist convenable.

Et ensy meesme del prioure dongrie

[fol. 46r] Cessont les baillis ordenes de la de mer:

[fol. 46v] Frére Peyre Cornut prior dungrie

** * *

1341. 05. 28. M OL Df.266373

Conventus cruciferorum ordinis Sancti Johannis Jerosolimitani domus hospitalis ecclesie beati regis Stephani de A lba. Omnibus Christi fidelibus presentibus pariter futuris presentem paginam inspecturis salutem in omnium salvatore. Ad universorum notitiam harum serie volumus pervenire, quod Jacobus filius Chumur et Dominicus filius eiusdem de Hothvon ab una parte; Item Beke filius Ipoch de Bocch ex altera coram nobis personaliter constituti; iidem Jacobus et Dominicus filius eiusdem confessi sunt medietatem portionis ipsorum possessionarie in villa Hothvon habite existentem Hothvon vocatam, scilicet medietatem sessionis ipsorum ab angulo ecclesie beati Stephani regis in eadem possessione constructe in vicinitate portionis eorumdem ab aquilone dicte ecclesie incipiens versus meridiem adiacentem cuius medietatis locitum cum mensura regia faceret triginta amplexus et longitudo eiusdem esse quod metas terre possessionis A nd vocate cum portione patronatus dicte ecclesie et medietatem portionis ipsorum possessionarie Hothvon et J obag vocate cum omnibus utilitatis suis, videlicet sessionibus terris arabilibus, fenestris pratis aquis et insulis et terris campestribus ac aliis utilitatis suis [...]m quaque universitatis ad ipsam medietatem portionis ipsorum pretacte pertinentibus quam antei mediantibus litteris nostris memorato Beke pignori obligaverunt. Nunc vero urgentibus necessitibus ipsorum predictorum Beke filio Ipoch et per eum suis heredibus pro quadraginta marciis denariiis Bude currentibus plene receptis ab eodem de voluntate Andree filii Johannis fratris ipsorum personaliter astantis perpetuo et irrevoçabili coram nobis vendidisse possidendo nichil iuris nichilque dominii vel proprietatis deinceptis ipsis et eorum posteris reservando. Tali obligatione per eodem Jacobum et Dominicum assumpta quod quicumque temporis in processu posteriorum Beke et suos heredes nomine dicte medietatis portionis possessionari molestat acceptarent. Extunc iideum Jacobus et Dominicum ipsorumque heredes sepedictas Beke et per consequens ipsius heredes ubique et coram quos judicis expedire tenebunter propris laboribus et expensis. In cuius rei memoriam stabilitatemque perpetuam, presentes litteras nostras privilegiales pendentes et autentic sigilli nostri maiori munimine roboratas duximus concedendas. Data in crastino festi Pentecostes. Anno Domini Mo CCC xlmo primo.

Religiosis viris dominis fratribus Petro Cornuti priore A urane prelato nostro, Donato preceptore, Andrea lectore, Johanne custode, ceterisque fratribus predicti ecclesie existentibus et jugiter famulantibus regis sempiterno.

** * *

1343. 03. 02. M OL Df.229977

---

Conventus cruciferorum domus hospitalis ecclesie beati regis Stephani de Alba. Omnibus Christi fidelibus presentibus pariter et futurus presentem paginam inspecturis salutem in omnium salvatore. Quoniam unitum est oblivionis remediu, scriptura que calumpnis infere silentium et modum contentionis explicans sic a serie loquitur presentibus et posteris veritatem. Proinde ad universorum et singulorum notitiam harum serie volumus pervenire, quod magister Thomas filius Petri comes Lyptouiensis et castellanus Choucakew pro se personaliter, pro Johanne vero et Petro filiis suis cum sufficienti procurationis coram nobis constitutus, per eundem propositum extitit viva voce et relatum, quod cum comes Demetrius filius Nicolai de M aalos famulus suus inservare fidelitatis a pueritia sua in multiplicis servitius. Specialiter autem in hiis videlicet in diversis exercitibus excellentissimum principis domini K aroli incliti regis Hungarie felicis recordationis cum eo bis in Chewcunia, Seuuterad in Bohemia, tertia vice in Clazia, quarta vice cum ipso magistro Demetriiis famulus suus in terra Bazarab ultra Alpes, ubi pretactus dominus Carolus dei gratia rex Hungarie ut premisimus dominus suus per ipsum Bazarab convictus extitisset similiter cum eo fuisse in defensione capitis sui unum equum dedisset, super quo ipse mortem suam evassisset et in hiis omnibus premissis fidelitatis idem comes Demetrius filius Nicolai iugiter conplacere studivisset. Et licet idem Demetrius filius Nicolai ob servorum suorum quietatem nonlitterum et irrevocabilitatem et irretractabiliter confessus est donasse, perpetuavit et ad manus eiusdem ascendavit quiescumque possidendam et habendam, nullo contradictione pericuius coram nobis apparente et existente. In cuius quidam iam donate et perpetuate possessionis memoriam firmitatemque et stabilitatem perpetuam ne in processu temporum per quemiam in irritum seu dubium revocari possit. Ad instantiam et petitionem sepenominato comiti Demetrio et suis heredibus, nunc natis et in futurum nascituris jure perpetuo et irrevocabilitate et irretcoractabiliter confessus est donasse, perpetuavit et ad manus eiusdem ascendavit quiescumque possidendam et habendam, nullo contradictione pericuius coram nobis apparente et existente. In cuius quidam iam donate et perpetuate possessionis memoriam firmitatemque et stabilitatem perpetuam ne in processu temporum per quemiam in irritum seu dubium revocari possit. A d instantiam et petitionem sepenominato comiti Thome filii Petri sepnominato comiti Demetrio et suis heredibus concessimus presentes litteras nostras privilegiales pendentes sigilli nostri autentici munimente roboratas et signaturas. Datum in Dominica Invocavit. Anno Domini Millesimo trecentesimo quartvo tertio. Religioso viro fratre Donato preceptore domus nostre eodemque custode existente.

* * *

28.

1344. 09. 12. -- 1344. 12. 12., AOM 280, fol. 48v

[...] chascun an au plus tart a la mayte des mes daost. Et le priors et baillis per chapitre general du Regne et de Messine et de Ongrie, a Napol al terme de sus dit. [...] 

* * *

29.

1345. 02. 02. M OL Df.260575, Df.280499
Nos conventus cruciferorum domus hospitalis ecclesie beati regis Stephani de Alba damus pro memoria quod domina Agatha filia Dominici filius Zul Bisseni de Tebercuk consors videlicet Nicolai filii A ndree de cuius persona discretus vir B enedictus plebanus de Sancta A gatha nos reddidit rationes et certiores ab una parte, Item Stephanus filius eiusdem Dominici ab altera coram nobis personaliter constituti per predictam dominam A gatham propositum extitit viva voce et raltum quod ipsa quemdam seriam suum T egue vocatum secundum propositionem pro proborum et nobilium virorum eidem domino devi? predicto karissimo fratri Stephani cum racione proximitatis tum etiam absolutione quindecim pensarum latorum V ienensorum plene habitorum et receptorum ab eodem et per eum suis hereditibus heredumque suorum successoribus iure perpetuo et irrevocabili ter dedisset et vendidisset tenendum et habendam ymo dedit et concedit coram nobis nullo condione apparente et existente. Datum in festo purificationis virginis gloriose A nno Domini M CCCo XLo quinto

* * *

30.

1345. 04. 24. M OL Dl.100023

Nos frater Petrus Cornutus ecclesie domus hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolomitani per Ungariam prior humilis. Notum facimus quibus expedit tam presentibus quam posteris has nostras litteras inspecturis et audituris quod accedens ad nostram presentiam Nobilis et discretus vir magister Paulus olim magistri Laurentii domini de Pokru exhibiut nobis quemdam litteram privilegiales sigillo prioratus nostri Ungarie et Sclavonie appensione munitam et robora tam cuius littere tenor talis est [1344. 08. 08.] Considerata devocione ipsius magistri Pauli quam erga ordinem nostrum et nos gessit et in futurum gerere premisit de consilio, assensu et consensu tocius capituli nostri nuper in domo nostra de Zanta solempniter celebrari suprascriptam litteram aprobatam, ratificamus et confirmamus eidem magistro Paulo et suis hereditibus ab ipso legitime descendentibus hanc confirmacione et aprobatione tenere volumus et valere quam diu predictus magister Paulus et sui heredes, fideles extirerint domui nostre, nobis et ordini nostro supradictum sobasium persolverint cum effectu. In cuius rei testimonium et certitudinem pleniorem has litteras fieri mandavimus et sigilli prioratus nostri Ungarie et Sclavonie ac preceptorum predicti nostrorum in domo existentium. Iussimus in pensione muniri et roborari. Datum in domo nostra predicta de Zanta ubi capitulum celebravimus in festo Sancti Georgii Martiris. A nno domini M illesimo CCCo xl quinto.

* * *

31.

1346. 05. 09. M OL Dl.99417

Magnifico viro et potenti domino Nicolao ipsorum reverendo conventus cruciferorum domus hospitalis ecclesie beati regis Stephani de Alba amicitiam paratam cum honore noverit vestra magnitudo litteras vestras condecenti nos recepisse in hec verba amicis suis honorandis conventui cruciferorum domus hospitalis ecclesie beati regis Stephani de Alba Nicolaus Konth regni Hungarie palatinus et iudex Comanorum amicitiam paratam debito cum honore dicunt nobis Jacobus filius Symonis de Kisazar et Ladislaus filius Johannis de Telehte quod ipsi unacum Symone magns et Zachyud ac Mortunus filio eiusdem Zachyud nennon Leustasyo et Mychaele filiiis Symonis de Zebegunustura non una forent lynea
generationis et ab uno avo propagati exitissent et idem veri patroni ipsius monasterii 
Zebegyn fuissent ac etiam possessio Farkasd vocata cum suis attinentiis ad eodem 
pertinuisset et de iure debet pertinere super quo amiciciam vestram potitus presentibus 
diligenter quatenus vestrum mittat et dicat lice et occulte diligenter de premissis investigando 
sciatur et inquirat omni modam 
veritatem et post hinc pro prout veritas consitit premissorum nobis amicabiliter referibatis 
datum in alba Regali in festo beatorum Philippi et Jacobi apostolorum anno domini Millesimo 
CCCmo lxmo sexto; Nos itaque mandatis vestre 
magnitudinis amicabiliter occurrere 
cupientes ut tenemur unacum prefato Johannes de Kacha homine vestro religiosum virum 
fratrem Dominicum socium et confratrem nostrum hominem nostrum fidedignum ad 
premissa peragenda pro testimonio transmissemus qui demum exinde ad nos reversi nobis 
concorditer retulerunt quod ipsi die dominico proximo post predictum festum beatorum 
Philippi et Jacobi in civitate A Ibensi in congregatone vestra generali a nobilibus, ignobilibus, 
clericis et laicis ac ab aliis a quibus decuit et licuit palam et occulte diligenter de premissis 
investigando tales scribent veritatem quo premfati Jacobus filius Symonis de Kisazar 
et Ladislaus filius Johannis de Telehte uncacum Symone magnu et Zachyud ac M ortunus filio 
eiusdem Zachyud necon Leustasio et M ychaele filius Symonis de Zebegynmonustura in una 
forent linea generationis et ab uno avo propagati exitissent et idem veri patroni ipsius 
monasterii Zebegyn fuissent ac etiam possessio Farkasd vocata cum suis attinentiis ad 
eosdem pertinuisset et de iure deberet pertinere. Datum tertio die termini prenotati A nno 
domini supradicto.

* * *

1347. 10. 10. M OL D1.30646

Conventus cruciferorum domus hospitalis ecclesie sancti regis de A lba. Omnibus Christi 
fidelibus tam presentibus quam futuris presentes litteras inspecturis salutem in eo qui est vera 
salus datis quietem omnibus et salutem. Quoniam unitum oblivionis remedium scriptura que 
calumpnie inseri silentium et modum contentionis explicans sua serie loquitur presentibus et 
posteris veritatem. Proinde ad singulorum et universorum tam presentium quam futurorum 
notitiam harum serium volumus pervenire, quod Elias filius Michaelis nobilis de M arton sua 
Egedy, Stephani et Nicolaei fratum suorum ---rume Nicolai filii Johannis nisi fratri sui 
patruelis et M athias filius Thekus nobilis de eadem M arton similiter sua ac Galli fratri sui 
vicini ab una parte. Item Nicolaus filius Pauli similiter per se Bartholomeoe, Benedicto et 
Georgio ---lami filii Stephani filii Corneli fratrius uterinis ex parte matris parte ab altera 
coram nobis personaliter constituti, per prefatam Eliaim filium Michaelis et Mathiani filium 
Thekus propositum extitit concorditer viva voce et relatum, quod cum prefatus Nicolaus filius 
Pauli Bartholomeus, [Benedictus, Geo]rgius fratres sui in possessionibus --- quartae 
puellaris nobilis domine M argarethe matris sue sororis videlicet carnalis predictorum 
Michaelis et Thekus patrium suorum ac dicti Johannis nisi jux seu portionem iuxta regni 
consuetudinem de jure habere dignoscantur sed quia sepedectis Nicolaus filius Pauli cum dicti 
suis fratribus nomine dicte quartae puellaris sepedectos Michaelis et Thekus patres ipsorum ac 
Johannem ausum in causam attrahere nolissent nec curassent sed potius benivolre servi re ---
divissent ac super ipsam quarta puellari ad voluntatem unum eorumdem se promissent, 
Igitur predictus Michaelis Thekus et Johannes n---animi voluteate et consilio ac concordi 
voto, duos fundos curie in possessionibus eorum cum omnibus utilitabilitibus ad eodem 
spectantibus videlicet terris arabilibus et aliis quibuslibet utilitabilitibus ad eodem spectantibus,
et quovis nomine v<---->tantibus, unum videlicet in dicta possessione Marton, et alium in possessione Saras predicta quarta puellari sepedictis Nicolao filio Pauli Bartholomeo Benedicto et Georgio filiis predicte domine Margarethe a memorato Stephano filio Stephani Doneli? et secundo marco ipsius domine genitis et protirans mediantibus litteris privilegalibus honoris capituli ecclesie Quinqueecclesiensis am<--->is <--->lapsis temporibus perpetuo et irrevocabiliter possidendas dedissent et contulissent sed quia predicta licet privilegalis dicti capituli Quinqueecclesiensis quorum vigore dictos duos fundos Tunc idem Nicolaus filius Pauli Bartholomeus et Georgius filius Stephani cum suis utilitatibus teneurient et possederent in domo contierna? extitissent sed quia ipsi cum eorumfratibus et proximis sepedictos Nicolaum filium Pauli Bartholomeum Benedictum et Georgium filios Stephani in dominis dictorum duorum fundorum indemniter proponere et conservare volentes, unde <---> Elias filius Michaelis et Mathias filius Thekus cum memorie ipsorum extunc prout sepedicti Michaelis Thekus et Johannis dictos duos fundos curie cum omnibus suis utilitatis ad eodem spectantibus et pertinentibus de consensu beneplacito et promissione sepedictorum fratum eorumdem uterinorum et patruelinum ac omnium proximorum cognatorum commetaneorum et vicinorum ipsorum dedissent donassent et contulissent et iure perpetuo et irrevocabiliter possidendas quiete et pacifice tenendas pariter habendas. Nil iuris nilque proprietatis ac donatis de dictis fundis curie sibi et ipsorum fratibus ac posteritatibus reservando scilicet in jus ac proprietate sepedictorum Nicolaum filii Pauli Bartholomei Benedicti et Georgii filiorum Stephani proversus transtulissent et applicassent ymo dederant donaverint et perpetuaverunt coram nobis nullo contradicione penitus apparente et <--->terente. Hoc tamen declarato quod quoniamque temporis in processu sepedicti Bartholomeus Benedictus et Georgius filii Stephani cum memoratis Elia filio Michaelis et Mathia filio Thekus filii fratibus et proximis ac posteritatibus eorumdem pacifice commorare nollent, sed vixas et in <---> ac immunitas ex <---> et eodem quoquamdo molestare et inquietare <--->, extunc ydem Elia Mathias ac eorum fratres et posteritates sepedictos Bartholomeum Benedictum et georgium filios Stephani de ipsius possessionibus juria ordine cum pecunia <---> valebunt et possint iuxta estimationem condignam regni consuetudinem requirente obligationem tali interposita et per eodem Elia et Mathias sponte assumpta qui <--->que temporis in processu sepedictos Nicolaum filius Pauli et filios Stephani aut eorum heredes et posteritates nomine predictorum duorum fundorum vel eius utilitatem turbare molestare et inquietare aut in causam attrehere sue quoquomodo agravara niteretur extunc sepedicti Elia et Mathias et eorum fratibus et posteritatibus <---> Nicolaum Bartholomeum Benedictum et georgium et consequenter ipsorum heredes et posteritates ubique et coram quos judicis expedire tenerentur laboribus propriis et expensis in cuius donationis memoriam firmatemque et stabilitatem perpetuam ad petitionem utrarumque partium presentes concessimus litteras nostras privilegiales pendentis sigilli nostri autentici munimine roboratas et consignatas. Datum Anno domini incarnationis M mo CCCmo xlmo septimo sexto ydus octobris religioso viro viro fratre Herrico de Samburg preceptore nostre eodemque custode existente.

** **

33.

