

The Titles of the Hungarian Royal Family in the Light of Hungarian and Papal Sources in the First Half of the Thirteenth Century¹

GÁBOR BARABÁS

The paper examines the charters of the Hungarian kings, queens and princes, as well as the papal sources from the first half of the thirteenth century to present a summary about the use of titles of the members of the royal family. This means that we aim to analyse the *intitulationes* and *insriptiones* of the charters and other sources. This survey can lead to a double result: on the one hand we can get more information on the division of power among the members of the Arpadian dynasty, on the other hand we can have an insight into a field of papal-Hungarian relations hitherto not studied. Undoubtedly, the papal chancellery had its weak points, especially in the daily routine² but we can assume that the addressing of rulers required a greater punctuality concerning their titles. Therefore, we shall analyse how the titles of the members of the Hungarian royal dynasty were used, and compare this practice with the formulae of papal sources in the era selected (1198–1241).³

Since diversity is mostly the characteristic of the charters of the royal dukes, first we have to examine the question what is to be understood by the title duke (*dux*) in thirteenth century Hungary, and second, what kind of territorial division of power could be found among the Arpadians. In the first centuries of Medieval Hungary the title duke could be used only by the male members of the royal fami-

¹ Research for this article was supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Found (OTKA NN 109690). I am grateful to Professor Endre Sashalmi for the correction of the text.

² Cf. O. Hageneder, *Die geistliche Gerichtsbarkeit in Ober- und Niederösterreich. Von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn des 15. Jahrhunderts*. Linz 1967. 59–60. J. Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*. London 1995, 139. P. Herde, "Zur päpstlichen Delegationsgerichtsbarkeit im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonische Abteilung* 119 (2002), 23. L. Falkenstein, Appellationen an den Papst und Delegationsgerichtsbarkeit am Beispiel Alexanders III und Heinrichs von Frankreich, *Zeitschrift der Kirchengeschichte* 97 (1986), 55–56.

³ The selection of the period can be justified from both sides. The pontificates of Innocent III (1198–1216), Honorius III (1216–1227) and Gregory IX (1227–1241) make the time span from the papal side, while the Mongol invasion itself was a significant caesura in Hungarian history, which makes it well-founded to draw the line here. The death of duke Coloman in 1241 also verifies this choice, since his person concerning our basic question, as we will illustrate it later, is quite controversial in the present historical discussion.

ly and it could be bound to a territorial sovereignty of a certain level,⁴ although not necessarily.⁵ At the same time, we have to emphasise that the duchies of the thirteenth century are not direct descendants of the of the 11th century duchies (*ducatus*). This can be proven, for instance, by the location of territories comprising the duchies: instead of Nyitra (Nitra) and Bihar⁶ the dukes ruled Slavonia (with Croatia and Dalmatia) and Transylvania. The *ducatus* of the eleventh century was after all terminated by king Coloman the Learned.⁷

Back to the essence of our analysis we have to point out that we examine only those members of the royal family from whom we possess charters of their own. Among the queens this applies solely to Yolanda de Courtenay,⁸ the second wife of King Andrew II (1205–1235),⁹ while regarding the sons of the kings, the princes,¹⁰ we analyse the charters of Andrew II and Béla IV (1235–1270) which they issued as princes, as well as the deeds of Coloman, the second son of Andrew. We do not draw into the research either the child of Emery (1196–1204), Ladislaus III (1204–1205), or the third son of Andrew II with the same name, since there are no sources issued by them which have come down onto us.

Before starting the analysis of the selected material we have to introduce briefly the literacy of the Roman Holy See and the Hungarian Royal Chancellery. We think it important to note, that we do not consider a determining factor the genre of sources, namely, whether they belong to the group of charters or letters.¹¹ For us it is far more important what formulae were used by them. The *stilus curiae* used in

⁴ See A. Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és alattvalóik. Magyarország története 1301-ig* [The Arpadians and their Subjects]. Debrecen 1997, 74–79.

⁵ The territorially separated rule, however, increases the possibility that there are sources from or about a particular member of the royal family.

⁶ For the *ducatus* of the eleventh century see Gy. Györffy, “A magyar nemzetségtől a vármegyéig, a törzstől az orszáig I–II,” [From Hungarian Clan to County, from Tribe to Country I–II] *Századok* 92 (1958), 47–55. Gy. Kristó, *A XI századi hercegség története Magyarországon*. [The History of the Duchy in the 11th Century Hungary] Budapest 1974. F. Makk, *Hercegség*, in Gy. Kristó – P. Engel – F. Makk, ed. *Korai Magyar Történeti Lexikon*, Budapest 1994. (henceforth: KMTL) 261. D. Bagi, “Egy barátság vége. Álmos 1106. évi alávetése és az Árpádok korai dinasztikus konfliktusai,” [The End of a Friendship. The Subjection of Álmos in 1106 the Early Dynastic Conflicts of the Árpáds] *Századok* 147 (2013), 399–408.

⁷ Bagi, “Egy barátság vége”, 381–382.

⁸ A. Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik. A királynéi intézmény az Árpádok korában*. [The Arpadians and their Wives. The Institution of the Queenship in the Arpadian-era] Budapest 2005, 190.

⁹ The wife of King Emery, Constantia and Maria, the queen of Béla IV do not belong to our topic according to these criteria.

¹⁰ Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és alattvalóik*, 74–79.

¹¹ Cf. P. Herde, *Beiträge zum päpstlichen Kanzlei- und Urkundenwesen im 13. Jahrhundert*. (Münchener Historische Studien, Abteilung Geschichtliche Hilfswissenschaften) München 1967, 57–71. Th. Frenz, *Papsturkunden des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*. Stuttgart 1986, 15–24. Ch. Egger, “*Littera patens, littera clausa, cedula interclusa*. Beobachtungen zu Formen urkundlicher Mitteilungen im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert,” in K. Hruza – P. Herold, Hg. *Wege zur Urkunde. Wege der Urkunde. Wege der Forschung. Beiträge zur europäischen diplomatie des Mittelalters*. (Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters. Beihefte zu J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii* Bd. 24.) Wien – Köln – Weimar, 2005, 41–44.

the papal court strictly regulated – among others – the formulation of the *inscriptions* and the mentioning of every living persons related to the given matter. In the charters not only names and titles can be found – in every case these are complemented (before the names) with various technical terms. Due to these regulations the archbishops and bishops were always named as *venerabilis frater*, emperors and kings were referred to as *charissimus in Christo filius*, while other men as *dilectus filius* and women as *dilecta in Christo filia*. In case of emperors – and some kings – the *semper augustus* could be added to the title, while kings were referred to by the term *illustris*.¹² In case of more persons the names follow each other in hierarchical order in the texts of the charters. Excluding cardinals and rulers, the name of the relevant diocese can be found with regard to each person.¹³ As for rulers, beside their titles the designation of the relevant territory or peoples is given, commonly in genitive. As we shall show later, this brief survey is helpful in our analysis of the titles and other references to the Hungarian kings and princes.

The existence of a Hungarian royal chancellery¹⁴ can be proven only from the time of King Béla III (1172–1196).¹⁵ Concerning the changes in the system of royal literacy the loss of the former head of the royal chapel (*comes capellae*) can be emphasised. This change was due to the conflict of King Béla III with Lucas,¹⁶ the archbishop of Esztergom.¹⁷ The prelate refused to crown Béla since he was raised in the court of the Byzantine Emperor, Manuel I Komnenos, and therefore he was a schismatic in the eyes of Lukas.¹⁸ This conflict had an impact on royal literacy: we know only seven charters issued between 1172 and 1178 which could be due to the lack of proper personnel. The setup of an independent chancellery and the reduction of the role of the royal chapel can be seen as an answer of Béla III to this situation.¹⁹ The death of Archbishop Lucas in 1181²⁰ initiated the possibility of a consolidation. The next archbishop, Nicholas and the chancellor, Calan (1181–1183) could

¹² In case of noblemen the naming *nobilis vir* seems to appear many times between the name and the title. The rulers of specific countries had their own constant attributes, like the French king had the title *rex christianissimus*. Frenz, *Papsturkunden des Mittelalters*, 35. This can be found once regarding the Hungarian king Béla III as well, although we cannot speak about a constant practice. See K. Szovák, "Pápai-magyar kapcsolatok a 12. században," [Papal-Hungarian Relations in the 12th Century] in I. Zombori, ed. *Magyarország és a Szentszék kapcsolatának ezer éve*. Budapest 1996, 39.

¹³ Frenz, *Papsturkunden des Mittelalters*, 36.

¹⁴ Cf. A. Kubinyi, "Királyi kancellária és udvari kápolna Magyarországon a XII század közepén," [Royal Chancellery and Court-Chapel in Hungary in the Mid-12th Century] in idem, *Főpapok, egyházi intézmények és vallásosság a középkori Magyarországon*. Budapest 1999, 58–63.

¹⁵ Kubinyi, "Királyi kancellária és udvari kápolna," 58–63.

¹⁶ See T. Körmendi, "Lukács (1158–1181)," [Lukas (1158–1181)] in M. Beke, ed. *Esztergomi érsekek 1001–2003*, Budapest 2003, 59–72.

¹⁷ The archbishop practiced inspection over the *capella regia*. Kubinyi, "Királyi kancellária és udvari kápolna," 42–58.

¹⁸ Cf. Körmendi, "Lukács (1158–1181)," 65–67. L. Koszta, *A kalocsai érseki tartomány kialakulása*. [The Formation of the Archdiocese of Kalocsa] Pécs 2013, 105–107.

¹⁹ Kubinyi, "Királyi kancellária és udvari kápolna," 58–63.

²⁰ A. Zsoldos, *Magyarország világi archontológiája, 1000–1301*, [The Laical Archontology of Hungary] Budapest 2011, 80. Cf. Körmendi, "Lukács (1158–1181)," 67.

cooperate well with the king.²¹ From this time on the existence of the Hungarian royal chancellery can be proven unequivocally: the office included the chancellor, the notaries and the scribes.²² The improved structure mirrored in the formulae of the charters as well. The royal title was, for example, constantly complemented with the words *in perpetuum*.²³ The expression of humility with the phrase *dei gratia* can be found in almost every known case, while to the word king (*rex*) was added to the names of the lands possessed, either *de facto* or theoretically.

To get back to our main topic we have to analyse first the *intitulationes* of the royal charters of the selected period. This task requires no investigation, since in almost every single instance the titles of the kings were based on this pattern: *Bela Dei gratia Hungarie, Dalmatie, Chroatie, Rame, Seruie, Galicie, Lodomerie, Cumanieque rex in perpetuum*.²⁴ Differences present themselves only because of the changes in the possessed territories, changes that were due to campaigns, conquests or various other claims.²⁵ The papal letters followed the regulations of the *stilus curiae* by all three pontiffs of the era (Innocent III, Honorius III, Gregory IX) in cases of invocations and mentions of the Hungarian rulers. Andrew II was therefore addressed in every case *carissimus in Christo filius noster Andrea illustris regis Ungarie*.²⁶ The differences were due to constraints of grammar.

In connection with the queens we have far less data. From the period examined

²¹ See I. Szentpétery, *Oklevéltan*. [Diplomatics] Budapest 1930, 84. G. Szeberényi, "Kálán, Isten kegyelméből palliumos pécsi püspök, egész Horvátország és Dalmácia kormányzója". Újabb szempont a horvát-magyar perszonálunió 12. századi történetének kérdéséhez, [Calan, by the Grace of God Bishop of Pécs with Pallium, and Governor of whole Croatia and Dalmatia. New Aspects of the History of the Croatiaoan-Hungarian Personal Union in the 12th Century] in L. Varga-J. Vonyó, ed. *Tanulmányok Pécs történetéből*, 10–11–12. Az Előadások Pécs történetéből '98, '99 és 2000, c. konferenciák válogatott előadásai, Pécs 2002, 229–230. L. Koszta, *A pécsi székeskáptalan hiteleshelyi tevékenysége (1214–1353)*. [The Activity of the Cathedral-chapter of Pécs as *loca credibilia* (1214–1353)] Pécs 1998, 119. Idem, "Püspökök és városuk. A 14. század közepéig," [Bishops and their City till the Mid-14th Century] in T. Fedeles-G. Sarbak -J. Sümegi, eds. *A pécsi egyházmegye története I. A középkor évszázadai (1009–1543)*. Pécs 2009, 69–71. Calan titled himself first constantly *aule regis cancellarius*. The formula *datum per manus* appeared during the chancellorship of Saul, in 1186 for the first time. Kubinyi, "Királyi kancellária és udvari kápolna," 64–65. Kumorovitz, *A magyar pecséthasználat*, 46.

²² Szentpétery, *Oklevéltan*, 64–68, 84.

²³ The protocols of the royal charters ended with this formula from Béla III till Andrew II, presumably under the impact of solemn papal privileges. F. Eckhart, "A pápai és császári kancelláriai gyakorlat hatása az árpádkori királyi okleveleink szövegezésében," [The Impact of the Papal and Imperial Chancellery on the Texts of Royal Charters in the Arpadian-era] *Századok* 44 (1910), 717. Szentpétery, *Oklevéltan*, 63–64.

²⁴ G. Wenzel, ed. *Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus continuatus – Árpád-kori új okmánytár*. I–XII, Budapest 1860–1873 (henceforth: ÁÚO) II, 1. Szentpétery–I. Borsa, ed. *Regesta regum stirpis Arpadianae critico-diplomatica*. Vol. I Budapest 1923 (henceforth: RA) no. 635.

²⁵ The majestic plural with word of *nos* can be found however only in a few cases. For example: "Nos Andreas, Dei gratia, Hungarie, Dalmatie, Croatie, Rame, Seruie, Gallicie, Lodomerieque rex in perpetuum". RA no. 409.

²⁶ Or as its versions. For example: A. Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*. Vol. I, Graz 1957 (henceforth: Potthast) no. 5852., P. Pressutti, *Regesti del Pontefice Onorio papae III Dall' anno 1216 all' anno 1227*. t. I–II, Romae 1888 (henceforth: Pressutti) no. 1433., ÁÚO I, 159.

only the charter of Yolanda de Courtenay, the wife of King Andrew II is known. Following the pattern of the royal charters she titled herself in 1224 *by the grace of God queen of Hungary*.²⁷ The papal letters are a bit more detailed, although we can repeat the former statement about the one and basic pattern²⁸: “*carissime in Christo filie Yoles, illustri regine Hungarie*”.²⁹

The sources concerning the royal princes are far more detailed and show us a more interesting picture, both from the Hungarian and papal sides. First we introduce the charters issued in Hungary and, then we compare them with the letters of the Holy See.

The selected era (1196–1241) starts with the conflict of King Emery and Prince Andrew.³⁰ The prince received Croatia and Dalmatia as his principedom after the death of their father,³¹ and inherited the pledge of going on a crusade, a pledge undertaken but never fulfilled by Béla III.³² In accordance with this situation in the royal charters Andrew used the title: “*Andreas Dei gracia Dalmacie Croacie Cul-*

²⁷ “*Yoles, Dei gratia, regina Hungarie*”. Az Árpád-házi hercegek, hercegnők és a királynék okleveleinek kritikai jegyzéke. *Regesta ducum, ducissarum stirpis Arpadianae necnon reginarum Hungariae critico-diplomatica*, ed. A. Zsoldos, Budapest 2008 (henceforth: RD) no. 47.

²⁸ This is not surprising, since the literacy of the Hungarian queens followed the royal practice regarding both the structure and the external signs. Szentpétery, *Oklevéltan*, 117.

²⁹ *Codex Diplomaticus Hungariae Ecclesiasticus ac Civilis*. ed. G. Fejér, Buda 1828–1844. (henceforth: Fejér CD) III/1, 388., Potthast no. 6875. The letter sent to Salomea, the wife of Coloman can be integrated into this line as well: “*Salomee regine, uxori Colomanni regis, nati [...] illustris regis Ungarie*”. *Les registres de Grégoire IX*. Recueil des bulles de ce pape publiées et analysées d’après les manuscrits originaux du Vatican par L. Auvray, t. I–IV, Paris 1890–1955 (henceforth: RGIX) I, no. 2126. Cf. K. Hollý, “Princess Salomea and Hungarian – Polish Relations in the Period 1214–1241,” *Historický časopis* 55 Supplement (2007), 29–30. So as the address of the letter sent to Yolanda, daughter of Andrew II in 1235. “*carissime in Christo filie J. Regine, nate carissimi in Christo filii nostri ... illustris regis Ungarie*”. Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára. Diplomatai Fényképgyűjtemény [Hungarian National Archive. Photo-Collecton of Diplomatics] (henceforth: DF) 285 380, A. Theiner, ed. *Vetera monumenta historica. Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, (henceforth: Theiner) I–II, Romae 1859–1860, I, no. 230., Potthast no. 9987., RGIX II, no. 2721.