1348. 03. 24.a A OM 317, fol. 211r

de Aurosio Santimauricii et de Troya preceptor Gaucelino de Cluiolis\textsuperscript{11} locumtenens prioris in prioratu Baroli prelibato, A udiberto de Sancto Michaele Albaroni, Ricavo de Vinçobris\textsuperscript{12} de Grassano et de Graunis,\textsuperscript{13} et Bernardo de Bornaco de M elfa preceptoribus super crimen de quo delatus extitit Franciscus Furoni olim ordinis nostri frater purgationem recipiendam et faciendam canonica de Francisco prefato per alias nostras patentes litteras ducxerimus [!] comitendum ordinaverimusque et velimus quod facta purgatione prefata per vos si dictus Franciscus inscius de objecto sibi criminem sit repertus restituatur eidem habitum domus nostre et per annum unum in vestrò prioratu Ungarie resideat prelibato, vobis ideo tenore presentium districte precipiendo mandamus sub virtute sancte obedientie nichilominus firmiter iniungentis quatinus cum per litteras dictorum commissariorum nostrorum omnium, aut trium aut duorum ipsorum ac minus vobis consisterit quod per purgationem canonicalam supradictam se munde purgaverit Franciscus nominatus et absque ulla culpa innocens sit repertus et habitum nostrum eique in dicto prioratu Ungarie usque ad annum unum integrum stagiam asignetis, in qua ei provideri in suis necessariis faciet secundum bonos usus et laudabiles consuetudines domus nostre. Data Rodi die vicesima quarta mensis M artii Anno Incarnationis domini M illesimo CCC\textsuperscript{14}o quadragessimo Septimo.\textsuperscript{14}

* * *

34.

1348. 03. 24.b A OM 317, fol. 211\textsuperscript{r}

Frater Deodatus dei grata Sacre domus hospitalis sancti Johannis Jerosolimitani Magister humilis et pauperum Christi custos\textsuperscript{15} Carissimo nobis in Christo Francisco Furoni olim ordinis nostri fratri. Salutem etc. Cum per alias nostras certi tenoris litteras per religiousum in Christo nobis carissimum fratrem Petrum Cornuti domus eiusdem priorem Ungarie vel locumtenente ipsius mandemus restituui vobis habitum domus nostre et in dicto prioratu ad annum unum stagiam asignari, quod huiusmodi anno uno preterito ad alterum prioratum nostrorum Sanctiegidii aut Baroli ad quem malueritis venire possitis pro stagia moraturum vobis tenore presentium litentiam elargimur; Mandantes harum serie sub virtute sancte obedientie firmiter et districte illi priorum prioratum Sanctiegidii et Baroli predictorum et ipsius locumtenenti ad quem venire malueritis, ut vos in eum accendentem benigne recipiatur favorabiliter quod pertractet vobis assignet stagiam in altera baiuliarum sui prioratus in qua vobis provideri faciet in vestris necessariis secundum bonos usus et laudabiles consuetudines domus nostre. Data Rodi die vicesima quarta Martii A nno Incarnationis domini M illesimo CCC\textsuperscript{10}o quadragessimo Septimo.

* * *

35.

1348. 03. 24.c A OM 317, fol. 211\textsuperscript{r-v}

Frater Deodatus de Gosono etc. Religiosis in Christo nobis carissimis fratribus Garino de Castronovo priori Baroli, Imberto de Aurosio Santimauricii et de Troya preceptor, Gaucelino de Cluiolis locumtenens prioris in prioratu Baroli prelibato, A udiberto de Sancto Michaele Albaroni, Ricardo de Vinçobris de Grassano et de Graunis, et Bernardo de Bornaco de M elfa

\textsuperscript{11}At other parts of the cartulary: de Clugolis (fol. 204\textsuperscript{r}), or Clueiolis (fol. 210\textsuperscript{r}).

\textsuperscript{12}At the bottom of the page, in another charter: Ricardus de Vinzobris de Grassano.

\textsuperscript{13}Uncertain reading.

\textsuperscript{14}Owing to the difference in the start of the new year, it is 1348!

\textsuperscript{15}In the original text: etc.
preceptoribus Salutem etc. Cum dudum Franciscus Furoni olim ordinis nostri frater delatus de sodomitiō criminē bone memoriae frarti Elyono [fol. 211v] de Vilanova predecessori nostro fuerit de mandato ipsius predecessoris nostri propteram privatus domus nostre habitus et carceribus mancipatus successīveque per affines et amīcos nominati Francisci dicto predecessori nostro egressus suppliantum, ut cum ipsē Franciscus de obiecto sibi predicto criminē esset prorsus innocens aliēquibus proceribus religionis nostre fratribus ut super illo veritatem inquirerent comittere dignaretur; qui dictus noster predecessor supplicationēs prefate tamquam ratione consone inclinatus; Religiosis in Christo nobis carissimis fratribus condam Beringario de Aurosio Baroli et Isnardo de Albano Capue prioribus comissit et mandavit per suas litteras opportunās ut per se vel alios domus nostre fratres ubi ipsi ad alliis [!] arduioribus occupāti intendere in personis propriis non valerent, an dictus Franciscus conscius aut innocens esset prescriptum criminis inquirerent aut inquirerent purum et nudum cum diligentia varitatem, qui priores Baroli et Capue prelibati alīs maioribus negotiis in Romana curia religionis nostre tunc temporis imminentibus prepedictō, inquisitionem predictam religiosis in Christo nobis carissimis fratribus Imberto de Aurosio priorātus Baroli et A nthonio de Santo Eusaneo priorātus Capue predictorum tunc locā tenentibus consensum fiendam per eorum litteras speciales; Et quia inquisitione iamdictā et instrumentis super deffensione bone famē prelibati delati per famosos doctores et magne auctoritatis viros visis atēnta et examinatiā diligerenter; dictus Franciscus indubitānter absolvēndus dicitur purgationē canonicā eī in dicta, prōt probant per alegationes virīditas quarum nobis in quodam quaterno sub sigillo nostro copiam destināmus per religiosos in Christo nobis carissimīs fratres Guillermus de Relania priori Sancti Egidii locum nostrumque tenens in ultramarinīs partibus generālem, A storgium de Caslusco visitātorem et procuratorem nostrum in partibus ultramarinīs ac virum nobilīm dominum Bernardum de Martrino militem dominum de Planis et Raymundum de Caslusco procuratōres nostros in Romana curia; ad requisitionis instantiam amicorum et affiniōm dicti Francisci nobis sub ipsorum sigilīs [!] noviter destinātas; Nosque nolentes sicut nec convenit a iuris tramite aliqutenus de mare, considerāto potissīme quod si dictus Franciscus se mundē purgare poterit de criminē supradictō infamia ex illo nostre Religioni contracta famam redigētur in bonam, ad quam nec ab re tocis desideriīs aspiramūs vobīs de quorum fidei puritate et diligentī soliciitudine plenam in domino fiduciam obtinemūs, de et cum voluntate consilīo et assensu fratrīm et procerūm conventus nostri Rodi nobis asistentiūm in hac parte tenore presenciūm comitiūm et expressīs mandamus sub virtute sancte obedience nichilominūs firmēnti inurgentēs, quatenus omnes aut quīque vel quātvr si comode poterītis simautem tres aut duo vestrum aut minus quō ad id habiliūs vacare poterītis sine contradictione et excusatione16 alīqua suprādictam purgationem canonicalēm de et cum sapientiūm consiliō a dicto Francisco sumatiş soloriā qua convenit diligentē, et si per purgationem huīsumodi ipsum innexium et innocentem reperitiūm de crimīne prēlibato ea completa cum testimonialiūs vestris litteris illorum vīdelicet qui dictam purgationem faciēnt, quomodo per purgationem huīsumodi iustiūs est repuertum nominatīn Franciscum ad religiosum in Christo nobis carissīsum fratrēm Petrum Cornuti priorem Ungariæ vel eius locumtenentēm cui per alias nostras comitiūs litteras ut ei restituat habitum domus nostre si ex dicta purgatione inveniatur innocens et ei per nostras testimonialiūs litterās supradictās constiterit habite libere permissītis; si vero quod absīt per dictam purgationem purgare se non poterit et mundare prēlibatus Franciscus de crimine suprādictō ipsum deteneri faciatis in statu in quo est et faciatis eundem cum diligentia custodiātis. Data Rodi die vicesima quarta mensis Martii, Anno septimo ut supra.

* * *

16 Later insertion.
Conventus cruciferorum domus hospitalis ecclesie Sancti regis Stephani de A lba omnibus Christi fidelibus tam presentibus quam futuris presentem paginam inspecturis salutem in omnium salvatore. Qiuam tempus est more [...] Proinde ad univerosrum notitiam harum serie volumus pervenire quod anno domini M o CCCo xlviijo videlicet secundo die festi beati Nicolai confessoris religiosus vir in deo devotis frater Briccius ordinis fratum predicatorem prior de Insula Leporum seu claustri Beate virginis in personainclusarum dominarum sanctimonialium predicti claustri Beate Virginis ad nostra personaliter accedendo presentiam exhibuit nobis quoddam privilegium excellentissimi principis domini Bele dei gratia qoundam incliti regis Ungarie recordationis duplici sigillo suo roboratum et consignatum, non abrasum, non cancellatum nec in aliqua sui parte viciatum sed ex omni sui parte iustum et verum quia id privilegium predicte domine sanctimoniales vel saltim ipsarum procuratores de loco ad locum in spem transferre formidarent petens nos in persona religiosarum dominarum sanctimonialium humili instantia ut tenorem predicti privilegii ad maiorem rei evidenciam et cautelam ubi eri de verbo et verbum inseri et transcribi sigilloque nostro autentico consignari facerimus cuuis tenor talis est. [1255. 07. 25.] Unde nos iustis et condignis petitionibus ipsius fratis Bricciii obedire cupientes ut tenemur predictum privilegium domine bele duum iustum et verum de verbo ad verbum inseri et transcribiri sigilloque nostro autentico facemus consignari. Datum Anno dominice incarnationis M o CCCmo xlviij decimo die mensis decembris, Religiosis viris et deo devotis fratre Donato preceptore et fratre Blasio cruciferiis ecclesie nostre existentibus.

* * *

Universis et singulis visuris presentes et pariter audituris. Nos frater Deodatus de Gosono dei gratia sacre domus hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolomitan magister humilis et pauperum Christi custos tenore presentium facimus manifestum quoniam de nostra licentia et voluntate et in nostra presentia frater Berengarius de A sparrowo domus eiusdem vendidit et titulo vendicionis concessit fratri Raymundo Guillermi de Campo induto domus eiusdem videlicet hospitium suum unum cum suis introhibitibus, exiabus, iuribus et pertinentiis universis situm intra Colacium R odi confrontatum a ponente cum hospiciis Lingue Anglie a transmontanea cum hospiciis Lingue Italie et ex alia parte cum hospicio fratri Bernardi de Campo induto et cum hospitio prioris Ungarie a levante et meridie cum viis publicis precio videlicet centum viginti florenos auri quod quartum precium totum et integrum idem frater Berengarius a dicto fratre Raymunde confessus fuit se habuisse et in munera poccunia integre recepisse eumque de dictis, centum viginti florenos liberavit et pariter quitavit. In quorum omnium fidem et certitudinem ad suppletionem dictorum fratum Berengarii et Raymundi presentis fieri vissimus et sigilli nostri in appenso impressione muniri. Data Rodi die vicesima octava mensis Martii.

* * *

17Later insertion.
Frater Deodatus de Gosono dei gratia sacre domus hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolimitani magister humilis et pauperum Christi custos. Religioso nobis in Christo carissimo fratri Petro Ortis domus eiusdem salutem in domino. Tuis culpis et pravis portamentis exigentibus te de conventu nostro Rodi harum serie reborantes tibi sub vertute sancte obedientie districte precipiendo mandamus qui nichil receptis presentibus in primo securo navigio de portu nostro Lengoni exituro assendes et de dicto portu recedas et accedas recto Viagio ad prioratum nostrum Ungarie preceptoriam nostram de Carasco sub preceptoris inhibi obedientia pro stagia moraturum. Cum harum serie\[19\] districte precipimus et mandamus ut tibi eum et dictum prioratum preceptoriam nominenti in aliqua domorum dicti prioratus assigneat stagiam in qua tibi provideri faciat in cuius nesessariis prout aliis domus nostre fratibus providetur in allia iuxta bonos usus et laudables consuetudines domus nostre. Data Rodi decimo mensis Junii.

* * *

Frater Deodatus de Gosono dei gratia sacre domus hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolimitani magister humilis et pauperum Christi custos fratri Petro Ortis domus eiusdem salutem in domino. Licet per alias vestras patentes litteras tibi directas Rodi datas anno subscripto et die x Junii tuis culpis et pravis exhigentibus te de conventu nostro Rodi reboraverimus precipimusque tunc tibi sub vertute sancte obedientie ut receptis litteris ipsis in primo securo navigio de portu Lengoni recessuro assenderes et ad prioratum nostrum Ungarie sub prioris dicti prioratus obedientia pro stagia accedent deberes, qi [!] de novo deliberavimus te ad preceptoria Carasco sub\[20\] sub preceptoris dicte preceptorie obedientia pro stagia accessurm et non ad prioratum predictum. Volumus ideo et tibi sub dicta vertute sancta obedientie districte precipiendo mandamus, quatenus receptis presentibus in primo securo navigio de dicto portu nostro Lengoni exituro assendes et de dicto portu recedas et accedas recto Viagio ad preceptioriam de Carasco predictam sub preceptoris inhibi obedientia pro stagia moraturum in qua tibi stagiam harum serie assignamus, mandantis firmiter et districte tenore presentium preceptori dicte preceptorie sub vertute sancte obedientie eidem nichilominus firmiter inustomer quatenus te ad eum et dictam preceptoriam declinament benign adjutat, tibiique in eadem preceptioriam in tuis necessariis provideri faciat prout aliis domus nostre fratibus providetur in illa. Data Rodi die quinta Julhii Anno.

* * *

The charter is lined through and a comment is added: non processit
\[19\] Recte: serie.
\[20\] Later insertion.

Clemens episcopus servus servorum Dei venerabilibus fratribus .. Quinque Ecclesiensi et .. Bosnensi episcopis ac dilecto fratri .. abbatib monasterii Sancti Nicolai Sibenicensis dioecesis salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Militantii ecclesie licet immeriti disponente Domino presidentes circa curam ecclesiariam et monasteriorum omnium solercia reddimur indefessa solliciti, ut iuxta debitum pastoralis officii eorum occurramus, dispendiis et profectibus divina cooperante clementia salubriter intendamus. Sane dilectorum filiorum Baudoni prioris et fratrum hospitalis sancti Iohannis Ierosolimitani in Ungaria et Sclauonia conquestione percepimus, quod nonnulli archiepiscopi, episcopi allique ecclesiarii prelati et clericii ac ecclesiasticis persone tam religiose quam etiam seculares necnon duces, marchiones, comites, barones, nobles, milites et laici communia civitatum universitates opidorum, castrorum, villarum et aliorum locorum et alie singulares persone civitatum et aliarum dioecesium et aliarum partium diversarum occuparunt et occupari fecerunt, castra, opida, villas et alia loca, terras, domos, possessiones, iura et iurisdictiones necnon fructus, census redditus et proventus suorum prioratus et domorum eiusdem hospitalis de Ungaria et Sclauonia predictis et nonnulla alia bona mobilia et immobilia spiritualia et temporalia ad prioratum et domos predictos spectantia et ea detinent indebte occupatae seu ea detinentibus prestant auxilium, consilium vel favorem nonnulli etiam civitatum, dioecesium et partium predictarum, qui nomen Domini una cum recipere non formidant, eisdem priori et fratribus super predictis castris, villis et locis alii terris, domibus, possessionibus, iuribus et iurisdictionibus, fructibus, censibus, redditibus et proventibus eorundem et quibuscunque aliis bonis mobilibus et immobilibus spiritualibus et temporalibus ac aliis rebus ad prioratum et domos predictos spectantibus estus molestiae et iniurias inferunt et acturias. Quare prefati prior et fratres nobis humiliter supplicarunt, ut cum eisdem valde reddatur difficile pro singulis querelis ad apostolicam sedem habere recursum providere ipsis super hoc paterna diligentia curaremus. Nos igitur adversus occupatores, detentores, presumptores, molestatores et iniuriatores huiusmodi illo volentes eisdem priori et fratribus remedio subvenire, per quod ipsorum compescatur tementitas et alii aditus committendi similim praecipuam, discretioni vestre per apostolica scripta mandamus, quatinus vos vel duo aut unus vestrum per vos vel alium seu alios etiam si sint extra loca, in quibus deputati estis, conservatores et iudices prefatis priori et fratribus efficacis defenseinis presidio assistentes non permittatis eisdem priori et fratres super hys et aliis quiabuslibet bonis et iuribus ad prioratum et domos predicta spectantibus ab eisdem vel quibusvis aliis indebte molestari vel eis gravamina seu dampna vel iniurias irrogari facturi priori et fratribus ipsis cum ab eis vel eorum procuratoribus suis aut eorum aliquo fueritis requisiite de predictis et alii personis quiabuslibet super restitutione huius modi castrorum, villarum, terrarum et aliorum locorum, iurisdictionum, iurium et bonorum mobilibus et immobilibus reddituim quoque et proventuum et aliorum quorumcunque honorum nec non de quiabuslibet molestis, iniuris atque damnis presentibus et futuris in illis videlicet, que iudiciale requirunt indicamen, summario et de plano sine strepitu et figura iudicii, in alii vero - prout qualitas eorum exegerit - iustitie complementum, occupatores seu detentores molestatores presumptores et iniuriatores huius modi nec non contradicitores quiabuslibet et rebelles - cuiuscunque dignitatis status, ordinum vel condicionis exterrit, quandocunque et quotienscumque expedierit - auctoritate nostra per censuram ecclesiasticam appellantione postposita compescendo, invocato ad hoc - si opus fuerit - auxilio brachii secularis non obstantibus tam felici recordationis Bonifacii pape VIII predecessoribus nostri, in quihus cavetur, ne aliquis extra suam civitatem et dioecesim, nisi in certis exceptis casibus et in illis ultra unam dieciam a fine sue dioecesis ad iudicium evocetur seu ne iudices et conservatores a sede deputati predicta extra civitatem et dioecesim, in quibus deputati fuerint, contra quoscunque procedere sive alii vel alii vices suas committere aut aliquos ultra unam dieciam a dioecesi eorundem trahere presumat, dummodo ultra duas dies dieciam aliquis auctoritate presentium non trahatur seu quod de alii quam de manifestis iuris et violentiis et aliiis, que
iudicialem indaginem exigunt, penis in eos, si secus egerint, et in id procurantes adiectis conservatores se nullatenus intromittant, quam alis quibuscunque constitutionibus a predecessoribus nostris Romanis pontificibus tam de iudicibus delegatis et conservatoribus quam personis ultra certum numerum ad iudicium non vocandis aut alias editis, que vestre possent in hac parte iurisdictioni aut potestati eiusque libero exercitio quomodolibet obviare seu si aliquisb communiter vel divisim a prefata sit sede indulgentia, quod excommunica suspenderi vel interdici extra seu extra ul°ro loca certa ad iudicium evocari non possint per litteras apostolicas non facientes plenam et expressam ac de verbo ad verbum de indulto huiusmodi et eorum personis locis ordinibus et nominibus propriis mentionem et qualibet alia dicte sedis indulgentia generali vel speciali - cuiuscunque tenoris existat - per quam presentibus non expressam vel totaliter non insertam vestre iurisdictionis explicatio in hac parte valeat quomodolibet impediri et de qua cuibusque totum tenore de verbo ad verbum habenda sit in nostris mentio specialis. Ceterum volumus et apostolica auctoritate decernimus, quod quilibet vestrum prosequi valeat articulum etiam per alium inchoatum, quamvis idem inchoans nullo fuerit impedimento canonicum preppeditus, quodque a data presentium sit vobis et uniciue vestrum in premissis omnibus et singulis ceptis et non ceptis presentibus et futuris perpetuata potestas et iurisdiction attributa, ut eo vigore eaque firmitate possit in premissis omnibus ceptis et non ceptis presentibus et futuris et pro predictis procedere ac si predicta omnia et singula coram vobis cauta fuissent et iurisdiction et vestrum in predictis omnibus et singulis per citationem vel modum alium perpetuata legitime exitisset constitutione predicta super conservatoribus et alia qualibet in contrarium edita non obsolete presentibus post biennium minime valuitur. Datum A vinioe III Kal<endas> Februar<ii> pontificatus nostri anno decimo