³⁰ Cf. Gy. Szabados, “Egy elmaradt keresztes hadjáratról. Magyar-szentszéki kapcsolatok 1198–1204 között,” [About a failed Crusade. Papal-Hungarian Relations between 1198 and 1204] in F. Piti-Gy. Szabados, eds. „*Magyaroknak eleiről*”. Ünnepi tanulmányok a hatvan esztendősk Makk Ferenc tiszteletére, Szeged 2000, 474–491. T. Körmendi, “A „varasdi jelenet” kritikája. Megjegyzések Imre király és András herceg trónviszályának történetéhez,” [Criticism on the so-called “Varaždin-scene”. Remarks on the History of the Conflict between King Emery and Prince Andrew] in G. Mikó-B. Péterfi-A. Vadas, eds. *Tiszteletkőr. Történeti tanulmányok Draskóczy István egyetemi tanár 60. születésnapjára*, Budapest 2012, 503–513.

³¹ Or at least he took it over. Cf. Gy. Szabados, “Imre és András,” [Emery and Andrew] *Századok* 133 (1999), 93–99.

³² Cf. Szovák, “Pápai-magyar kapcsolatok,” 39–40. M. Font, “Ungarn, Bulgarien und das Papsttum um die Wende des 12.–13. Jh.” in P. Király-A. Hollós, eds. *Hungaro-Slavica* 1988. *International Congress of Slavists*, Budapest 1988, 259–260. Szabados, “Egy elmaradt keresztes hadjáratról,” 474. A. Zsoldos, “II. András Aranybullája,” [The Golden Bull of Andrew II] *Történelmi Szemle* 53 (2011), 25.

meque dux in perpetuum".³³ While King Emery referred to him only as his brother ("*frater noster*")³⁴ without any title in the famous letter in which he informed Pope Innocent III³⁵ about the participation of certain Hungarian bishops in the conspiracy of Andrew.³⁶ King Emery never have acknowledged the title of his brother.³⁷ The expression used by Innocent is perhaps more meaningful, since he called the younger brother till 1205 – i.e. during the regency of Andrew³⁸ – constantly as *noble man and prince* ("*dilecto filio, nobili viro A. duce*")³⁹. As mentioned before, this was the proper naming of people beneath emperors and kings according to the *stilus curiae*,⁴⁰ but it also shows, that the pope acknowledged his princely title.⁴¹ After Emery had designated Andrew to be governor to assist the future Ladislaus III, the title *gubernator* was also added to the *inscriptio*.⁴² In one case he was called the lord (*dominus*) of Hungary.⁴³ It is not very surprising, that after the coronation of Andrew II the situation changed and Andrew was duly addressed king⁴⁴ by Innocent III and by his successors.

Regarding the sons of Andrew II we are facing a far more complicated situation. In the 1210s the firstborn, Béla, and later the second son, Coloman were given royal title. Béla was crowned King of Hungary in 1214, although this seems to have happened against the will of Andrew.⁴⁵ This assumption can be supported by a royal letter of 1214 in which he asked the pope to excommunicate the conspirators who had planned the coronation of his son causing thereby troubles around Béla.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, the coronation was performed despite this complaint.⁴⁷ The abovementioned second son of Andrew, Coloman, was on the oth-

³³ Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára, Diplomatikai Levéltár [Hungarian National Archive. Collection of Diplomats] (henceforth: DL) 36 125.

³⁴ RA no. 187. ÁÚO VI, 198.

³⁵ The pope's answer: 21 January 1199. Potthast no. 748. *Die Register Innocenz' III.* Band I–XI, ed. O. Hageneder, Graz 1964–2010. (henceforth: RI) II, no. 89. (96., 97.).

³⁶ For the conspiracy see J. Udvardy, *A kalocsai érsekek életrajza (1000–1526)*. [The Biographies of the Archbishops of Kalocsa] Köln 1991, 85–88. Szabados, "Egy elmaradt kereszties hadjáratról," 477–479.

³⁷ Szabados, "Imre és András," 94.

³⁸ Gy. Kristó, "II András" [Andrew II] In *KMTL* 43.

³⁹ Fejér CD II, 412., Potthast no. 2015., RI VI, no. 154. (155.)

⁴⁰ Frenz, *Papsturkunden*, 35.

⁴¹ The Polish dukes also received this address. (For example: "*filiam nobilis viri ducis Poloniae*". Theiner I 65. Potthast no. 6777.), So did the duke of Austria in 1198. ("*Nobili viro... filio ducis Austriae*". RI I, no. 241.)

⁴² *dilecto filio nobili viro, duci Andree, regni Ungarie gubernatori*". Fejér CD II, 455., Potthast no. 2473., RI VIII, no. 36.

⁴³ The attribute *nobilis* was changed to *illustris*: "*dilecto filio, illustri viro Andree, domino Ungarie*". Fejér CD II, 460., Potthast no. 2550., RI VIII, no. 89. (88.)

⁴⁴ "*carissimo in Christo filio A. illustri regi Ungarie*". Fejér CD III/1, 22., Potthast no. 2567., RI VIII, no. 130. (129.)

⁴⁵ In this case we cannot count with the active role of Béla, since he was only eight years old by this time. See Zsoldos, "II. András," 10.

⁴⁶ "*Deprecamur insuper paternitatem vestram, ut omnes conspiratores, et infidelitatis machinatores, qui propter regni scissuram filium nostrum, nobis viventibus et nolentibus, in regem sibi preficere, vel coronare attentaverint, tam clericos, quam laicos sententia excommunicationis [innodetis]*". Fejér CD III/1, 165., RA no. 294.

⁴⁷ This shows a royal charter of 1214 as well. Zsoldos, "II. András," 8–9., 22.

er hand crowned the king of Galicia (*Halych*), a principality of the Rus'.⁴⁸ A royal charter issued in 1215 informs us about the thanksgiving of the Hungarian king concerning the papal approval of Coloman's elevation.⁴⁹ The reign of the new ruler and his Polish wife, Salomea did not last long in Galicia: they returned to Hungary in 1221 or in 1222⁵⁰ at the very latest date,⁵¹ where Coloman became the duke (*dux*) of Slavonia in 1226 after his brother, Béla.⁵² By this time Andrew II and Béla already had conflicts. At first, the tension can be revealed around the edition of the Golden Bull of 1222, as one specific article of the decree⁵³ and a papal letter show. In his letter on the 4 July 1222, addressed to the prelates of Hungary, Pope Honorius III wrote about the intention of some "perverted" (*perversi*) who intended to use the former coronation Béla to justify their own resistance.⁵⁴ Another dispute concerning the marriage of the prince in 1224 turned into a real conflict, and as a consequence Béla had to leave the country for a while.⁵⁵ In 1226, as mentioned before, he was forced to move his centre from Slavonia to Transylvania, and Coloman was given this south-western territory.⁵⁶

It is well worth examining the charters of Andrew II, as well as the papal sources, to see how his sons were named in them. The first known letter deserves particular attention, since this concerns the cases of both Béla and Coloman. The elder brother appears without his name, only as the son of his father in the already mentioned part about the conspirators.⁵⁷ The name of Coloman, on the contrary,

⁴⁸ See M. Font, *Árpád-házi királyok és Rurikida fejedelmek*, [The Arpadian Kings and the Rurikid Princes] Szeged 2005, 189., 204., 206–213., 217., 220., 229–232., 268. Salomea, the wife of Coloman was the daughter of the Duke of Kraków, Leszek Biały (the White). The pact about the marriage was made in 1215–1216 in virtue of the well-known meeting of Spiš of Leszek and Andrew II in 1214. Ibid., 203–210. Hollý, "Princess Salomea," 11–20.

⁴⁹ RA no. 302.

⁵⁰ See Hollý, "Princess Salomea," 22–26.

⁵¹ Possibly first to his estate in the Spiš. Cf. A. Zsoldos, "Szepes megye kialakulása," [The Formation of Szepes (Spiš) County] *Történelmi szemle* 43 (2001), 25.

⁵² Font, *Árpád-házi királyok*, 204–214., 217. A. Zsoldos, "Egész Szlavónia bánja," [The Ban of Whole Slavonia] in T. Neumann, ed. *Analecta mediaevalia I, Tanulmányok a középkorról*. Budapest 2001, 280.

⁵³ According to the text the Hungarian potentates could freely choose between the king and his son. "*Item seruientes, accepta licentia a nobis possint libere ire ad filium nostrum, seu a maiori ad minorem, nec ideo possessiones eorum destruantur*". The golden bull, art. 18. F. Knauz, ed. *Monumenta Ecclesiae Strigoniensis*. Strigonii, 1874, I, 234.

⁵⁴ Potthast no. 6870. For the opposition to and plans of Andrew II see Zsoldos, "II. András," 6.

⁵⁵ Cf. G. Barabás, *Das Papsttum und Ungarn in der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts (ca. 1198 – ca. 1241). Päpstliche Einflussnahme – Zusammenwirken – Interessengegensätze*, Wien 2014, 183–187.

⁵⁶ It is possible that Andrew II planned to play out his sons against each other, but Coloman was loyal to his brother till his death. See Font, *Árpád-házi királyok*, 217. On the other hand it is assumable, that the relationship of the brothers has not been always completely free of conflicts, because before 1234 Béla was also interested in the affairs of Galicia. See Hollý, "Princess Salomea," 27–32.

⁵⁷ "*Deprecamur insuper paternitatem Vestram, ut omnes conspiratores, et infidelitatis machinatores, qui propter regni scissuram filium nostrum, nobis viventibus et nolentibus, in regem sibi preficere, vel coronare attentaverint, tam clericos, quam laicos sententia excommunic-*

appears in the text and the will of the nobles and people of Galicia was also emphasized by Andrew II as the reason for the intended role of Coloman there. A further argument of his was the possibility that the coronation could promote the Church union of this territory with Rome.⁵⁸ A glance at the papal sources; namely the letter of Honorius III also deserves attention for in 1222 he wrote about the papal permission of Coloman's coronation.⁵⁹ It can also be added that in 1215 when Andrew II expressed his thanks for Coloman's coronation, the unction of his son was also mentioned.⁶⁰

In 1214 – before the coronation – Béla was mentioned in another royal charter.⁶¹ The latter sources are, understandably, more detailed as his royal father could not refer to him in the same way after his elevation. Béla was named *the favourite first-born of Andrew and illustrious king* (“*carissimus primogenitus noster illustris rex Bela*”) in a group of royal charters⁶² mostly issued on the topic of estate restitutions.⁶⁴ In another remarkable passage Béla is called *lord king*.⁶⁵ It can be furthermore stated, that Béla appear in the texts of the known charters of Coloman only in 1237, so after the death of his father. The duke of Slavonia called him *his brother and the most illustrious king of Hungary* (“*frater noster Bela rex illustrissimus Hungarie*”).⁶⁶

The analysis of Béla's own charters offers an even more colourful picture. There is an *intitulatio* which refers to King Andrew II by including the royal titles and the expression of humility (“*Bela dei gracia Hungarie, Croacie, Dalmacie, Rame, Seruie, Lodomerieque, illustrissimi regis Andree filius, rex in perpetuum.*”).⁶⁷ In another case

tionis [innodetis]”. Fejér CD III/1, 165., RA no. 294.

⁵⁸ “[...] *quod Galicie principes et populus, nostre ditioni subiecti, humiliter a nobis postularunt, ut filium nostrum Colomanum ipsis in regem preficeremus, in Unitate et obedientia Sancte Romane Ecclesie perseveraturis in posterum*”. Fejér CD III/1, 164., RA no. 294.

⁵⁹ Potthast no. 6777.

⁶⁰ “[...] *coronando filio nostro in Regem Galicie ad mandatum Apostolicum optatum consecuta est effectum, [...] Supplicamus insuper Sanctitati Vestre quatinus coronam auream regie dignitati congruentem filio nostro conferre et per latorem presentium fidelem nostrum in proximo transmittere dignemini, ut sicut unctionem regalem a Sede Apostolica, ita et coronam a liberalitate vestra se recepisse gaudeat*”. ÁÚO VI, 374–375., RA no. 302.

⁶¹ “*filium nostrum Bela in nostra desolacione de latere nostro assumpsit*”. ÁÚO VI, 367., RA no. 291.

⁶² ÁÚO VI, 455., RA no. 445. A version is known although in which the attribute *dilectus* can be found. RA no. 471.

⁶³ Pl. RA no. 444., 445., 461., 462., 463., 471., 494. A case another type: RA no. 511. (The donation given the monastery of Borsmonostor at the request of Béla. DL 868 18).

⁶⁴ Honorius III empowered Béla with his letter issued on the 15th July 1225. (*Intellecto iam dudum*) to reconsider the donations given earlier by his father and to take them back, if necessary. Potthast no. 7443. Cf. H. Zimmermann, *Der Deutsche Orden im Burzenland. Eine diplomatische Untersuchung*, Köln – Weimar – Wien 2000, 141–145. J. R. Sweeney, Sweeney, *The Decretal Intellecto and the Hungarian Golden Bull of 1222*, in *Album Elemér Mályusz*, Bruxelles 1976. Beside Béla Archbishop Ugrin of Kalocsa was also given a letter. Potthast no. 7444. He was already warned in 1220 to raise his voice against the alienation of the crown properties. Potthast no. 6318.

⁶⁵ “*dominus rex B.*”. Fejér CD III/2, 207. RA no. 463. This could be compared to the presumed title *dominus/urum* of Rostislav as well. Cf. M. Font, *Rosztyszláv herceg IV. Béla udvarában [Prince Rostislav at the Court of Béla IV]*, manuscript

⁶⁶ RD no. 15., ÁÚO VII, 38.

⁶⁷ Smiciklas III 186.

the title Duke of Slavonia appears, presumably not independently of the fact that the charter was issued for the bishop of Zagreb.⁶⁸ Later on the *intitulationes* of the charters of Prince Béla were stabilized. After 1225, almost in every known case,⁶⁹ it followed the pattern: "*Bela Dei gracia rex, primogenitus regis Hungarie*".⁷⁰ In the course of the procedure concerning the estate restitutions reference to his father was not missed in the charters, although it became less frequent. We have to emphasize furthermore, that Béla was not referred to *dux* any time after he had been put in to rule Transylvania. As the crowned king of Hungary and the firstborn of Andrew II this must have been unnecessary for him, in contrast to his brother, Coloman.⁷¹ After the death of his father, the former practice of the royal chancellery continued under Béla IV.⁷²

Examining the papal letters first we have to underline the abovementioned conflict between Andrew II and Béla in 1223–1224.⁷³ The king planned to have the marriage of his son⁷⁴ with Maria Laskaris dispensed.⁷⁵ The prince however – with the pope's support – refused to fulfil his father's will and ran away to Austria to Duke Leopold VI. Pope Honorius III wrote on this issue on the 27 January 1224⁷⁶ for the first time and encouraged Béla to stay with his wife. The prince in this text was named king and the firstborn of Andrew, similarly to most⁷⁷ of the papal char-

⁶⁸ "*Bela Dei gracia rex, filius regis Ungarie et dux totius Sclavonie*". ÁÚO XI 164., RA 568. For the connection between Slavonia and the bishopric of Zagreb see G. Szeberényi, "A zágrábi püspökség Szlavónia megszervezésében játszott szerepének egyházszerkezeti vonatkozásai," [The Ecclesiastical Aspects of the Role of the Bishopric of Zagreb in the Organization of Slavonia] in Gy. Bebesi, ed. *Az Illyés Gyula Pedagógiai Főiskola Társadalomtudományi Tanszékének Közleményei* 1, Szekszárd 1999.

⁶⁹ An exception: "*Bela dei gratia primogenitus regis Hungarie, Dalmatie, Croatie, Rame, Ser-vie, Gallicie, Lodomerie, Bulgarie, Comaabovenieque*". Fejér CD VII/4, 81., RA no. 602.

⁷⁰ RA no. 596., ÁÚO XI, 234.

⁷¹ Based on this fact it is uncertain if we could draw any conclusion regarding the state of Transylvania and Slavonia in the 13th century.

⁷² For example: "*Bela dei gratia rex Ungarie*". ÁÚO XII, 271., RA no. 606.

⁷³ Cf. Barabás, *Das Papsttum*, 183–187.