* * *

41.

1353. 05. 06. MOL Di.3261

Conventus cruciferorum domus hospitalis ecclesie beati regis Stephani de Alba omnibus Christi fidelibus tam presentibus quam futuris presentem paginam inspecturis salutem in omnium salvatore. A d universorum notitiam harum serie volumus pervenire quod Andreas filius Bernoldi Bissenus de Cheche ad nostram personaliter accendendo presentiam exhibuit nobis quasdam litteras nostras patentes memoriai sigillo nostro consignatas petens a nobis humilibre precum cum instantia ut tenorem earumdem litterarum autem in litteris privilegialibus sigillo nostro in contraria edita non ostante vestre iurisdictioni et cuiuslibet vestrum et vestrae potestatis et iurisdictionis vestrae in predictis omnibus et singulis omnia et singula per citationem vel modum alium perpetuata legitime exitisset constitutione predicta super conservatoribus et alia qualibet in contrarium edita non obsolete presentibus post biennium minime valuitur. Datum A vinioe III Kal<endas> Februar<ii> pontificatus nostri anno decimo

* * *

42.

1358. 08. 20. A OM 316, fol. 234c
Noverint universi et singuli presentem procurationem visuri et pariter audituri, quod nos frater Rogerius de Pinibus dei gratia sacre domus hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolomitani Magister humilis et pauperum Christi custos22 et nos conventus domus eiusdem de discreto virorum Consratini23 et M archizculi24 fratrum cívicum et mercatorum civitatis Venetiarum fide et legalite confisi eosdem Constantinum et M arcum licet absentes tanquam presentes et quemlibet eorum insolidum ita quod non sit melior condicio primitus occupatis sed quod per unum eorum ceptum fuerit per alium resumi25 valeat prossequi et finiri; tenore presentium facimus, creamus, constituimus et solemniter negotiorumque gestores ad petendum et recipiendum nostro procuratorie nomine atque vice pro nobis omnes et singulas responsiones prioratum nostrarum A lamanie, Boemie et Ungarie ac camerarum pensiones nostri prelibati M agistri et omnia et singula alia iura nobis comuniter vel divisim expectantia et debentia quomodolibet pervenire a prioratibus26 prioratum predictorum vel ab aliis pro eisdem et ad faciendum eis et eorum ceptum de receptis quitancias perpetuo valituras promitentes bona fide sub ypotheca et obligatione omnium bonorum nostrorum et dicte nostre domus presentium et pariter futurorum habere et tenere gratum, ratum et firmum per dictos nostros procuratores et eorum alterum in predictis petitum receptumque fuerit et pariter quititatum. Non intendentes procuratores nostros alios ad quecumque nostra negotia ubilbet per vos comuniter vel divisim ordinatos propter presentis procuratoris constitutionem revocare sed potius de certa scientia confirmare. In cuius rei etc. Data Rodi die vicesima mensis Augusti Anno Lviij.

* * *

1358. 11. 19. A OM 316, fol. 258

Frater Rogerius de Pinibus etc. nobili viro domino Leuco dicto Tot militi de Roholcz salutem in filio virginis gloriose. Attendentes pie devocionis affectum quem ad nos nostrum ordinem hospitalis habere noscimini et habelbilis dante domino in futurum iudicium quantum cum deo possumus condescendere votis nostris ut prionde vestra sinceritas ad religionem eandem tanto ferventius devocionis incrementa suspiciat quantum ab eadem potiores, favores et comoda sentieris. Eapropter vos qui virtistis ad sancti dei evangeliæ corporalem manu tacta, nos et frater ac bona et iura29 dicti ordinis ubilbet toto posse defendere et salvare procurando utilia et inutilia pro viribus evitando et si per vos evitari non possent defferi facere vestro posse nuntio vel litteris ad nostram notitiam successorum nostrorum aut30 alterius alciuicus fratis nostri ordinis qui nos aut dictos nostros successores de eis31 certos reddat in confratrem nostrum et dicte32 nostre religionis recipimus33 et aliorum confratrum domus eiusdem consortio tenore presentium agregamus facientes pariter nos qui

22In the original text: etc.
23At the second occurrence it reads Constantinum, but here: Cronstratini.
24At the second occurrence it reads M arcum. Cf. A OM 316, fol. 228.
25Uncertain reading.
26Later insertion.
The text of the charter has been reconstructed on the basis of a charter issued for the priory of England.
28English variant: quanto.
29English variant: iuria.
30English variant: autem.
31English variant: dei.
32English variant: decem.
33English variant: regiximus.
anno quolibet in festo nativitatis Sancti Johannis baptiste nostre domui libras duas cere dare ubicumque fueritis zelo devotionis inductus voluntate spontanea promisistis ac parentes nostros particeps in omnibus bonis spiritualibus orationibus ieiunis, missis eemosinis suffragiis vigiliis et quibuscunque aliis piis operibus que facta fuerit in nostre ordine a primeva sui institutionem et fuerit usque in finem seculi divina gratia suffragante. Volentes insuper ut ubicumque sicut ali confratres nostre religionis gaudeatis nostris privilegiis et honore. In cuius rei etc. Data Rodi die decima nona mensis Novembris anno L viij

* * *

44.

1366. 03. 20. AOM 319, fol. 235

Frater Raymundus etc. frari Baudon Cornuti prior Vngarie salutem etc. Cum Johannes de Zagrabia desideret omnipotenti deo, beate M arie semper virgini matri eius ac santo Johanni baptiste patrono nostro et Christi pauperibus sub regulari habitu domus nostre perpetuo famulari, nosque ipsius pio desiderio in hac parte defflexi et mandamus ut Johannem predictum, si aptus sit sanusque et integer membris suis, ad eius requisitionem recipiatis sollempniter, ut est moris, in fratrem servientem domus nostre, sibique in altera baiuliarum prioratus predicti stagniam assignetis, in qua ei provideri is suis necessariis faciatis secundum bonos usus et laudabiles consuetudines domus nostre. Cuique cum per vos predictitur receptus fuerit in domus nostre fratrem, veniendi quando voluerit ad conventum nostrum Rodi cum equis et armis sufficientibus, a suo superiore prius licentia requisita, tenore presentium licentiam conferimus et donamus. Data Rodi die XX Martii anno LXV.

* * *

45.

1365/66 AOM 319, fol. 322

Frater Raymundus Berengarii etc. religiosis in Christo nobis carissimis universis et singulis fratribus .. domus nostre prioribus, viceprioribus et aliis, ad quos subscripta debebunt et poterunt pertinere, presentibus et futuris. Salutem et sinceram in domino caritatem. Ut qui

---

34English variant: ac uxor libera.
35English variant: institutionem.
37Engel: Johannes.
38Engel: Sancto.
39Engel: deflexi.
40Dobroni: volumus.
41Engel: committimus.
42Engel: stagnem. Dobroni: stagniam.
43Edition: Engel, "14. századi magyar vonatkozású íratok," 117. Engel dated the charter to 1 June but the date at the end of the charter (fol. 325 die primo Junii) belongs to the next document. It cannot be ruled out that it was also issued on 1 June but it is better to only indicate the year in the edition.
44Engel did not notify that the names have been ommitted.
45Engel: futuris salutem.
fratres domus nostre precptores in quolibet prioratuum domus nostre ad manus nostras retinuerimus, secundum continentiam statuti certitudo evidens et indubia habeatur, vobis tenore presentium facimus manifestum, quod cum consilio fratrum et procerum conventus nostri Rodi nobis assistentium in hac parte in prioratibus domus nostre subscriptis retinuimus ad manus nostras fratres precptores domus eiusdem subscriptos cum eorum baiuliis at arnesiis habitis et habendis. Primo videlicet:

[...]

in prioratu Ungarie fratrem Petrum Orticii de Salzedo preceptorem, in prioratu Alamanie

* * *

46.

1366. 07. 25. M OL DI.106151

Magnifico viro domino Nicolao Konth regni Hungarie palatino judici comanorum amico eorum reverendo Capitulum ecclesie Quinqueeclesiensis amitittiam cum honore, litteris vestris annualibus pro religioso viro fratre Baudone priorre fratrum cruciferorum ordinis Sancti Johannis Jeresolimitani per Ungarium et Sclavoniam constituto necnon magistro Donato viceprioire suo ad citationes, inquisitiones, prohibitiones possessionum apud manus alienas et apud manus ipseorum habitarum recaptivationes, reemulationes et metarum suarum reuentiones ac ad omnia alia que talibus in processibus fieri consuerit facienda quanto se datis et concessis honore condententi receptis iuxta earumdem continentium Petro filio Martini de Zabo homine vestro inter alios homines vestros in eisdem litteris vestris nominatum cum scriptum hominem nostrum magistrem Dominicum socium et concanonicum nostrum ad infrascriptam inquisitionem faciendam pro nostro testimonio transmisimus fidedignum qui postmodum ad nos ex inde reversi nobis concorditer retulerunt quod idem homo vester presente dicto nostro testimonio feria tertia proxima ante festum nativitatis beati Johannis Baptiste nunc preterisset annualis eo contentas metas possessionis eorumdem Crasouenthniklos vocate a parte meridiei habitas anihilasset et parari fecisset in preudicium eorumdem non modicum et derogatam precedente ut dicitur inter ipsos. Datum in festo beati Jacobi apostoli Anno domini Mмо CCCmo lxmo sexto

* * *

47.

1366. 09. 29. M OL DI.5498

Nos frater Raymundus de Bellomonte preceptor de Churgovo et de Nova Curia memorie commendamus presentium tenore significamus quibus universis quod Johannes iudex et famulus magnificorum viorum Johannis et Stephani filiorum Nicolai condam bani de Lendwa coram nobis personaliter astans de possessione et predio nostro Zenha nomine solutionem quinque marcarum quam deebant solvere in festo Sancti Michaelis archangeli annuatem Johannes famulus eorum predictus in festo predicto de nostro predio Zenha solvit quinque markas denarum denarioque descenso quinquaginta denarios plene et integre unde eosdem filios Nicolai bani predictos de Lendua redidimus et relinquimus penitus et per omnia

*6Engel: Alamanye.
solutione annuali expeditos et satisfactos. Datum in Chorgovo in supradicto anno domini Mo CCCmo lxmo sexto.

* * *
48.

1367. 05. 22. MOL Dl.8617

Nos frater Baudonus Cornuti sacre domus hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolomitani per Ungariam et Sclavoniem prior humilis et Comes Dubyche tenore presentium significamus quibus expedit universis quod nos considerantes fidelitates et fidelium servitiorum merita que nobis et domui nostre predicte Georgius dictus Rus filius Johannis exhibuit et exhibiturum se promisit in futurum, volentesque eidem pro huiusmodi suis fidelibus servicis aliqualem inde de consilio consensu et assensu universorum fratrum et procerum nostrorum in prioratu nostro nobiscum existentium in hac parte quandam possessionem nostram Nagymarthon vocatam in tenuitis domus nostre de Chergo existentem cum omnibus utilitatibus et pertinentiis universis quovis nomine vocatatis eidem Georgio et per eum suis heredibus more aliorum fidelium predialium nostrorum sub censu duarum pensatorum denariores in prima currentium singulis annis in festo beati M ichaelis archangelii solendo et uno descensu qualibet anno dando nobis vel preceptori nostro de eadem Chergo donamus, damus et conferimus ac presentium auctoritate contulimus possidendum, tenendum et habendum reservando nobis et ordini nostro tria iudicia consueta de quibus iudiciis due partes nobis vel preceptori nostro de dicta Chergo tertia vero pars ipsi Georgio et suis posteris debebat devenire. Hanc autem donationem et collationem nostram valere volumus et tenere tamdiu donec dictus Georgius et suis heredes nobis et ordini nostro fideles more aliorum predialium extiterint et predictum censum solverint cum effectu. Reservata nobis gratia et libertate de facto predialium nostrorum per dominum nostrum regem facta et concessa. In cuius rei testimonium presentes fieri fecimus sigilli prioratus nostri Hungarie et sclavoniæ appensione munitas et roboratas. Datum in domo nostra de Pukricha die vigesima secunda mensis M ay Aanno domini M illesimo trecentesimo sexagesimo septimo.

* * *
49.

1368. 09. 29. MOL Dl.5704

Nos frater Raymundus preceptor de Chorgo et de Nova Curia memoriae commendantes presentium tenore significamus quibus expedit universis quod Dominicus villicus de Scentha magnificorum virorum condam bani Nicolaie Stephani et Johanni de Lendua coram nobis personaliter astans de possessione et predio nostro Scentha vocata solutionem quinque marcarum quam debebat solvere in festo Beati M ichaelis archangeli annuatim predictus Dominicus villicus eorum in festo supradicto de nostro predio Scentha solvit quinque marcas denariores descenso quinquaginta denarios plene et integre unde eosdem filios Nicolaie bani predictos de Lendua redidimus et relinquimus penitus et per omnia solutis annualis expeditos pariterque absolutos. Datum in Chorgo in festo supradicto anno domini Mo CCCmo lx octavo.

* * *
50.

* * *

51.