⁷⁴ The son of Andrew II married the daughter of Theodore I Laskaris, the emperor of Nicaea, but the matrimony lost its political meaning due to the death of the father in 1222. It can be presumed that the Hungarian king planned to have close relations with the Latin Emperor, and to win his brother-in-law, Robert of Courtenay as his ally. In this situation the Greek marriage could have appeared disadvantageous, especially because of the new emperor of Nicaea, John III Doukas Vatatzes. The constellation of these factors could lead to the plan of the dissolution of the marriage. A. Bárány, "Courtenay Róbert latin császár Magyarországon," [Latin Emperor Robert of Courtenay in Hungary] in A. Györkös–G. Kiss, eds. *Francia–magyar kapcsolatok a középkorban*, Debrecen 2013, 159–161. A. Bárány, "II András és a Latin Császárság," [Andrew II and the Latin Empire] *Hadtörténeti Közlemények* 126 (2013), 473–474. L. Szende, "Szent-földtől Katalóniáig. II András külpolitikája és dinasztikus kapcsolatai a korabeli Európában," [From the Holy Land to Catalonia. Foreign Policy and Family Relations of Andrew II in Contemporary Europe] in J. Majorossy, ed. *Egy történelmi gyilkosság margójára. Merániai Gertrúd emlékezete. 1213–2013*, Szentendre 2014, 34–35.

⁷⁵ Zsoldos, *Az Árpádok és asszonyaik*, 190–191.

⁷⁶ Potthast no. 7152.

⁷⁷ The expression born (*natus*) can be found as well ("*Unde carissimo in Christo filio nostro B. regi, nato tuo*". Theiner I, no. 97., Potthast no. 7189.), and in some cases only the royal title appeared. ("*[...] carissimi in Christo filii nostri Bele Regi et uxori [...] Quia vero*

ters issued on this matter⁷⁸ (*carissimus in Christo filius noster, rex Bela, primogenitus carissimi in Christo filii nostri Andree, regis Ungarie*⁷⁹). It is more surprising how the pope called Béla in his letter (*Intellecto iam dudum*) in 1225, since he used the title *junior king* (and honourable man),⁸⁰ a title, which was common in the second half of the century in connection with the son of Béla, the future king Stephan V.⁸¹ Although the mentioned form was stabilised later on,⁸² right up to Béla's accession to the throne, when the papal chancellery started using the standard form of *stilus curiae*, the proper form of addressing a king.⁸³

At last we have to examine the last group of sources which, compared to the previous ones, can be considered the most problematic: namely the charters issued about or by Prince Coloman. First we analyse the letters written by his father and elder brother and the formulae used in them. The charter of Andrew II of 1214 sent to Innocent III⁸⁴ has already been thoroughly examined. In this letter Coloman is called only the son of the Hungarian king.⁸⁵ After his coronation in Galicia⁸⁶ he was referred to king in every single case. We know however – similarly to the situation of Béla – some examples, in which beside the royal title the titles of Coloman as the duke of Dalmatia and Croatia were emphasised which he acquired by the favour of his father.⁸⁷ This is not very surprising, however, since in this case Andrew II confirmed the donation of his son which the latter gave to the bishop of Trau (Trogir). In other sources – beside his title as king – Coloman was named “only”

idem Bela Rex [...]. Theiner I, no. 95., Potthast no. 7178.).

⁷⁸ See Potthast no. 7152., 7172–7178., 7189–7193.

⁷⁹ Theiner I no. 90., Potthast no. 7176. Or: “*carissimi in Christo filii nostri B(ele) regis primogeniti carissimi in Christo filii nostri (Andree) Ungarie regis illustris*”. V. Fraknói–J. Lukcsics ed. *Monumenta Romana Episcopatus Veszprimiensis – A veszprémi püspökség római oklevéltára I–IV*, Budapest 1896–1907, I, 61.

⁸⁰ “*Carissimo in Christo filio illustri viro Bele, iuveni regi*”. Theiner I, no. 126., Potthast no. 7443. The text of the charter given to the archbishop of Kalocsa is not fully known, in the papal register only *Regi predicto* can be found: Theiner I, no. 126.

⁸¹ Gy. Kristó, “V István,” [Stephan V] in KMTL, 294. J. Szűcs, *Az utolsó Árpádok*, [The Last Arpadians] Budapest 1993, 114.

⁸² “*carissimo in Christo filio, illustri regi Bele, primogenito regis Hungarie*”. Theiner I, no. 224., Potthast no. 9750., RGIX I, no. 2156. There are, however, other formulations known as well. “*Bele regi, primogenito regis Ungarie*”. Theiner I, no. 225., Potthast no. 9764., RGIX I, no. 2198.

⁸³ “*Bele regi Ungarie illustris*”. Theiner I, no. 249., Potthast no. 10066., RGIX II, no. 2872.

⁸⁴ “[...] *ut filium nostrum Colomanum ipsi in regem preficeremus, in unitate et obedientia Sancte Romane ecclesie perseveraturis in posterum*”. Fejér CD III/1, 163., RA no. 294. We can find a similar expression in a charter from the next year: “[...] *quod postulatio nostra super coronando filio nostro in regem Galicie [...] quatinus coronam auream regie dignitati congruentem filio nostro*”. ÁÚO VI, 374–375., RA no. 302. It has to be emphasized that Andrew II in his letter underlined the importance of the unction of Coloman. “[...] *ut sicut unctionem regalem a Sede Apostolica, ita et coronam a liberalitate vestra se recepisse gaudeat*”. ÁÚO VI, 375., RA no. 302.

⁸⁵ Even if he was merely mentioned: “*Prefatus itaque B. rex habito consilio dilecti fratris sui et omnium principum regni, fratris dico, Colomani regis*”. Fejér CD III/2, 204., RA no. 461.

⁸⁶ For the possible circumstances of the coronation and for the holding Coloman's title see. Hollý, “Princess Salomea,” 15–23.

⁸⁷ “*Quia enim illustris filius noster Colomanus, Dei gratia, Ruthenorum rex, et liberalitate nostra dux Dalmatie, atque Croatie [...]*”. Fejér CD III/2, 103., RA no. 438.

the *duke of whole Slavonia*.⁸⁸ This circumstance is important in the light of the papal letters, as we shall see later. First we have to throw a glance on a donation of Andrew II of 1234, in which Coloman – similarly to the practice of the Holy See – was mentioned *illustris rex*.⁸⁹

Concerning the charters issued by Béla both as prince and king we can underline first that next to the “expression of brotherhood, Coloman was named *illustris king* in the royal and papal letters alike,⁹⁰ while during the revisions of the royal donations⁹¹ Béla wrote about the support of his brother. The title *duke of whole Slavonia* appeared too,⁹² and it was so frequent that after the beginning of Béla’s rule the expression *beloved brother, King Coloman, the duke of whole Slavonia* came into general use.⁹³

The first known charter of Coloman was issued in 1226 and it is remarkable in itself, since we can find a relatively complex *intitulatio*, which can be bound to the mentioned inscription of Andrew II. According to this Coloman was *the king of the Ruthenians by the grace of God and the duke of Dalmatia and Croatia by the grace of his father*.⁹⁴ This expression shows well the situation of the prince: on one hand his coronation could not lose its validity,⁹⁵ although by this time he could not even think of a real role in Galicia, as his younger brother Andrew represented the Hungarian interests there.⁹⁶ Maybe that is the reason why he used the term *Ruthenian* as a supplement to his royal title which referred to the eastern Slavic population living there. On the other this reference is eloquent, since Andrew II gave the territory to

⁸⁸ “*Carissimus filius noster Colomanus rex et dux tocius Slavonie*”. I. Nagy-F. Deák-Gy. Nagy, eds. *Hazai oklevéltár 1234–1536: néhai gr. Dessewffy Lajos hazafias áldozatával*, Budapest 1869, IV, 14., RA no. 512.

⁸⁹ “*Illustrem regem Gallicie*”. ÁÚO VI, 546., RA no. 529.

⁹⁰ “*de consensu fratris nostri illustris Cholomani Regis*”. ÁÚO VI, 485., RA no. 593.

⁹¹ Cf. Gy. Kristó, *A feudális széttagolódás Magyarországon*, [The Feudal Fragmentation in Hungary] Budapest 1979, 76.

⁹² “*fratre nostro Colomano rege et duce tocius Slavonie*”. ÁÚO XI, 234., RA no. 596., DL 168. Another formulation: “*carissimum fratrem nostrum Colomanem regem ducemque*”. ÁÚO VII, 167.

⁹³ “*carissimus frater noster rex Colomanus et dux tocius Slavonie*”. ÁÚO XI, 306., RA no. 665. Cf. I. Basić, “O pokušaju ujedinjenja zagrebačke i splitske crkve u XIII. stoljeću,” [About the Attempt to Unify the Churches of Zagreb and Split in the 13th Century] *Pro tempore* 3 (2006), 34.