1373. 11. 22. AOM 347, fol. 51

In nomine domini nostri Jesu Christi Amen. Anno nativitatis eiusdem Millesimo CCCmo septagesimo tertio die xxiiij mensis Novembris pontificatus sanctissimi in Christo patris et domini nostri domini Gregorii superna providentia pape xi anno tertio; Notum sit cunctis presentibus et futuris hoc presens verum et presentium instrumentum inspecturis et audituris quod cum questio seu controversia oritur esse inter venerabiles et religiosos viros, dominos, fratres Gaufrideum Rostagni magnum preceptorem conventus Rhodi et pro reverendissimo in Christo patre et domino fratre Raymundo Berengarii dei gratia magno magistro et conventu sacre domus hospitalis sancti Johannis Jerosolomitani, in cunctis partibus cismarinis generalem visitatorem Nicholaum de Solerio priorem dicti conventus, Sicardum de Muro veteri Sancti Egidii, Gauterium de ? Tholose priores, Beltrandum Flote Neapolis, Petrum Boysani Medianij, Petrum de Capitelito, A melyari Aymericum de Ripa de Roysacho, Arnaldum de Rieria de Condito et Sariacho, Arnaldum Leonardi Cleardi Burdegalarum, Petrum de Alta Ripa A venionensis domus predicte preceptores, nomine suo ac nomine et pro parte fratrum dicte domus Lingue Provincie ex parte una et venerabiles et religiosos viros dominos fratres Danielen del Careto Lombardie, Guirardum quondam domini Ruffini Urbis, Palamidem Johannis Pisarum, Johannem de Riparia Venetiarum, Bernardum de A qua viva Capue priores, Domicicum de Alamania Sancti Stephani de Monopolo, Rogerium de Sanconiciis de Vensus, Nicholaum de Strociis Padue, Johannem de Patis pontis gibery, Nicholaum de Perutia Acquile, Petrum de Thibertis Verone, Vellorum Imole, Laurentium Ceve, Ricardum Charulosi Cuzary, Johannem Ruffi Caratelli et Belrandum de Mara preceptores dicte dominus nomine suo et nomine et pro parte fratrum Lingue Italie ex parte

---


altera; Petebant namque dicti domini priores et fratres Lingue Italie ad se et suam linguam Italie pertinere et spectare prioratus Capue, et Barlete ac preceptorias Neapoli Sancti Stephani de Monopolo, Venose et Sancte Euphame ipsorum prioratum et preceptoriarum vacationem conferri, dari eiusdem per dominum magistrum predictum et conventum ante illos Provincie Lingue predicte; Item petebant dicti domini priores et preceptores Lingue Italie habere, et haberi debere provisionem in prioratu Ungarie et preceptorias eiusdem quotiens vacari contigerit equaliter cum dominis prioribus et preceptoribus Lingue Provincie antedici dictis dominis prioribus et preceptoribus Lingue Provincie contra asserentibus et dicentibus ad Ipsos et ad Linguam Provincie provisionem dictorum prioratum Capue, Barlete, Ungarie et prenominatarum preceptoriarum pertinere et pertineri debere eo, quod ea et eas habuerunt, possederunt per tanta tempora de quorum memoria hominum in contrarium non existit; Eisdemque et suis predecessoribus de premisis prioratibus et preceptoris facta fuit collatio et provisio per dictum dominum magistro et conventum, tandem premissa questione seu controversia exposita dominice sanctitate predicte per eamdem remissa remissa [!] extitit, amicabiliter concordari per reverendissimos in Christo patres et dominos dominos Thoaronem Ispanie et Florentie sacrosancte Romane ecclesie cardinalis coram diversis diebus et horis plures et varii tractatus fuerunt inter ipsas partes prolocuti pro ut contraentes prenominati vera assuerent omnia premissa hinc est: quod anno, die, mense, pariter quibus supra prenominata partes presentes et personaliter constitute in presentia venerabilium et religiosi viri domini fratres Johannes Ferdinandi de Heredia dicte domus Castellanie Emposte et prioris Cathalonie ac pro dicto domino magistro et conventu ad tenendum assembleam in Avenione celebratam mandato apostolico locumenentis specialiter deputati dominorumque fratrumb testium et mei notariorum infrascriptorum assignetis et totaliter inherentis Jerusalem evangelii dicentis beati pacifici quam filii dei vocabuntur ac cupientis sanctis moni noribus factis per dictam dominicam sanctitatis humiliter et devote obedire dictorumque dominorum cardinalium debita reverentia et honore unaminiter fraterna et amicabili concordia et pacta infrascripta perpetuo duratum. In modum qui sequit devenerunt et convenerunt primo videlicet quod preceptoria Sancti Stephani, Estunibia, Alissii, item preceptoria de Venosa, item preceptoria de Monopoli cum omnibus suis iuiribus et pertinentiis et dependenciis universis ab inde in antea sint et esse debent fratum Lingue Provincie; Et quod dicta preceptoria de Monopolo non reponderat nec pro ipsa responderi debeat, responsi preceptorie Sancti Stephani seu preceptori dicti Sancti Stephani et sub ipsius obedientia existat et illi responsionem solvat et solvere teneatur unam et consuetum; item quod cetera remanant et remanere debeant deinceps et provisionem fratum Lingue Italie .s. prioratus Baroli et Capue et preceptorie Neapoli et Sancte Euphane cum suis omnibus iuiribus et pertinentiis et dependentiis universis secundum tamen præludicio fiendo per presentem concordiam alicui seu aliquibus fratribus premissorum partium de beneficiis seu prioratibus et preceptoriiis quos seu quas ad presens habent, tenent et possident; Item quod qando dicte preceptorie Sancti Stephani de Monopoli et Evenose que ad presens possidentur per frateres Lingue Italie vacabunt morte vel resignatione, permutacione vel alio quoquomodo de ipsis provideatur fratribus lingue Provincie; Item per similem modum quando prioratus Barlete, preceptoria Neapoli et Sancte Euphane et alie qui et que per frateres Lingue Provincie ad presens possidentur vacabunt morte vel resignatione, permutacione vel alias quoquis modo ipso et ipsius provideatur fratribus lingue Italie; Item qoud tempore fratribus Rayne de Sabiano prioris Baroli toto tempore quo in ipso prioratu preerit et preceptorie vacare continget ab inde in antea que spectent ad suam collationem seu provisionem conferri et dari huiusmodi preceptorias vacantes conferre et donare teneatur equaliter videlicet unam fratri Lingue Provincie et aliam fratri Lingue Italie; Item per similem modum quod de preceptoriis vacantibus tempore dicti fratribus Rayne prioris Baroli pertinentis et spectantis ad collaborationem seu provisionem domini magistri predicti, ipso dominus magister unam conferre teneatur
fratribus Lingue Provincie et aliam fratribus Lingue Italie; Item quod prioratus Ungarie remaneat in communi fratribus Lingue Italie et fratribus Lingue Provincie taliter quod quam primum ipsum prioratum vacare contingerit dictus dominus magister cum consilio proborum conventus provide valeat melius merenti de lingua Provincie aut Italie et post quotiens vacare contingerit, si prior prefererit Lingue Provincie sequatur prior Lingue Italie et econtra, et baiulie dicti prioratus sint in communi Lingue Provincie et Italie et sic sit pax finis et vera concordia inter dictas partes de quibus omnibus quilibet partium petiet sibi fieri publicum instrumentum et publica instrumenta tot, quoet tanta, quanta petierint et habere voluerint per me notarium infrascriptum. Actum Avenione in domo Sancti Johannis in aula in qua tenet assemblea presentibus venerabilibus et religiosis viris dominis fratribus Guilelmo de Chanconi hospitalerio conventus Lingue Francie, Johanne Achandi montis Chalny Lingue Alvernie, Arnaldo Guicardi Monsi dei, Pellegrino de Nicosia Lingue Ispanie, Johanne dei ville, Johanne Goselliri Lingue Italie Anglie, Hesseno Slelhols, Galfrendo de Ridenlzen, Franchi Langi Lingue Alamanie preceptroibus dicit domus testibus ad premissa vocatis specialiter et rogatis; Et me Guihelmo Ferrandi notario qui hoc scripsi etc.

* * *

1374. 05. 21. M OL DI.6204


* * *

1374. 09. 25. AOM 320, fol. 41r

Frater Robertus Juilliaco dei gratia sacre domus hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jeresolomitani magister humilis et pauperum Christi custos. Religioso in Christo nobis carissimo fratri domus eiusdem priori nostri Francie prioratus salutem et sinceram in domino caritatem.

Cum in assembleia seu congregatione virtute bullarum apostolicorum per quem nobis conceditur quod quidquid per nos fieri contingat habeat eamdem robustam firmamentum ac si per conventum nostrum Rodie ipso conventu presente facta forent A vini one facta de consilio Religiosorum in Christo carissimorum fratum domus eiusdem Emposte, Castellani ac Cathallonie priorum Alvernie, Sancti Egidii et Tholose priorum necnon et quamplurirum preceptorum et domus nostre fratum nobis assistentium pariter et assensu vobis ad hoc consentium fuerit ordinatum quod summan decem millium florenorum super prioratibus, castellaniis et preceptoriiis et aliis nostre religionis domibus pro passaggio nostro de his partibus ad conventum nostrum Rodi fiendo levabitur et perciperetur vobis in virtute sancte obedientie districte precipiendi mandamus quatenus mille florenorum summan vobis et vestro prioratu

---


51 Engel: prioratu.
assideatis et imponatis racionalibiter et iuste super preceptorem dicti nostri Francie prioratus ipsum nobis seu thesauro aut procuratori et receptori nostro generali sine defectu deliberatis, solvatis et tradatis una cum responsionibus prioratus ipsius, Sic in premissis taliter vos habentes quod nota contemptus seu negligentie vobis nullatenus ascribatur, sed de completo mandato possitis in domino monito commendari. In cuyis rei testimonium bulla nostra plumbea presentibus est appensa. Datum A vinione xxv die mensis Septembris Anno predicto.\footnote{Engel: prerenatato.}

Among the commands: [f. 41v.] Item priori regenti prioratus Ungarie de summa CL

\* \* \* 

1374. 10. 06.b A OM 320, fol. 50v-51r

Frater Robertus Juilliaco de gratia sacre domus hospitalis Sancti Johannis Jerosolimitani magister humiliis et pauperum Christi custos.\footnote{In the original text: etc.} Religioso in Christo nobis carissimo fratri domus eiusdem priori Francie prioratus salutem et sinceram in domino caritatem.\footnote{In the original text: etc.} Cum anno preterito in assembleya anno domini millesimo ccc\textsuperscript{o} lxxiiii\textsuperscript{o} in A vinione celebrata mense Septembris aliqua firmiter ordinata de mandato domini nostri pape de consenso et voluntate procerum et fratrum et proborum virorum in dicta assembleya exista in qua fuit ordinatus et constitutus commisseri nostri Religiosus in Christo frater Johannes Ferdinandi etc. ad colligendum pecunias, responsiones, taxa, arreragia, spolia prioratum quorumcumque vacantium necnon mortuaria et quoquumque alia piantia et debita quoquomodo nobis et domui nostre de quibus responsionis, taxis, arreragii, spoliis, vacantiis et mortuariis aut debitis summam xl\textsuperscript{m} [40,000] florenorum debent dari conventui Rodi pro sustentacione dicti conventus et summam octuaginta millium [80,000] florenorum debent pavi in deposito in A vinione libet in veniens secundum ordinationem dictae assembleye pro oneribus dictae religionis supportandam. Et quia nos acta mente affectavimus beneplacita et mandata domini nostri pape adimplere vobis perpetuis districte precipiendo mandamus quod cum Benedictus Neroci, Jacobus Bernardi, Renocius Bernardi, M atheus de Bono Cursu et M atheus de Vita de societate Albertorum antiquorum de Florentia et quilibet eorum nobis et nostre domui fuit pro dictis summis efficaciter obligari reddendi in A vinione eorum sumptibus et expertis ut per iustiam super hoc lacunis confecta ari metu? responsiones, taxa, arreragia, spolia et debita prioratus vestri is ipsis libet eorum alteri dare, solvere seu dari et assignari facere debitias computantias valuitas de dicta societate vestre altero eorum de societatis iuxta informationem faciendi vobis predictam castellanum in omnibus solutionibus per vos solucione Esspionem de qua quidem solucione et quitantia nos et commissariam nostram predictam certificatis com portamentis ne peccunias camerarum nostrarum seu subsidia passagii nostri ad conventum nostrum Rodi deliberatis eisdem primo ipsas tradatis et solvatis per vos super licet ordinatis vel ordinandi in premissis et qualibet premissorum taliter vos habentis quod de negligentie seu inobedientia non possitis accusari ymo de bona et fidelia diligentia et obedientia commendari. In cuyis etc. Data A vinione vj Octobris Anno predicto Simile mandatum fuit:

[fol. 51r] Item priori Ungarie
Nos conventus cruciferorum domus hospitalis ecclesie sancti regis Stephani de A lba memorie commendamus per presentesquod nobilis K atherina vocata filia Nicolai de Gaan relicta magistri J ohannis filii R afaelis de J ulia de cuius personali notitia U grinus filius Nicolai de Torne et L aurientius litteratus filius J ohannis de Wesprimio assecurarunt ad nostram personaliter accedens presentiam confessa extitit viva voce in huncmodum ut ipsa ob dilectionem filialem quam ad nobilem dominam Lucia vocatam filiam suam coniugem Ladizlai filii J ohannis de M eree habere dinoscentur possessionarias suas portiones in annotata possessione J ulia et B ere in Comitatu Symigiensi existentibus habitas et unam particulam terre A nistelek nuncupatam cum omnibus earum utilitatis et pertinentiis ad predictas possessionarias portiones spectantibus preterea medietatem equarianum equatiliun prenotate nobili domine Lucie filie sue et per eam suuis heredibus in perpetuum dedisset, donavisset et contulisset ymo dedit donavit et contulit coram nobis tenendas et possidendas, Salvo nichilominus iure ecclesie nostre. Datum in festo beati Valentinii martiris anno Domini millesimo trecentesimo septuagesimo quinto.

---

1375 A OM  16, nr. 52.\textsuperscript{55}

[...] Item recebio del priorado d'Ongria por la responsion del dito priorado del anyo suso scripto nichil. Item por tallya nichil. Item por arregares nichil. Item por mortuoris nichil. Item por vagantes nichil. [...] Item la responsion del priorado del Vngria los quales ha recebidos el prior de Venesia iiiic flor. [...] 

---

1378. 05. 11. M OL Dl.6536

N os frater A rnaldus de Bellomonte viceprior et preceptor de Nova Curia etc. memorie commendamus quod magister N icholaus filius J ohannis filii L aurentii de K aniza et fratres sui nobis solverunt duos equos et duodecim boves sicut fuit ordinatum in Zakan per probos et nobiles viros de quibus boves et equos dictum magistrum N icholaum et fratres suos reddimus expeditos et absolutos vigore nostrarum litterarum mediante. Datum in Chorgo tertia feria post festum Sancti J ohannis ante portam latinam. Anno M illesimo CCCo LXX o octavo.

---

1382. 07. 15. A OM 322, fol. 251r\textsuperscript{56}


\textsuperscript{56}Edition: D obronić, V iteški redovi, 171-172.
Frater Johannes etc. Religioso etc. fratri Johanni de Palisna domus eiusdem priori prioratus nostri Ungarie salutem etc. dum grata consideratione attendimus in commissio dudum vobis regimen prioratus nostri Ungarie quam utilem vos experientia rerum magistriata exibuit et prebuit multipliciter fructuosum et ad vestre sufficienentie notam varia vestrorum grandia virtutum merita aciem considerationis nostre reflectimus non indigne exaudicionis digna prosequimur vote vestra hinc est quod prioratum nostrum Ungarie supradictum cum baiuliis, ordinariis, cameriis et omnibus et singulis suis membris iuribus et pertinentius universis ad prioratum ipsum spectantibus et pertinentibus ac spectare et pertinere debentibus quoque et cum omni onere emolumentis et honore habendum etc. vobis tamquam digno et benemerto de nostra certa scientia et speciali gratia de consilio voluntatis et assensu Religiosorum etc. fratrum Petri Bussoni prioris ecclesie nostre conventualis Rodi, Hessonis Slegiligoz de Filiburgo, Guillermi de Fontanay de Spaliaco preceptoris procuratoris conventus nostri Rodi, Siccardi de Muro veteri Sancti Egidii, Petri de Altaripa T holose priorum aliorumque preceptorum et procerum nostri assisstentium necon Petri Culento M arechalli et locumtenentis, Palamidis Johannis A mirati, Petri de Corey hospitalarii Petri Votteri locumtenentis prioris ecclesie Sancti Martini, Aurentii M agistri locumtenentis Thesaurarii in dicto composita nostro Rodi basilium residentium et nosb suppliantum per eorum patentes litteras sigillis dictorurn officiorum et propriis pro huiusmodi collectione fienda sigillis sub annua responsione quadringentorum florenorum de Florentia in Rodo nobis communi thesauro conventus nostri Rodi aut aliis seu aliis cui et ubi ordinarivm in festo nativitatis Sancti Johannis Baptiste annis singulis infallibiliter exolvenda et quibuscumque alius oneribus dicto prioratui qualibetcumque et quocumque incumbentibus et impositis et imponendis ex predicto etiam ultra responsionem predictam supportandis benefaciendo in eodem conferimus, concedimus et donamus ad annos decem incipientes et annis singulis infallibiliter in festo nativitatis beati Johannis baptiste primo proxime venturo et extunc continuos et completos retento nobis et specialiter reservato que de una et pluribus prout per mortem preceptorum eventur contingere vacante vel vacatura baiulia vel baiuliis in dicto prioratu possumus anno quolibet providere secundum continentiam statuti. Ac etiam retentis et reservatis nobis ordinationibus omnis per bone fratrem Raymondum Berengarii dicte sacre domus magistrum predecessore nostrum factis et sibi reservatis in generali capitullo per eum anno sexagesimo sexto in A vinitione celebrato nichil nobis retento et etiam reservato ut si quod absit in solutione annuarum responsionum per vos statuto termino facienda deffficere vos contingat que nos cum consilio fratrum et procerum dicte domus possumus disponere et ordinare de premisso prioratu secundum continentiam statuti editi in prelibato generali capitullo, dantes et concedentes vobis etc. Committentes vobis fiducialiter circa curam et administrationem ac gubernationem utilem dicti prioratus ac honorum et iurium eiusdem defensionem et recuperationem tam in agendo quam in defendendo harum serie vices nostras. Quocirca universis et singulis fratribus, preceptoribus et baiuliis et aliis fratribus, confribus, sororibus et donatis sub virtute sancte obiediente, ac hominibus ac vassallis et quibusvis aliis nobis et domui nostre prefate subditis in dicto prioratu constitutis presentibus et futuris sub sacramento fidelitatis et homagii quo nobis et nostre domui sunt stricti precipimus et mandamus harum serie districte ut vobis tamquam eorum superiori, prout priori et maiori reverenter pareant, obediant et intendant vobisque suum preveant auxilium, consilium et favorem in omnibus que ad curam regimen et administrationem ac gubernationem utilem prescripti prioratus pertinere noscuntur quotiens opus fuerit et eos duxeritis requiringos inhybentis vobis districtus sub dicta virtute Sancte obedientie etc. Et si quod absit etc. In cuius rei testimonium bulla nostra plumbea presentibus est appensa. Datum A vinitione die quintodecimo Julii anno incarnationis domini M illesimo Trecentesimo Octuagesimo secundo.
Frater Johannes etc. Religioso etc. fratri Johanni de Palisna domus eiusdem priori prioratus nostri Ungarie salutem etc. Inter ceteras solicitudines nobis inherentes illa peramplius nos excitat per quam indempnitati religionis nostre ex presumptis distractionibus et alienationibus bonorum ipsius possit et valeat provideri; intellecto siquidem quid doletur refferimus quoi nonnulli domus nostre fratres, priores prioratus nostri Ungarie seu ipsius prioratus regimini presidentes violatus detemtor eiusdem frater Raymundus de Bellomonte necnon fratres, preceptores et alii dicti prioratus bona, res, iura, possessionionaria et alia religionis nostre prioratus predicti retrohactis temporibus pluribus et diversis personis secularibus et ecclesiasticis in perpetuum et ad tempus vendiderunt, alienaverunt, inpignoraverunt et transtullerunt extra religionem nostram in dei cuius officio bona deputantur offensam nostrum et religionis nostre dispendium non modicum in ipsorum et detinentium periculum animarum voti et precepti Sancte obedientie, Sancte Sedis apostolice ac nonnullorum Romanorum pontificum haberi, fieri, prohibentes contemptum; Idcirco volentes in premissis ut tenemur salubriter providere de consilio et assensu religiosorum etc. Fratrum Petri Bussoni prioris ecclesie conventualis Rodi, Hessonis Slegiligloz de Filiburgo et Guillermi de Fontanay de Spaliaco preceptoris ac procuratoris conventus nostri Rodi, necnon fratrum aliorum priorum et preceptorum nostre dicte domus nobis assistentium de certa nostra scientia tenore presentium omnes et singulas venditiones, donationes, alienations, impignorationes et distractiones bonorum, rerum, possessionum et iurium religionis nostre in dicto prioratu existentium per quosvis domus nostre fratres cuiuscumque conditionis preheminentie dignitatis fuerint presumptas, factas et attemptatas quibusvis personis ecclesiasticis seu secularibus etiam preeminentibus pontificiis sui regalibus dignitibus cassamus, irritamus, et anualamus cassas, irritas et nullas nuniantamus bona ac vendita, alienata deterita et distracta a iure et proprietate dicte nostre domus perhybentis Sancta Sede apostolica nonnullis Romanis pontificibus statutis et usibus religionis nostre ad ius et proprietatem recuperatis et ad ius et proprietatem ipsius reducimus per presentes mandantes vos sub virtute sancte obedientie firmiter et distincte ut omnia et singula bona religionis nostre prioratus predicti vendita, impignorata, distracta et alienata a iure et proprietate dicte nostre domus religionis recuperatis et ad ius et proprietatem ipsius reducatis vobis harum serie attributa poteste etiam in iudicio ecclesiastico et seulari et extra iudicium pro executione premisorum ac universis et singulis domus nostre fratibus, sororibus et donatis in dicto constitutis prioratu necon hominibus et vassallis sub sacramento fideltatis et homagii quo nobis et nostre domui frater sunt astricti ut in premissis et quolibet premisorum vobis prestant auxilium, consilium et favorem quotes

57Edition: Dobronić Viteški redovi, 172. Dobronić dated the charter to 17 July!
58Dobronić: retroactis.
59Dobronić: detrimentum.
60Dobronić: detrimentum.
61Dobronić omitted: Sancte obedientie.
62Dobronić: tenemus.
63Dobronić: Sigillogisi.
64Dobronić: preeminentibus.
65Dobronić: quibusvis.
66Dobronić: cassamus.
67Dobronić: etc.
opus fuerit et eos duxeritis requendos. In cuius rei etc. Datum Avinione die sextodecimo Julii anno Incarnationis domini Millesimo Trecentesimo octuagesimo secundo.

* * *

60.

Frater Johannes etc. Religioso etc. fratri Johanni de Palisna domus eiusdem priori prioratus nostri Vngarie. Salutem etc

Cum domino permittenti a quo procedunt gratiarum munera quamvis immeriti fuerimus promittendi ad domus nostre magistratus regimen ad ingens pondus eius administratis suscepte convertentis tocius nostre considerationis aciem excitati etiam assiduis validis clamoribus fratrum bailivorum, priorum, procerum omnium et singularum residentium ad dei servitia in nostro Rodi conventu occasionibus et causis pluribus expositiorum perplexi in augustis paupertatis iminentibus amissionis periculis asserentone inspiciens, inspiciendis festino expedientes eisdem necessario remedio per alium quem nos ac nostre solicitudinis industriamadmindere non posses neque nostram religionem directionis, correctionis, reformationis et restitutionis incrementum suscipere salutiferum ad has occidentales partes nullo ad antiquitatem nostram respectu habito omnibus possessionis periculis pi patris merum pro filiis capientes consilium et ferentes moleste filiorum incomoda cum religiosis etc. fratribus Petro Bussoni priori ecclesie conventualis Rodi, Hessonis Sigiligloz de Filiburgo et Guillermus de Fontanay de Spaliaco preceptorissolemniter procuratore ellectis per prenominatum conventum cum plena potestate relictis et dimissis nostris Insule bellicis et acquisitis sudoribus sub nostri locumtenentis generalis fideli custody de consilio premissi conventus ordinati non suine gravi periculo quod deus advertere dignetur non absque immenso labore et onere expensarum dirrexerimus congressus nostros provisuros in hiis partibus nobis subditiis de salubri, reformatione et laudabili consolidatone cum qua nobis possibile diligentia ferventi opere circa premissa et alia concernentia honorem, utilitatem religionis nostre de premissorum procuratorum consilio voluntatis et assensu fratriarum aliorum priorum et procerum nobis assistentium in hac parte in civitate Valentinie supra Rodanum dominica prima instantis

---

68 Dobronić: fuit.
69 Dobronić: septimodecimo.
71 Dobronić: promittenti.
72 Dobronić: propius immeriti.
73 Dobronić: sumus.
74 Later insertion: Promiti. Dobronić: -.
75 Dobronić: administrationis.
76 Dobronić: convertent.
77 Dobronić: perplexis.
78 Dobronić: angustiis.
79 Dobronić: assecute.
80 Dobronić: quem.
81 Dobronić: correctionis.
82 Dobronić: vestram.
83 Dobronić: Sigiliglosi.
84 Lacuna.
85 Dobronić: amissis.
86 Dobronić: insultis.
87 Valence-sur-Rhône.
mensis Martii nostrum generale capitulum in Christi nomine celebrandum ordinaverimus in quo nostrum et nostri conventus principale propositum prosequendum disponere, decernere et ordinare intendimus ut dicte religionis reducantur obiecta consolidentur contracta corrigantur corrigenda et reformentur in melius reformanda domini favente gratia tali modo ut propter executionis actionem prefati fratres et conventus subleventur et respirientur a miserabili statu quo degent religio liberata a pondere debitorum in augmentum christiane fidei et Christicolarum protectionem favores, salubres, potiores sentiant et nos ab alissimo eius etiam regibus, principibus et tocius orbis Christi fidelibus valeamus de nostra cura regiminis salutifera commendari. Quapropter fraternitatem vestram in domino exortamur ac vobis et per vos deputandis, eligendis et ordinandis distrirecte precipiendo mandamus in virtute sancte obedientie districtius iniungentis quatenus adunus mortuariorum quam baiuliarum vacationibus et quorumlibet aliorum honorum que habetis et habere poteritis nobis et dicto nostro conventui pertinentibus et spectantibus comuniter vel divisim ac etiam cum litteris vestrar priouratus cameralum baiuliarum et aliarum gratiarum magisterialium prout ad vos et vobiscum conferendi dignoscitur pertinere nobiscum personaliter excusatione cuiuscumque remota intersitis. Atenius precaventes ne in premissis adimplendas committatiam negligentiam sed tamquam veri filii obedientie valeatis. Alias contra vos et eos prioratus et baiulias rigide procedemus prout nostrae religionis regula et statuta continant; nichilominus rescribatis per vestrar litteras diem receptionis presentium non aliter presentes ad vestrar notitiam pervenisse credimus; Ceterum volumnus et vobis harum serie precipiendo mandamus sub dicta virtute sancte obedientie quatenus particulariter et distincte ad endem civilatem die prescripta vobiscum apportetis statum cameralum, baiuliarum, domorum, grangiarum, membrorum et eorum nomina que et quanta sit cuiuslibet responsio et in quanta quantitate restat unusquisque teneri ac nomina et cognomina singulorum fratum, sororum et donatorum qui et qui sint in dicto prioratu veniatis instructis et plene informatis de omnibus negotiis prioratus eiusdem ut suffragante domino vestro et aliorum fratum procerum domus nostrae auxilio super hiis providere salubriter valeamus. In cuius rei et alii. Datum Avinione die decimoseptimo July Anno incarnationis domini octuagesimo secundo.
Frater Johannes etc. Religioso etc. fratri Johanni de Palisna domus eiusdem priori prioratus nostri Ungarie Salutem etc. Carissime considerantes humanum genus pro bonorum personarumque custodia securitate et salubritate precavendo ab iniquorum insidiis castra, fortalicia, et terras edificasse et diei edificare supplicationem pro parte vestra nobis factam continentem ut vobis licetiam edificandi castra seu edificia vel terras unum seu plura tam in territorio vestri patrimonii quam nostre religionis ipsius prioratus concedere dignaremus benivolo prosequimur assensu; Eaporter vobis in quantum ad nos spectare nosscitur in territorio vestri patrimonii et religionis nostre ipsius prioratus pro securitate vestra et subditorum nostrorum et religionis terras, castra seu fortalicia unum seu plura de certa nostra scientia et speciali gratia tenore presentium licentiam concedimus et donamus edificandi et construendi. Datum Avinione etc. die xvij July Anno lxxxij

Die xx Julii predicti anni data fuit licentia predicto fratri Johanni de Palisna priori Ungarie recipiendi viros sequentes: quinque nobiles etc. in fratres milites religionis et in fratres servientes viros quinque ut in forma, quibus militibus receptis ut prefertur data fuit licentia eundi ad conventum cum armis et equis sufficientibus ut in forma.

Johannes Ferdinandi etc. etc. Religioso etc. fratri Johanni de Palisna domus eiusdem Salutem etc. priori prioratus Ungarie. Dum ad probitatis virtutum et gubernationis diligentis habite per vos in nostro religionis administratis famam aciem, mentis nostre dirrigimus illa vobis annulius scilicet conservationem vestri status concernere dignoscuntur extra prioratum nostrum Ungarie cum omnibus et singulis etc. de consilio etc. ut in prioratu Lombardie continentur etc. sub annua responsione per vos nobis aut cui et ubi mandaverimus et
ordinaverimus in festo nativitatis Sancti Johannis baptisteannis singulis infallibiliter
exolvenda ex presento expresso et quibuscumque aliis oneribus etc. confirmamus et de
novo ad annos decem continuos et completos conferimus etc. Retento nobis et specialiter
reservato pro de una vel pluribus etc. A c etiam retentis et reservatis omnibus ordinationibus
per bone memorie fratrem Raymondum etc. Nichilominus retento et nobis reservato ut si
quod absit etc. dantis et concedentis vobis etc. Committentes vobis etc. Quocirca etc.
Inhibentes etc. Et si quod absit etc. Insuper per presentes revocamus omnes et singulos domus
nostre fratres et quosvis alios ad quevis negotia procuratores constituti. In cuius etc. Datum
Valentine supra Rodanum die xii mensis M artii A nno Ixxxij.

* * * 64.

1383. 03. 12. b A OM 322, fol. 292r-v

Frater Johannes Ferdiandi de Heredia et etc. generale capitulum celebrantes, Universis et
singulis dicte domus nostre prioribus castellanis, preceptoribus aliiis videlicet fratribus,
sororibus et donatis salutem etc. Considerantes merito curis assiduis et diligenti opere quibus
modis, viis et formis nostri Rodi conventus respiret et sublevetur ab onerosis noxiis et
dispendiosis periculis et premissi quibus quod dolenter referimus supponitur et substentari
valeat discussa deliberatione pensare circa salubrem et celerem expedicionem premissorum
no dictus magister cum dicte domus fratribus . . . procuratoribus dicti conventus ac fratribus ..
prioratum prioribus videlicet Campanie, A lvernie, Francie, Sancti Egidii, Tholose, Pisarum
et de Neapoli ac Sancte Trinitatis de Ven etai preceptoribus capitularibus necnon fratribus ..
prioratum A quitanie, A lamanie, Boemie, Lombardie et Venetiarum locumtenentibus
nunnulis aliiis fratribus preceptoribus et proceribus prioratum priorum et aliorum ad
sonum campane convenientibus in civitate Venetie supra Rodanum et in domo habitationis
nostre electa specialiter ad hoc congregatis unanimiter de voluntate et assensu prioratum
nome et vice totius religionis nostre priorum prioratum preceptorum preceptoriarum
suorum et aliorum subscriptorum absentium statuimus et ordinamus presentium tenore et
auctoritate presentis nostri generalis capituli quod omnis et singuli fratres, priores, castellani,
et preceptores suscripti scilicet supra nomine subveniant et solvatur in festo nativitatis beati
Johannis baptiste proxime sequente fratribus .. receptoribus in ipsis prioratibus deputatis pro
talhia imposita summam subscriptam pro cuius solutione efficaciter facienda priores et
preceptores presentes suorum prioratum et preceptoriarum nomine et aliorum prioratum
suorum absentium se obligationis modo sufficienti et valituro supplentem omnem defunctum
primis obligationis si quis intervenerit suppleri etiam ordinamus dominum Clementem papam
septimum venerabilem cum commune religionis proficium circa hac versetur ad quod fratres
omnes et singuli tenetur de debito ordinamus omnis et singulos religionis fratres
conventuales per eorum superiores, priores considerata ipsorum facultate taxari in premissis
et taxacionem ipsis impositam compelli solvere per omnem cohetionis modum; Et ut
imposita infrascripta talhia dicto exsolvatur termino infallibiliter ipsis fratribus, prioribus,
castellanis et preceptoribus non habentibus vel unde solvere quorum animas in hoc oneramus
fructus iura et emolumenta suarum camerarum et preceptoriarum absque prejudicio
responsoris obligandi et impignorandi ad certum tempus quibusvis personis securarius seu
ecclesiasticis harum serie potestate attributa; ex certa quippe tam fratres conventuales
prioratus vestri Sancti Egidii pro subventione ipsis talhie impositae per dominum priorem
conventualem et preceptorem M ontepessulani ordinamus taxari; ceterum ut prefatus

117Uncertain reading.
conventus oppressus pondere debitorum sub usurarum voragine ab huiusmodi libertur pressuris Statuimus et ordinamus quod de annis quatuor incohandis et proximo festo nativitatis Sancti Johannis baptister continuis de omnibus et singulis fructibus, bonis, iuribus, emolumentiis et omni valore omnium et singularum prioratum, castellaniarum, camerarum ipsorum preceptoriarum et beneficiorum quorum libritet nostre religionis fratum cis- et ultramarinorum durante dicto quadriennali tempore annuo quarta particionis thesauri religionis et ad ipsum pertineat ex tam solutionis suorum debitorum primitus et deducta annua responsione et aliis necessariis deductis de quorum valore fiat extimatio per fratres... priores et preceptores quatuor suas responsiones vestri solventes prescito prius per ipsos sacramento que premisse fideliter exequentur de quibus debita fratribus pro quarta parte debitorum annuo dicit quadrienni exsolventur; Si vero gueriarum impedimento seu divisione, electione fraternos infrascriptorum prioratum, castellaniarum et preceptorum non solverent, ob hoc se excusante lapso etiam dicto termino tailhias eisdem impositas et quemcumque pro eis debita communi thesauro quandocumque fieri poterit compellantur solvere neque longitudine temporis fuit liberi; Subsequentur prescriptis tailhia imposita fraternos Castellaniis, Emposte, Cathalonie, Castelle et Legonis, Portugalie et N avarre, priores et prioratus florenorum decem milia [10,000]; A nglie et Irlande priores et prioratus octo millia [8,000], priores et prioratus Francie sex milia [6,000], Campanie mille [1,000], A quitanie duo millia et quingentos [2,500], A Ivernie tria millia [3,000], Sancti Egidii quinque milia [5,000], Tholose tria milia [3,000], Ungarie mille [1,000], Bohemie mille ducentos [1,200], Capue septingentos [700], B arlete mille [1,000], V enetiarum octingentos [800], Lombardie octingentos [800], Urbis octingentos [800], P isarum octingentos [800], M essane quadringentos [400]; preceptores et preceptoriae Neapolis et Venese Neapolis octingentos [800], Sancte Eufemie sexcentos [600], Sancte Trinitatis Venuse trecentos [300], Sancte Stephani prope Monopolium quadringentos [400]; fraternos et donati residentes in regno Cipri duo millia [2,000]; Quocirca vobis omnibus et singulis dictorum prioratum et castellanie prioribus et castellano fratibus .. prioribus, preceptoriibus, fratibus .. sororibus et donatis quacumque dignitate vel officio fulgentibus districte precipiendo mandamus sub virtute sancte obedientie et sub pena destitutionis et privationis prioratum castellanie et preceptoriarum ut predicta statuta ordinata et omnia et singula in ipsis contenta immobilitatem observatis, dantes et concedentes vobis dictorum prioratum fratribus prioribus et castellano dicte domus frater preceptores et alios tailhias impositas prescriptas et quicumque tam ex responsionibus, arreragiis responsionum, mortuariis, vacatio nunca baiuliorum quam alius quibusvis causis et titulis debita et pervenire debentia communi religionis nostre thesauro solvere recusantes auctoritate, potestatem et licentiam compellendi per captiorem honorum, privationem et destitutionem baiuliarum et factura planta habitum domus nostre privationem personarum incarceracionem et detentionem et quemcumque alium dicte domus nostre cohortionis modum cum consilio et assensu fratrum preceptorum quattuor suorum baiuliorum responsiones et tailhias vestri solvere non obstantibus retentione aliqua de ipsis facta ad manus nostras oppositione, contradicione et appellazione quibuscumque; invocato etiam ad hoc premissa siopus fuerit auxilio brachii secularis. In cuius rei testimonium bulla nostra plumbea est appensa. Datum V alentie supra Rodanum durante generali capitulo die duocimero mensis M artii Anno incarnationis domini M illesimo Triecesimo octuagesimo secundo.