⁹⁴ “*nos Colomannus, Dei gratia Ruthenorum Rex, et largitate gloriosi patris nostri Andree, Hungarorum regis, dux Dalmatie atque Croatie*”. Fejér CD III/2, 90–91., RD no. 1. It has to be mentioned, that the editor of the register suspects the charter’s authenticity since it follows the papal pattern. Cf. Kristó, *A feudális*, 54.

⁹⁵ Pope Honorius III stated in his letter to Andrew II in 1222 that due to the previous coronation authorized by Innocent III the royal title could not be transferred to Coloman’s brother, Andrew. Potthast no. 6777., Pressutti no. 3764. Cf. N. Procházková, “Koloman Haličský na Spiši pred rokom 1241,” [Coloman of Galicia in Spiš before 1241] in R. Gladkiewicz–M. Homza, eds. *Terra Scepusiensis. Stan badań nad dziejami Spiszu*. Levoča – Wrocław 2003, 244–245.

⁹⁶ Font, *Árpád-házi királyok*, 215–218. Cf. N. Procházková, “Postavenie haličského kraja a slavonského knežata Kolomana z rodu Arpadovcov v uhorskej vnútornej a zahraničnej politike v prvej polovici 13. storočia,” [The Position of Coloman of the Arpadian Dynasty, King of Galicia and Duke of Slavonia in the first Half of the 13th Century] *Medea* 2 (1998), 73.

Coloman instead of Béla ending thereby the obligate “political inactivity” of Coloman in the Spiš.⁹⁷

The latter examples from the charters of the prince are, however, less detailed: *King of Ruthenia and even duke of Dalmatia and Croatia*,⁹⁸ *King of Galicia by the grace of God and the duke of Slavonia*.⁹⁹ There is on the other hand a case in which the royal title is missing, which probably can be explained by the nature of the arrangement, since Coloman addressed his letter to the count (*comes*) – and people – of the Dalmatian city of Split.¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, the fact has to be emphasized that before 1229 Coloman was called only *duke of Dalmatia and Croatia*, and not of Slavonia, but the concrete reason for this practice is not known.¹⁰¹

In the 1230s the practice became more stabilized, and the following *intitulatio* was the most frequent in the prince’s charters¹⁰²: “*Nos Colomanus, Dei gratia rex, et dux totius Sclavonie*”.¹⁰³ The title *duke of whole Slavonia* can be seen as a *novum*, although Béla had used it once before.¹⁰⁴ It seems rather unlikely that this *intitulatio* served the expression of the claims of Coloman to territories outside his duchy, to Bosnia or to every land of the Hungarian Kingdom inhabited by Slavic population.¹⁰⁵

⁹⁷ Cf. Font, *Árpád-házi királyok*, 213. Zsoldos, “Szepes megye”, 25. N. Procházková, “Some Notes on the Titles of Coloman of Galicia,” in V. Kucharská-S. Kuzmová–A. Mesiarkin, eds. *Slovakia and Croatia Vol I. Slovakia and Croatia Historical Parallels and Connections (until 1780)*, Bratislava – Zagreb 2013, 105–106.

⁹⁸ “*C. dei gratia rex Ruthenie, nec non Croacie, Dalmacieque dux*”. Fejér CD VI/2, 363., DF 280 230, RD no. 2.

⁹⁹ “*Colomanus Dei gracia Halicie rex ac dux Sclavonie*”. ÁÚO VI 477, RD no. 4.

¹⁰⁰ “*C. Dei gracia Dux Crohatie et Dalmatie*”. ÁÚO VI, 482., RD no. 6.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Kristó, *A feudális*, 92.

¹⁰² Presumably not independently of the possible consolidation of Coloman’s chancellery, in which process his later chancellor, provost Phyla of Zagreb could have played an important role. Cf. Zsoldos, *Magyarország világi*, 118. Procházková, “Some Notes,” 108.

¹⁰³ Pl. DF 283 328, ÁÚO XI, 268., RD no. 12. The addition *Ruthenorum* did not entirely vanish from the royal title, it can be found in a charter of 1240: “*Colomanus Dei gracia rex Ruthenorum et dux totius Sclavonie*”. ÁÚO XI, 313., RD no. 20.

¹⁰⁴ See note no. 66. and Kristó, *A feudális*, 92. Attila Zsoldos raised the possibility that the consolidation of special territorial rules in Slavonia and Transylvania was finished by Prince Béla. Zsoldos, “Egész Szlavónia bánja,” 280.

¹⁰⁵ Already György Györffy referred to this possibility. Gy. Györffy, “Szlavónia kialakulásának oklevélkritikai vizsgálata,” [Critical Assessment of Diplomatical Sources Relating to the Formation of Slavonia] *Levéltári Közlemények* 41 (1970), 234. Recently Nataša Procházková expounded similar views. Procházková, “Some Notes,” 107–108. There are many opinions present concerning the territorial status and the extension of Slavonia. According to György Györffy the expression *totia Sclavonia* described the territory between the Adriatic Sea and the Drava-Sava rivers. Györffy, “Szlavónia,” 226–230., 233–239. Cf. Zsoldos, “Egész Szlavónia bánja,” 271–272. J. Csákó, “A Magyar-lengyel Krónika és a hazai elbeszélő hagyomány,” [The Hungarian-Polish Chronicle and the Domestic Narrative Tradition] *Századok* 148 (2014), 312. On the contrary Gyula Kristó discarded the theory that the name Slavonia could have referred to Adriatic Croatia. In his view it appeared first at the outset of the 13th century in Hungary and it spread out from the Drava-Sava territory to Croatia and Dalmatia. Kristó, *A feudális*, 89–94. Cf. Zsoldos, “Egész Szlavónia bánja,” 272. Attila Zsoldos acknowledged the appearance of the term in the 13th century and searched for the reasons of its spreading. Like Györffy he assumed the territory called Slavonia belonged to Hungary since the time of St. Stephan. The geographical term *Sclavonia* acquired admin-

We have to get back to the aspect that the royal dignity was not supplemented by any territorial belonging in case of Coloman in the overwhelming majority of the examples. Only the expression *king of Galicia* can be found occasionally. It has to be underlined therefore that Slavonia – optionally with Dalmatia and Croatia – emerged exclusively as an addition to the dignity of *dux*. The title *king by the grace of God and duke of whole Slavonia* (*Dei gratia rex, et dux totius Sclavonie*) can hardly be interpreted as the king of Slavonia – at least it would have been very uncommon to attach many titles to one single territory; precisely the opposite was typical. Therefore we cannot speak about the Kingdom of the Slavic peoples or about similar formations,¹⁰⁶ even if we acknowledge the importance that Spiš played in the life Coloman.¹⁰⁷ Especially because the beginning of the thirteenth century was the era when the authority of the Croatian-Dalmatian bans spread over the territory between the Drava and Sava rivers, and in it was in connection with this fact the title *banus totius Sclavonie* evolved.¹⁰⁸ As a further proof we can emphasise that the coronation of Coloman approved by the papacy concerned only Galicia, even

istrative meaning and spread out to Croatia and Dalmatia, when the ispáns (counts/comes) of Zala and Somogy performed the duty of the ban of Croatia. The administration of the named counties was pulled back later to the river Drava and the authority over them was given to the ban. The name of the new district (*totius Sclavoniae*) refers to the common administration of Croatia and the Drava-Sava territory. Zsoldos, "Egész Szlavónia bánja," 276–281. B. Weisz–A. Zsoldos, "A báni joghatóság Szlavóniában és a Dráván túl," [The Jurisdiction of the Bans in Slavonia and Beyond the Drava] in T. Almási–É. Révész–Gy. Szabados, eds. *Fons, skepsis, lex. Ünnepi tanulmányok a 70 esztendő Makk Ferenc tiszteletére*, Szeged 2010, 478–480. For the differentiation between Slavonia, Croatia and Dalmatia and the formation of those terms see J. V. A. Jr. Fine, *When Ethnicity Did Not Matter in the Balkans. A Study of Identity in Pre-Nationalist Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia in the Medieval and Early-Modern Periods*, Ann Arbor 2006, 70–94. Basić, "O pokušaju," 33.

¹⁰⁶ M. Homza, "Król Halicza Koloman jako *dux Scephusiae*," [Coloman King of Galicia as *dux Scephusiae*] in M. Homza–S. A. Sroka, eds. *Historia scepusii Vol. I*, Bratislava–Kraków 2009, 148. D. Bagi, "Sclavonia a Magyar-lengyel krónikában," [Slavonia in the Polish-Hungarian Chronicle] in D. Bagi–T. Fedeles–G. Kiss, eds. *„Köztes-Európa” vonzásában. Ünnepi tanulmányok Font Márta 60. születésnapjára*, Pécs 2012, 46. Procházková, "Some Notes," 107–109. We have to take a nearer look at the work of Martin Homza, since he used the title *rex Russiae*, which is not to be found in the sources concerning Coloman. It is similarly extraordinary that he translated the word *dux* regarding Slavonia (and Croatia) as voevoda (*wojewoda*), since concerning the Spiš he used the term *książe*, which means prince. See Homza, "Król Halicza," . The version *rex Russiae* – which is similar to the addressing *primus rex Ruthenorum* – is encountered in the papal charters concerning Daniel of Galicia, who was crowned with papal authorisation in 1253. The Polish historian Dariusz Dąbrowski presumes that the named version was in use in the papal chancellery regarding the former royal title of Coloman, and also as the phrasings of the Hungarian royal charters (*rex Galicie, Lodomerieque*). Furthermore, it is imaginable that this practice meant the acknowledgement of the superiority of King Béla IV over Daniel. For the latter his royal title could have a relevance with regard to other Ruthenian dukes, and the Mongols as well. D. Dąbrowski, *Daniel Romanowicz król Rusi. (ok. 1201 – 1264). Biografia polityczna*, [Daniel Romanowicz, the King of Russia. A Political Biography] Kraków 2012, 361–364.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Zsoldos, "Szepes megye", 25.

¹⁰⁸ Zsoldos, "Egész Szlavónia bánja," 276–278.

though such a kingdom existed only theoretically.¹⁰⁹ We have to mention the hypothesis too, that Coloman, after his return to Hungary, might have used the title duke of the Spiš (*dux Scepusiae*), or at least he started the later "tradition of the *dominus terrae Scepusiensis*",¹¹⁰ although it cannot be proven by any written source.¹¹¹

Moving from the charters issued in the name of the prince to the papal charters, we have to state that they show a slightly different picture. According to a data from 1231¹¹² Pope Gregory IX called Coloman *the illustrious king of the Ruthenians and the duke of Slavonia*,¹¹³ when he gave a mandate to Bishop Bartholomew of Pécs concerning the litigation between the prince and the Templars of Slavonia.¹¹⁴ The first papal letter sent directly to Coloman named him – due to the regulations of the Chancellery of the Apostolic See and the described Hungarian practice – *beloved son in Christ and illustrious king*.¹¹⁵ But in two papal mandates issued in the same year, 1233 (23 December)¹¹⁶ he was called *the king of Slavonia (Sclavonie)*.¹¹⁷ This wording could lead to some nonconventional interpretations, such as the idea that behind this *inscriptio* a reference to the Slavic kingdom of Svatopluk should be seen.¹¹⁸ In our opinion this presumption is highly improbable since here the royal title¹¹⁹ was

¹⁰⁹ Font, *Árpád-házi királyok*, 206–210.

¹¹⁰ Procházková, "Some Notes," 105. Cf. Idem., "Koloman Haličský," 246.

¹¹¹ See "haličským kráľom, chorvátsko-slavónslym i spišským vojvodom". M. Homza *Uhorsko polska kronika. Nedocenený prameň k dejinám strednej Európy*, [The Polish-Hungarian Chronicle. An Underrated Source for the History of Central-Europe] Bratislava 2009, 25. The fact itself that Coloman possessed estates there is, however, certain. See Procházková, "Postavenie haličského," 70–71. Zsoldos, "Szepes megye", 25.

¹¹² Procházková probably used the false data found by Fejér and dated the charter to the "late 1220s". Procházková, "Some Notes," 108.

¹¹³ "*carissimi in Christo filii nostri Colomani, Regis Ruthenorum illustris, et Ducis Sclavonie*". Fejér CD III/2, 112., Potthast no. 8776.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Barabás, *Das Papsttum*, 316–318.

¹¹⁵ "*carissimo in Christo filio nostro, Colomano, regi illustri*". Theiner I, no. 201., Potthast no. 9305., RGIX I, no. 1522. (10th October 1233)

¹¹⁶ Coloman was to be a lay protector of the widowed polish duchesses. See G. Barabás, "Viola opolei hercegnő és Kálmán szlavón herceg. Egy historiográfiai vita margójára," [Duchess Viola of Opole and Coloman, Duke of Slavonia. Contribution to a Historiographical Dispute] *Világtörténet* 37 (2015), 5–10.

¹¹⁷ "*Carissimo in Christo filio, C. illustri regi Sclavonie*". Theiner I, no. 204., Potthast no. 9352., RGIX I, no. 1649. See further Potthast no. 9349.

¹¹⁸ Procházková, "Some Notes," 108–109. On the contrary, in Vladimir Goss's view the goal of Coloman was to "create a powerful and prosperous political unit consisting of Slavonia, Croatia, Dalmatia, and Bosnia within the Hungarian-Croatian Commonwealth." V. P. Goss, "Bishop Stjepan II and Herceg Koloman and the Beginnings of the Gothic in Croatia," *Hortus artium medievalium* 13 (2007) 212. Idem, "Slovak and Croatian Art in the Thirteenth Century. Some Striking Analogies and Their Background," in V. Kucharská–S. Kuzmová–A. Mesiarkin, eds. *Slovakia and Croatia Vol I. Slovakia and Croatia Historical Parallels and Connections (until 1780)*, Bratislava – Zagreb 2013, 261.

¹¹⁹ In this paper we do not aim to introduce fully the historiography of the Hungarian-Polish Chronicle and the questions concerning its place of origin, and in connection with it the court of Coloman. Fortunately the study of Judit Csákó excuses us from this task. We have to state though briefly that we do not hold the passages of the chronicle concerning Slavonia as decisive regarding the titles of Coloman and his as-

bound to a territory not to an ethnicity (unlike the later term *slavorum*).¹²⁰ Later examples suggest that the curiosities of the mentioned charters can be traced to the deficiencies of the papal chancellery.¹²¹ Or possibly the nature of the mandates – papal protections of two Polish widowed duchesses, Grzymisława of Sandomierz and Viola of Opole – made an impact on the address of Coloman,¹²² while this anomaly henceforth never again appeared. Already from the year of 1234 there are sources in which the prince was named king without any territorial supplements.¹²³ It cannot be forgotten, however, that there is only one single passage in Coloman's charters, in which the duke referred to his territory as a *regnum*.¹²⁴ But this data, which might seem strange at first sight, does not justify to assume that Coloman thought of his rule in Hungary in terms of a separate kingdom.¹²⁵

Parallel to the Hungarian situation there is an example in which Coloman was called *noble man and duke of Slavonia* disregarding his royal dignity.¹²⁶ This can be explained by the nature of the case (litigation concerning possessions) and perhaps by the fact that the charter was issued in a procedure of papal delegated jurisdiction.¹²⁷ In a papal letter written in 1235 – but still under the reign of Andrew II – Pope Gregory IX addressed Coloman *king and the son of his father*,¹²⁸ presumably not independently of the fact, that he confirmed the donation of Andrew given to the prince.¹²⁹ Later on it can be observed that the employees of the papal chancellery used the title *duke of Slavonia* beside of his rank as king but separately from

sumed claims. Despite the presumed place of origin in Slavonia or in Spiš, it can be assumed that the chronicle was written (even by a Pole) in Poland. Csákó, "A Magyar-lengyel Krónika," 312–316. Cf. Procházková, "Some Notes," 106., 108.

¹²⁰ Potthast no. 10890., RGIX III, no. 5216.

¹²¹ We have although to take in consideration, that in the papal curia the terms Slavonia, Dalmatia and Croatia were used not entirely in the same sense, as locally. Fine, *When Ethnicity*, 106–109.

¹²² Cf. Barabás 2015. 5–10. Cf. D. Dąbrowski, "Slovak and Southern Slavic Threads in the Genealogy of the Piast and Rurikid Dynasties in the Thirteenth Century," in V. Kucharská-S. Kuzmová-A. Mesiarkin, eds. *Slovakia and Croatia Vol I. Slovakia and Croatia Historical Parallels and Connections (until 1780)*, Bratislava – Zagreb 2013, 113–116. Procházková, "Some Notes," 108.

¹²³ "*carissimo in Christo filio nostro illustri regi Colomanno*". Theiner I, no. 218., Potthast no. 9726., RGIX I, no. 2128. See further: Potthast no. 9728., 9735. In the charter sent to his wife there is a reference to Andrew II as well: "*Salomee regine, uxori Colomanni regis, nati [...] illustris regis Ungarie*". RGIX I, no. 2126.