* * *

65.
1383. 03. 12.c AOM 322, fol. 252

Sub eisdem data modis et formis scriptis et registratis in prioratu Alvernie foliis Cxl et xli super taxactione talie imposite scriptum fuit et mandatum ac ?ssatum summam Mille florenorum solvi debere per priorem et prioratum Ungarie ut in dictis litteris continentur

* * *

66.

1383. 03. 12.d AOM 322, fol. 253

Die xii mensis martii commissum fuit priori Ungarie ut fratrem Petrum de Cassam receptum per ipsum in fratrem religionis ipso non decorato militie decoret cingulo militie ut in forma

* * *

67.

1383. 03. 12.d, AOM 322, f. 253

original text notified omission [etc.] non notified omission

Frater Johannes Ferdinandi de Heredia dei gratia Sacre domus hospitalis sancti Johannis Jerosolomitani magister humilis et pauperum Christi custos generale capitulum celebrantes Religioso in Christo nobis carissimo fratri Jacobo de Leone domus eiusdem Salutem et sinceram in domino caritatem propter suscipient de probitate vestra et administratione utili testimonium laudabiliter commendandum vobis ad gratiam redditi liberaliter preceptoriam seu baiuliæ Dubice seu comitatum Dubice prioratus nostre Ungarie per obitum fratris Albertini vel quocumque alio modo presentaliter vacantem et ad nostram dispositionem propter area rationabiliter devolutam cum omnibus et singulis membris iuris et pertinentii universis ad ipsam spectantibus et pertinentibus et spectare et pertinere debeatibus quoquomodo habendam, tenendam etc. Sub annua responsione et alis oneribus impositis et imponenti rationabiliter secundum communem cursum aliarum baiulliarum ipsius [Dubice] in capitulo generali dicte [Dubice] annis singulis, personis, loco et tempore ordinatis infallibiliter exolvendis A lias secundum continentiam et seriem statuti super deficientibus in repulsionem solutione suarum baiulliarum seu preceptoriarium editi in generali capitulo apud Avinionem de mense Martii anno sexagesimo sexto celebrato de premissa baiulii per religiosum in Christo nobis carissimum fratrem domus eiusdem dicte [Dubice] cum consilio quator fratum preceptorium iamdicte [Dubice] puta sufficienti, utili et ydoneo ad regimen baiulii seu iamdicte et qui illius responsiones et alia onera vestri solvat et supportet expresse precipimus provideri gratia huiusmodi de dicta baiulia vobis facta in aliquo non obstante de consilio et assensu religiosorum in Christo nobis carissimorum fratum Petri Bussoni prioris ecclesie conventualis Rodi, Hessonis Slegiligloz et Guillermy de Fontenayo de Spaliaco precceptoris et

118Edition: Dobronić, Viteški redovi, 170; Dobronić read Alemanie instead of Alvernie-t thus she could not find the record.
119Uncertain reading.
120Dobronić, Viteški redovi, 170.
121Dobronić, Viteški redovi, 170-171. Dobronić gives wrong foliation.
122In the original text: etc.
123Dobronić: Lenon.
124Dobronić: vostra.
125Dobronić: commitandum.
126Dobronić: Albertini servitii continentia etc.
procuratorum conventus Rodi ac fratrum .. Campanie, Francie, Sancti Egidii, Tholose et Pisarum prioratum priorum ac fratrum de Alemania, Neapoli, et Cipri, Johannis Flote Venusi preceptorum capullarium ac etiam prioratum Acquitanie, Alvernie, Venetiarum, Bohemie, et Lombardie locumtenitis, necon fratrum .. preceptorum et procerum nobis in hac parte assistentium de certa\textsuperscript{127} nostra scientia et speciali gratia requirentibus etiam nobis religiosis etc. fratribus .. M areschallo conventus Rodi nostro locumtenenti baiulivis, prioribus, preceptoribus et proceribus dicti nostri conventus hinc ad instans festum nativitatis Sancti Johannis baptiste proxime venturum et\textsuperscript{128} ab eodem festo in antea ad annos decem conferimus, concedimus et donamus beneficiando in eadem vosque preceptorem et commendatorum in dicta constitutis baiulia hac serie et etiam ordinamus committentes\textsuperscript{129} vobis etc. Quocirca univisversis et singulis fratribus, preceptoribus et baiulivis preceptoribus et baiulivis aliis fratribus, confribus, sororibus et donatis sub virtute sancte obedientie, ac hominibus ac vassallis et quibus alii nobis et domui nostri prefate subditis in dicto prioratu constitutis presentibus et futuris sub sacramento fideltatis et homagii quo nobis et nostre domui sunt astricti precipimus et mandamus harum serie districte ut vobis tamquam eorum superiori, prout priori et maiori reverenter parent, obedient et intendant vobisque suum preveant auxilium, consilium et favorem in omnibus que ad curam regimen et administrationem ac gubernacionem utilem prescripti prioratus pertinenti noscuntur quotiens opus fuerit et eos ductentis requiringos inhybentis vobis distintius sub dicta virtute Sancte obedientie. Necnon universis et singulis fratribus domus nostre quacumque auctoritate, dignitate vel officio fulgentibus presentibus et futuris ne contra presentium ratificationem, assavsem, donacionem et gratiam nostram non contra omnia et singula contenta in presentibus et quibus annexantur aliquatenus venire presuming quin ymo illas et illa stadeant inmolalibere observare iuxta eam continentiam, seriem et tenorem. A c fratri .. dicit prioratus priori seu predentis prefato ut vos vel procuratorem vestrum\textsuperscript{130} in possessionem corporalem pacificam et quietam dicte baiulie inducat et inductum conservet omni contractione remota, amota abinde quolibet allo detentore si quis sit quem nos per presentium amovem us et decernimus firmiter amovendum. Inhybentes\textsuperscript{131} vos distinctius sub dicta virtute Sancte obedientie; Ne pretextum donationis et gratie nostre huiusmodi tibi sacre aliqua de binis, rebus aut iuribus predictorum tenimentorum des vendas obliges, inignores, distrahas, alienes, permutes, seu memphiostim perpetuam concedas vel quocumque alio colore queso extra nostram religionem transferas sine nostra speciali licentia et mandato. Et si quod\textsuperscript{132} absit contra inhibitionem nostram huiusmodi aliquid vel aliqua operari vel facere te contingit illud et illa ex nunc prout extunct et extunct prout exnunc cassamus, annulamus, ac decernimus irritum et inane nullius quod existere penitus efficacie vel valoris. In cuius rei testimonium bullo nostra plumbea presentibus est appensa. Datum \textsc{Valentie supra Rodanum} durante generali capitulo die duoecimo mensis \textsc{M}artii \textsc{A}nno incarnationis domini Millesimo Trecentesimo octuagesimo secundo

\* \* \*

1383. 03. 12.e, AOM 322, f. 292r-v

Frater Johannes Ferdiandi de Heredia et etc. generale capitulum celebrantes, Universis et singulis dicte domus nostre prioribus castellanis, preceptoribus aliis videlicet fratribus, sororibus et donatis salutem etc. Considerantes merito curis assiduis et diligenti opere quibus modis, viis et formis nostri Rodi conventus respirote et sublevetur ab onerosis noxiis et

\textsuperscript{127}Dobronić: etiam.
\textsuperscript{128}Dobronić: -.
\textsuperscript{129}Dobronić: Committimus.
\textsuperscript{130}Dobronić: vostrum.
\textsuperscript{131}Dobronić: Inhibentes.
\textsuperscript{132}Dobronić: quidem.
dispendiosis periculis et premissis quibus quod dolenter referimus supponitur et substentari
doleat discussa deliberatione pensare circa salubrem et celerem expeditionem premissorum
nos dictus magister cum dicte domus fratribus... procuratoribus dicti conventus ac fratribus...
prioratum prioribus videlicet Campaniae, Alvernie, Franciae, Sancti Egidii, Tholose, Pisarum
et de Neapoli ac Sancte Trinitatis de V enuse preceptoribus capitularibus necon fratribus...
prioratum A quitane, A lamane, Boemie, Lombardiae et V enetiarum locumtenentibus
nonnullis aliiis fratribus preceptoribus et proceribus prioratum prioratum predictorum et aliorum ad
sonum campane convenientibus in civitate supra R odanum et in domo habitacionis
nostre electa specialiter ad hoc congregatis unanimitate de voluntate et assensu predictorum
nome et vice totius religionis nostre priorum prioratum preceptorium preceptoriarum
suorum et aliorum subscriptorum absentium statuimus et ordinamus presentium tenore et
auctoritate presentis nostri generalis capituli quod omnis et singuli fratres, priores, castellani,
et preceptores suscripti scilicet supra nomine subveniant et solvatur in festo nativitatis beati
J ohannis baptiste proxime sequeto [...] fratribus... receptoribus in ipsis prioratibus depupatissi
pro talhia imposita summam subscriptam pro cuius solutione efficaciter facienda priores et
preceptoris presentes suorum prioratum et preceptoriarum nomine et aliorum prioratum
suorum absentium se obligationis modo sufficienti et valituore supplentem omnem
deficientem primis obligationis si quis intervenirit supplere etiam ordinamus dominum
Clemente papa septimum vero cum commune religionis proficium circa hac versetur ad
quod fratres omnes et singuli tenentur de debito ordinamus omnis et singulos religionis
fratres conventuales per eorum superiores, priores considerata ipsorum facultate taxari in
premissis et taxacionem ispis impositam compelli solvere per omnum cohortionis modum; Et
ut imposita infrascripta talhia ditto exsolvatur termino infallibili ipsis fratribus, prioribus,
castellanis et preceptoribus non habentibus vel unde solvere quorum animas in hoc oneramus
fructus iura et emolumenta suarum camerarum et preceptoriarum absque preuidicio
responsionis obligandi et impignorandi ad certum tempus quibusvis personis secularibus seu
ecclesiastici harum serie potestate attributa; ex certa quippe tam fratres conventuales
prioratus vestri Sancti Egidii pro subventione ipsius talhie impositae per dominum priorum
conventualem et preceptorem M ontapessulani ordinamus taxari; ceterum ut prefatus
conventus oppressus pondere debitorum sub usurarum voragine ab huiusmodi liberetur
pressvis Statuimus et ordinamus quod de annis qvatvor incohandis, priores et preceptores
priores et preceptores qvatvor suas responsiones vestri solventes prescito prius per ipsos
sacramento que premissa fideliter exequentur de quibus debita fratribus pro quarta parte
debitorum annuo dictator quadrienni exsolvitor; Si vero gueriarum impedimento seu divisione,
electione fratres infrascriptorum prioratum, castellaniarum et preceptorum non solventem, ob
hoc se excusante lapso etiam dicto termino tailhias isdem impostas et quecumque per eos
deleta communis thesauro quandocumque fieri poterit compellentur solvere neque longitudine
temporis fuit liber; Subsequentur prescriptis talhia imposita fratres Catellaniis Emposte,
Cathaloniis, Castelle et Lagonis, Portugaliis et Navarre, priores et prioratus florenorum decem
milia [10,000]; A nglie et Irlande priores et prioratus octo millia [8,000], priores et prioratus
Francie sex millia [6,000], Campaniae mille [1,000], A quitane duo millia et quingentos
[2,500], Alvernie tria mille [3,000], Sancti Egidii quinque millia [5,000], Tholose tria millia
[3,000], Ungarie mille [1,000], Bohemie mille ducentos [1,200], Capue septeingentos [700],
Barlete mille [1,000], V enetiarum octingentos [800], Lombardie octingentos [800], Urbis
octingentos [800], Pisarum octingentos [800], Messane quadringentos [400]; preceptores et
preceptorior Neapolis octingentos [800], Sancte Eufemie sexgentos [600], Sancte Trinitatis
Venuse trecentos [300], Sancti Stephani prope Monopolium quadringentos [400]; frateres et
donati residentes in regno Cipri duo millia [2,000]; Quocirca vobis omnibus et singulis
dictorum prioratuum et castellanie prioribus et castellano fratribus .. prioribus, preceptoribus,
fratribus .. sororibus et donatis quacumque dignitate vel officio fulgentibus districte
precipiendo mandamus sub virtute sancte obedientie et sub pena destitutionis et privationis
prioratuum castellanie et preceptoriarum ut predicta statuta ordinata et omnia et singula in
ipsis contenta immolabiliter observatis, dantes et concedentes vobis dictorum prioratuum
fratribus prioribus et castellano dictae domus frateres preceptores et alios tailhias impositas
prescriptas et quicumque tam ex responsionibus, arreragiis responsionum, mortuarum,
vacationum baiularum quam aliis quibusvis causis et titulis debita et pervenire debentia
communi religionis nostre thesauru solvere recusatam auctoritatem, potestatem et licentiam
compellendi per captionem bonorum, privationem et destitutionem baiularum et facta planta
habituum domus nostre privationem personarum incarnationem et detentionem et
qucumque aliqui dicti domus nostre cohertionis modum cum consilio et assensu fratrum
preceptorum quavtor suarum baiularum responsiones et tailhias vestri solvere non
obstantibus retentione aliqui de ipsis facta ad manus nostras oppositione, contradictione et
appellatione quibusvis; invocato etiam ad hoc premissa si opus fuerit auxilio brachii
secularis. In cuius rei testimonium bulla nostra plumbea est appensa. Datum V alentia supra
Rodanum durante generali capitulo die duodecimo mensis M artii A nno incarnationis domini
M illesimo Trecentesimo octuagesimo secundo.

** **

69.

1384. 05. 23.a A OM 281, f. 37v

A marginális glossza szerint megerősítés/confirmatio (s nem kinevezés)!
original text notified omission [etc.] non notified omission

Frater Ricardus Caraczolus de Neapoli dei gratia sacre domus hospitalis sancti J ohannis
J erosolimitani magister humilis et pauperum Christi custos una cum fratribus nobis
assistentibus domus eiusdem in nostra Neapolitani ecclesia Sancti J ohannis in capitulo
generali capitulariter congregatis ad sonum Campane ut moris est capitulum celebrantes.
Religioso in Christo nobis carissimo fratri A rnoldo de Belmonte domus eiusdem preceptori
domorum nostrarum Dubize, Chero et Odarchel prioratus nostri A urane. Salutem et
sinceram -

Attendentes itaque quid in administratione dictarum
preceptoriarum prioratus nostri predicti es fructuosus laudabiliter et utiliter comprobatus. Igitur
preceptorias seu baiulias predictas tibi actenus iuste concessas cum omnibus et singulis earum
menbris in rebus et pertinentiis universis ad ipsas spectantibus et pertinentibus ac spectare et
pertinere de baiularibus quoquomodo habendas, tenendas, gubernandas, augmentandas et
meliorandas in spiritualibus et temporalibus tam in capite quam in membris sub annua
responsione et aliis oneribus importis et racionabiliter imponendis secundum cursum
aliorum prectoriarum seu baiularum prioratus predicti in capitulo provinciali prioratus
eiusdem per te annis singulis integre et infallibili exolvendis alias secundum continetian
et seriem statuti super deficientibus in repensionum solotione suarum baiularum seu
preceptoriarum editi in generali capitulo apud Avinionem de mense Martii anno sexagesimo sexto celebrato de premissis baiuliis seu preceptoriiis per religiosos in Christo nobis carissimos fratres domus eiusdem priorem prioratus nostri predicti et receptoris responsionum prioratus ipsius cum consilio quattuor fratrum preceptorum prioratus iamdidi suarum baiuliarm atque preceptoriarum responsiones vestri solvunt fratrum alicui nostre dicte domus prioratus prescripti puto sufficienti, utili et ydoneo ad regimen baiuliarm seu preceptoriarum iamdicturnarum et qui illarum responsiones et alia onera vestri solvat et supportet expresse precipimus provideri gratia huiusmodi tibi facta in aliquo non obstante. Invicem deliberato consilio de nostra certa scientia et speciali gratia atque auctoritate presentis generalis capituli ad annos decem tantummodo incipiendos in festo nativitatis beati Johannis Baptistae proxime venturi et extunc integre secuturos et completos tibi tamquam digno et benemerito auctoritate presens et nostri predicti generalis capituli confirmamus de novo gratiose concedimus et donamus beneficiando in eisdem et Teque preceptorem et commendatorem in dictis preceptorii seu baiulii constituimus harum serie et etiam ordinamus. Commitentes tibi fiducialiter circa curam, regimen et administrationem accomodam dictis preceptorii seu baiullii ac membrorem et iurium ipsius defensionem et recuperationem tam in agendo quam defendendo hac serie vices nostras. Quocirca universis et singulis fratribus, confratribus, sororibus et donatis sub virtute sancte obedientie ac hominibus et vassallis et quibusvis alis nos ab imis dictis preceptorii seu baiului constituitis presentibus et futuris sub sacramento fidelitiatis et homagii quod nobis et nostre domui sunt asstruti precipimus et mandamus ut tibi tamquam eorum superiori, preceptorii et maiori reverenter pareant, obediant et intendant tibique suum prebeant consilium, auxilium et favorem in omnibus concernentibus utilitatem dictis preceptorii seu baiuliis utilitatem supradictorum tenimentorum grancia atque menbrarum quociens opus fuerit et eos duexeris requiro nec non universis et singulis fratribus domus nostre quacumque auctoritate, dignitate vel officio fulgentibus presentibus et futuris ne contra hanc nostram confirmationem donacionem et gratiam aliquatenus venire presumant quin yno eam stadeant iuxta eius mensem et seriem inmolabiliter observare. Ammventes abinde quemlibet alium detentorem quem nos si quis ammovemus per presentes ac decernimus firmiter avvomendem. Inhibentes tibi districtus in virtute sancte obedientie supradicta, Ne pretextum donationis et gratie nostre huiusmodi tibi sacre aliqua de binis, rebus aut iuribus preceptorum tenimentorum des vendas obliges, impignores, distrahas, alienes, permutes, seu memphileosim perpetuum concessas vel quocumque alio colore quostio extra nostram religionem transferas sine nostra speciali licentia et mandato. Et si quod absit contra inhibitionem nostram huiusmodi aliquid vel aliqua operari vel facere te contingat illud et illa ex nunc prout extunc et extunc prout exnunc cassamus, annullamus, ac decernimus irritum et inane nullius quod existere penitus efficacie vel valoris. In cuius rei testimonium bulla nostra plumbea presentibus est appensa. Sine executore. Datum Neapoli die xxiiij mensis May A nno incarnationis domini M o CCC o L xxxiiij o

* * *

70.