¹²⁴ Regarding his quarrel with his younger brother, Andrew. "*in regnum nostrum videlicet Sclavoniae*". Fejér CD III/2, 287., RD no. 10. Cf. Basić, "O pokušaju," 34. Procházková, "Some Notes," 106–107.

¹²⁵ On the one hand this passage is the only one information we possess, while on the other hand the charter is known only thanks to a later transcript. See RD no. 10.

¹²⁶ "*Dei dilecto filio nobili viro Colomanno duci Sclavonie*". DF 206 949, Potthast no. 9848. Or as the prince of Slavonia: "*Cum ex litteris Colomani, ducis Sclavonie, intelleximus [...]*". Theiner I, no. 312., Potthast no. 10823., RGIX III, no. 4992. Italics G.B.

¹²⁷ Barabás, *Das Papsttum*, 372.

¹²⁸ "*carissimo in Christo filio, illustri regi Colomano, nato carissimi in Christo filii nostri A. illustris regis Ungarie*". Theiner I, no. 229., Potthast no. 9986., RGIX II, no. 2726.

¹²⁹ See A. Bárány, "II András balkáni külpolitikája," [The Foreign-Policy of Andrew II towards the Balkans] in T. Kerny-A. Smohay, eds. *II András és Székesfehérvár: King Andrew and Székesfehérvár*, Székesfehérvár 2012, 158–159. Barabás, *Das Papsttum*, 249.

it.¹³⁰ All this can be compared to the consolidation of the titles in Coloman's own charters.

A few further extraordinary sources have to be examined too. In two papal charters issued in April and December 1238 concerning the matters of Bosnia, Coloman was called *illustrious king and the duke of the Slavs*.¹³¹ On 6 June 1240 Gregory IX wrote to Coloman because of the planned union of the archbishopric of Split with the diocese of Zagreb¹³² and called him *king and the duke of the Slavs*.¹³³ In our opinion these special cases should not be overrated, the genitive was not related to the royal title but to that of the duke, so it cannot be linked to its territorial aspect.¹³⁴ On the other hand the nature of the cases has to be emphasized as well, since the handling of the affairs of Bosnia and Dalmatia (Split) could explain the exceptional use of ethnicity.¹³⁵ Regarding the whole analysis we can state that the continuous and unambiguous separation of the title of the prince and king can be observed both in the Hungarian and the papal sources.¹³⁶

Before the brief summary of the results of the whole research we have to take another group of sources into consideration, namely the charters of Andrew II, Béla and Coloman issued in 1233.¹³⁷ This year James Pecorari, the papal legate present in Hungary, finally achieved his goal and managed to sign a concordat with the Hungarian king, the so-called Concord of Bereg.¹³⁸ In virtue of this pact Andrew and his sons had to take an oath to observe it, and in addition to that, even

¹³⁰ "*carissimo in Christo filio Colomano illustri regi Ruthenorum ac duci Sclavonie*". Theiner I, no. 253., Potthast no. 10086., RGIX II no. 2920. See: Potthast no. 10671., 10688., 10822., 10890. and RGIX III, no. 5774., 6058.

¹³¹ To the bishop of the Cumans: "*carissimus in Christo filius noster, Colomanus rex et dux Sclavorum illustris*". Theiner I, no. 289., Potthast no. 10585., RGIX II, no. 4286. To the Benedictine abbot of Pécsvárad: "*carissimi in Christo filii nostri Colomanni, regis illustris. ducis Sclavorum*". Theiner I, no. 304., Potthast no. 10690., RGIX II, no. 4696. It has to be mentioned that Nataša Procházková stated that the papal letter was sent to the abbot of Oradea (Nagyvárad) Procházková, "Some Notes," 108.

¹³² See Györffy, "Szlavónia," 234. Basić, "O pokušaju,".

¹³³ "*carissimo in Christo filio Colomano, illustri regi et duci Sclavorum*". Theiner I, no. 322., Potthast no. 10890., RGIX III, no. 5216.

¹³⁴ According to Procházková the pope used the term of ethnicity because of the problematic Slavonia-concept. Procházková, "Some Notes," 108.

¹³⁵ According to Procházková the pope used the term of ethnicity because of the problematic Slavonia-concept. Procházková, "Some Notes," 108.

¹³⁶ There are two statements concerning the nature of Coloman's rule, which cannot be supported by any sources, but have to be discussed here briefly. The title *Duke of Spiš* has been already mentioned, which can be found many times in the works of Martin Homza. "*haličským kráľom, chorvátsko-slavónslcym i spišským vojvodom*". Homza *Uhorsko polska kronika*, 25. Idem, "Król Halicza,". The Slovak professor used the similarly controversial term, *Croatian-Slavonian Kingdom* as well. "*królestwo chorwacko-slawońskie*". *ibid.* The Croatian Vladimir Peter Goss, on the contrary, used the title *viceroi*, which cannot be found in the sources concerning Coloman. Goss, "Bishop Stjepan II," 211.

¹³⁷ RD no. 11., RA no. 500., 501., 599. And the charter of Béla of 1234: RA no. 604.

¹³⁸ See T. Almási, "Egy ciszterci bíboros a pápai világhatalom szolgálatában. Pecorari Jakab magyarországi legációja," [A Cistercian Cardinal in the Service of Papal Power. The Hungarian Legation of Jacob Pecorari] *Magyar egyháztörténeti vázlatok* 5 (1993) 135-138.

issue charters about this oath. It has to be emphasized, however, that the letters of the king and Béla were released by the staff of the papal legate and consequently they show the features of the *stilus curiae*.¹³⁹ But the charter of Coloman is in line with the literacy of the prince. All this can be corroborated with the *intitulationes* as well. Andrew II was only mentioned after legate Jacob, and even there in an unusually short formulation.¹⁴⁰ After a few days he had this charter transcribed and this latter version shows more regular elements, although the enumeration of the ruled territories is still missing.¹⁴¹ Concerning the charter of Béla we cannot speak about significant differences, despite the fact that it also can be connected to the personnel of the legate.¹⁴² The *intitulatio* of Coloman, however, fits to the pattern of his literacy in the 1230s.¹⁴³ The reason for this may be explained by the priorities of legate Jacob, since the guarantees of the king and his heir could have been more important for him, whereas that of the duke of Slavonia was only subsidiary.

We have to start the summary with underlining that regarding the *intitulationes* a heterogenic practice can only be found in the cases of the princes. This was not very significant during the time when Andrew was the prince, while it became characteristic with Béla and most of all with Coloman. If we throw a glance at the papal sources the mixed use of the titles is even more obvious. We cannot forget about the trend of a unification – which led to a stabile practice of issuing charters in both cases – and this trend went parallel with the consolidation of their rule. This issue has special importance for the uncritical use of data concerning the titles can lead to unfounded presumptions. The systematic analysis of the whole material, however, can reveal which expressions can be explained as probably false formulations and what kind of processes can be observed regarding the unification of the use of titles.

¹³⁹ See RA no. 500., 501., 599. Cf. Almási, "Egy ciszterci bíboros," 136–137. As the formulation of the charter of Coloman shows: "*litteras sigillo domini Andree illustris regis Ungarie*". Fejér CD III/2, 350., RD no. 11.

¹⁴⁰ "*Obis Domine Iacobe, Prenestine electe, Apostolice sedis legatē, vice et nomine Romane ecclesie, et omnium ecclesiarum Ungarie. Nos Andreas, rex Hungarie, iuramus ad sancta Dei evangeli [...]*". Fejér CD III/2, 319., RA no. 500.

¹⁴¹ "*Venerabili in Christo patri et amico carissimo, Iacobo, Dei gratia Praenestino electo, Apostolicæ sedis legato, Andreas Dei gratia rex Ungarie*". Fejér CD III/2, 326., RA no. 501.

¹⁴² "*Nos Bela Dei gratia rex, primogenitus domini Andree illustris regis Ungarie*". ÁÚO I, 306., RA no. 599. The term *dominus* has to be underlined which can be found in the next charter of Béla (1234) as well. "*Nos Bela, Dei gratia, rex, primogenitus domini Andree, regis Hungariae illustris*". Fejér CD III/2, 375., RA no. 604.

¹⁴³ "*Nos Colomanus, Dei gratia rex, et dux totius Sclavoniae*". Fejér CD III/2, 350., RD no. 11. The letters of Béla and the charters of Coloman were not addressed to the legate but were formulated with a general *inscriptio*. (*omnibus presentes litteras inspecturis*).