1384. 05. 23.b A O M 271, fol. 37v

original text notifed omission [etc.] non notified omission

Frater Ricardus Caraccolzus de Neapoli dei gratia sacre domus hospitalis sancti Johannis Jeresolomitani magister humilis et pauperum Christi custos una cum fratribus nobis assistentibus domus eiusdem in nostra Neapolitani ecclesia Sancti Johannis in capitulo generali capiulariter congregatis ad somum Campane ut moris est capitulum celebrantes. Religioso in Christo nobis carissimo fratri Bauduno de M onte Iustino domus eiusdem preceptori domorum nostrarum Sancti M artini de Nascissa et Crasso ac Sancti Laurentii de Occor prioratus nostri Aurane.
Salutem et sinceram in domino caritatem. Extimamus digne agere et rationabiliter operari si quos meritum dulcedine se refectos conspiciunt honoratos ad queque nostre religionis accomoda industrie eorum studia iugiter ferventur convirent. Attendentes itaque quod in administratione dictarum preceptoriarum prioratus nostri predicti es fructuosus laudabiliter et utiliter comprobatus. Igitur preceptoriarum seu bauilias predictas tibi factenas iuste concessas cum omnibus et singulius earum membris in rebus et pertinentibus universis ad ipsas spectantibus et pertinentibus ac spectare et pertinere debentibus quoquammodo habendas, tenendas, gubernandas, augmentandas et meliorandas in spiritualibus et temporalibus tam in capite quam in membris sub annua responsione et aliis oneribus importis et rationableniim secundum curesm aliorum preceptoriarum seu bauiarum prioratus predicti in capitolo provinciali prioratus eiusdem per te annis singulis integre et infallibiliter exolvendi alias secundum continetian gen seriem statuti super deficiensibus in reponisionem solutione suarum bauiarum seu preceptoriarum editi in generali capitulo apud Avinionem de mense Martii anno sexagesimo sexto celebrato de premissis bauiiliis seu preceptoriis per religiosos in Christo nobis carissimos fratres domus eiusdem priorum prioratus nostri predicti et receptoris responsionum prioratus ipsius cum consilio quattuor fratrum preceptorum prioratus iamdidi suarum bauiarum atque preceptoriarum responsiones vestri solventium fratri aliqui nostro dicte domus prioratus prescripti puto sufficienti, utili et ydoneo ad regimen bauiarum seu preceptoriarum iamdidi et qui illarum responses et alia onera vestri solvat et supportet expresse precipimus providerit gratia huismodi tibi facta in aliquo non obstante. Invicem deliberato consilio de nostra certa scientia et speciali gratia atque auctoritate presentis generalis capituli ad annos decem tantummodo incipientios in festo nativitatis beati Johannis Baptistae proxime venturi et extunc integre secuturos et completos tibi tamquam digno et benemerito auctoritate presentium confirmamus et de uberiori dono gratie de novo conferimus, concedimus et donamus benefaciendo in eisdem. A c etiam tibi auctoritate presentium damus et concedimus facultatem et licentiam recuperandi possessionem Dobze sitam in priurato nostra predicti quod prout asseruit est in manibus secularium quam sit recuperatam tibi concedimus auctoritate presentium vita tua durante secundum statuta nostre religionis cum omnibus suis iuribus et pertinentiis universis. Teque preceptorem et commendatorem in dictis preceptoriis seu bauiiliis constituimus harum serie et etiam ordinamus. Committentes tibi fiducialiter circa curam, regimen et administrationem accomodam dictis preceptoriis seu bauiiliis ac membrorum et iurium ipsis defensionem et recuperationem tam in agendo quam defendendo hac serie vices nostras. Quocircum universis et singulis fratribus, confratribus, sororibus et donatis sub virtute sancte obedientie ac hominibus et vassallis et quibusvis aliiis nobis subditis in dictis preceptoriis seu bauiiliis constituitis presentibus et futuris sub sacramento fidelitatis et homaggi quo nobis et nostrae domui sunt astrutii principium et mandamus ut tibi tamquam eorum superiori, preceptori et maiori reverenter pareant, obediant et intendant tibique suum prebeant consilium, auxilium et favorem in omnibus concernentibus utilitatem dictis preceptoriis seu bauiiliis utilitatem supradictorum tenimentorum gracie atque membrarum quociensopus fuerit et eos duxeris requierendos necnon universis et singulis fratribus domus nostre quacumque auctoritate, dignitate vel officio fulgentibus presentibus et futuris ne contra hanc nostram confirmationem donacionem et gratiam aliquatenus venire presumant quin ymo eam stadeant iuxta eius mentem et seriem inmolabiliter observare. Ammoventes abinde quemlibet alium detentorem quem nos si quis ammovemos per presentes ac decemnium firmiter avvomendam. Inhibentes tibi districtus in vertute sancte obedientie supradicta, Ne pretextum donationis et gratie nostre huismodi tibi sacre aliqua de binis, rebus aut iuribus prectorum tenimentorum des vendas obliges, impignores, distrahas, alienes, permutes, seu memphiteosim perpetuo concedas vel quocumque alio colore quesito extra nostram religionem transferas sine nostra speciali licentia et mandato. Et si quod absit contra inhibitionem nostram huismodi aliquid vel aliqua operari vel facere te contingat illud et illa ex nunc prout extunc et extunc prout exnunc cassamus, annullamus, ac decemnium irriitum et inane nullius quod existere penitus efficacie vel valoris. In cuius rei testimonium bulla nostra plumbea presentibus est appensa. Sine
executore. Datum Neapoli die xxij mensis May A nno incarnationis domini M° CCC° Lxxxiiij\(^{133}\)

* * *

1385. 09. 09. AOM 24, nr. 11.

In nomine domini Amen. Anno nativitatis eisdem M illesimo trecentesimo octagesimo quinto indictione octava die nona mensis Septembris. Notum sit universis presen publicam instrumentum inspecturis [...]

et supradicto colore quod venerabiles viri fratres Palamides Johannes Rodi ammiratus et venetorum prior et Ranfortiatus de Castellana prior Ungarie tamquam procuratores ipsius magni magistri ut de procuratis constaret disserunt magistri Johannis quondam secundum Frederici de Sargnia imperiali auctoritati pro cuius nomine predicti magni magistri et totius conventus anno domini M illesimo trecentessimo\(^{133}\) die vicesima nona octobris in portu Rodi voluerunt et sponte ex certa scientia fuerunt contenti quod ipsi idem illustris dominus dux et eius consilium essent et esse deberent veri iudices, determinatores, declaratores pariter congrutores dicte litis, causis, causis et questionis et dominis nominibus promiserunt ratum et gratum habere et tenere omne totum et quicquid per dictum dominem ducem et eius consilium super predictis fuerit terminatur que predicte nullo modo venire sive aliqua fora quia favore quoque modo de iure vel de facto prout de predictis sit aliter et latius continetur patet subdictis anno, mensis et die magistri A ntonii secundum Francisci Santini de sacro imperiali auctoritati notarii pro eo quod dominus dux et eius consilium virtute dicte concesorii facto per predictos ammiratum et priorem Ungarie in dicta causa nullam habent vel habere possunt iurisdictionem vel notitiam, congrutionem ullam et maxime in preiudicium aliqua gravam aut icturam sacre domus predicte et dicti magni magistri baliviorum, procerum, priorum et fratrum predictorum et alium eorum causis, iuribus et rationibus inscriptis. Et primo quia predicti ammiratus et prior Ungarie non haberunt sufficientem mandatum ac concedendi potestatem predictam dicto domino ducis et eius consilio ut ex forma eorum magistrati colligetur evidenter secundum solum habuerunt mandatum ad obligandi bona Religionis predicte pro summa dicte pecunie eo causa quo dictus dux et eius consilium de iure congruo fient auditis utriusque partis rationibus dictam quantitatem eidem domino Carulo pertinere, debere et quo seu quibus et loco restituanda foret de iure solam ergo habuerunt potentiam obligandi bona Religionis postquam congrutum foret de iure cui et in quo loco esset dictam pecuniam restituenda precedere ergo congrutio? iuris dictam obligationem et non sequi unde dictam obligationem fuit est nulla tamquam factura directo contra formam mandati.

Item commissio et congrutionis facta in dominum ducem predictum et eius consilium similiter fuit et est nulla quia ad faciendi ipsam nullum habuerunt mandatum, constat secundum magistrato palatii non iudices eligere nec non iurisdictionis judicium prorega? ut iura sunt? ex canonis?.

Item posto pro costanti secundum? preiudicio quod predicti ammiratus et prior Ungarie habuissent potestatem predictum quod negatur omnino tamen concessio potestatis predicte fuit extra nulla funditus ipso iure pluribus dicta? primo quia fuit facta absentis dicto domino ducet et eius consilio tam per se quam per personam representante eosdem aut alterum ipsorum et absentis dicto domino Carulo et sociis eius unde unum ex tali concessione nullum ius iurisdictionale aut congrutionale potest dici quaesitum dictis domino ducet et eius consilio

---

\(^{133}\)The year has been omitted.
et si quaesitum esset negatur non essent quaesitum inrevocabiliter immo penitentie locus esset negatur ad liitis concessionem. Et imo si et in quantum quaesitum esset dicti procuratori et sindici, instituti et substituti dictis nominibus omnimodo  iure et forma quibus melius possunt revocavit et tamquam penitentes expresse declarant quod nolunt litigare aut contendere ullo modo coram dictis domino duce et eius consilio occasione predicta dicte summe florenorum et maxime quia si vellent non possent obstantibus canoniciis sanctionibus dispomentis quod clerici omnis processus fuit, est et esset ipso iure veratiis? et in anis? Item quia aut dicti dominus dux et eius consilium virtute dictae concessionis volunt de dicta causa cognoscere [!] tamquam iudices vel ordinarii vel delegati hoc in posibiles cum sint laici, laic us in clerico? nulla sit actus buta? potestas aut tamquam arbitri similiter hoc impossibile quia dicta concessio facta fuit tamen per ammiratum et priorem Ungarie non autem per dictum dominum Carolum vel alium ex partis altera compromittantem. Constat autem arbitrerem non subesse nisi utriusque litigatorum firmetur assensu. A ut volunt congronsere tamquam arbitres similiter impossible quia per concessionem que sit in arbitratorem contrahitur per ipsos concedentes. Constat autem inter absentis non intervenientis numptio? vel epistola contrahi non posse ...  

1386. 05. 23. AOM 281, fol. 86r-v

Frater Riccardus Caraczolus de Neapoli dei gratia sacre domus hospitalis sancti Johannis Jerosolomitanii magister humilis et pauperum Christi custos una cum fratibus nobis assistentibus domus eiusdem. Religiosis in Christo nobis carissimis fratri domus eiusdem locumtenenti prioris prioratus nostri Anglie ac preceptoribus prioratus eiusdem ad quos presentes pervenerunt seu certa notitia eorumdem. Cum sanctissimus in Christo pater et dominus noster dominus Urbanus divina providentia papa sextus reverendissimus pater et dominus dominus Nycolaus miseratione divina tituli Sancti Ciriaci sacrosancte Romani ecclesie presbyter cardinalis nostre religionis protector, corrector et reformator ab eodem domino nostro papa specialiter deputatus nobis vive vocis oraculo mandaveritis et invinxeritis134 ut capitulum generale una cum singulis prioribus preceptoribus et fratibus domus nostre dicto domino nostro et nobis subjectis quibus interest seu interesse poteritis quoquo modo propter nonnulla nostra et nostre religionis negotia in Christo supplicatio divina favente clementia pro bono statu ipsius nostre religionis ad quam prefatus sanctissimus dominus noster speciali devotione affiatur salubriter ordinanda et necessaria reformanda celebrare curaremus. Nos igitur volentes procedere ut temen premissa135 Debite executioni demanding et accendentes quod prior prioratus nostri predicti propter certa et legita negotia quibus preseditus est eidem capitulo persona ommoder commonde non poterit interesse te locumtenentem ipsius prioris predictum auctoritate presentium requirimus, movemus et hortamur attentios vobisque nichilominus et vestrum cuilibet in virtute sancte obedientie et sub pena suspensionis a vestris administrationibus distincte precise et permptit precipiendo mandamus quatenus cum tribus fratibus ipsius prioratus subjectis preceptoribus per vos eligendis qui de statu ipsorum prioratum plenariae fuit informati ac eadem auctoriitate requirendis, movemis ad infrascripta et hortandis quos nos etc. exnunc sub pena et virtute predictis requirimus, movemus et hortamur Janue vel alibi ubi cunctis dominum nostrum papam cum sua curia redidere contingent in festo omnium sanctorum de mense

134 Infixeritis
135 In the original text it reads only ut supra.
Novembris proxime venturi personaliter legi tim impedimento cessante alias per procuratores legitimos fratres domus nostre ydoneos cum pleno mandato specialiter ad supra et infrascripta studeatis remoto cuislibet difficultatis obstaculo convenire Responsor es quoque singulas arreragias, spolia et alia quecumque nobis et thesauro nostro debitas et debita ac plenam informationem de statu et circumstanciis ipsorum prioratum ad ipsum capitulum vobiscum si tute fieri poterit apportetis seu per fidem procuratorem et nuncium destinare curetis ipsum generale capitulum legitime celebraturi, disposituri et ordinarii aliqua scitur ad reformationem nostre religionis prout in quibusdam vestris citatoris super huiusmodi generalis capituli celebracione per dictum dominum cardinali emanatis plenius, seriosius emanantur. Alioquin conra vos et vestrum quemlibet inobedientie seu rebellion ac premissa iuxta dicti dominum cardinali et nostri huiusmodi mandata ad implore no curatis ad graviora procedemus prout secundum nostre religionis statuta dictaveratis ordo racionis. In cuius rei etc.\textsuperscript{136} Data Janue die decima mensis Aprilis lxxxvi sexto\textsuperscript{137}

Et in simili forma fratri Johanni Johannis de Polisna gubernatori prioratus Aurane, cum quatuor vel tribus fratribus etc. sub data Janue die xxiii Maii Lxxvj 73.

1386. 06. 15. A OM 281, fol. 92\textsuperscript{v} original text notified omission [etc.]

Noverint universi et singuli presentem procurationis constitutionem visuri et audituri, quod nos frater Riccardus una cum fratribus. Confisi de fidei legalitate et circumspectionis industria. Religiosi in christo nobis carissimi fratis Gerardi Cornuti domus eiusdem preceptorii domorum nostrarum de Gora et de Doubixe prioratus nostri A urane eumdem fratem Gerardum presentem at acceptatem tenore presentium omnibus melioribus vestra iure nostro causa et forma quibus melius et efficacius pro nostra et nostre religionis utilitate possimus et debemus de nostra certa scientia facimus, constituiimus, creamus et solempniter ordinamus nostrum et nostre dicte domus procuratorem, actorem, factorem, negotiorumque gestorem, responsiorumque receptorem, sindicum yconomie et nuncium specialem et generalem ita tamen quod generalitas specialitati non derogetis nec econtra ad petendum, exigendum, recuperandum, recipiendum, et tenendum nostro et nostre dicte domus procurationis nomine atque vice cameram nostram prioratus nostri A urane sive Ungarie predicti et etiam prioratum ipsum si fuerit oportunum. Necnon ad petendum, exigendum, et recipiendum quo supra nomine omnes et singulas responsiones et arreragias responseionum omnium et singularum preceptoriarum, bauiularum et domorum aliarm quaramcumque prioratus nostri prefati quegoq pensiones sive pecunias camere nostro antedicie tam de preterito tempore quam de presenti et futuro [a fratre Gerardo Cornuti] preceptore dictarum domorum et ab alis quibuscumque personis religiosis ecclesiasticis vel secularibus cuiuscumque status dignitatis sive conditionis existat quorum interest seu interesse poterit coniunctum vel divisum quolibet in futurum. Necnon ad audiendum et calculandum computa predictorum nomine quo supra tam de introitu quam exitu ipsius prioratus seu preceptorie antedicie. Et ad compellendum, corrigendum, restringendum predictos ad solvendum omnia et singula que nobis et thesauro nostro treatur quoqueque nomine censeantur tam de preterito tempore quam presenti et futuro et de receptis finem, quitionem et apodissas perpetuo valituras nostro nomine et pactu de valiturs non petendo faciandum, Rebelles quoque et inobedientes

\textsuperscript{136} In the original text it reads only: etc. ut supra.

\textsuperscript{137} In the original text it reads only: ut supra.
et solvere per eos debita et debenda recusantes et in aliis quibuscumque casibus culpabiles ad ipsius presentiam evocandum et eum seu eos secundum statuta et consuetudines nostrae Religionis etiam puniendum per iustitiam dicte domus nostrae. Invocato ad hoc si opus fuerit brachio ecclesiastico vel securi seu eum vel eos nostras presentiam transmittiendi et ipsum prioratum seu preceptoriam ad manus nostras retinendi quosque alteri ydnoneo et benemero di ipso vel ipsa duxerimus providendii dantes et concedentes eidem fratri [Gerardo nostro procuratori predicto] plenam et liberam potestatem et auctoritatem cum plena libera et generali administratio ne secesse fuerit pro premisis et eorum singulis agendi vel causandi toris quoscumque. Indite ecclesiastico vel securi contra quascumque personas religiosas ecclesiasticas vel mundanas sua interesse credentes conjunctum vel divisum lus vimque defendendi libellum seu libellos et petitiones alias quascumque dandi et recipiendi etc. procuratorem seu procuratores ad lites et causas tantummodo loco sui substituendi et eum seu eos etc. Et generali omnia alia et singula faciendo, excendi, et procurandi in premisis quam quilibet verus, ydnoneus visitator et corrector et procurator facere potest et debet et qui nos inet ispi facere possemus si personaliter interessemus etiam si talia sint qui exigerent mandatum propertiae speciale promittentes ratum, gratum et firmum habere perpetuo et tenere quitquid per dictum nostrum procurationem, visitationem et correctionem, actum, factum, gestum sive procuratum fuerit in premisis et quilibet premessorum ac iudicio sistt e iudicatum solvi sub ypotheca et obligatione omnium bonorum nostrorum presentium pariter et futurorum. Mandantes per presentes fratri [Gerardo preceptorii predicto] ac universis et singulis fratibus confratribus, sororibus et donatis sub virtute sancte obedientie ac hominibus et vassallis et quisquis aliis nobis subditis in dictis preceptorii seu baiuliis constitutis presentibus et futuris sub sacramento fidelitatis et homaggi quo nobis et nostre domui sunt astricti. Necnon universis et singulis fratibus domus nostre quacumque auctoritate, dignitate vel officio fulgentibus presentibus et futuris non contra hanc nostram confirmationem donacionem et gratiam aliquatenus venire presumant quin ymo eam stadeant iuxta eius mentem et seriem inmolabiliter observare. Rursum si fratri [Gerardo] preceptorii predicto ad nostram presentiam insimul venire contingerit damus licentiam eisdem quod ipsi alrei regimen et gubernationem ipsius prioratus seu preceptorie ydoneoe valeat usque ad eorum seu alterum ipsorum redditum committere fidicialiter et commendare. Inhibentes fratri [Gerardo nostro procuratorii] predicto sub virtute sancte obedientie ne auctoritate predictam aliquatenus in fratrem seu confratrem domus nostre recipiat seu recipere possit nec alius lecetiam faciendo tribuat sine nostra speciali licentia et mandato. Et si quod absis contra inhibitionem nostram huiusmodi aliquid vel aliqua operari vel facere te contingat illud et illa ex nunc prout extunc et extunc prou exnunc cassamus, annullamus, ac decernimus irrum et inane nullius quod existere pentus efficacie et valoris. In cuius rei testimonium bulla nostra plumbea presentibus est appensa.\textsuperscript{138} Datum Janue die xv mensis Junii Anno lxxxvi

\textsuperscript{138}In the original text it reads only: ut in forma.
studia iugiter ferventiora convertunt. Invicem deliberato consilio de nostra certa scientia et speciali
gratia atque auctoritate presentis generalis capituli ad x annos tantummodo incipiendos in festo
nativitatis Joannis Baptistae proxime venturi et extunc integre secutos et completos tibi
confirmamus et de novo concedimus et donamus beneficiando in eisdem et Teque preceptorem et
commendatorem in dictis preceptoriis seu bailliis constitutum harum serie et etiam ordinamus.
Committentes tibi fiducialiter circa curam, regimen et administrationem accomodam dictis preceptoriis
seu bailliis ac membrorum et iurium ipsius defensionem et recuperationem tam in agendo quam
defendendo hac serie vices nostras. Quocirca universis et singulis fratribus, confratribus, sororibus et
donatis sub virtute sancte obedientie ac hominibus et vassallis et quibusvis alius nobis subditis in dictis
preceptoriis seu bailliis constitutis presentibus et futuris sub sacramento fidelitatis et homagii quo nobis
et nostre domui sunt asstruti precipimus et mandamus ut tibi tamquam eorum superiori, preceptori et
maiori reverenter pareant, obediant et intendant tibique suum prebeant consilium, auxilium et favorem
in omnibus concernentibus utilitate dictis preceptoriis seu bailliis utilitatem supradictorum
tenimentorum grancia atque menbrarum quociens opus fuerit et eos duxeris requirere necnon
universis et singulis fratribus domus nostre quacumque auctoritate, dignitate vel officio fulgentibus
presentibus et futuris ne contra hanc nostram confirmationem donacionem et gratiam aliquatenus
venire presumant quin ymo eam stadeant iuxta eius mentem et seriem inmolabilitatem observare.
Ammoventes abinde quemlibet alium detentorem quem nos si quis avmovemus per presentes ac
decernimus firmiter avvemendum. Inhibentes tibi districtus in virtute sancte obedientie supradicta, Ne
pretextum donationis et gratie nostre homini tibi sacre aliquia de binis, rebus aus iuribus predictorum
tenimentorum des vendas obliges, impignores, distrahas, alienes, permutes, suo memphileosim
perpetuam concedas vel quocumque alio colore queso extra nostram religionem transferas sine
nostro speciali licentia et mandato. Et si quod abit contra inhibitionem nostram homini aliquid vel
aliqua operari vel facere te contingat illud et illa ex nunc prout extunc et extunc prout ex nunc cassamus,
anullamus, ac decernimus irritum et inane nullius quod existere penitus efficacie vel valoris. In cius
rei testimonium bulla nostra plumbea presentibus est appensa. Datum Janue die ii mensis Julii
A nno Ixxxvj

***

75.

1392. 02. 05. A O M 325, f. 61v-62r

Frater Johannes etc. Religiosis etc. fratribus.. nostri locumtenentis in ultramarinis baillivis,
prioribus et procuratoribus nostri Rodi conventus omnibus et singulis eisdem salutem et
sinceram in domino caritatem. Cum prout sumus plenarie et veridice informati dicte domus
frater Barraxius de Barrax ad nostrum conventum cum equis et armis et in statu detenti
secundum statuta nostro religionis accesserit tempore predecessorum nostri fratris Berengarii
eisdem licentia a dicto conventu ad prioratum Ungarie in communia quondam fratri
Raymundi de Bellomonte etiam partes alias cismarinas se contulerit in eis residens quosque
ad dictum conventum deo et religione servitutem de nostra licentia nuper accessit spe
condigne retributionis dominum casus occurret fieri quod decet et conseguiet in religione nostra
ex debito ipsius professeores fratres antiquiores et potiores meritis ad honores et regimina
preteritis provehi et assumi horrum consideratione vos et vestrum quemlibet hortandos
duximus et volumus vosque mandamus tenore presentium quatenus dictum fratrem
Barraxium de Barrax ad eus antiquitatem a dicto tempore predictus Rodum ut prefertur
accessit admittere curates seu admittere faciatis suis suffragantibus meritis ad honores
emolumenta et onera sibi pertinere debentia in premissement non obstantibus contrariis
quibuscumque Sic vos et quemlibet vestrum super hoc habiturum que dictus frater Barraxius
merito contentetur. Data A vinione die quinta mensis Februarii anno quo supra nonagesimo primo.
1. Székesfehérvár Hospitaller commandery; 1265, BTM 64.60. Ø 55 mm

2. Székesfehérvár Hospitaller commandery; 1486, MTA MKI 28068, Ø 55 mm

3. Székesfehérvár commandery; 1500, BTM 64.873, Ø 55 mm

4. Székesfehérvár commandery; 1524, BTM 64.60. Ø 55 mm

5. Regular canons of St. Stephen of Budafelhévíz, 1290, MTA MKI 28240, Ø 40 mm
+S. FRATRUM DOMVS HOSPITALIS SANCTI REGIS HUNGARIE

6. Regular canons of St. Stephen of Budafelhévíz, 1309, 1341, MTA MKI 58, 114, Ø 40 mm
+S. FRATRUM DOMVS HOSPITALIS SANCTI REGIS HUNGARIE
7. Székesfehérvár commandery; 1325, BTM 64.230, 44×27 mm

8. Székesfehérvár collegiate chapter, 1328, BTM 65.1854, 53×29
+S. MEMORIAE CAPITVLI EC[C]L[ES]IE ALBENSIS

9. Újudvar Hospitaller commandery; 1307, BTM 64.175, Ø 48 mm
+S. CONVENTUS CRUCIFERORUM DE NOVA CURIA

10. Gérard vicepreceptor of Újudvar; 1266, BTM 64.188, Ø 28 mm
+S. FRA[... ]

11. Sopron Hospitaller commandery; 1310
GY M SM L DI. 47, Ø 30 mm,
+S. DOM[US] CR[VCIFERORUM IN SVPRONIO

12. Sopron Hospitaller commandery; 1325–1347,
GY M SM L DI. 82, 84, 85, 115, 135, 136; Ø 30 mm
+S. DOM[US] CRVCIFERORUM IN SVPRONIO
13. John, Hospitaller commander of Sopron; 1302, 1307, GYM SM L Dl. 35, 38 Ø 30 mm +S. FRATER IOHANNIS

14. Giovanni Latini de Perugia, viceprior of H-Sl and commander of Sopron; 1346, GYM SM L Dl. 135, Ø 20 mm +S. FRAT[ER?] IOHANNIS

15. John, Hospitaller Prior of Hungary; 1226, Abbey of Pannonhalma Capsa 31, +S. PRIORIS VNGARIE HOSPITALIS

16. Raymond de Beamont; 1374, BTM 64.411, Ø c.40 mm +S. PRIORATUS HOSPITALIS [SANCTI] [H]OA[NN]I[S HUNGARIE] ET SCLAVONIE

17. John of Palisna Jr. Prior of Bela?, 1395-1405; BTM 64.766, Ø c.18 mm
APPENDIX D

MEASURES OF WEIGHTS (14TH CENTURY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mark</th>
<th>ferto</th>
<th>pondus</th>
<th>pensa</th>
<th>denarius</th>
<th>grossus</th>
<th>grams of silver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>245,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ferto</td>
<td>¼</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>61,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pondus</td>
<td>1/48</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pensa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30 or 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denarius</td>
<td>1/504</td>
<td>1/60</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***

PROVINCIAL CHAPTERS OF THE HUNGARIAN-SLAVONIAN PRIORY

1274. 10. 06. or before
1275. 00. 00. Csurgó
1293. 03. 23. Čičan (?)
1304. 01. 13. Bela (?)
1312. 02. 11. K araševo (?)
1314. 03. 27. Dubica
1315. 01. 11. Našice (?)
1320. 04. 24. Gyánt
1321. 04. 09. Possegaria
1323. 11. 19. Našice (?)
1324. 05. 29. before ?
1326. 04. 24–05. 22. Pakrac
1327. 06. 03. Gora
1329. 11. 25. Csurgó
1336. 12. 06. Bela
1339. 12. 09. Csurgó (?)
1340. 05. 31. Vrana
1344. 08. 08. Pakrac
1345. 04. 24. Szenta
1350. 01. 16. Vrana
1353. 04. 12. Dubica
1353. 05. 17. Gora
1357. 05. 25. Dubica (?)
1360. 09. 12. Pakrac or Dubica
1361. 06. 24. Dubica
1367. 05. 22. Pakrac
1374. 09. 08. Csurgó

***
Accumulation of preceptories, 1348-1378

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gora</th>
<th>Sopron</th>
<th>Dubica</th>
<th>Mostanica</th>
<th>Szfv</th>
<th>Gyánt</th>
<th>Krassó</th>
<th>Újudvar</th>
<th>viceprior</th>
<th>Bela</th>
<th>Božjakov.</th>
<th>Csurgó</th>
<th>Glogonca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lay-out of the building-complex of the Székesfehérvár Hospitaller preceptory
(Source: Gyula Siklósi, Adattár Székesfehérvár középkori és törökkori építészeteiről [Repertory on the Architecture of Székesfehérvár in the Middle Ages and during the Turkish Occupation] (Székesfehérvár: Megyei Művelődési Központ, 1990), 83.
APPENDIX E

Acre (Akko, Israel)  Kápolna (Croatia)
Adony (Tiszadony, Hungary)  Keresztény–Christiana (Egyházasfalu, Hungary)
Amalfi (Italy)  Kesztelc (Tolna county, Hungary)
Antalya (Turkey)  Kós island (Greece)
Aracsca (nearby Hene and Fir, Hungary)  Kosučica (Košutarcica, Croatia)
Arad (Romania)  Köszeg (Hungary)
Babót (Babót, Hungary)  Kraso (Karaševi, Croatia)
Baráti (Sopron county, Hungary)  Lendva (Lendava, Slovenia)
Beaune (France)  Lesniča (Lesník, Croatia)
Bekcsehely (Becsehely, Hungary)  Limassol (Cyprus)
Bela (Bela, Croatia)  Luba (Ljubač, Croatia)
Bérény (Nógrád county, Hungary)  Lucca (Italy)
Boisé (Bojišće, Croatia)  Ljudbreg (Croatia)
Bologna (Italy)  Manosque (France)
Borsosberény (Hungary) Margať (al-Markab, Syria)
Bó (Sopron county (now in Vas), Hungary) Margsziget (Budapest, Hungary)
Brindisi (Italy)  Mirisló (Miruslau, Romania)
Buda (Budapest, Hungary)  Mohács (Hungary)
Budafelhévíz (Budapest, Hungary)  Montpellier (France)
Carašo (Karystos, Greece)  Mostanica (Moštanica, Croatia)
Cassia (Košice, Slovakia) Nagykároly (Carei, Romania)
Crac de Chevalier, castle (Hisn al-Akrad, Syria)  Nagyszombat (Tyrnava, Slovakia)
Csáktonya (Čaklovec, Croatia)  Naples (Italy)
Csicsán (Čiće, Croatia)  Nekcseszentmárton (Našice-Martin, Croatia)
Csurgó (Somogy county, Hungary)  Padua (Italy)
Dada (Kaposdáda, Hungary)  Pakrac (Croatia)
Darnóc (Slatinski Drenovac, Croatia)  Pannonhalma (Hungary)
Dobsza (Dopsin, Croatia)  Pécs (Baranya county, Hungary)
Dua Lamec (France)  Perugia (Italy)
Dubica (Dubica county, Croatia)  Poitiers (France)
Pécs (Baranya county, Hungary)  Pozsony (Bratislava, Slovakia)
Eger (Heves county, Hungary)  Prague (Czech Republic)
Esztergom (Hungary)  Pula (Croatia)
Fadd (Hungary)  Radna (Rodna, Romania)
Florence (Italy)  Rasosa (Rasošča, Croatia)
Földvár (Dunaföldvár, Hungary)  Rottweil (Switzerland)
Freiburg-im-Breisgau (Germany)  Rozgony (Rozhanovce, Slovakia)
Genoa (Italy)  Sacile (Italy)
Glogovnica (Ivanec Vojakovički, Croatia)  Scardona (Skradin, Croatia)
Gora (Gora, Croatia)  Segesd (Alsó- and Felsősegesd, Hungary)
Gragnana (Grignano, Italy)  Selény (Croatia)
Gyánt (Alsógyánt, Hungary)  Siena (Italy)
Györ (Hungary)  Szentiván (Ivanec, Croatia)
Hresztva (Hresno, Croatia)  Sopron (Hungary)
Ivanec (Vojakovički, Croatia)  Somogyvár (Hungary)
Jadra–Zara (Zadar, Croatia)  Szalacs (Salacea, Romania)
Jászó (Jásov, Slovakia)  Székesfehérvár (Hungary)
Jenő (Diósjenő, Hungary)  Szekszárd (Hungary)
Jerusalem (Israel)  Szentiván (Ivanec, Croatia)
Kalocsa (Hungary)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Szentiván</td>
<td>Trnava, Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szentlőrinc</td>
<td>Okur, Okriszentlőrinc, Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szentmárton</td>
<td>Božjakovina, Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sziráki</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szomolya</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapolca–Toplica</td>
<td>Esztergom, Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temeszvár</td>
<td>Timișoara, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teruel</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolmács</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torda</td>
<td>Turda, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toulouse</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trau</td>
<td>Trogir, Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trnava–Tornava</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udvarhely</td>
<td>Somogyudvarhely, Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Újudvar</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Újvár–Németújvár</td>
<td>Güssing, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence-sur-Rhône</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valletta</td>
<td>Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Várad</td>
<td>Oradea, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varasd</td>
<td>Bonyhádvarasd, Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veszend</td>
<td>Veszprém, Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veszprém</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viena</td>
<td>Venice, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vrana</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zadar</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zádány</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zara</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zdeljá</td>
<td>Ždala, Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelinaszentmárton</td>
<td>Božjakovina, Croatia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>